

**Lewis Integrative Science Building**  
**Meeting Notes**

Held: June 11, 2009

In Attendance: Jim Hutchison, Lou Moses, John Conery, George Sprague, Mike Jefferis, Corey Griffin, Rick Glover, (Bruce Bowerman)

Design Team: Laurie Canup, Steve Simpson, Becca Cavell

UO: Fred Tepfer, Emily Eng, Chris Ramey, Martina Bill

Subject: Campus Character, Part I

---

**Summary**

The CUG viewed a slideshow that provided an overview of the UO campus character. The purpose of this meeting was for the CUG to become familiar with this topic and to have an initial open discussion on what design elements might be appropriate or not for the exterior of LISB. This document includes individual comments from CUG members. An overall summary of these comments suggests that the participants prefer:

- A building that has some depth and variation in the façade
- Composition, materials & detail that make the building feel academic and human-scaled
- Clean details
- A building that responds to its location on campus

**Comments**

**Building Meets the Sky:**

- Tower could work, if not redundant
- Like variety of sizes in heights of windows
- Not appropriate/Don't Prefer:
  - Jagged roofline of Knight Law School
  - Corrugated sheet metal at the top of the Living Learning Center
  - The look of College of Ed
  - Villard's roofline (historic building) because it is too severe
  - A complex roofline, or too much complexity
- Mechanical system may be a factor in the appearance of the roofline

**Rhythm of Windows:**

- Appropriate/Prefer:
  - Willamette rhythm because of the repetitive accents and 3-D feeling
  - Variation, depth in facade
- Not appropriate/Don't Prefer:
  - Gerlinger rhythm (annoying), too much rhythm and repetition, windows are too big and don't feel human-scaled
  - Cascade (feels too flat)
  - Windows that span multiple floors and seeing lab clutter through windows

**Bold Main Entrances:**

- LISB main entrance won't be central, examples don't seem to relate to LISB

- Knight Library example shows entrance off to the side, like LISB, but that entrance feels convoluted and LISB entrance should be clear
- Deschutes entry feels false because it doesn't seem to go anywhere once inside
- Like feeling of Chapman Hall- arch and windows above accentuate the door
- Like Lillis entry because it represents the space beyond

### **Secondary Entrances: More than just an entrance**

- These entrances seem to be clearer than the main entrance examples
- Because of detail and clear color contrast of secondary entrances shown in examples, it is obvious where the entrance is
- Willamette Atrium secondary entrance looks like something that would work for main entry of LISB

### **Operable Windows & Window Details:**

- Like windows with more panes- feels more academic. Plain windows feel more commercial
- Like window details- if details in the window frame are not possible, consider details in the brick around the window
- Need to respect lab function and consider energy efficiency goals
- Might not want operable windows near pigeon habitat

### **Composition (Top, Middle, Bottom):**

- In general, prefer the look and idea of a top, middle and bottom
- Will be important to do in keeping with adjacent buildings

### **Arcades:**

- Like:
  - Covered walkway on Science Walk
  - Arcades that allow light to come in
  - Columns/features that relate to other science buildings
- Willamette stairway arcade is not too effective- big concrete wall blocks access and makes it too dark
- Transition space (from inside to out) is good, but arcade may not be necessary. A shelter at entry could help with the transition.
- Would an arcade be redundant? Do arcades make sense given the interior connections?
- Arcades may be important to students and those who don't know the insides of buildings

### **Details:**

- Like:
  - Simple detail, not too busy. Prefer clean to ornate (group agreement)
  - Brick detail with lighter color (makes a difference)
  - Gargoyles
- Most examples of details don't seem appropriate for LISB
- Streisinger and Deschutes seem to capture what this area of campus is about
- Buildings should represent the time in which they were built. This might mean simpler details
- Details on the School of Music addition and Rec Center are too sleek
- User group members are encouraged to take a look at other buildings on campus- old and new. Newer buildings may have more to offer than at first glance