

Student Recreation Center Expansion Project  
 User Group Meeting 1  
 March 3, 2011  
 10:00-11:30

**Meeting Notes**

<p><b><u>User Group in Attendance:</u></b>          Geoff Hale, SRC Advisory Board          Brent Harrison, SRC          Bryan Haunert, SRC          Kristen Gleason, EMU/Club Sports          Dennis Munroe, SRC          Jen Phillips, Neuroscience          Derick Olsen, SRC          Rob Thallon, AAA          Sue Wieseke, SRC</p>	<p><b><u>Other Participants:</u></b>          Kody Nathe, Architecture          Student/SAFAC Member           Charlene Lindsay, Capital Construction          Darin Dehle, Capital Construction</p>
<p><b><u>User Group Not in Attendance:</u></b>          Mike Eyster, Student Affairs</p>	<p><b><u>Staff in Attendance:</u></b>          Gene Mowery, CPRE          Emily Eng, CPRE</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b><u>Notes by: EE/GM</u></b></p>	

1. Introductions
2. Role of User Group and Project Process
  - (A) Gene introduced “Role of User Group” description. Encourage all to read through if haven’t already done so.
  - (B) Gene pointed out the YGH Architects 2004 Concept Study and noted that user groups are not bound by concept studies. The study is one firm’s idea of a possible solution at a given point in time. Factors have changed since the study and will likely result in a design solution that deviates from the 2004 concept. Gene recommended reviewing the YGH study but recognizing that it is only a resource and this project starts with a clean slate. Link to study written on meeting agenda.
  - (C) Gene gave quick overview of the *Campus Plan* and encouraged all to review and become familiar with the document. The *Campus Plan* contains Policies and Patterns that will be used as guidelines for the project. The user group will create additional patterns that will be documented in a Project Description, along with other information, and given to the Architect firm as a basis for design and dialogue with the user group. Link to *Campus Plan* written on meeting agenda.

3. Comments and Project History by User Group Chair, Dennis Munroe
  - (A) 3,000 students when Esslinger Hall was originally built in 1937
  - (B) Late to game for building rec facilities, compared to peers
  - (C) Leighton built in 1958; Facility wasn't expanded until 1999
  - (D) Challenged for capacity / currently 5000 users per day
  - (E) 189 phys ed courses; generate 16,000 credits for UO
  - (F) Significant new feature of expansion is natatorium
  - (G) Important key element – hubs for interaction
  
4. Group Discussion: Project Vision, Expectations, and Goals
  - (A) Question asked: When the project is complete, what effect would you like to see the project have on the campus community?
    - 1) Potential for integrating all/diverse groups on campus
    - 2) Welcoming environment for all ages, gender, ability
    - 3) “Common Denominator Hub”
    - 4) Hub of Activities – not just recreation but gathering /social activities
    - 5) Continues to draw students/fac/staff in one location to recreate/socialize/learn
    - 6) Space to do everything in daily routine
    - 7) Create continuing buzz about the atmosphere/quality of spaces and the facility as a whole
    - 8) Location is ideal for a central campus hub/ EMU-SRC relationship
    - 9) Generate positive visual impression from east
    - 10) Multiple entries/heighten presence (recognize need for central entry control point)
    - 11) Place where education happens
      - i. Habits formed for life
      - ii. Enhance educational mission
  
  - (B) Question asked: When the project is complete, what effects should the project have on the programs/departments in the building?
    - 1) Provide the ability to create more programs and a diverse selection of programs
    - 2) Enough space in all venues to allow drop in activity, anytime in the day, for any activity
    - 3) Provide capacity for eliminating crowding and allow for new creative growth opportunities
    - 4) Space allows flexibility and ability to react to trends
    - 5) Be in a situation to fully be able to meet the varied needs of users
    - 6) Hub within the building for faculty and staff (and student workers?) to strengthen work relationships - all inclusive
    - 7) Support core purpose: Active, balanced lives
    - 8) Ability for significant customer service

- (C) Question asked: What quality of space/look and feel of interior do you envision?
- 1) Open, light-filled and contemporary
  - 2) Colorful, energizing, spirited ... inspiring ... relaxing
  - 3) Supports mental and physical well-being
  - 4) Sustainable, tech savvy, accessible to all
  - 5) First impression – Wow factor!
  - 6) Sightlines between activities –ability to see through one activity area into another through level of transparency between spaces
  - 7) Supportive of social space and academic study – destination place for such activity
    - a. Juice and/or coffee bar (open to community), as example
  - 8) Areas to wait for classes, shield from rain, etc...
  - 9) Supportive of synergies with Human Phys and Healthy Campus Initiative
  - 10) Portray a fun place to be (University of Missouri themes cited as example)
  - 11) School pride / branding opportunity (we are past paranoia of portraying too much school pride that has been perception in the past number of years)
  - 12) Well organized space and building plan layout, easy way-finding
  - 13) Comfortable, not intimidating (especially for first time users), inviting
  - 14) First impression also welcoming and inclusive
  - 15) Seamless transition between expansion and existing building spaces

## 5. Schedule

### (A) Pre-design schedule distributed:

- a. Tasks – produce Project Description based on information taken from User Group sessions. Gene will take lead on writing and producing the Project Description document; User Group to review and confirm; Project Description given to architect firms selected for interviews.
- b. Request for Qualifications (RFQ) - Gene writes and submits to Department of Justice for review; User Group reviews and scores RFQ responses and selects architect firms for interviews – targeted for week of April 25-29.
- c. Architect interviews and selection targeted for week of May 23-27.
- d. Contract negotiation with Architect takes place over the summer.

### (B) Design and Construction phase schedule distributed:

- a. User Group will start design process with architects in early October.
- b. Expect heavy User Group involvement during Schematic Design phase – potentially October through December; less involvement in Design Development phase.
- c. Caution that this schedule is conceptual and the dates of the phases and construction should not be thought of as definitive, particularly the end of construction and occupancy dates. Do not distribute this schedule for fear that others will think this dates are set in stone.

6. Next Steps

(C) Next meeting scheduled for April 1<sup>st</sup>, 8:30 – 10:00 in the SRC Bonus Room.

(D) Encourage all to familiarize themselves with the *Campus Plan*. See attachment

(E) If interested review the 2004 YGH Concept Study. See attachment

(F) If interested review the 2011 Brailsford & Dunlavey Master Plan and Campus Consultation Process, Erb Memorial Union & Student Recreation Center, Final Report. See attachment.

-End of Meeting-