

# BORA

## MEETING MINUTES

---

Date	By
08/25/2020	Kate Feiertag

---

Subject	Project Name	Project Number
GUFI DAG 1	Grant Upper Field Improvement:	30088

---

### Present

Jamie Hurd, PPS	Shawn Lindsey	David Pietka
Stephen Weeks, Bora	Deb Engelstad	Kirsten Cowden
Kate Feiertag, Bora	Jon Coney	Ken Petersen
Jason Gillies, Cameron McCarthy	Diallo Lewis	Kirsten Cowden
Kim Knox	James MCGee	Andre Ashley
Maya Agarwal	Matt Kabza	
	Erin McNulty	

---

### Distribution

Those Present

---

### Minutes

#### 1. DAG CHARTER

- a. This is a Design Advisory Group whose role is to provide advice only.
- b. Decisions will be made by district leadership
- c. You are asked to participate wholly in the process
- d. Each of you represents a stake holder group and we ask that you share perspectives of your group and listen to others.
- e. Everyone should be able to speak
- f. This is a PPS project that will incorporate the goals of the community, school and the school district
- g. The Upper field is on property that is owned by both PPS and PPR, so the project is a Partnership between both institutions.
- h. There is going to be a significant land use process that is designed to be another outlet for public input
- i. We also will hold two Town halls on YouTube Live Stream.

---

## 2. PROJECT HISTORY

- a. This project has a long history of 25 years or more.
- b. In most recent history starting in 2015, softball was included in the Grant Modernization project. Through the design process, it was decided that the proposed softball field was not in a good location and the site was too constrained, and so softball was removed from the Grant Modernization project.
- c. October 2018 the project team presented 4 options to the PPS School Board. Those four options were to put softball in the bowl, at Wilshire park, in the Upper Field, or in the North field.
- d. The PPS School Board voted to pursue a master plan that included softball in the bowl. At this time the project did not have a specified source of funding, however PPS agreed to fund a Master Planning process.
- e. In Fall of 2019 PPS underwent the master planning process which included 3 DAGs and 2 town halls.
- f. Out of that process, the project team submitted two proposals to the PPS Board of Education. The first option was the base scope placing softball in Grant bowl and the alternate to placed softball in Grant's Upper Field.
- g. The Board approved the alternate plan, but with a phased implementation.
- h. We are now currently working on Phase 1 of the alternate master plan.

## 3. MASTER PLANNING REVIEW

- a. During the master planning process, we developed two options: the base showing softball in the Bowl and the alternate with softball in the Upper Field.
- b. We held two big public meetings to solicit feedback
- c. We also met with the Master plan Advisory Group.
- d. We developed a list of pros and cons of both options and solicited feedback from the community
- e. A strong preference emerged for the alternate option both from the DAG and community members.
- f. The alternate option minimizes conflicts in the Spring season with track and field using the bowl. From a scheduling and safety and space perspective, the alternate master plan made the most sense
- g. Issues have emerged = want to acknowledge and we will work to mitigate the following issues:
  - i. Fencing
  - ii. Parking
  - iii. Noise - amplified audio system
  - iv. Lights to accommodate schedule - lights are required. Extended period of use.

## 4. CURRENT PROJECT SCOPE

- a. We currently are approved to proceed with Phase 1 of the alternate master plan.
  - i. This only includes the Upper Field Improvements
  - ii. No work will happen to the bowl
- b. Minor project but a huge impact for athletics
- c. The addition of the Softball field will extend the field 20' to the south.
- d. Close attention will be required to coordinate with existing underground utilities - stormwater, fire water, power and telecom.
- e. The new field will meet OSAA guidelines
- f. There will an additional bullpen area, similar to baseball
  - i. The visiting team will not have a permanent bullpen but will have to set up a temporary bullpen in the available space in right field foul territory.
- g. The softball field will have permanent dugouts that match baseball.
- h. There will be added bleacher seating to match baseball with a capacity of about 130 seats.
- i. There will be a portable outfield fence to make a 200' softball field.
- j. This new field pushes the walkway 10' closer to gym and has some impacts to grading drainage and landscape but will provide better access to field.
- k. There will be a differentiated color of the turf at the softball infield.

# BORA

- 
- l. The soccer field will also be extended with this improvement, bringing it to be a more average size.
  - m. The current location of the scoreboard won't work for softball. We will explore options to relocate or possibly add a second scoreboard.
    - i. We will also explore the possible need for a universal scoreboard.
  - n. We will be adding light poles with this project. The poles between Upper Field and the Bowl can be multi-directional to serve both areas so that potential future lights are cost efficient.
  - o. Light glare is nearly eliminated with new fixture technology.
  - p. Helps school make most use of fields.

## 5. SCHEDULE

- a. The Upper Field Improvements will help to build community in neighborhood and school. In the Fall men and women soccer will both use the field
  - i. Since there is less daylight in fall, lights will allow multiple practices to occur.
- b. The lights will also allow parents to come see games after work.
- c. In the Spring, there will be 2-3 games a week. In the current condition, students have to miss their last period to get to the field on time.
- d. Having lights and softball on campus make things equal. Lights make it so that each team has its own facility.
- e. We also have a strong youth program with 100 kids participating. Little league has 800 kids.
  - i. Lights will help build community beyond just school athletics.
- f. Baseball and Softball will share space. We run early and late practices so that all the teams can get practice time. The practices run from 3:30-6, and from 6:30 to 9pm.
- g. Baseball usually has 45-50 kids participating. Baseball could have 4 teams with the amount of interest, but we don't have the facilities to do that.
- h. Which takes more time- back to back practices or games? -
  - i. Games take longer due to warm up time.
  - ii. A game takes 3 hours for planning purposes.

## 6. NEXT STEPS

- a. Project Schedule
  - i. Project has a quick design development phase and then a long Land Use process.
  - ii. Construction Documents won't start up until we have land use approval.
  - iii. The goal would be to have the field open for Spring of 2022 sports.
- b. Land Use
  - i. The addition of lights necessitates a land use process.
  - ii. The criteria that they use to evaluate the project:
    1. Character and impacts
    2. Public Services
    3. Livability
    4. Area Plans
  - iii. This is a public process under control of the City that allows for community input.

## 7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- a. Neighbors came up with a list of issues that they would like addressed for the project. The list is included in the presentation.
  - i. Issues that can be addressed in the land use process
  - ii. If the issues are design related, then they can be addressed in the DAG as well.
  - iii. Some issues are operational and are outside of the purview of the DAG.
- b. We would like to identify Items to work on as a DAG, either items to research or work together to resolve.
  - i. David Pietka - what can DAG do - project is 95% acceptable so long as mitigation takes place. Design looks fine - what comments can DAG offer when team has done such a great job?

# BORA

---

1. Huge amount was done with master planning process. We can talk about lights, use, landscaping netting, what to do about fly-balls?
  2. Dugouts don't work great in rain - can we make slight modification to make them work better?
  3. Scoreboard location
  4. Audio system
  5. Landscaping that can help mitigate views from US Grant.
  6. Look through list that neighbors are concerned about that you can mitigate in design.
  7. Neighbors will be involved in operation issues.
- c. Help us understand how to communicate with stakeholders.
- d. Ken Peterson - people concerned about commercial signs around the bowl that interfere with aesthetics in the park. Is that a design issue? What sort of large signs or posting are part of the field?
- i. Matt Kabza explains that the issue is with the sponsorship signs at the baseball field. This is a function of baseball team funding.
  - ii. There are City codes around signage.
  - iii. The sponsorship signs at baseball come through Game Day Media who support athletics. It is a way to help fundraise.
- e. Who is neighborhood is supposed to talk to regarding operations?
- i. If during land use there has been no coordination with neighborhood, it will break down the process.
  - ii. Send concerns to Kirsten Cowden. She is in the real estate at PPS and works with PPR.
  - iii. David - Kirsten should reach out to Kenneth Peterson to work in collaboration with the neighborhood.
    1. Neighbors are interested in livability
    2. If 2 parties agree, then the City will embrace the desires of neighbors, community park and school
- f. Diallo - great opportunity to have softball on campus. Lights will support both uses as well as soccer.
- i. Netting is important to talk about it. Lack of netting inhibits ability to play games.

Next Planned Meeting

October 8, 2020

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