BORA

# MEETING MINUTES

| Date | By |
|---|---|
| 12/12/2019 | Abe Cambier |

| Subject | Project Name | Project Number |
|---|---|---|
| Focus Group Meeting 3 | Grant Bowl Master Plan | 19008 |

**Present**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Jamie Hurd, PPS | Mary Kane, PPS | Debbie Engelstad, Grant HS |
| Andre Ashley, PPR | Marina Cresswell, PPS | John Beck, Grant HS |
| Lisa Tyler, PPR | Carol Campbell, Grant HS | Stephen Weeks, Bora Architects |
| Maya Agarwal, PPR | Kent Siebold, Grant HS | Abe Cambier, Bora Architects |
| Diallo Lewis, PIL | Erin McNulty, Grant HS | |

**Distribution**

Those Present

**Minutes**

1. **MASTER PLAN PROCESS UPDATE**
   - A. Jamie Hurd described how the Master plan process would work going forward. This is the last advisory meeting. The design team will submit two options to the cost estimator for pricing and the master plan document will go to the Bond Subcommittee for consideration in January.
     1. Jamie described how this group was tasked by the Board to study how softball could be added to the Bowl. Therefore, we are going to complete this task and describe this as a base option. Because the group did look at an alternate location in the Upper Field, and that option garnered significant support, we will price this option and present it in the report as an alternate.
        - a. The Board of Education directed the Office of School Modernization to complete a master planning process to address Option, placing Softball in Grant Bowl.
        - b. Discussion of the options looked at in the past. Debbie talked about how the current upper bowl option is different than the one rejected in the past. The option considered was baseball and softball on the same part of the field, without lights.
        - c. Carol reminded the group that softball in the bowl have positive improvements for other sports that could be lost if softball was added to the Upper Field.
        - d. Kent expressed the sentiment that Option B (softball in the upper field) has been widely embraced by the staff. He considered the past process problematic in that decisions didn't include track.

e. Jamie said she distributed and reviewed the Superintendent's report at the beginning of the Master Planning process. She stated that she could have done more to keep the direction at the forefront of the meetings.
f. Kent asked how the community can impact the ultimate decision.
g. Jamie said that there will be a number of factors that will impact the final decision; Board of Education, Parks and Recreation, Land Use, and City Codes.
h. Lisa asked about the process if it is not included in the next bond.
i. Jamie said the board will make future funding recommendations.
j. Marina commented that once we have costs we can start the conversation with the Board. Public comments are always considered by the Bond Committee and Board. Our task is to get those costs and get that conversation going. The Bond Committee is Jan 16th at 4pm (?). They will reach out to the group to let them know when that will be and there will be a comment period.

**2. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MEETING 2 RECAP**

A. Stephen presented a summary of what we heard at the community engagement meeting. See Exhibit A presentation.
    1. Commitment from all coaches to find the solution that works best for all, despite potential compromises to any individual sport
    2. Preference for softball game field at the upper field because the group feels it best minimizes conflicts between sports activities, especially in the busy spring season
    3. Safety is paramount and a 20' minimum buffer from field boundaries to permanent fencing is required
    4. Support for seating extending around the curve, especially on the east side of the track near the finish line
    5. Secondary practice field can utilize a portable backstop and be shared by softball and baseball
    6. General excitement for the emerging stadium master plan design approach.
    7.

B. Additional comments that may not have been represented
    1. Jamie said that there were comments of concern about the height of the seating and seeing any concrete from 33rd.
    2. Lisa received feedback regarding concerns for any buildings along 33rd.

**3. MASTER PLAN REFINEMENT REVIEW**

A. Stephen presented two versions of Option A, softball in the Bowl. One with temporary backstop and dugouts as previously described (A.1) and an A.2 that would place permanent softball elements in the Bowl. Stephen and Jamie asked the group to decide between the two. The primary impact of making the backstop and dugouts permanent would be the need for 20' buffer between these elements and the soccer field. The temporary design has only a 10' buffer. In order to maintain the 20', the soccer, football and lacrosse fields must be moved south and to the east. The result is to lose an additional 10' of width and 30' of length from the soccer field.
    1. The group had a number of questions about how temporary elements would work.
        a. Kent asked how the football goalposts are moved. (After Stephen described the removable posts that would support the backstop netting.)
        b. Lisa – the football goals are removed and stored by parks.
        c. Lisa – asked if the sidelines would get narrower with A2. She encouraged flipping the whole thing to give the home team more room on the sidelines. One of the concerns about a narrow sideline is the track surface could get damaged by

players walking on the track with cleats due to lack of space between the sideline and the track.
   d. Debbie wanted to make sure the fencing would go at least as far as 3rd and 1st bases.
   e. Lisa- in either version, we would need padding on hard elements you might run into.
2. Discussion of whether temporary softball infrastructure would adequately serve softball and be sufficiently equitable.
   a. Carol – the community may view some options not giving softball an equal facility. A permanent facility in the bowl also might be viewed as compromising other sports. We were called together to give softball a comparable facility to baseball and other sports. The temporary netting will be a difficult sell. The setup and storage will be challenging. They are more vulnerable to damage.
   b. Debbie – Would love to have the facility that is always there and used by feeder groups other times of the year. Sharing a field with other sports creates visual challenges given all of the overlapping linework. Last year they painted over the football lines within the arc, but it is visually different than the baseball field. She would like a permanent facility. She is also concerned about the impacts on soccer and feels conflicted. They stopped pushing for the upper field because improvements in this area will have wider positive impacts for more kids. Option A2 would be her choice between A1 and A2, but she does not like the impacts on soccer..
   c. A conversation about the infield being permanently brown and the football lines be temporary.
   d. Diallo - Perhaps all of the football lines could be temporary. You could still play games on the smaller soccer field, but there would be concerns and preferences for the wider field.
   e. Carol Campbell - How would the smaller soccer field compare to the other fields they play on? They could choose to play some games elsewhere. This problem seems solvable, but the temporary facility would not.
3. Stephen asked whether the setback of the fence from the soccer sideline could be less than 20', thus allowing the soccer field to be wider.
   a. Lisa suggested parks might be open to it.
4. Jamie asked whether the permanent would be the preference. Carol, Debbie and others seemed to agree.
   a. The final decision for bringing softball back to campus must meet Title IX requirements.
   b. The team will work with Title IX experts to determine that the project is incompliance.
   c. There was discussion about what equity means.
   d. Carol likes the idea that softball and baseball could be playing at the same time. Two separate areas would be valuable.
   e. Carol is concerned about altering a relatively new upper field and how that will be perceived.
   f. Kent has safety concerns about track events. That softball is juggling with track while baseball does not have to. It is hard to advocate for anything but Option B
   g. The group voted to proceed with a permanent softball facility 6 to 0.

**4. SUPPORT FACILITIES | SEATING | LIGHTING**

A. Stephen described the two general approaches to support building locations as shared with the community and advisory group. The preference was to integrate them with the seating.

B. Stephen and Jamie talked about how the seating design will be refined in later phases.
   1. Graffiti on vertical surfaces is a concern.
   2. Skateboarding is a concern.
   3. Lisa - less fencing is a virtue of the seating that steps down in the back.

C. Stephen described how the two fencing schemes were received, with some preference for fencing that would have less impact on the park.
   1. The group suggested that it needs to be far enough for people can circulate within the fence. That it would have to be 6'tall.
   2. Diallo, would think the appearance would be moderated if it was pushed back into the bushes.

D. Stephen relayed the public support for lighting at the upper field in addition to the Bowl. He mentioned how we may need another pole to light softball in the Bowl.
   1. Jamie – We need to make sure the Bowl would be lit for track. Stephen confirmed that was the intention.

E. Bathrooms – How many should we plan to build? Stephen described an approach where new (unisex) restrooms would be constructed on both sides of the field to meet ADA requirements. For large events, some combination of existing facilities in the school and pool, permanent facilities at the Bowl and temporary porta-potties would be employed. It was agreed that a number of 11 stalls was a reasonable and conservative number for planning purposes until conversations with code officials and the school could take place during the design phase.
   1. The group considered this a reasonable approach.
   2. It was pointed out that people would have to leave the fence line to use the restrooms in the building.

F. Storage and Concessions – Stephen described the current intent to provide concessions spaces on both sides of the bowl and to co-locate them with storage and restrooms. The storage amount would be a third larger than the existing space at the Bowl and Upper Field.
   1. The group thought that this would be adequate.
   2. Diallo asked whether we need concessions on both sides. The point was made it would limit the need to move from one side to the other.
   3. It was pointed out that both locations are constrained for space and that dividing the services would aid in crowd management.
   4. Lisa pointed out that some may prefer to use the pool, instead of additional buildings depending on the required distances.
   5. Stephen – our narrative could describe how the pool could potentially replace some of the function of the SE building.
   6. Lisa asked about shifting the east concessions north, near the finish line. There was some concern about losing seats in this location, but it was emphasized that we can re-examine the locations in the design phase.
   7. Others asked about the possibility of a three story press box.

**5. FINAL THOUGHTS**

   1. Would the master plan list all of the concerns that have been raised?
   2. Debbie is concerned that by the time construction starts, costs will have gone up and we will not realize what we thought was possible.

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**