
Date
11/18/2019

By
Laura Krueger

Subject
Master Plan Advisory Group 2

Project Name
Grant Bowl Master Plan

Project Number
19008

Present

Jamie Hurd, PPS	Shawn Lindsey, PPR	Stephen Weeks, Bora Architects
Carol Campbell, Grant HS	John Beck, Grant HS	Laura Krueger, Bora Architects
Deb Engelstad, Grant HS	Jeff Peeler, PIL	Kent Siebold, Grant HS
Erin McNulty, Grant HS	Abe Cambier, Bora Architects	Jason Gillies, Cameron McCarthy
Manolis Tjuanikis, Grant HS	Maya Agarwal, PPR	
Erik Miller, Grant HS	Lisa Tyler, PPR	

Distribution
Those Present

Minutes

1. GENERAL UPDATES

- A. A website is available to reference the Grant Bowl Master Planning process and can be accessed at <https://www.pps.net/Page/14612>. This provides notice for upcoming community meeting dates as well as postings for meeting minutes on previous gatherings.

2. WHAT WE HEARD

- A. MPAG 1
 - 1. Provide equitable facilities for GHS and community athletes.
 - 2. Build community through athletics.
 - 3. Expand the usability of the bowl.
 - 4. Increase safety for athletes, spectators and community.
- B. Community Engagement Meeting 1
 - 1. A summary was provided of the verbal feedback and board notations of the six meeting stations. Refer to the meeting minutes from Community Meeting 1 dated 11/06/2019 for a full description.
 - a. Grandstand seating
 - b. Access and security
 - c. Support facilities
 - d. Field improvements and lighting
 - e. Hopes and concerns

3. SOFTBALL FIELD OPTIONS

- A. Option A, two softball fields in the bowl
 1. Due to the restricted size of the existing bowl and track, neither field complies with Title IX nor meets OSAA regulations.
 - a. In order to take precautions for those using the track including the public, the school would be required to control practices. This means regulating the timing and direction of hitting balls.
 2. Safety is a concern for both athletes using the fields and any other user of the track during practice.
- B. Option B, one softball field in the bowl
 1. Based on the rotation of the softball field and reconfiguration of track and field pits, this option complies with Title IX and meets OSAA regulation size play for practice and games.
 2. The overlapping softball, soccer and football field delineation can either be permanent striping or temporary for seasonal use.
 3. In order to achieve run-off clearances before the softball backstop, the soccer field would be reduced by 5' in width.
 - a. 10' of run-off clearance is the suggested design standard, however many locations allow 15-20' of run-off for increased safety.
 - b. Since the field would be on Parks property, the city standard of 20' run-off distance should be considered. A semi-permanent option was proposed which could require up to daily set up of fencing or netting with additional storage space demand.
 4. The home plate to fence distance is 20' rather than the NFHS standard of 25'. This is acceptable for game play if competing team coaches agree to this field size modification.
 5. High jump is currently overlapping with the track surface at the existing bowl. The one softball field option proposed allows the high jump area to be fully inside the track lanes.
 6. At the softball field, dugouts with roofs would be a permanent addition to the bowl. This option has the capacity to allow a second temporary practice field at the south end of the bowl; however, built-in features (fencing, dugouts, etc) could not be accommodated.
- C. Option C, one softball field at the upper field
 1. The design proposed to incorporate a singular softball field opposite the baseball diamond which would comply with Title IX and meets OSAA regulation size play. The addition of field lighting at the upper field would be required to make this option feasible.
 2. The home plate to fence distance meets the NFHS standard of 25'.
 3. Built-in dugouts will make the circulation paths between the field and the new gymnasium building tighter.
 - a. Spectators would sit on bleachers behind the backstop similar to the baseball area.
 4. A temporary bullpen could be provided in the outfield area.
 5. By expanding the fencing to the south, 20' would be added to the soccer field length.
 6. If the softball field is permanently established at the upper field, permanent backstops could be removed in the bowl depending on Parks direction for Little League use.
 7. More study is needed to determine if the footprint expansion of the upper field triggers redesign of stormwater systems. This could be a cost prohibitive solution.

4. FIELD OPTION DESIGN FEEDBACK

- A. The questions were proposed: *How are the facilities and sports currently shared between fields? If the softball game field is placed at the upper field, can softball still practice on the bowl fields?*
 1. Field lighting at the upper field would increase duration of use and make it possible for baseball and softball to share if scheduled properly.
 2. The field use should be considered part of the flexibility in scheduling to utilize every athletic facility possible.

- B. Option A does not fulfill the addition of a Title IX compliant softball facility which is one of the goals for the project.
- C. From a safety standpoint, especially considering shared public use of the bowl it was noted that Option C to place the softball field at the upper field is the most ideal.
- D. Option B to place a rotated softball field at the bowl will not allow backstops at both ends of the field to remain permanent. This is due to the necessary reconfiguration of track and field throwing areas.
 - 1. The two throwing events for better pairing at one end of the field are shot put and discus. These events are more common to share athletes.
- E. The success of all options depends on the terms agreement between PPS and PPR to allow dedicated field use later in the evenings.
 - 1. An agreement would need to be in place prior to funding of the improvements.
- F. A benefit of Option C is that the bowl would not require permanent dugouts.
- G. In any option, good surveillance and design for access can decrease vandalism.

Action Items

>> Lisa Tyler and PPR to analyze current use of the bowl fields for Little League and T-ball.

5. SITE ANALYSIS

- A. Parking and approach
 - 1. Updated parking counts will be provided from the traffic study. Parking capacity will continue to remain on the neighboring streets.
 - a. Parking demand is understood to be similar to current Grant HS events, especially those with simultaneous use (gymnasium, auditorium, etc).
 - b. Since there will be several access points to the bowl, parking will not be concentrated around one end of the field.
 - 2. Primary gateways into the bowl are initially proposed at the end of Thompson St and from the SE corner. Other access can be considered secondary.
- B. Grant Park character
 - 1. Improvements to the bowl should not disrupt the existing character of Grant Park.
 - 2. The trees lining the west and south edges are important, and this entry corner should continue to feel like Grant Park not like a Grant HS stadium.
 - 3. An existing cluster of mature trees at the NE corner of the bowl is also an established visual boundary.
- C. Bowl slopes
 - 1. There is approximately a 6' vertical rise over 20' horizontal grade along the east and west edges of the bowl.
 - 2. The 10' wide clear path that exists between the upper field and the bowl needs to be maintained.

6. PRELIMINARY STADIUM CONFIGURATION

- A. Grandstands
 - 1. Based on feedback from the Community Engagement meeting, the design team explored seating options to be built into the hillside.
 - a. In order to increase seating capacity, the back of seating would be higher than the park path adjacent. Sight lines are proposed to be maintained over the seating.
 - b. The seating directly adjacent to the track could be elevated to include better sight lines for event viewing. Along the east side of the bowl this would be high enough to require a guardrail at the edge.
 - c. Accessible seats would be accessed at mid-level, creating breaks within the seating mass for greater visual connection to the bowl.

BORA

2. Outside of lane 8 there is currently a shoulder on the track. A meter in length is typically requested between the edge of this lane and a seating structure.
3. Fencing will need to be considered for both safety at seating guardrails as well as access and security of the bowl.
 - a. The fencing layout should provide continuity of the cross-country course.
 - b. It was noted that fencing cannot be placed close to the park trees which could impact growth and health.
- B. Support buildings, note these are separate options from the softball field designs
 1. Calculating from a seating capacity of 1500 people, a minimum of 29 plumbing fixtures (water closets) are required by code.
 - a. Temporary restrooms could be used for larger events.
 2. Option A was proposed with a series of freestanding buildings across the site to support spectators and athletes. In this scenario, a press box on the east side of the bowl was shown in order to provide double sided use for the upper field as well.
 - a. The 10' wide pathway between the two fields would remain.
 - b. To meet accessibility requirements, restrooms cannot be located greater than a 500' length of path from accessible seating.
 - c. An alternate to Option A suggests utilizing the park, pool and Grant HS gymnasium restrooms for larger events.
 3. Option B illustrates integrating buildings into the seating structure.
 - a. A benefit of this approach is that it reduces the footprint on the park and contains the construction to the immediate bowl surrounds.
 - b. It was noted that the buildings along the west of the seating keep the edge of the park more intact.
 4. Similar to integrating buildings at the seating, Option C proposes to consolidate functions for larger structures.
 - a. The extended seating around the north and south edges of the bowl increase capacity. These seats could provide better viewing for certain events in softball or track.
 - b. The group noted benefit in having two concessions stands, one on each side of the bowl.
- C. Security fencing
 1. Fencing for the bowl is proposed to follow the perimeter of the track and rear of seating. There will be several access points provided from pedestrian pathways.
 - a. Purpose of fencing is for safety and security during an event. Gates are proposed to remain open during other use hours for public access.
 2. EMT and AMR emergency personnel need continued access to the bowl from NE US Grant PI down the ramp in the SE corner. A clear 10' pathway between the upper field and the bowl also needs to be reserved for maintenance access.
- D. The location of scoreboard additions has not yet been evaluated.

Action Items

- >> Jamie Hurd and PPS to suggest square footage and programmed use for storage facility design.

BORA

7. NEXT STEPS

- A. Planning for the Community Engagement Meeting 2
 - 1. Conveying that this is a shared effort between PPS and PPR; the group is meeting in solidarity to provide improvements to the bowl.
 - 2. 3D images are helpful to illustrate scale. Rendered views from the street are also useful for a perspective into the bowl.
 - 3. This Master Planning process is important to happen first in order to identify the scope. Only then can a budget and schedule be established.
 - 4. The improvements and extended hours of use are envisioned to increase safety at the bowl and across the park.

Next Planned Meeting

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

12/12/2019, Master Plan Advisory Group Meeting 3, Grant HS Library

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