



## UO Student Recreation Center Project User Group (PUG) Meeting 2B – 10/27/11

### Program Development – follow up meeting

User Group:	Dennis Munroe	UO	PE & Rec	present
	Mike Eyster	UO	Student Affairs	
	Bryan Haurert	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	
	Kristen Gleason	UO	Club Sports	present
	Jen Phillips	UO	Neuroscience	present
	Julie Haack	UO	Chemistry	
	Rob Thallon	UO	Architecture	
	Support	Gene Mowery	UO	Planning
Emily Eng		UO	Planning	present
Charlene Lindsay		UO	FS Cap Con	
Design Team	Jack Patton	RDG	Architect	present
	Jeff Schaub	RDG	Architect	present
	Michael Andresen	RDG	Energy	present
	Otto Poticha	Poticha	Architect	
	Carl Sherwood	RSA	Architect	present
	Dave Guadagni	RSA	Architect	present
	Matt Koehler	CM	Landscape	present
	Justin Caron	ADG	Pool Design	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. Reviewed the program elements that are currently in the budget, that currently exist, and that are hoped for.
2. The User Group will receive project data sheets that include information from the PUG and focus group meetings.
3. The four plan organization options outlined in workshop 2A were again presented. This time the spaces were reduced to their basic organizational diagram by trace paper overlays that emphasized groupings of program elements rather than individual spaces. These are diagram studies in order to understand spatial / functional relationship rather than proposed floor plans. (See also Pro/Con Live Notes on Project Webpage.)

- a. Option 1:  
Pro: 3-story option, roof garden, south expansion area.  
Con: No east access, flat roof, no track expansion, outdoor space not covered.  
Comment: Gym over pool is acceptable.
- b. Option 2:  
Pro: Good daylight opportunities, good views, could expand at Tennis Center.  
Con: Expansion to east, undesirable linear pool alignment.  
Comments: the fitness and weights areas might move with a future east infill expansion in order to maintain views.
- c. Option 3:  
Pro: Good top daylight opportunity, good dynamics at entry/free zone, potential for privacy at pool.  
Con: Uses whole site, no future expansion except at Tennis Center.  
Comment: Liked excitement & complexity of zone between entry and control.
- d. Option 4:  
Pro: Liked east access, liked stacking.  
Con: Pool below grade, down view to pool, leisure pool not close to exterior.  
Comment: Concern for privacy separation of recessed pool and field level and wonder about possible pool level exterior deck.

- 4. General notes regarding the 4 schemes:
  - a. Like potential of free zone access between Esslinger and SRC. Esslinger spaces that could be connected to free zone include:
    - 1. Administration offices, Peg's office and all Rec and PE offices now at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor
    - 2. Outdoor Pursuits offices
    - 3. Human Physiology classrooms
    - 4. New Conference Rooms.
  - b. Group likes the through building north/south free zone
  - c. Group wants free zone to connect to east field level access.
  - d. One individual said that any outdoor BB courts need to be covered.
  - e. Consider possible future expansion at Tennis Center location. Possible funding problem with remaking the courts above the expansion. Tennis Center is shared with Athletics.
  - f. 3-story schemes are preferred so long as sound transmission is mitigated/managed
  - g. Interior views into pool are important.
  - h. Some areas of privacy at pool are desired.
  - i. Like the irregularity illustrated at Entry area in Scheme 3. Way finding needs to be understandable with out everything being linear.
  - j. Like pool at southeast corner for possible southern exposure even though this exposure might be lost with future expansion

- 5. Group decision / direction:
  - a. 3-story scheme
  - b. Free zone connecting north, south and east entries.
  - c. SRC free zone space connection to free-zone Esslinger
  - d. Views into Natatorium
  - e. No turnstiles at entry.

- 6. New plan diagrams will be presented at the next workshop and the next workshop will include an integrated design session in the Thursday at 11:00 time slot.

End of Report