UO Student Recreation Center
Project User Group (PUG) Meeting 4B – 12/15/11

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	
	Sue Wieseke	UO	PE & Rec	present
	Geoff Hale	Student	SRC Advisory Bd	
	Michelle Vander Heyden	Student	ASUO	present by web-ex
	Derick Olsen	Student	SRC Student Emp	
	Kristen Gleason	UO	Club Sports	present
	Jen Phillips	UO	Neuroscience	
	Julie Haack	UO	Chemistry	
	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	
	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
	Justin Caron		Pool Designer	present by phone
Guests	Jeff Fryer	UO	PE & Rec	present for first 1/2
	Jackie James	UO	PE & Rec	present
	Russ Schrantz	UO	PE & Rec	present for first 1/2

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. The pool/natatorium options were reviewed. By eliminating a tank you can save a significant amount of money. Is it possible to do so and save a million dollars without significant compromise? Aquatic space is more expensive than fitness spaces or social spaces due to the mechanical loads.

2. Nationwide more facilities are constructing leisure pools as part of natatorium. The current 4-tank design might be a little "lap lane" heavy and light on leisure water per Justin Caron. Leisure is not just leisure, it is also social and wellness related.

3. Michelle noted that a leisure pool would attract non-swimming members of the campus.

4. Leisure pool would be about 85 degree (possibly 84 in summer and 86 in winter) and the lap pool at about 82 degree.

5. 1 leisure user takes about 25 sf of water. 2,500 sf is good for leisure

6. Scuba wants to have about 35 sf per user. Scuba classes are about 20 to 25. About 700 sf to 875 sf of deep water will be required for scuba. Some scuba activity can be done in shallow water.

7. A diving tank attached to a leisure pool as in schemes E and F is good for scuba if large enough and could be added as a component to other of the schemes

8. Group decision for pools: the project should have two tanks, lap and leisure (plus spa). The leisure tank is to include: a 900 sf dive / scuba tank, 2,500 sf of open leisure and 4 lap lanes at about 2,250 sf. The leisure pool would be about 5,650 sf (not including spa and only providing for 1 diving board) Adding a second diving board changes the dive tank to about 1,085 sf and the total tank to about 5,835 sf (excluding spa). The second tank would be 12 lanes with full water polo course at 2 meters and a 3-1/2' deep shallow end. This would meet program needs and save over 1 million dollars. If diving boards are purely leisure one board is enough, with two boards a larger tank (31' x 35') is required but could accommodate a diving class. Lap lanes can be 7-1/2 feet wide (Leighton pool has 7' wide lanes) and it is OK to have the four warm water lap lanes in leisure pool.

9. The direction of the group is to have two hot tubs for 12 (or 8 and 16) rather than 1 tub for 24. This will cost a little more in equipment but has some advantages since you can do maintenance and still have an open tub.

10. Healthy Oregon 5 possible location:
    a. At entry - rejected.
    b. At maintenance and weights at northeast corner – gives up SRC frontage on 15th so is less desirable.
    c. In bonus room – problem with noise and now bonus room is a rentable space so this is not a desirable location.
    d. In lower level east side south of new east entry.
    e. In existing Esslinger locker rooms. Entry would be off of Main Street. Preferred location if OK with donor. Places in abandoned portion of building and would have less cost than building new or relocating other existing program elements (as in option "a or b" above).

11. New maintenance shop in new location would free up space for outdoor pursuits at 15th street northeast location.

12. Review of new scheme 13A and 13B (refer to web site) which are compact 3 story schemes with the east entry and pools at the field level. The natatorium is surrounded by service and lockers to the west, fitness to the north and north east, fields to the east and an outdoor deck at southeast. At the main level the control has view to the east fitness area and through to the exterior. From the fitness area would be a view down into natatorium. Dry lockers are entered from main level and has interior stair to lower wet lockers. The upper level has fitness, gyms running north / south and an outdoor patio

with BB court on the east roof top edge. This level would be about 4' above the indoor track level so would require some floor transitions but the 4' elevation gain will give better headroom at main level overview of natatorium.

13. The yellow zone would be like option 12 with space set aside to the west. In the yellow zone the MAC courts would be at the below grade lower level field elevation (same as pools) and the multi-purpose and racquetball courts above would be at the upper gym court level. Office location would depend on the future of the green zone build out.

14. Option 13B is similar to 13A but with only 2 pools and the upper level gym is moved to the east edge. It gives up sky lighting over the pools and the east side patio and basketball court at roof. In this scheme the gyms do not need to be raised above indoor track level and the main entry sequence from the east is shortened.

15. The outdoor BB court could have a retractable-netted surround. Might have rolling hoops.

16. Money saved on pools should be used for expanding climbing and possibly the track.

17. Multi-purpose rooms need to have daylight and possibly some view.

18. Equipment check-out needs to be inside of control.

19. Pro-shop can stay with membership services.

20. Leighton pool could be repurposed as a cistern for a storm water retention and thermal battery. There is a possible $150,000 cost with a long payback period but it could save on site required storm water retention and energy savings along with sending a good message to students. It is agreed that it is a good idea to proceed with repurposing pool for storm water if we do not lose other program elements.

End of Report