# University of Oregon – Student Recreation Center
## Workshop #5 – Schematic Design

### AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>January 17, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>University of Oregon – SRC Bonus Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12:30 – 1:00pm | **Student Steering Committee Meeting – SRC SSC**

- **12:30pm** Opening Comments (Gene Mowery)
- **12:35pm** Project Overview and Schematic Design Status Report (Jack Patton)
- **12:50pm** Q&A

### 1:00 – 5:00pm | **Project User Group Meeting 5A – SRC PUG, SRC MGMT**

- **1:00pm** Opening Comments/Project Update (Gene Mowery)
- **1:10pm** Review Agenda (Carl Sherwood)
- **1:15pm**
  - Review/Comparison of Area/Cost Model and CM/GC-IE Opinion of Cost
  - Conduct “Value Analysis” as needed
  - Confirm Priorities
- **1:45pm**
  - Review and Evaluation of Schematic Floor Plans (Design Team)
  - Program Area confirmation
  - Functional Layout/Organization
  - Healthy Oregon Integration
  - Yellow Zone location
  - Green / Outdoor Spaces
  - Accessibility
- **2:45pm** BREAK
- **3:00pm**
  - Review and Evaluation of Building Sections (Design Team)
  - Spatial Relationships and Transparencies
  - Vertical Adjacencies
  - Daylighting Strategies
- **3:30pm**
  - Review and Evaluation of Exterior Context, Building Mass, Character (Design Team)
  - Relationship to Campus Architecture
  - Relationship to Connected Buildings
  - Site Improvements
- **4:00pm**
  - Review and Confirm Key Questions/Decisions
  - Free Zone Continuity
  - Natatorium / Gym Locations
  - Locker Room Placement
  - Balanced Daylighting
  - Healthy Oregon Initiative
  - Control Zone Continuity
  - Phasing – Yellow Zone
  - East Side Activities
  - Open Space

Robertson | Sherwood| Architects pc + RDG Architecture pc + Poticha Architects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:30pm</td>
<td>Preliminary Recommendation for CPC Check-in Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50pm</td>
<td>Wrap Up / Conclusions / Notes (Carl Sherwood)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJECTIVES**

- Confirmation of Schematic Plan
- Reconciled Area/Cost Model
- Direction on Changes/Refinements
- Recommendations to CPC
As we move into more detailed plans, a few additional Patterns become more applicable as we evaluate the design opportunities. The following patterns associated with Workshop 5 build upon those provided with your agenda materials from Workshops 3 and 4. A simple listing is provided below and the text of each new pattern is provided on the pages to follow. As always, these are intended to prime the conversation as we consider important decisions that will confirm the design direction.

**Workshop 5 Patterns**

INCLUSIVE AND WELCOMING TO ALL

EASILY SUPERVISED

EVENT SUPPORT SPACE

MAXIMIZE REVENUE OPPORTUNITIES

**Workshop 3 and Workshop 4 Patterns** (refer to previous agenda materials for text of these patterns)

CLEAR ORGANIZATION, SIGHTLINES, AND ADJACENCY

ARCHITECTURAL STYLE

SUPPORTIVE OF SOCIAL INTERACTION

DYNAMIC BUILDING

ENOUGH SPACE AND CAPACITY

SOUTH FACING OUTDOORS

EASY ACCESS, YET APPROPRIATE LEVELS OF ACCESS CONTROL

GOOD NEIGHBOR

QUALITY OF LIGHT

PEDESTRIAN PATHWAYS*

FRESH AIR

POSITIVE OUTDOOR SPACE

LEAVE THE GOOD PARTS ALONE

FAMILY OF ENTRANCES
INCLUSIVE AND WELCOMING TO ALL
The SRC is open to the UO community and serves a wide range of students and UO community members, who are from different backgrounds, cultures, and countries, of different races, religions, ages, genders, and sizes, have different abilities, and have varying comfort levels with using recreation facilities.

Therefore, design the building with consideration for the potential to integrate diverse groups of people and create a welcoming and inclusive atmosphere for all. Design fitness areas in a way that welcomes all experience levels and abilities, and with consideration for those who want to be seen and those who may not. Provide a variety of comfortable social spaces that meet the varying needs of users, such as places to be alone, meet in small to large groups, places that are more open or more enclosed. Take advantage of opportunities to facilitate social interaction (such as a café and other “common denominator” amenities). Consider the varying needs and desires for privacy, particularly with respect to changing and using the

EASILY SUPERVISED
Supervision required to ensure safe and effective use of facilities and equipment varies considerably from activity to activity. Labor costs associated with activity supervision account for a major portion of operational expenses in recreational facilities and can result in reduced facility-access hours.

Therefore, the design of the facility should consider the unique supervision needs of each activity, including specialized design of supervisory stations, as appropriate, maximizing spatial control with minimal personnel. Sight lines, electronic communication systems, and video cameras, for example, may help facilitate supervision.

EVENT SUPPORT SPACE
Campus-wide tournaments are popular recreation events. The current facility does not contain a gathering space specifically designed to support the organization of large events. The Student Recreation Center should have the capacity and appropriate space to hold and support campus-wide tournaments and other large events inside and outside the building.

Therefore, make comfortable, easily accessible gathering and support space(s) that is conducive to social interaction and that can accommodate the organizational needs of such events. Design the space(s), required systems, and circulation so that other parts of the building can remain operational during an event. Consider options for periodic separate entry for large special events to spaces like the natatorium, tennis, or gymnasium complex.

MAXIMIZE REVENUE OPPORTUNITIES
Every aspect of the student’s higher-education experience must be delivered in the most cost-effective manner possible. The Student Recreation Center depends on student fees for operational and equipment expenses. However, as operation costs rise and as student-fee support reaches its limits of tolerance, the recreation center must become increasingly self-supporting.

Therefore, while the center’s purpose is to provide recreation facilities for students, the design should maximize current and new opportunities for generating income by developing versatile spaces that are adaptable to a variety of uses, both in the short and long term, and to the specific needs to fee-paying groups.