



**UO Student Recreation Center  
Project User Group (PUG) Meeting 1a – 10/4/11**

**Programming**

User Group:	Dennis Munroe	UO	PE & Rec	present
	Mike Eyster	UO	Student Affairs	
	Bryan Haunert	UO	PE & Rec	present
	Brent Harrison	UO	PE & Rec	present
	Sue Wieseke	UO	PE & Rec	present
	Geoff Hale	Student	SRC Advisory Bd	present
	Michelle Vander Heyden	Student	ASUO	present
	Derick Olsen	Student	SRC Student Emp	
	Kristen Gleason	UO	Club Sports	present
	Jen Phillips	UO	Neuroscience	present
	Julie Haack	UO	Chemistry	present
	Rob Thallon	UO	Architecture	present
Support	Gene Mowery	UO	Planning	present
	Emily Eng	UO	Planning	present
	Charlene Lindsay	UO	FS Cap Con	present
	Darin Dehle	UO	FS Cap Con	present
Design Team	Jack Patton	RDG	Architect	present
	Jeff Schaub	RDG	Architect	present
	Justin Platts	RDG	Architect	present
	Otto Poticha	Poticha	Architect	present
	Carl Sherwood	RSA	Architect	present
	Dave Guadagni	RSA	Architect	present
	Larry Gilbert	CM	Landscape	present
	Matt Koehler	CM	Landscape	present
G.Z. Brown	ESBL	Architect	present	
Guests	Robin Holmes	UO	Student Affairs	present

**MEETING MINUTES**

1. Robin Holmes introduction – There is a Challenge and Vision for the project. This project with the EMU can and should “transform” the university. These projects should support the campus as a community and help all to stay connected. These projects will support “LIVE AFTER 5” for the UO. Our campus will have vibrant facilities that integrate student and academic affairs. We want building facilities that have spaces for everyone so they must be flexible and multi-use. Think about what the campus needs to be in a broad sense. We want to make a statement about who we are and what we can be with this project. The facility will have an impact on and be attractive to new students. It will be a recruiting element that will bring in and retain students and faculty. It will support student, staff, and faculty interaction and will be accessibility for all. It is a tall order!
2. Per Gene Mowery the decision making should be according to the following:

- a. All voices are heard.
  - b. Strive for clear directions and decisions... consensus will be critical. Thumbs up or thumbs down will be utilized for decisions.
  - c. Decisions will not be made outside the group.
  - d. There is a secondary management group that will meet on a weekly basis that will mostly deal with project logistics and project management.
3. Carl Sherwood summarized the Agenda, budget and patterns of a global nature.
4. Jack presented a slide show of the various university campus recreation facilities visited by the tour group last month. A tour memo dated September 21<sup>st</sup> was distributed. The following are comments about the various facilities.
- a. University of Cincinnati
    - 1. Building was dark and oppressive due to materials and colors selected.
    - 2. Main street was "harsh". Facility had dramatic but uninviting spaces.
    - 3. Leisure pool was not connected visually to the rest of the facility.
    - 4. Pool tanks ran off the same mechanical system so both the lap and leisure pools were the same temperature.
    - 5. Separate pool entrance for spectators offered dual control.
    - 6. Sense of being "on a cruise ship at the bottom of the ocean"
  - b. Ohio State University
    - 1. Double Control
    - 2. Good natural day light
    - 3. Good entry and good free zone walk through spaces.
    - 4. Sun deck not attached to pool deck
    - 5. Racquet ball side wall glazing was not successful.
    - 6. The large natatorium had an overemphasis on children play.
    - 7. Facility had a demonstration kitchen and a cardio equipment repair space.
  - c. University of Dayton
    - 1. The entry system allowed for portions of the building to be used for special events.
    - 2. The fitness areas were remote.
    - 3. A poor use of natural light in gym caused glare problems.
    - 4. The sidelines of the basket ball courts were unsafe
    - 5. There was a lot of daylight which worked well in most locations.
    - 6. The facility had commercial grade laundry equipment.
    - 7. There was a good hybrid lap and leisure pool
    - 8. Food service was behind control and not successful.
    - 9. The facility had an over bold color scheme based on school colors.
    - 10. The building had good social spaces.
  - d. Ball State
    - 1. The free weights were on a lower level but had good day lighting
    - 2. TVs were well placed in lieu of having them integral with each piece of equipment.
    - 3. Building exterior materials traversed into the interiors.
    - 4. There was an indoor turf area with skylights
    - 5. There was a separate entry for outdoor recreation.
    - 6. All corridors were in the free zone with check-in at each activity area.
    - 7. The building had good I-Pod connectivity
    - 8. Office spaces were not satisfactory.
  - e. Indiana State

1. The open scheme in places creates acoustic problems between spaces such as the gym and main circulation.
  2. The steam room had a broad appeal.
  3. There was a good meet and greet entry.
  4. The building had a lot of plants.
- f. University of Illinois
1. The facility was built around an existing outdoor pool.
  2. A terrazzo floor was prevalent and worked very well.
  3. The climbing wall was cramped.
  4. The indoor running track was in an "L" configuration and had blind corners in places.
  5. Well sized group exercise rooms
  6. They had 340 birthday parties at the leisure pool last year and this was a good source of revenue.
  7. Customer service was not handled well
  8. There were good "framed" interior views.
  9. Separated women's weight area
- g. University of Illinois Chicago
1. The control desk was in a poor location.
  2. The food service was in a central location and was successful financially.
  3. The use of spray on fireproofing for the exposed steel was a bad choice for a recreation facility.
  4. Good use of day lighting.
  5. Separated women's weight area
5. General comments on the facilities toured:
- a. Ball state had asked all students what food venue they preferred. Quiznos was selected and was a good revenue source.
  - b. Cincinnati was the only LEED certified project and none of the projects used their facility for sustainability education.
  - c. Most facilities had a limited integration between indoor and outdoor activity spaces.
  - d. Only one facility had tennis in its MAC court
  - e. Some facilities were better than others for branding integration into the architecture.
  - f. Dennis's overall favorite was University of Illinois.
  - g. Ball State was also appreciated except for how they handled control.
  - h. The question arose as to if and how these projects were "transformational" for their campuses. Many of these buildings provided new opportunities for student social interaction, along with new pathways and campus destinations.
6. Project Goals (From UO - SRC Project Description)
- a. Support the mental, social and physical well being of the campus community.
    1. Provide spaces and programs that support pausing and reflection.
    2. Provide diverse programs and spaces with an emphasis on multi-purpose.
    3. Consider using satellite fitness programs or wellness carts.
    4. Consider providing wellness information centers with interactive displays.
    5. Provide spaces for unscheduled interaction – social and brainstorming
  - b. Provide for new and future programs and growth.
    1. The current SCR was designed for a student population of about 16,000. We should plan for 24,500 students with possible additional future growth.
    2. Expand aquatics and provide a leisure pool.

3. Consider future needs while knowing that the future will bring many unanticipated changes and needs.
  - c. Fully meet the needs of all users
    1. Make the facility a magnet for all students as a social opportunity even if they are not involved in recreational pursuits.
    2. Create both open and private areas. Many beginners, people with image issues and individuals from other cultures are sometimes intimidated by or uncomfortable in open settings.
    3. Consider acoustic issues between adjacent spaces. Provide some quiet spaces.
  - d. Integrate academic uses into the building
    1. Provide spaces that support teaching. Virtually every space except cardio should be capable of being a “classroom”
    2. Provide seating at spaces so that they can be used to support both recreation and teaching
7. What works well in the current facility
- a. Great views to the north cardio and weights and to the east from the track.
  - b. Cubbies work well at group exercise areas.
  - c. Locker room hall with its art work, sky lights and seating alcoves is well used.
  - d. Entrance is light filled and welcoming
  - e. Good proximity to outdoor fields and tennis courts.
  - f. Good well proportioned and open feeling cardio area.
  - g. Building is a beacon at night due to gazing at fitness area.
  - h. Good indoor track that could be even better with an additional lane.
  - i. Good connection between weight room 50 and adjacent gym
  - j. 1999 SRC addition works well.
  - k. Good and “natural” feeling exterior entry, but would be better if fountain was functioning.
  - l. Food for events is typically catered.
8. What works poorly in the current facility:
- a. Way finding is a problem
  - b. Facility too small – sense that people are being “herded”
  - c. There is a bottle neck at controls and equipment check-out particularly at class change surge times
  - d. There is a problem with accessibility at upper Esslinger areas
  - e. There are ventilation shortcomings at several Esslinger rooms.
  - f. Courts 4 and 5 are lacking spectator areas
  - g. Administration area is beyond control and the Recreation and PE offices are separated.
  - h. Pool facilities are in poor condition, poor location, and are too small. They lack cubbies and the 3-meter diving board is unsafe and shut for use.
  - i. Racquet ball and squash courts are not regulation size.
  - j. Laundry is in Gerlinger hall and should be in the SRC.
  - k. Delivery comes in at front of building.
  - l. Fountain not working.
9. LEED and Sustainable goals? Don’t want to lose program space to achieve LEED levels. The priority is program space considering the space requirements. Should strive for sustainability. “We are looking for a highly sustainable building”. A transformational building should be cutting edge. Net zero gain, per Oregon Model for Sustainable Development, is tough to achieve but it is a target. LEED certification is not a priority but upholding high sustainability standards will be. At some point the group will want to add up the LEED points and decide then if they will go for certification.

10. Future Mac Court work might impact back of building. In addition Esslinger Hall might be demolished and rebuilt in not too distant future
11. Project Priorities were confirmed:
  - a. Aquatics
  - b. Court sports – 3 new gyms
  - c. Fitness – double current area
  - d. Way finding

End of Report