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## OBJECTIVES

- Well-Defined Values / Goals
- Confirm / Advance Pattern Language Discussion
- Know Benefits and Drawbacks from Existing Facility
- Have thorough understanding of the existing site and facilities
- Continued confirmation of Draft Program
- Refine Scope and Budget
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 21st 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.

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, skylights 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 bottleneck 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. Racquetball and squash courts are not regulation size.
   j. Laundry is a 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
Social, Physical, Well being

Diversity & Inclusion - opportunity
My space
Mental well being

Don't want to help people anymore!
Need to dramatically improve space

Balance life opportunities.

Support needed programs
Exercise & Creativity

[Brainstorming Space]
Low Tech - Wired Bond

Select space for interaction & meetings - (Balcony?)
Wellness Info & Conference - Integrated

- 23,000
- 24,000

24,500 Target
NEW PROGRAM OPPORTUNITIES

24 CLASSES, NOW 40 CLASSES
Leisure & Therapeutic Aquatics

Flexibility & High Function

Be prepared for the unknown

Variety meets all users
Respect different user types
- cultural
- physical

Fast & SLOW
- Quiet
- Earn

Balancing Sport & Recreation, body in the line of travel
185 academic classes

Active balanced lives
1a exhibits

University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

**Integrate academic use**

be a happy, respectful family

Blunt the line between academic & rec recreation space.

*Example:* 1.m. sun @ 3 heat 6 pm.

*Draw academic flow into space & design.*

**Exist facility**

- How to explain how to use space in daily
  - Not intuitive, through
  - Connection to upper track & wt room to outside = good
  - Some good views exist
  - Look to exist
  - Good view into fan green area
  - Front door across too right (especially at academic time)
  - Membership services (academic & rec. combines)
  - Not a one-stop shop (want to be)
  - Disabled access = great (physical access)
  - Like existing track. Want mixed + corners are good too
  - Biggest track too
- Court 4 & 5 have no racquet space.
- They are too small.
- RB Courts are too small
- Squash Courts not available
- Need to bring bags to court to store racquet cases
- Need multiple grain ex to serve multiple matches
- Court size too small – 2x read
- Need to accommodate across class – need multiple grain ex space
- Room 50 = weight room
- Need more bags and unreserved space. Want to join
- Want staff to be prepared to coach others

- Blog & forum ideas = promote?
- Aggregate collection of ideas
- Opinions & visibility are hits & winners
- Easy to share about
- Good comments
- Good suggestions & ideas
- Like our new logo (not finished)
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- Pool - all of it
  - Nickel size "Q" (even for Rec)
  - Not enough, whole space -
  - all in the pool, right now -
  - no place to wait -
  - inadequate -

- Main entry -
  - art & space @ hallway (N/3)
  - new & old spaces merge now.
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Program Development

- Quantitative - What is included? Spaces? Sizes?
- Qualitative - What should it be like to experience? How should it look and feel?

Policies and Patterns

- Our tools for development of the values that will guide the program
- Universal Access
  - Inclusive and Welcoming to All
- Sustainable Development
  - Engage in Sustainability, LEED Certification,
  - Function
  - Enough Space and Capacity; Comprehensive Yet Complimentary Activities
- Quality
  - Supportive of Social Interaction, Leave the Good Parts Alone
- Design
  - Dynamic Building, Clever Organization, Sightlines, and Adjacency

Revisit the Project Description

- Why? - Project conditions have changed…which may/will influence:
  - Goals
  - Types of Spaces
  - Priorities
- What has changed:
  - Budget - Reduced to Phase 1 Budget of $50,000,000
  - The future of Esslinger Hall
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Introduction
- University of Cincinnati
- Ohio State University
- University of Dayton
- Ball State University
- Indiana State University
- University of Illinois - Champaign-Urbana
- University of Illinois - Chicago
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center
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The Great Midwestern Tour!
### OBJECTIVES

- Establish / Confirm Program Priorities
- Determine Preferred Area/Cost Model Alternative
- Determine Goals for Leighton Pool
- Review applicable patterns to confirm
- Establish goals for next workshop
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) present
- 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) present
- 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. Wayfinding

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 Wayfinding. 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 3rd and 4th PUG meeting due to the thanksgiving holiday.

End of Report
1b exhibits
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Activity Space: 50 METER + LEISURE (ALL NEW)

Department:

Description:
- Pools
- Waterpool
- Pool meet
- AEI department office

Area: 32,000 NSF

Diagram:

Scale: 1" = 10' - 0"
PROGRAM DATA

Activity Space: 25m x 25y + 6 Lane Up + LEISURE (all NEW)
Area: 29,500 sq ft NET

Diagram:

105'

80'

165'

Scale: 1’ = 30’-0”

University of Oregon
Student Recreation Center

October 4-7, 2011
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RENOVATE LEIGHTON?... OR REPLACE

- Repair Tank
- New Finish, throughout
- New HVAC
- Renovate Pool Mech
- Build to like new.

VS.

REPLACEMENT

- Build a new pool
- Deep & B M Board
- Deck Level Gates
- All New Pool Mech
- All New HVAC

Pool Cost = $2,400,000
\[\Delta = +700,000\]

Locker Cost = $550,000
\[\Delta = +1200,000\]
Top 4 Identified Program Priorities

- **Priority 1 – Aquatics**
  - Was important 12 years ago!

- **Priority 2 – Court Sports**
  - Note: Lose MC court drives this. Need Bldg REC not just BB!

- **Priority 3 – Weights & Fitness**
  - Need to balance 30% vs. 40% in space. Grow!!
  - Balance Btw. PE & REC.

- **Priority 4 – Way Finding**
  - One said to do it first.

**CONFIRMED!**
Evaluate Impact on Design Values / Goals / Patterns

- Enough Space and Capacity
- Leave the Good Parts Alone
- Future Expansion

Interactive Review / Comments on Initial Program Summary

- Aquatic Program Scenarios
  - Top Priority Spaces
  - Mix 'n Match?
  - What’s Needed for PE & Rec?
- Initial Observations on Leighton Pool
  - Current Opinions about Leighton Pool
- Area / Cost Model Scenarios & Diagrams
  - How much can we accomplish for $35 M?
  - Review Three Scenarios
- Site Layouts – Where do we Build?
  - Review Three Blocking Scenarios
**Scenario 1**

**Relocate**

**Strategy 1:** Reserve 100,000 square feet of buildable space in area now being considered for SRC expansion so that before Esslinger is demolished PE and Rec spaces can be replaced in this reserved area.

**Scenario 2**

**Replace**

**Strategy 2:** Reconstruct PE/Rec as part of new building at Esslinger site with the likely lose of use for lengthy periods of time during reconstruction.
**Scenario 3**

**Renovate**

**Strategy 3:** Esslinger is not demolished and PE/Rec spaces stay in place and are renovated as needed over time.

---

**Evaluate Impact on Design Values / Goals / Patterns**

- Enough Space and Capacity

- Leave the Good Parts Alone

- Future Expansion
Preliminary Site Opportunities & Constraints

- Building Site
- Adjacent Parcels
- What are we working with?

Wrap Up

- Conclusions Reached
  - Replace lengthen floor
  - Site Option
    - Scenario #1 Preferred
  - SOM or NOT?
    - Visitor Experience & Operation & Programming = goal
    - Use model pool, instead

- Look Ahead
  - Set direction for work to be accomplished for next User Group
  - WK of Oct 24, 2011
### Architectural Building Program Summary

RDG No. 2011.499.00  
Created: October 6, 2011

#### Workshop No. 1 - Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NSF</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total - Best Guess Each Scenario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,794,243</td>
<td>36,855,709</td>
<td>49,610,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITY 1 - AQUATICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Yds x 25 Meter Pool (e.g.; 10 Lanes @ 25 Yds)</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>SF Water</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,760</td>
<td>5,466,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Yds x 50 Foot Pool (e.g.; 6 Lanes @ 25 Yds)</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>SF Water</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>3,764,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Pool w/4 25 Yds Lap Lane</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>SF Water</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>3,644,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whirlpool</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Room (on Pool Deck)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>71,239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Mechanical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>790,485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natatorium Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>271,075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Director’s Offices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>37,343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Aquatic Director’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31,119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Guard Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>58,715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Locker Room</td>
<td>Replace Exist</td>
<td>Half-Size</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1,302,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Locker Room</td>
<td>Replace Exist</td>
<td>Half-Size</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1,302,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family / Unisex / Gender Neutral Locker Rooms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>134,478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Classroom</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>404,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Classroom Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>58,239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition Cost @ Leighton Pool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITY 2 - COURT SPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Court Gymnasium - 84 ft courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19,344</td>
<td>5,439,420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Court Gymnasium Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>232,958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator Seating</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>NSF Exist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>232,958</td>
<td>190,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITY 3 - WEIGHTS &amp; FITNESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weights &amp; Fitness</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Pieces Eq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>4,338,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Fitness Room Storage - New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>145,597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight and Fitness Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>34,231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITY 4 - WAYFINDING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding Improvements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**  
- NSF = Non-Sendable Funds  
- Extension = Cost of extending a program to a full capacity (e.g., adding more lanes to a pool)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NSF</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total - Best Guess Each Scenario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NSF</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSSIBLE REPLACEMENT SPACES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NSF</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub Totals 128,737 NSF

Net to Gross Ratio 47.615

Gross Area Totals 176,352 GSF 306,263 132,365 173,166

Bldg Cost Subtotal 28,209,358 31,886,330 43,481,452

Bldg Cost / GSF 265 241 251

Site Construction Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Site Costs 30,000 SF 1 600,000 2 600,000 3 600,000

Replace Outdoor Basketball 2 Courts 34,400 SF 1 99,360 2 99,360 3 99,360

Repairs at Existing Front Door 1 EA 1 225,000 2 225,000 3 225,000

Replace Synthetic Turf Field No. 2 1 EA 1 600,000 2 600,000 3 600,000

Parking Replacement 27 EA 1 94,500 2 94,500 3 94,500
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ENOUGH SPACE AND CAPACITY

With as many as 6,500 users on some days, space is so limited that the facility gets overly crowded, and classes and open recreation cannot occur in the same space simultaneously. The SRC’s goal is to be able to fully meet all the varied needs of its users. In the short and long term, the SRC should have the ability to react to trends and create more (and a diverse selection of) programs.

Therefore, organize layouts and provide enough space and capacity to allow users to drop in and do anything they wish. Pay particular attention to areas in which both drop-in activities and classes occur, such as cardio areas, weight room, natatorium. Consider long-term growth, and provide enough capacity and flexibility to allow the SRC to respond to trends and fully meet the needs of its users. Consider the capability for vertical expansion in the future.

LEAVE THE GOOD PARTS ALONE

Some spaces within the existing building work well as they are. Other elements of the building, including wood flooring materials, are worth keeping as well. It makes economic sense to retain the parts of the building that work as they are and focus the renovation efforts on the parts that do not work.

Therefore, when the renovation plans are made, those areas thought to work well as they are should be left alone.

FUTURE EXPANSION

Buildings inevitably change and expand over time to adapt to changing user needs.

Therefore, Consider the possibility of future expansion and change when designing a new building or addition.
### Student Recreation Center Patterns

#### LARGE SCALE CAMPUS

- **Universal Access** ("Inclusive and Welcoming to All")
- **Sustainable Development** ("Engage in Sustainability")
- **Welcoming to All** ("Inclusive and Welcoming to All")
- **Good Neighbor**
- **Outdoor Classroom**
- **Open-space Framework**
- **Comprehensive Yet Complimentary Activities***
- **Supportive of Social Interaction***
- **Inclusive and Welcoming to All***
- **Engage in Sustainability***

#### TRANSPORTATION

- **Bike Paths, Racks, and Lockers**
- **Pedestrian Pathways**
- **Path Shape**
- **Paths and Goals**
- **Shielded Parking and Service Areas**

#### SITE ARRANGEMENT

- **Site Repair**
- **Use Wisely What We Have***
- **Existing Uses/Replacement**
- **Positive Outdoor Space**
- **Main Building Entrance**
- **Family of Entrances**
- **Water Quality**
- **Seat Spots**
- **Sitting Wall**
- **Tree Places**
- **Activity Nodes**
- **Accessible Green**
- **Access to Water**
- **Building Complex**
- **Connected Buildings**
- **South Facing Outdoors**
- **Quiet Backs**
Benefits / Drawbacks Summary

Benefits:
- Great views to green space to north and play fields to east
- Building as beacon at night
- Good indoor track
- Cubbies at group exercise spaces work great.
- Good relationship between Weight room 50 and Gym
- Students like to use locker room hall seating alcoves
- The Student Recreation Center Addition (fitness, weights, gym, rock wall and bonus room)

Drawbacks
- Confusing building layout creates problems with way-finding.
- Bottleneck at Entry and at Equipment Check-out.
- Need a one-stop-shop concept.
- Too congested at Membership Services (102 Esslinger).
- No spectator seating by Gyms 4 and 5
- Racquetball and squash courts do not meet standards.
- “Spin” space too small.
- Poor ventilation at Weight Rm 150 and elsewhere
- Disconnect between PE and Recreation administration.
- Administration office beyond Control (not in free zone).
- Not enough support spaces for fields (i.e.: restrooms and storage)
- Leighton Pool
Synthesis of Tour Notes “Take-Aways”

Design
- Bold is not necessarily beautiful or “right.”
- Bold interior spaces are very desirable.
- A big, bold open lobby with multiple entry points is desirable.
- Powerful visual excitement and interest is highly desirable to the Committee.
- Don’t let form run roughshod over function. Make sure the two can well marry in your facility.
- Seeing activity spaces is a good thing, and highly desirable to this Committee.
- Steeply angled glass walls (like the ones at Ohio State) allow for very desirable views to the out-of-doors (out and up!).
- Being excessive (in space, or bling, or volume) can make a University look like a poor steward of resources.
- UO wants intelligent, well thought-out design, not excess!
- Proper organization of spaces is important.
- A well crafted, properly scaled exterior space – leading up the facility’s entry – can readily set the tone for expectations within a building.
- Having small pockets of social space throughout a facility is desirable for the Committee.
- Design visual corridors that allow patrons to see and be seen in a rec center.
- Having and open and airy building is desired by the Committee.
- Locating the fitness spaces (especially Cardio) on an exterior glass wall is a nice feature to replicate.
- Great visibility into activity spaces is highly desirable to the Committee.
- Filling a recreation building with natural light is a great feature!
- Be aware of creating spaces that are “too open.” They may be unacceptably noisy, negatively impact audibility of the human voice, and or filled with too much reverberation.
- Winter Garden at main entry is a nice open airy feature.
- Low ceilings are oppressive.

Aquatics
- Public entrance for spectator events (ex: Swim Meets) can well be served via separate entrance.
- Physical access to the out-of-doors form a Leisure Pool is very important.
- Must well consider desired features in a Leisure Pool
  - Focus on intended audience (family vs. student)
- Ohio’s pool can be used for rentals without impact on others?
- Consider benefits of having two spas
  - Could be smaller than one large spa
  - One could be visible, the other not
  - One always operational even when serving other
- Creating a three-part (or similar) spa, like this facility enjoys, is highly desirable for a large capacity spa.
- Creating a Leisure Pool with a zero depth entry (can be a ramp) and spaces for volleyball and basketball are highly desirable.
Gyms
- Using portable basketball goals, as opposed to ceiling mounted varieties can “clean up” a large gymnasium volume.
- Pay close attention to the materials used in high impact areas of a building. Many materials won’t hold up to the damage from fast moving balls and other objects of recreational play.
- A dynamic high flying jogging track can be beautiful for some, and scary for others!
- A Leisure Pool for a collegiate user need not have much equipment or space dedicated to child’s play. Consider the collegiate user when designing the pool.
- Don’t place flat top guard railings or a similar “shelf” in areas where hand weights are used. If (when) the hand weights fall, his can be a dangerous (even deadly) situation to patrons on the floors below.

Fitness
- Placing Cardio equipment in a “Canyon-like” area is riskier than it appears. Pay close attention to view lines, and to what the user will see and experience when using equipment.
- Placing the free weights (aka the Meathead’s area) at the “front door” of your Weights & Fitness area is a very bad idea. The Committee much prefers to locate that space away from the primary entry to this area, thus improving a patron’s willingness to come in and explore the space.
- Locating the Meathead’s and their free weight equipment in the “back” of the Weights & Fitness area is much wiser than putting them on display at the front door!
- If you have a Spin Studio, make it a dedicated (or at least mostly dedicated) space.
- Make sure you design enough space in an around activity areas (like Jogging, Weights, etc.). This improves safety, function, and the user’s experience.
- Pockets of space in the Weights & Fitness area for both genders (e.g.: weights specific) is desirable.
- Multiple sizes of Group Ex rooms provides for great flexibility (each room is right-sized for the needs).
- Providing a “Women’s Zone” (or similar, with a better name!) in the main Weights & Fitness area is a great idea.

Wayfinding
- Wayfinding should as intuitive as possible for patrons.
- Good wayfinding (with signage, if necessary) is critical.
- Environmental Graphics are a powerful story telling medium. This is desirable.

Free Zone
- Public meetings rooms are best in a Free Zone area.
- Creating a circulation path that passes through a rec center provides an opportunity for users and non-users to “shop the activities” within.
- Views into activity spaces from the main lobby are desirable, which aids the process of attracting users into these spaces.
- Locating a Guest Services counter in front of the control counter is highly desirable.

Climbing Wall
- Enclosing a Climbing Wall inside a smallish glass box is not a good idea. That does not invite users to use the wall.

Administration
- Administrative Suite must support a collaborative communication between members of the professional staff.
- Creating an open collaborative office suite is desirable to the Committee.

Lighting
- Natural light is a very good thing when well harvested!
• Dark, dimly lit interiors are oppressive. It would be hard to work full time in such a facility.
• Make sure you install light fixtures in locations and places where you can readily change the lamps.
• Use good and smart lighting, but make sure it is well controlled with proper systems for operation.
• Make certain to properly balance glass so as to avoid glare.

**Jogging Track**
• Even a Jogging Track needs suitable ceiling height (say 10’ or better).
• Creating an asymmetrical Jogging Track is an exciting prospect for this Committee.

**Materials**
• Terrazzo flooring is visually desirable, and it always appears to be a good long investment.
• Good material selections matter! Terrazzo. Ceramic Tiles with Glass Tile accents! Colorful maple wood floors.
• Plain or colored CMU walls are a downer! Ground face block or better is necessary at Oregon.
• Using bold colors or school colors in a “heavy handed” way can easily create an undesirable result. Be intentional about application of bold and primary colors.
• Finish and detailing is important. More important than you might think!
• Heavy use of red and blue (school colors) was too much.
• Dayton has one interior designer for the campus.
  • This individual makes all decisions on color, etc.
  • This includes signage.
• Terrazzo is a highly desirable flooring material.
• Painted CMU is not an acceptable material for extensive use in the Oregon SRC.
• More expressed desire for Terrazzo!
• Be careful about using “natural” concrete.
• Spray applied fire proofing is not an acceptable finish material in or around a MAC.

**Food**
• If building a Juice Bar, put it where patrons frequent, not in a remote portion of your building. This is not a destination venue for most patrons.
• Food Service, even when well placed and with what is perceived to be the right menu, does not mean it will be financially viable.

**Amenities**
• Committee loved the easy user interface for A/V equipment in the building.
• Furniture is an important part of how we all experience a building environment.

**Special Events**
• Creating a special events entry (even if is the main front door for a facility) is a good strategic idea.
• Creating a separate building zone for rentals and other special events is a nice feature.
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SRC Schematic Design

Programming Focus Groups

1. Administrative and staff offices and work spaces, control desk and member service.

2. Gymnasiums (w/ alt. jogging track) and court space (racquetball, squash), including Intramural Weight, fitness and cardio and Field #2 turf replacement.

3. Multipurpose, Group Exercise, including Intramural Sports / Club Sports and academic program.

4. Natatorium/aquatics and associated storage and exterior space.

5. Climbing wall and Outdoor Pursuits, staging, and associated storage and exterior space.

6. Support spaces - locker rooms, equipment checkout, laundry, storage, equipment repair, loading dock, including operations, management, and janitorial staff.

7. Tennis and associated storage and exterior space.

8. Food Service, Pro Shop, Social areas and associated exterior space.
DATE: October 7, 2011
LOCATION: University of Oregon – SRC Bonus Room

8:30am-10:30am  Student Recreation Center Staff Meeting – SRC STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30am</td>
<td>Introduction – Planning and Design Process (Gene Mowery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40am</td>
<td>Facilities Tour Debrief / Trends (Jack Patton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20am</td>
<td>Review and Comment on Draft Program (Jack Patton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Program Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Aquatic Program Scenarios Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Initial Observations on Leighton Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Area/Cost Model Scenarios and Diagrams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:50am</td>
<td>Benefits / Drawbacks of Existing Facility (Carl Sherwood, Jack Patton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10am</td>
<td>Programming Focus Groups Meeting Schedule (Carl Sherwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20pm</td>
<td>Wrap Up / Conclusions / Notes (Jack Patton)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECTIVES

- Review Program Priorities
- Share Decisions and Direction from the User Group
- Solicit Input from Staff on Existing Benefits / Drawbacks
- Confirm Focus Group Process
MEETING MINUTES

1. Jack presented the slide show of the various University Recreation facilities visited by the tour group last month.

2. There was a concern that many of the facilities visited had an emphasis on open layouts. This group needs to be aware that some private spaces are also required since open spaces can often discourage or intimidate beginners, individuals with body image concerns and some people of other cultures.

3. The group needs to keep in mind and express ideas about what can make this project a uniquely Oregon project.
4. Jack reviewed the following trends in recreational facilities.
   a. Health; Six dimensions of total wellness are physical, intellectual, emotional, social, spiritual, and environmental. New project should support wellness by providing health assessment and lifestyle management support.
   b. Quality of Life; Recreation facilities along with residence halls and student unions are key to student’s quality of life.
   c. Control and Security: Secure but inviting, passive control and establishing points of control.
   d. Multi-Purpose Spaces: More than just big boxes, integration of I.T.
   e. Openness and Views: Encourages use
   f. Student Recreation blurs Student Union: Recreation centers now provide for social interaction which was primarily a function of student unions in the past.
   g. Social Space and Convenience: Students lead fast paced lives, opportunities for social interaction and convenience of use are necessary.

5. 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.

6. Jack reviewed the decisions made during the PUG meetings:
   a. 4 priorities: Aquatics, Court Sports, Weights and Fitness, and Way Finding. Reviewed the components and cost model for these priorities.
   b. Eliminate and replace Leighton Pool.
   c. Provide multiple aquatic tanks but no 50 Meter pool.
   d. Site Scenario 1 “Relocate” option with reserved space for future relocation of Esslinger program elements.

7. Carl reviewed the good and the bad comments on the existing building generated by the user group.

8. Matt reviewed the site issues.

9. The next meeting will be the week of Oct 24th.

10. Dennis will be putting together 8 focus groups to meet with the design team to discuss particular program areas in depth. The meetings will start early (7:00 AM?) and be scheduled for Wed, Thurs and Fri, Oct 26th thru the 28th. The groups will be receiving program data sheets in advance of the meetings. The groups should think ahead about their special requirements and needs and also consider what makes their programs a uniquely Oregon experience.

   Postscript: It was later decided to have 9 focus groups that will be meeting between 5:00 pm to 6:30 pm or 6:45pm to 8:15 pm on Tues, Wed, and Thurs, Oct 25 – 27.

End of Report
Top 4 Identified Program Priorities

- **Priority 1 – Aquatics**
  - Was important 12 years ago!

- **Priority 2 – Court Sports**
  - Note: Lose MC Court drives this.
  - Need #8 Court, not just BB!

- **Priority 3 – Weights & Fitness**
  - Need to balance #8, #9, #10, #11.
  - Balance between PE and REC.

- **Priority 4 – Way Finding**
  - One shot to do it right!

---
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Evaluate Impact on Design Values / Goals / Patterns

- Enough Space and Capacity
- Leave the Good Parts Alone
- Future Expansion

Interactive Review / Comments on Initial Program Summary

- Aquatic Program Scenarios
  - Top Priority Spaces
  - Mix ‘n Match?
  - What’s Needed for PE & Rec?
- Initial Observations on Leighton Pool
  - Current Opinions about Leighton Pool
- Area / Cost Model Scenarios & Diagrams
  - How much can we accomplish for $35 M?
  - Review Three Scenarios
- Site Layouts – Where do we Build?
  - Review Three Blocking Scenarios
Strategy 1: Reserve 100,000 square feet of buildable space in area now being considered for SRC expansion so that before Esslinger is demolished PE and Rec spaces can be replaced in this reserved area.

Strategy 2: Reconstruct PE/Rec as part of new building at Esslinger site with the likely lose of use for lengthy periods of time during reconstruction.
Scenario 3
Renovate

Strategy 3: Esslinger is not demolished and PE/Rec spaces stay in place and are renovated as needed over time.

Evaluate Impact on Design Values / Goals / Patterns

• Enough Space and Capacity

• Leave the Good Parts Alone

• Future Expansion
Trends

TOTAL WELLNESS

• Six Dimensions of Total Wellness
  – Physical, Intellectual, Emotional, Social, Spiritual, Environmental

• Healthy, Balanced Lifestyles
  – Life long recreation opportunities

• Assessment
  – Fitness, self–image, nutrition, habits, stress mgmt, etc.

• Lifestyle Management
  – Gradually modify habits and self expectations

QUALITY OF LIFE

• Collegiate QoL Facilities\(^{(1)}\)
  – Residence Halls
  – Union
  – Recreation

• Project impacts 33% of what you have control over.

• Must meet today’s needs for a social environment.
  – Welcoming, Ease of way–finding, See and be seen opportunities,
    Something for everyone, Open recreation, and Health bars.

\(^{(1)}\) Source: Carnegie Foundation
Trends

CONTROL & SECURITY

- No open door policy
- One point of control
- Secure yet inviting
- Maximize passive control
- Control Headquarters
  - Equipment Issue
  - Laundry Access
  - Etc.

MULTI PURPOSE SPACES

- More than Just a Big Box
- Design for Flexibility
- Revenue Enhancement Opportunity
- Plan for Specific Events
- Large Storage Requirements
- AV / Data / Power / Access
- Economize, Optimize
Trends

OPENNESS & VIEWS

- Encourage use
- See and be seen
- The social place to be
- Self policing
- Dynamics
- Visual control
- Auditory control

Planning Approach > Trends

STUDENT RECREATION blurs STUDENT UNION

- Food Service Integration into Recreation
- Media Facilities
- Central Atria and Collaboration Spaces
- Break Out and Meeting Rooms
- Wireless Everything!
Trends

**SOCIAL SPACE / CONVENIENCE**

- Time Sensitivity
- Fast Access
- Place to See & Be Seen
- Juice Bars / Lounges
- Retail sales / Pro shop
- Health Services
- Counseling
- Network access
SRC walk-through photos
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Program Data

Activity Space: 25 YDS X 25M POOL
Area: 11,760 SF

Department:
Description:

Diagram:

Scale: 1" = 10' = 0"
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Room Diagrams

Program Data

Activity Space: LEISURE POOL W/4 LANES

Department:

Description:

Area: 8,000 SF

Diagram:

Scale: 1" = 10' = 0"
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Activity Space: **Steam Room**

Department: 

Description: 

Area: 200 SF

Diagram: 

Scale: 1" = 10'-0"
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October 4-7, 2011
Activity Space: MECHANICAL

Department:

Description:

Area: 2,500 SF

Diagram:

Scale: 1" = 0'-0"
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Activity Space: LOCKERS - MEN

Area: 3510 SF
7020 SF

Diagram:

- Lockers - Men
- Towel Station
- Toilets & LAVS
- Private Showers
- Plumbing Chase
- Women's
- Grooming Stations
- Wet Toilet Room
- Vision Block

540 Half-Size Lockers (15W, 18H, 30 in)
Benches

Scale: 1" = 10'-0"
Activity Space: WET CLASSROOM + STORAGE

Diagram:
room diagrams
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Diagram for 3 COURT GYM

Activity Space: 3 COURT GYM

Department:

Description:

Area: 9,344 sq.

Diagram:

Scale: 1" = 10'-0"
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Room Diagrams

Activity Space: Spectator Seating

Area: 500 sq ft

Diagram:

Scale: 1" = 10'-0"

October 4-7, 2011
2. Activity Space: **GYM STORAGE**

   Department: 

   Description: 

   Area: **800 SF**

   Diagram:

   Scale: **1" - 10'-0"**
Room diagrams
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Activity Space: WORKOUT & FITNESS + STOR. +

Area:

Diagram:

Scale: 1" = 10'-0"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/Space</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram:**

Scale: ______________
room diagrams
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PRIORITY

4
Activity Space: WAY FINDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description:

Diagram:  

$150,000

Scale: _______
Activity Space: LAUNDRY ROOM

Area: 600 SF
Room Diagrams
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Activity Space: PRO SHOP RETAIL
Area: 800 ft²

Diagram:

Scale: 1” = 10’-0”
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Room Diagrams

5. Activity Space: Social & Learning Areas

Department: 

Description: 

Area: 6,400 SF

Scale: 1" = 10'-0"
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Room Diagrams
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Activity Space: Small Group Exercise + Storage

Area: 1,500 sq ft + 150 sq ft

Diagram: 80 x 30

Scale: 1" = 10'-6"
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Activity Space: MEDIUM GROUP EXERCISE + STORAGE
Area: 2,500 ft² + 250 ft²

Diagram:

Scale: 1" = 10'-0"
Room Diagrams

University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Program Data

Activity Space: MEDIUM GROUP EXERCISE + STORAGE
Area: 2,500 + 250

Diagram:

Scale: 1" = 10' - 0"

October 4-7, 2011
Activity Space: LARGE GROUP EXERCISE + STORAGE
Area: 2,600'² + 360'²

Diagram:

Scale: 1" = 10'-0"
5. Activity Space: LARGE GROUP EXERCISE
   + STORAGE
   Area: 2,400 sq ft

Diagram:

Scale: 1" = 10'-0"

University of Oregon
Student Recreation Center

October 4–7, 2011
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Room Diagrams

Activity Space: Tennis Center Expansion

Area: 13,960 sq ft

Diagram:

COURT #1

COURT #2

...
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Activity Space: (REPLACEMENT) WEIGHT ROOM

Area: 4,170 sq ft

Diagram:

Scale: 1" = 10' - 0"
Activity Space: (REPLACEMENT) MULTIPURPOSE RM

Department: 

Description: 

Area: 2,000 sq ft

Stoa: 260 sq ft

Stoa: 170 sq ft

Diagram:

Scale: 1/4" = 1 ft
6. Activity Space: Replacement Outdoor Rackets Store

Department: 

Description: 

Area: 220 +

Diagram:

Scale: 1" = 1'-0"
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Site Inventory
### Student Rec Center – Example Facilities

Examples of Student Rec spaces at other Universities – spaces similar to those being planned for in the University of Oregon Student Rec Center

### Lap Pools

![Lap Pools Image](image-url)
example recreation center images
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Lap Pools

Lap Pools
example recreation center images
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Leisure Pools

Leisure Pools
example recreation center images
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Whirlpool Spas

Whirlpool Spas
example recreation center images
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Locker Rooms

Locker Rooms
example recreation center images
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Locker Rooms

[Image of Locker Room]

Locker Rooms

[Image of Locker Room]
example recreation center images
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Wet Classrooms

Multi-Court Gymnasia
example recreation center images

University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Multi-Court Gymnasia

Informal Spectator Seating
example recreation center images
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Informal Spectator Seating

Weights & Fitness
example recreation center images
University of Oregon, Student Recreation Center

Weights & Fitness

Weights & Fitness
Weights & Fitness

Wayfinding Improvements and WOW!
Wayfinding Improvements & WOW!

Multi-Court Gymnasia
example recreation center images
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Wayfinding Improvements & WOW!

Wayfinding Improvements & WOW!
example recreation center images
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Wayfinding Improvements & WOW!

Wayfinding Improvements & WOW!

Wayfinding Improvements & WOW!