UO Student Recreation Center
Project User Group (PUG) Meeting 5A – 1/17/12

Schematic Design

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	present – first part
	Michelle Vander Heyden	Student	ASUO	present
	Derick Olsen	Student	SRC Student Emp	present
	Kristen Gleason	UO	Club Sports	present
	Jen Phillips	UO	Neuroscience	
	Julie Haack	UO	Chemistry	present
	Rob Thallon	UO	Architecture	present – second part
Support	Gene Mowery	UO	Planning	present
	Emily Eng	UO	Planning	present
	Charlene Lindsay	UO	FS Cap Con	present
	Daren Dehle	UO	FS Cap Con	present
	Greg Lobisser	UO	Student Affairs	present – first part
	Brett Rogers	UO	Zone A Maint	present – first part
Design Team	Jack Patton	RDG	Architect	present
	Jeff Schaub	RDG	Architect	present
	Jim Henry	RDG	Energy	present
	Otto Poticha	Poticha	Architect	present
	Carl Sherwood	RSA	Architect	present
	Dave Guadagni	RSA	Architect	present
	Matt Koehler	CM	Landscape	present
CMGC	Dan Pelissier	HSW	Contractor	present
	Bill Jensen	HSW	Contractor	present
Guests	Peg Rees	UO	PE & Rec	present
	Manny Garcia	UO	Student Rep	present – first part

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

Review/Comparison of Area/Cost Model and CM/GC – IE Opinion of Cost

1. The contractor has provided preliminary budget information based on the 13A scheme and the project is over budget. The target budget is $35.5 million and the Contractor cost model is just under $39.8 million. The 13A plan drawings are over program area. The design team will be looking at right sizing areas such as circulation, social spaces, fitness zones and natatorium to

bring the building plans closer to the program area. It might be necessary to cut program area, and in the event this is necessary the User Group identified the following possible area of savings:

a. Lockers – only provide new wet lockers, shell in new dry lockers, and reuse old dry lockers.
b. Eliminate or defer upper patio.
c. Reduce area for circulation and social spaces.
d. Eliminate one Spa, build adjacent to Leisure pool to reduce deck
e. Reduce Leisure pool
f. Eliminate 4 lanes in leisure pool
g. Eliminate Dive tank
h. Reduce Building height/volume, skin elements, windows, finishes
i. Replace Field #2 under a different budget
j. Eliminate Fountain repair or place under a different budget

2. Design team is required to come up with 10% in deductive alternates in bidding documents in order to address market conditions. Some of the above may be alternates

Review and Evaluation of Schematic Design

3. Review of design (refer to web site for plans). The new Schematic Design features:

a. Free zone access from two entries.
b. Stacked lockers rooms.
c. Transparency and views between floors. The east entry opens up 3 stories tall.
d. Fitness areas located out to east side view – visual feature on exterior design.
e. Lower level has: Free weights, natatorium, wet lockers, wet classroom, pool support, and outdoor deck at grade.
f. Main level has: Control, group ex, dry lockers and fitness areas.
g. Upper level has: Group ex, fitness, gyms, and rooftop patio/court.
h. There are multiple skylights to brighten and to bring daylight deep into building.
i. Space for future yellow zone has: Mac courts and group ex at lower level, admin and offices at main level, group ex, RB courts and more admin at upper level.
j. Healthy Oregon is placed in the area of existing locker and west edge of Leighton Pool area. This is a separately funded area, and has not received a commitment as yet.
k. Outdoor area at east developed to strengthen path zone with more paving, tiered seating and landscaping. A combination of openness and buffer into the natatorium is desired. The natatorium is 2' above east path system which will help with privacy.
l. Pool patio to have open sunning area and still provide privacy. Ornamental iron fence, seat wall, and landscaping will be used as ways to create separation and privacy.
m. West court (currently parking), could be outdoor activity area or might be a service area.
n. There is a possibility to have bike parking on each side of existing covered area at east end of bonus room. This parking needs to be close to entry without conflicting with the pedestrian flow at the entry.

4. The transparency between the three floor levels might trigger a need for glazing separation between floors in order to eliminate the need for an expensive smoke control system. Two floors can be connected. A connected 3rd floor creates a problem.

5. There is a concern the Free zone areas are too wide. It was noted that part of this area will include social areas and space for a future juice bar

6. There is a concern about having Group Ex space at the lower level of the future yellow zone due to noise from MAC-courts passing through walls.

7. Weights at east entry might not be desirable as an entry element. Might be OK if not all glass. The area directly adjacent to east entry might instead be used for: toilet room, wet classroom, expanded natatorium.

8. Existing weight room 50 in Esslinger might be used for yoga and group ex if other areas are set aside for weights. Enhancements of Rm 50 will be required if used as a Group Ex space.

9. Think of all fitness areas as weights and cardio. Need 26,600 sf weights and cardio between existing and new spaces. Weights could be in three areas. Need at least one weight area with doors – maintain existing for PE Classes.

10. Upper gym might serve as a graduation space. Assume that gym and outdoor patio spaces are calculated at 15 sf per occupant for determining exit widths. The design team will need to verify that the City will not require even greater density.

Campus Character PowerPoint Presentation

11. Emily reviewed campus character: Brick, openness, arches, lots of detail, mature landscape, clear entrances, human scale, response to place on campus, reflect and be compatible to existing context without mimicking existing, high quality and carefully detailed. The UO has an interest in roofline profiles that are not flat and undifferentiated but look good against the sky. Other desirable characteristics are: Variety of roof shapes, windows broken into groupings that create rhythm, interesting detailing, walls that show their thickness, tripartite building designs that have an articulated base, middle and cap, and reflect size of space beyond. Secondary entrances provide weather protection and are more than back doors. Operable windows and arcades are part of campus character. Well thought out plantings and landscape features add to character.

Review and Evaluation of Exterior Context, building Mass, Character

12. Some drivers of exterior design are: transparency, views to east and fitting in as part of campus. A variety of approaches to the east (primary elevation for this addition) elevation were presented:

    a. Exterior elevation option 1 (refer to website for elevations): A regular box at east edge with a large element punched through it, large picture window at wrap around, relationship to north side of 99' SRC, shed roof forms key into surrounding elements. Monitors that provide natural light and ventilation at gymnasium.
    b. Exterior elevation option 2: More contemporary expression
    c. Exterior elevation option 3: More solid.
    d. All options have rhythm of windows. The "box" base could have brick elements.
    e. The cantilever east edge will act as lantern and be highly visible from fields and south approach.

13. The group would like to see the introduction of brick on the east elevation.

14. The synthetic stucco on the existing east end of SRC is failing and might need to be repaired.

15. There are not many examples of shed roofs on campus and they are generally not well regarded.

16. User Group finds Option 2 a little jarring and competes too much with the existing east gable end. It also does not help define the east entry.

17. Options 1 and 3 build on the elements on the north edge of the '99 SRC.

18. Secondary entry is not yet articulated enough. Consider the depth of the entry with regard to being able to find it. Consider what markers or horizontal cues (paving) that maybe incorporated.

19. The cantilever extends quite far to the east. There needs to be a sense that it will not fall off the face of the building.

20. The monitors on the gym could come out to the building edge or be held back. There were differing opinions among the user group. Wind power ventilators are a possibility for the gym or other roofs.

21. The User Group prefers Option 1 and to a lesser extent Option 3. Option 1 glazing works better with the existing '99 SRC. The design is contemporary and meets the sky well. Eliminate option #2. Use of materials will impact how everyone feels about the design.

Preliminary Recommendations for CPC Check-in Meeting

22. The User Group felt that the three elevations should be shown to CPC as an indication of the conversations about the architecture that is underway. The preferences of the User Group should be shared as well.

23. The Project needs to make about 16,000 sf of improvements to Designated Open Space improvements outside of the project limits. South path to 18th is not now designated open space, but it might be possible to ask for an exception to make improvements along this path as part of site improvements.

Action Items

24. Work to be done before Meeting 5B:
    a. Need to develop plan modifications to tighten areas, consider noise generation concerns at yellow zone and develop elevation options.
    b. Schedule to meet with CPC in Check-in Meeting to review architectural and site design progress and receive feedback.
    c. Schedule to meet with Accessibility Focus Group, to receive feedback to improve the design.

End of Report