



UO Student Recreation Center Project User Group (PUG) Meeting 2A – 10/25/11

Program Development

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	
	Michelle Vander Heyden	Student	ASUO	present
	Derick Olsen	Student	SRC Student Emp	present
	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
Design Team	Jack Patton	RDG	Architect	present
	Jeff Schaub	RDG	Architect	present
	Michael Andresen	RDG	Energy	present
	Otto Poticha	Poticha	Architect	present
	Carl Sherwood	RSA	Architect	present
	Dave Guadagni	RSA	Architect	present
	Matt Koehler	CM	Landscape	present
Guests	Peg Rees	UO	PE & Rec	present

MEETING MINUTES

Diagrams and other visual information presented at this workshop and noted below are available at the UO project web site: <http://pages.uoregon.edu/eeng/src.html>

1. Jack Patton reviewed priority list, program elements, program / budget summary, and three site options as were agreed upon during the first workshop.
2. During this workshop the User Group was encouraged to look at the “Big Picture” and not so much at the detail. There will be 9 focus group meeting to look at particular program areas and their dimensional, operational and storage needs, and important programmatic adjacencies.
3. In response to the question, are there potential program pieces that are missing, the group responded as follows:
 - a. There is a need for more rock wall, it is not large enough, not tall enough and does not have a ceiling.
 - b. More indoor track is desirable.

- c. Golf simulator.
 - d. Indoor turf
 - e. Accountant suite
 - f. Outreach space
 - g. Instructor room of about 400 sf for sharing by 60 part time instructors. Only a few instructors would be in the space at any one time. Include cubbies and computers.
 - h. Upscale separate locker rooms for staff.
 - i. Additional courts beyond the 3 court gym.
 - j. Enough social and support spaces for 24,000 students.
4. Rooms should be considered / designed to support being rentable.
 5. Carl presented a series of “Patterns” for consideration and discussion – refer to the Agenda for the Patterns section or visit the website. New patterns were included, but not discussed in detail. The User Group was asked to review and consider the new patterns before the next workshop.
 6. The site issues were reviewed and illustrated on a site diagram – refer to website for diagram.
 7. A functional relationship diagram was presented showing the proximities / connections between the various key program elements. Refer to web site for diagram The following was noted:
 - a. There will be a separation of the “free” zone from the “controlled” zone spaces.
 - b. Free zone to include: entry, juice bar (if added to program), social space, administration, outdoor pursuits. The diagram showed club sports in the free zone but it should move to a controlled space close to the gym.
 - c. An intermediate zone linking the “Free” and “Controlled” zones should include: control, pro-shop, and equipment check-out. Note that the location of some of these spaces was discussed in more depth in the Focus Group #1 session held latter.
 - d. Controlled zone would include aquatics, lockers, wet class, racquet ball, group ex., gyms, fitness, & weights, track, social spaces, and exterior deck.
 - e. Exterior storage will be required to replace space lost by the addition.
 - f. Outdoor fields should be added to the diagram noting its connection to other related spaces.
 - g. Does the building have more than one controlled entry? This is a fundamental decision with both convenience considerations weighed against long term cost implications. How would second entry impact security or support rentals?
 - h. Social spaces should be view points for multiple activity spaces.
 - i. Ideally the wet and dry locker rooms are combined. It might be OK to split wet from dry until Esslinger is replaced but room for locker room growth will need to be set aside. Note that in latter discussion it was decided to build combined wet and dry lockers now.
 8. The User Group broke up into 3 smaller groups with design team members working with each group. The groups then explored the possible positioning of the major elements (3-gym, aquatics and locker rooms) on the site by using site plans and paper cut-outs. This exercise was followed by a whole group discussion of the issues raised by this exercise:
 - a. Placing the new gyms by the old gyms might be of value but not essential.
 - b. There should be a simple to understand path between any separated fitness and weights areas.
 - c. There will be potential privacy issue if pools are placed by entry or if viewed from field level.
 - d. If pools have an exterior deck it should be a raised and securable area.

- e. The 3 dimensional relationships should be considered along with the side by side relationships when locating program elements.
9. The design team presented four preliminary building organizations. Refer to website for these diagrams. Each option had multiple levels.
- a. Option 1: Three levels, with the natatorium at southeast main level and a reserve zone along south edge. The new 3-court gym would be at upper level above natatorium. The free zone would run north to south and would descend at the control point to go under the controlled area before rising to connect to the south exterior.
 - b. Option 2: Three levels with the natatorium at the southeast corner of site and the building forming a “C” shape with an east facing reserve space courtyard. The new 3-court gym would be at upper level southeast corner of site above the natatorium. The track could be expanded. The free zone would run north to south and would descend at the control point to go under the controlled area before rising to connect to the south exterior. This scheme maximizes views to the east.
 - c. Option 3: Two level scheme with natatorium at south east corner of site and new 3 court gym at same level and adjacent to existing gyms. Upper level would have fitness and support spaces. The track could be expanded. The flowing and irregularly shaped free zone would run north to south and would descend at the control point to go under the controlled area before rising to connect to the south exterior. This scheme uses the whole site and does not leave much of a reserve space. In the future it might be possible to deconstruct the Tennis Center and use this space for expansion then rebuild the Tennis Center above the expansion.
 - d. Option 4: Three level scheme with the natatorium at the southeast basement (playing field) level and a reserve space to the south. The 3-court gym would be at the entry level and adjacent to the existing gyms and above the natatorium. The free zone would run north to south and would descend at the control point to go under the controlled area before rising to connect to both the south exterior and to the east fields.
 - e. In all four options the fitness and exercise spaces could be used to fill gaps between the larger program elements.
 - f. Note that these schemes are diagrams only and are not solutions. They are meant to raise various issues related to placement of the large program elements and reserve space on the site.
10. The user group again broke into three smaller groups to discuss and rank how well or how poorly the various schemes supported the “Patterns”.
11. The group got back together and discovered each group had approached the exercise differently. All agreed that this use of the patterns was a miss because they were not the same patterns identified earlier. No consensus was reached during this discussion on any of the Options. The Design Team was charged with further evaluation and analysis of the Options prior to Workshop User Group Meeting 2B.

End of Report