
Date
11/06/2019

By
Laura Krueger

Subject	Project Name	Project Number
Community Meeting 1	Grant Bowl Master Plan	19008

Present
See attached Exhibit A Sign-In Sheet

Minutes

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- A. Team members from PPS, Bora Architects and Cameron McCarthy welcomed the community and introduced themselves to the group.
- B. The design team clarified that this is a Master Planning process. A general scope of improvements and location of possible structures will be included in the document published at the end of the Master Planning process. Detailed design including building materials are not part of this process.
- C. The final Master Plan document will be published at the end of January 2020. Future design phases are not scheduled. An overall completion date for project installation is unidentified.

2. PROJECT OVERVIEW

- A. PPS has provided funding for the Master Planning work; however, funding is not currently identified for construction of the improvements. A cost estimate will be included as part of the Master Plan to understand budget considerations.
- B. The list of improvements being studied include:
 1. Providing a regulation OSAA softball field.
 2. Integrating spectator seating, potentially including a press box.
 3. Field lighting to extend hours of use.
 4. Fencing for safety and security which also provide accessible pathways to the bowl.
 5. Concessions and restrooms for use during events.
 6. Incorporating built storage for athletic equipment.

3. MEETING STATION BOARD FEEDBACK

*See attached Exhibit C Board Illustration Feedback. The following notes are transcribed from the comments and dots attached to the boards.

- A. Grandstand seating
 1. Where would you like to sit?
 - a. 11 people identified the west side as preferred seating.
 - b. 9 people identified the east side.

BORA

2. Reaction to type of seating and press box.
 - a. 1 person preferred freestanding, metal bench bleachers.
 - b. 33 noted preference to integrated, concrete platform seating along the slope.
 - c. 8 people favored the single-story press box with overhang and durable materials.
- B. Access and security
 1. Reactions to type of fencing.
 - a. 33 people favored various precedent images of ornamental fencing. 11 of those noted preference for a gateway potentially to include a ticket booth.
 - b. 5 people preferred a style like the existing Grant HS fence surrounding the upper field.
 - c. 1 person favored the black vinyl-coated chain link.
 2. Where do you enter the bowl?
 - a. The corners of the field were more clearly favored. NE with 15 dots, SE with 12 dots, SW with 4 dots and NW with 4 dots.
 - b. The connection from 33rd Ave and NE Thompson was noted as well as the east field stair access from the north side of the upper field.
- C. Support facilities
 1. Where might amenities go? These include concessions, tickets, toilets and storage.
 - a. 29 people favored the NE corner of the bowl, near the large trees and access from the north edge of the upper field.
 - b. 2 people favored the dual use of the pool building facilities.
 - c. 3 people preferred areas near the NW corner, 1 of those with better access to the tennis courts.
 - d. 3 people favored the SE corner between the track and paved access.
 - e. 1 person noted the SW corner.
 2. Reactions to type of buildings.
 - a. 13 people favored an example of durable materials down low with wood (warmth) above and at the roof line.
 - b. 4 people noted a building with an extended canopy for covered seating.
 - c. 2 people preferred a transparent concessions counter with a single sloped roof.
- D. Field improvements
 1. Suggestion to place the softball field either at the upper field or at the SE corner of Hollyrood field.
 2. Comments related to track events.
 - a. Relocate the javelin throw area.
 - b. Gravel or sand should be provided for shotput rather than turf.
 3. Comments related to softball field.
 - a. Concern for foul balls being hit onto the track from both the softball and baseball fields.
 - b. Dugouts should be provided for softball team seating.
 - c. Make room for warm up pitching with a mound and plate. Also provide a batting cage if baseball has one.
 4. Comments related to the upper field.
 - a. Make soccer field the correct size to facilitate games or schedule issues will not be resolved.
- E. Project hopes and concerns
 1. What is your biggest hope for project success?
 - a. Lights as soon as possible, both for extended hour use and security.
 - b. More expedited process for faster delivery of installation. This effort should move the process forward, not backward.
 - c. Increase in surrounding property values.
 - d. Ability for Grant HS to host home events, this is very important.

- e. The seating should be safe, durable, accessible and comfortable.
 - f. Maximize the use of space for everyone, this includes extended hours of use from field lighting.
 - g. To create a community hub for the neighborhood, not just Grant HS.
 - h. The bowl is not all about one sport. It should serve all sports and interests.
 - i. Hollyrood should be part of the plan for improvements. The pool should be considered as well with its concessions and restroom facilities.
 - j. Hope for private donors to be identified and help fund the improvements.
 - k. Project can be constructed in parts with the field lighting first.
2. What is your primary concern regarding Grant Bowl improvements?
- a. Increase in noise.
 - b. Hours of operation are not clearly identified.
 - c. Decrease in property values, especially to the areas in direct proximity to the bowl.
 - d. Shared use agreement between PPS and PPR is not finalized.
 - e. The project does not appear phase-able.
 - f. The process takes too long. Discouraged that the improvements will not get done in a timely manner if at all.
 - g. Concern that the improvements will not have a low impact. This could mean losing trees and green space.
 - h. Concern for balancing security and access.
 - i. The question was proposed: *When are the field lights on and off?*
 - j. Could be a loss of community access during non-school functions.
 - k. Concern for traffic congestion due to highly attended events and lack of off-street parking.
 - l. The park users could overuse the field and its lighting.
 - m. Cleanup of trash, especially after a game.
 - n. Due to the necessary striping of the field, the softball field is compromised for visual contrast related to another sport.
 - o. Concern for increased vandalism and graffiti at built improvements.
 - p. Do not let perfect be the enemy of the good.
 - q. The question was proposed: *Who gets to use the field and at what times/durations?*

4. MEETING STATION ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

*The following comments were heard from individuals or small groups providing feedback at the meeting stations and does not suggest consensus of the larger community.

A. Grandstand seating

- 1. Grant HS coach expressed concern about providing good sightlines. The lower portion of the slope near the track does not allow visibility to the field, especially for football due to players standing on sidelines.
- 2. Grant HS coach preferred that the press box be located on east side so that it could be used for the upper field if it were double sided. It does not need to be on the 50 yard line.
- 3. Concern was expressed about safety during the spring season when track, softball and baseball are occurring simultaneously. Foul balls create a hazard for park users.
- 4. A slight preference was expressed to site on the west side due to solar orientation away from the setting sun.
- 5. There was a strong preference voiced for grandstands built into the slope to minimize visual impact on the park. Aluminum bleachers are also disliked due to noise and cold.
 - a. While concrete seating surfaces are less preferred for comfort, most recognized it as a practical and durable choice.
 - b. Wood seating surfaces were suggested as an option to explore.

BORA

- B. Access and security
 - 1. There was support for fencing options proposed. Comments noted that a black color will be more subtle.
 - 2. Ornamental style seems to fit with the period of the park and community. Chain link is not preferred.
 - 3. The following questions were proposed: *When will the gates be closed? Only for large events or will they close at night to help reduce vandalism and mischief?*
 - 4. In addition to pedestrian access, the gates should be placed to allow the cross-country course to access the bowl.
 - 5. If there is an entry feature or main gate, consider placing them internal to the park and not on a corner or street edge. Traffic and parking congestion could overload one street if it is placed at the edge.
 - 6. The padding installed on the fence at the Upper Field was not liked by the community.
- C. Support facilities
 - 1. Perception is that there is limited open space surrounding the field for an amenity building. The largest of these areas is in the NE corner adjacent to the mature park trees.
 - 2. The following question was proposed: *Will the restrooms be available as a park amenity? What hours will they be open?*
 - 3. An amenity building should be equally accessible to the upper field, providing access to sports such as soccer and baseball.
- D. Field lighting
 - 1. General support for the improvement to light the bowl.
- E. Field improvements
 - 1. Simultaneous use of the bowl by different sports should be considered. Suggestion to use internal temporary fencing to keep balls from rolling onto the track.
 - 2. Hollyrood field should be evaluated for installation of synthetic turf to provide more multi-use potential. This could alleviate the load of use at the bowl field.
- F. Comment cards, see attached Exhibit B Comment Cards.

Next Community Meeting

12/03/2019, Community Engagement Meeting 2, Upper Commons

The foregoing is the writer's interpretation of the issues discussed. Please report any discrepancies or omissions to Bora within three business days of receipt of this document.

END OF MEETING MINUTES