



UO Student Recreation Center Project User Group (PUG) Meeting 5B – 1/19/12

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	
	Kristen Gleason	UO	Club Sports	present
	Jen Phillips	UO	Neuroscience	
	Julie Haack	UO	Chemistry	
	Rob Thallon	UO	Architecture	
Support	Gene Mowery	UO	Planning	present
	Emily Eng	UO	Planning	
	Charlene Lindsay	UO	FS Cap Con	present
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
	Charlie Brown	ESBL	Energy	present – second half
CMGC	Dan Pelissier	HSW	Contractor	present
Guests	Peg Rees	UO		present
	Manny Garcia	UO	ASUO	present – first & end
	Gabriella Ailstock	UO	SHAC	present – first & end
	Brandon Morelli	UO	SRC Advisory Bd	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>

Student Steering Committee Comments and Questions

1. Meeting started with Student Advisory Committee. The overall design is presented to them and they had the following comments:
 - a. What can be done to lower fees?

- b. One member surprised that vote did not pass. Did not know anyone against the SRC. Students were not very informed about fee structures. Ballot was confusing. It is the heart of campus and needs to expand.
- c. Students were not shown how fees compare with other facilities.
- d. The ASUO did not handle ballot/project information well and the ballot was written with a negative slant.
- e. Question by PUG to students: If graphic illustrations (renderings and plans) of project are available would students be more appreciative during next ballot? Yes answer, by student representatives.
- f. What can design team do to lower overall cost? Gene's and Dennis's response: This is a decision by the administration rather than the design team.
- g. One student suggested that the higher fee is worth it for the improvements that will be provided.
- h. Question by PUG: Would the SRC fee have been a problem if it was not lumped with the fee increase also proposed with the EMU? Probably yes – reply by student. Dennis Monroe stated that both the SRC and EMU are critical projects to the campus.
- i. PUG recommendation: The SRC and EMU student committees should share info. – Students agree

End of Student Steering Committee portion of meeting

Review Campus Planning Committee Comments/Recommendations

2. Gene Mowery, Project Planner and members of the Design Team presented the conceptual planning influences and the evolution of the functional building plans to introduce the project to the Campus Planning Committee (CPC). The was followed by a presentation of the exterior design, proposed site improvements, and a discussion about the requirement for improving Designated Open Space as part of the project. The CPC shared the following comments. (CPC minutes of this meeting will be provided on the project web site.)
 - a. The east entry is a second entry but still an important and primary entry – it needs to make a stronger architectural statement.
 - b. The east end gable of the existing SRC references back to a historical precedent at Gerlinger Hall – what cues are inherent in this design?
 - c. Bike routes are an important issue. After a brief discussion it was felt they should be kept on east –side path and not diverted to University Street – which has its own problems
 - d. Multiple uses for the east-side path should be encouraged and the CPC liked the covered seating and bike parking along this edge.
 - e. Approximately 16,000 sf of improvement is required by project to existing Designated Open Space on campus outside of project area. The dollar value of improvements is not defined. The possibility of improvements along the east-side path system to satisfy the open space improvement requirements has not been determined, but the CPC seemed open to a proposal.
 - f. Possible improvements to Designated Open Space could be at the 15th Avenue Axis at northeast corner of site and at crossing to Straub Green.
 - g. Could fountain be improved as part of open space improvements or by funding required by open space improvements?
 - h. Solar water heating rather than photovoltaic panels are recommended for meeting the solar requirements.
 - i. Energy monitoring and education is desired.
 - j. There was not much discussion on the elevations except a concern that the form expressed in the east elevation fitness area does not have a precedent on campus.

- k. Another meeting with CPC to further discuss the architectural expression of the design will be considered. We cannot wait until our next scheduled meeting in March if the cantilevered form is not acceptable. The overhang has a functional advantage of providing weather protection, and the CPC suggested more along the length of the building be considered.
3. Budget has set aside \$225,000 for repairing exterior north entry fountain. This might be pulled from budget. Dennis and Bryan will research.

Review Accessibility Focus Group Comments/Recommendations

4. Gene Mowery, Project Planner and members of the Design Team presented the Schematic Design to the Accessibility Focus Group to evaluate adherence to the spirit and requirements of the campus Universal Access policy. Comments from the participants are as follows:
- a. Social isolation is a real problem. For example the existing front entry approach from east separates chair bound people from stair users. The new east entry is a welcome improvement to this situation.
 - b. Access from 15th Avenue Axis to the east side path is difficult due to cross slopes and the location of the bollards.
 - c. Ramp into pool is much preferred to lifts. Lifts often requires training for its use and assistance which might not be readily available. Some people will not use lifts at all, especially if they are on “display” from people overlooking the pool
 - d. The visually impaired preferred right angles and if not they need contrasting visual or tactile cues such as at floor surfaces in order to improve way-finding.
 - e. The existing elevators are hard to find –new elevators need to be better located, preferably next to the stairs in order to avoid the social isolation issue.
 - f. Storage for personal equipment such as a sport chairs would be helpful. Some sport chairs are extra wide and others such as track racing chairs are extra long and won't fit into elevators. Storage spaces needs to be adjacent to use areas.
 - g. Need accessible locks at locker rooms – which don't require fine motor skills. Hand scanners are problematic – for the same reason.
 - h. Glare can be a problem for visually impaired. Walking towards a bright window wall can cause problem if light is not balanced.
 - i. Accessible turnstiles need to be adjacent to normal turnstiles and ideally all turnstiles are the same.

Schematic Design Update/Analysis

5. The basic site improvements outlined at Meeting 5A had not changed. Further comment and discussion from this meeting is summarized as follows:
- a. The existing pavement materials at the east path are undesirable. The plan is to reduce the width of the rubberized red surface (run off area for soccer) and add more hard paving between the building and the field. The east path is heavily used and is a designated path in the Campus Plan. (Some consideration is being given to narrowing Field #1 to allow for better alignment of the path along the length of Fields #1 and #2.)
 - b. The proposed amphitheater type seating along building east exterior edge needs accessible seating areas. (from Accessibility Focus Group)
 - c. The south patio needs privacy, as proposed by design approach.
 - d. The fire lane at south will not be modified in the current plan.
 - e. The existing parking lot east of Esslinger Rooms 49/50 will need to be improved as part of project since the construction process will damage area. Activity space is recommended as opposed to parking.

- f. The proposed new site plan can accommodate 26 bike parking spaces near the east entry area. The required number of spaces and types (i.e.: open, covered and enclosed) is still to be determined by UO Planning.
 - g. A field storage area is required. Sweepers and program support components need a space. Use of the south end of the Bonus Room is a possible location, as is the south side of the building expansion.
 - h. There is a possibility, if funding allows, for improvements at east side of Tennis Center along the path system. The Tennis Center was originally designated within the project area and so long as it is considered as such, open space funds cannot be used for improvements at this area. However it could be argued that the project area does not extend to the Tennis Center because the work at the Center was dropped after the budget dropped from \$61 million to \$50 million. The UO planning staff will need to check if this area's designation as part of the project area can be dropped, and if so with CPC approval the Designated Open Space improvement funds could be proposed for this area.
 - i. Group affirms that improvements to increase use and support at the east edge as a multi-use area is a project goal.
6. Changes have been made to building plans since Tuesday's workshop 5A as follows (refer to web-site for drawings):
- a. Project program area has been reduced and is now at 114,000 sf. This was accomplished by reducing the core area by moving the natatorium / gym wing about 35 feet north into core and reducing the width of this area by about 8'. The reductions in this area include the elimination of numerous opening between levels – now consolidated to a select few. The location of the lower level stair and elevator has been moved east to reduce the area required at this level.
 - b. The circulation path from the main entry through the Leighton pool shell has been narrowed down and more program area has been placed here for fitness and Healthy Oregon. Healthy Oregon is properly sized in this plan and takes up more of the former Leighton Pool area than previously shown.
 - c. A future climbing wall expansion could go where fitness area has been shown as expanded.
 - d. The east cantilever overhang is currently shown wider than before to create more weather protected outside area.
 - e. Future snack bar area may be located anywhere from Main Entry through free zone to control.
7. If Healthy Oregon does not go into the Leighton space the current Room 102, Physical Education office use could move into area. Funding for this move would have to be determined.
8. If Healthy Oregon cannot get all their funding perhaps they only use the Leighton space of 2,100 sf and not the whole 7,100 sf area now indicated. This would leave locker rooms alone or for other program uses.
9. If Healthy Oregon does not get funded the space could be an additive alternate for another program use.
10. A possible cost saving would be to maintain the Esslinger lockers and only shell out upper level of new locker room. Only the lower level wet lockers would be fully finished with this project. This might be a deductive alternate.
11. The revised plans show access to the Tennis Center along the east path and not from south entry. This is a compromise until yellow zone is constructed since this path is not accessible at the fire lane portion (too steep) and requires wheel chair users to go around the west side of Mac Court. There is a concern about isolating the Tennis Center from the

main facility. It might be possible to provide chain link walk along the edge of the parking lot basketball court and have turnstile and equipment issue adjacent. If so, a second control entrance at south with equipment issue staff acting as gatekeepers. Equipment issue needs to be by entry to locker rooms. There is a need to support universal access by having south controlled entrance that can be used for passage to the Tennis Center.

12. There is an interest in having the east cantilever extend a little further south and maintain some two-story space.
13. There is a desire to be able to seat 100 spectators at natatorium lap pool. This might be provided with moveable bleachers set up in the space between pools. Bleacher storage would have to be provided.
14. Changes to the exterior east facade are the result of development based on Workshop 5A comments. Jeff provided a rendered elevation, which better illustrated the potential of material selections in contributing to the overall composition of the façade and it references to adjacent buildings and the rest of campus. Presentation points are as follows:
 - a. Brick has been introduced at the base level to align with the “1999” SRC.
 - b. A tripartite, base, middle and top is being developed in the expression of the façade.
 - c. The east entry is responding to northeast end of existing SRC, but is not yet well developed.
 - d. The east facade of gym may have windows. These are not yet indicated on drawings.
 - e. The Design team is still looking at how ventilation and glazing at gym roof will affect form.
 - f. Some structural walls will be required along east edge of Natatorium.
 - g. The exterior gym wall materials are not yet selected but should not be a synthetic stucco Dryvit system as used at the existing SRC.
15. Along the East facade there is a need to consider pedestrian scaled exterior detailing, particularly in the brick. A member of the group suggested looking at Willamette Hall for good examples.
16. A member of the group likes the large lanterns that now exist at main entry, and suggested something similar or in the same family might assist in marking the new east entry.
17. The east cantilever glazing has to respond to solar glare (exterior fins and interior shades), structural issues, and adjacent elements. It becomes the key piece of the east elevation.
18. There is a need to maintain lighting for fields during construction.

Summarize Action Plan for further Schematic Design Work

19. Work on Schematic Design will continue on the basis of this plan and the comments collected this week.
20. A separate meeting with the Fitness Focus Group will be held to assist in defining the most likely configuration of weight and cardio zones within the newly designated areas.
21. The next workshop is scheduled for the Week of February 13 – 17.

End of Report