



**UO Student Recreation Center  
Project User Group (PUG) Meeting 1b – 10/6/11**

**Programming – follow up meeting**

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

Guests

**MEETING MINUTES**

1. Due to the loss of the G-bonds the total project budget has been diminished from \$61 million to \$50 million. The \$50 million project budget would provide about a \$35 million direct construction budget. The other \$15 million would be for furnishings and equipment, design and engineering fees, testing, permits, facilities management costs etc.
2. Two Handouts were attached to the Agenda:
  - a. A Synthesis of Tour Notes “Take-Aways” was distributed and Carl noted that this is a working draft. The architects will develop additional project Patterns based on the list. User Group members were encouraged to think about and submit Pattern suggestions of their own.
  - b. A summary of the Benefits / Drawbacks of the existing facility that were recorded at User Group Meeting 1a.

3. Carl reviewed 3 Patterns:
  - a. Enough Space and Capacity: Up to 7,000 users, support drop-in use and Plan for growth.
  - b. Leave Good Parts Alone
  - c. Future Expansion
  
4. The four main priorities in order were reviewed:
  - a. Aquatics
  - b. Court sports
  - c. Weights and Fitness
  - d. Way finding
  
5. Aquatics overview:
  - a. Option 1: (2) tanks one at 50 meter and one leisure
  - b. Option 2: (2) to (3) tanks one 25m x 25yd, one 25yd and one leisure
  - c. The Option 2 with (3) tanks give programming and water temperature flexibility and is less water surface, energy usage and natatorium space than Option 1.
  - d. The aquatics program should also accommodate 1 water polo course, a spa and a steam room.
  - e. Leighton Pool: Justin spoke about the existing pool: The bones (structure) of the existing pool are good. The "organs" are in disarray...filters and chemicals etc need replacement. Rim flow gutters are the current standard for university pools. Switching to a rim-flow gutter will would be problematic due to the existing pool depths. The pool floor would need to be lowered 8". The surge tank is a problem and needs to be replaced at \$80,000. Regrouting the pool is a yearly expense. The pool would need a new skin. The pool is not in full ADA compliance. Air quality is also a concern.
  
6. Jack reviewed the program elements that would make up the other three priorities: Court Sports, Weight and Fitness, and Way Finding. Refer to separate diagrams for the program elements included in the 4 priorities and the optional additional program elements under consideration.
  
7. Jack presented preliminary budget information that illustrated that the 4 main priorities plus necessary site work and a 10% contingency would have a cost of about \$31,795,000. This would allow for some added pieces beyond the 4 priorities. Adding everything that the group would like, to the project would raise the budget to about \$49,000,000 which is well beyond the available money. Refer to preliminary budget summary sheet.
  
8. At some point in the not to distant future it is likely that Esslinger Hall will be demolished and a new building constructed in its place. Currently the lower levels of Esslinger and some of the upper office spaces are occupied by PE and Rec. This project needs to consider the ramifications of this possibility. Jack presented 3 Scenarios for consideration (refer to diagrams):
  - a. Relocate: Reserve space on the SRC site for future relocation of PE and Rec program elements now located in Esslinger.
  - b. Replace: Plan that when Esslinger is demolished that PE and Rec spaces will be replaced in kind in the Esslinger replacement building. In this approach the future building will need to deal with the unusual sizes and heights of Rec spaces along with potential acoustic issues. Also of concern would be the loss of program and administration spaces during the Esslinger construction.
  - c. Renovate: Plan on spending part of this and future budgets on renovating spaces in Esslinger with the idea that the building will remain.

9. Consensus to remove Leighton Pool. After discussion of Justin's findings and their future needs including the concern for Way Finding the group decided to demolish Leighton Pool and construct a new lap pool as part of a larger aquatics program elsewhere on the site.
10. Consensus to proceed with Aquatics Option 2 to build a leisure pool and either (1) large or (2) smaller tanks of water for lap swimming and other programs. A 50 meter pool will not be part of the project. There is a limited number of people that would be served by a 50 meter pool and the changing of 25 yard crossing lane lines to 50 meter lanes lines will be very labor intensive.
11. Consensus to proceed with "Relocate" site scenario and to reserve space on the SRC site for the future relocation of Esslinger program elements. The reserved space needs to be claimed by SRC and the cost of the future relocation will need to be funded by which ever group takes over the Esslinger site.
12. Larry reviewed site opportunities and concerns.
13. PUG meetings will typically be scheduled for every third week and the next PUG meeting will include more patterns, discussion on functional relationships, conceptual diagrams and use of site. There will be a 4 week gap between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> PUG meeting due to the thanksgiving holiday.

End of Report