

ADM COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Athletic Facilities Athletic Masterplanning Committee

Meeting Minutes

October 26, 2015 5:30 PM

Attendees

Greg Dufoe	Superintendent of Schools	gdufoe@adm.k12.ia.us
Lucas Asche	Director of Building and Grounds	lasche@adm.k12.ia.us
Reece Satre	Activities Director	rsatre@adm.k12.ia.us
Bart Mueller	Coach Girls Track	bmueller@adm.k12.ia.us
Rick Dillinger	Coach Girls Softball	coachdillinger@gmail.com
Michael Whisner	Track Coach/PE Teacher	mwhisner@adm.k12.ia.us
Bill Shields	Coach Boys Soccer	shieldsb@dwx.com
Russ Braun	Marching Band	
Jason Book	Coach Baseball	jtbook3@gmail.com
Kelsey Gaffney	Coach Girls Soccer	
Ed Origer	Athletic Booster	eoriger@manichcorp.com
Tim Canney	ADM CSD Board President	tcanney@aol.com
Tom Wollan	frk architects + engineers	twollan@frk-ae.com

1

1. Meeting minutes from the October 6, 2015 meeting were reviewed
2. The committee's purpose statement was reviewed
3. Excerpts of the October 2015 Draft Athletic Masterplanning Report were considered:
 - a. Health and safety concerns of a synthetic turf were discussed.
 - i. The synthetic turf representative sent additional information which was made available to the committee members for review. In particular two reports from the Connecticut Department of Health and the Massachusetts Department of Public Health were discussed. The concerns sent to the committee by a local parent were also discussed.
 - ii. It is confirmed that no lead is used in the manufacture of synthetic fields from FieldTurf.
 - iii. Committee members expressed comfort in the safety of synthetic fields. A large number of Iowa colleges and universities, as well as high

schools have recently installed these fields. Recent FieldTurf installations include Harlan, Ankeny Centennial, and the University of Iowa indoor practice facility.

- iv. As a post-meeting follow-up, the Superintendent of Schools contacted the following organizations and obtained information about their facilities:

1. **The New England Patriots NFL Professional Football Team:**

Mr. Jim Nolan, VP of Finance, Administration and Operations. In his discussion with Mr. Nolan, Mr. Dufoe learned the following information:

- a. Regarding safety, Jim stated the Patriots relied on all the 3rd party information on the safety of the product as well as the fact that so many NFL teams use FieldTurf on their game and practice fields.
- b. Gillette Stadium is the home of the Patriots of the NFL and an MLS soccer franchise, the New England Revolution. Natural grass is not an option for them since they cannot sustain a nice grass field due to weather and the number of events held each year.
- c. He acknowledges that all things being equal, professional athletes would prefer to play on high-quality grass fields. However, they have been committed to providing a consistent playing surface regardless of conditions. They cannot provide that on a grass field. He indicated that it was critical for Coach Belichick to know the playing surface is the same day in and day out.
- d. Their FieldTurf is Revolution 2.5 - the best monofilament and is preferred by the soccer team. He had his soccer people review all available synthetic fields and this is the best for soccer. The field has been certified a FIFA 2 star field.
- e. They analyzed the major US turf companies and FieldTurf was deemed by them as the best company - proven history, will stand by their product, made in the US, etc.

2. **The Ohio State University:** Mr. Don Patko, the Associate Athletic Director for Facilities at The Ohio State University. In a discussion regarding their research into the safety of synthetic fields. Mr. Patko informed Mr. Dufoe that they utilized OSU's Environmental Health Services Department to do an internal review of synthetic turf. In addition, he mentioned studies done by the states of New York and California. OSU has deemed these fields to be safe and currently has several in operation. Mr. Dufoe has also been in contact with the New England Patriots professional football program to obtain further information about the safety of these fields.
 3. **University of Iowa:** Paul Fedderici, Football Operations. Mr. Fedderici indicated that the U of I did not find any concerns with the reports of health concerns with regard to synthetic turf. It is a "non issue" for the University. FieldTurf was installed in Kinnick Stadium prior to the 2009 football season as a proven product at the high school, university and professional level. In addition to FieldTurf being installed at Kinnick Stadium for competition events as well as practice, FieldTurf was also installed at the University's indoor practice facility in 2012.
- b. Expanded use of a synthetic turf field was reviewed. In addition to the suggestions listed on page 13 of the Draft Report it was also discussed that the baseball and softball teams would be able to do drills on the field if the diamonds were too wet for practice. Track and field athletes would be able to practice and warm up runs on the field if wet conditions prevented them from using natural grass fields. Steel cleats would not be allowed on a synthetic turf field.
 - c. Concurrent use of the stadium was discussed. It was determined that due to safety it is rare that multiple programs practice in the same area. This informs the stadium field selection because it is unlikely that expanded use of the stadium, if a synthetic turf, would include two programs practicing simultaneously.
 - d. It was confirmed that marching band would use the synthetic field for practice.

The marching band currently uses the M.S. Softball Field. The dirt infield is not an ideal practice surface; in addition maintaining the proper field markings for practice is not possible. Lines will not need to be painted, however, if the turf is synthetic. The band director elaborated on how precise the markings need to be for optimum performance. It was acknowledged that it will take slightly longer to get to the stadium than to the M.S. Softball Field.

- e. On page 16 of the Draft Athletic Masterplanning Report it indicates that committee did not feel it was necessary to have separate concessions and toilet room facility for home and visitors, however, a suggested design for the “combined building option” of the building configuration options provides separate facilities for home and visitor. This is not deemed a critical item if a combined stadium building is preferred by the committee. The general functionality of the combined building option would outweigh the prior indication that separate facilities are not required.

- 4. It was brought up that it will be important for the district to provide for regular maintenance of the new track and field. Lack of regular maintenance on the existing facility contributed to its current poor condition, particularly the track.
- 5. Phase One work (as described in the Draft Athletic Masterplanning Report) would be considered on by the board in November, 2015. Phase Two and Phase Three work will be considered at a later date. The committee, however, needs to make recommendations for all three phases as part of the final Athletic Masterplanning Report, particularly with regard to the stadium building configuration slated for Phase Two work, since the earthwork for the stadium work would be done during Phase One.
- 6. An option for Phase One earthwork is to balance the site (i.e. no dirt is imported or exported during earthwork construction) is to use excess dirt from stadium construction to make the existing south practice field larger.
- 7. **Phase One Consensus** The committee reviewed the items related to Phase One work as outlined on pages 17, 18 and 19 of the Draft Athletic Masterplanning Report in order to reach consensus for moving forward and making their recommendation to the School

Board. The focus was on Phase One – A, which was to create an IAAF sized track oval since the committee’s preference during prioritization was the wider oval. Discussion also focused on the projected costing for the grading work for maintaining the same oval shape verses reconfiguring the track to create an IAAF sized oval. It was the general consensus that preliminary costing shown on page 19 of the Draft Report indicating grading work to keep the same track size should be higher than \$400,000. Updated costing will be provided in the Final Athletic Masterplanning Report. The importance of this information is that it shows that there is less of a cost differential between keeping the track in the same configuration or changing it to the IAAF wider oval shape.

a. Track Type: Midwest Tennis and Track Revolution SS Red (mid range track surface)

Rationale:

- i. Midrange track adequate and appropriate for H.S. track surfaces
- ii. The SS Red coating is a protective coating and will help with long term wear ability of track
- iii. Track lane width will be 42”

b. Track Shape: IAAF Oval (wider oval, allows for wider soccer field)

Rationale:

- i. The wider oval was identified as a top priority in the Masterplanning process.
- ii. The IAAF Oval is the “new standard” for H.S. tracks in the area due to the fact that it allows for a wider soccer field and it keeps football teams sideline area off the track.
- iii. It was pointed out that the stadium needs to be viewed as a “Multi-Sport” facility and as such serve the needs of all the activities and programs that will use it.
- iv. Cost of track material/surface is the same for IAAF oval shape and normal oval shape.

c. Field Type: FieldTurf Monofilament Synthetic Turf

Rationale:

- i. A synthetic turf allows for the greatest flexibility and expanded use of the field for the ADM District which is experiencing increased enrollment and

activities at the stadium and could benefit from more use of the stadium for practice, band, tournaments, completion events, etc.. Many committee members indicated that at the start of the Athletics Masterplanning process their preference was for natural turf, but after learning the pros and cons of natural turf verses synthetic turf it became clear that a synthetic turf field makes sense for the future direction and growth of the activities on the field.

- ii. While a natural grass turf is preferred by many athletes, it is limited to 70 games per year and precludes use for other purposes. Currently the ADM Athletics program has about 70 games per year, but that number will increase and the desire to use the stadium for expanded use is increasing as well. Currently during stadium sports seasons the existing field is used 3 hours per day. A synthetic turf field will allow an increase of use of the field to 12 hours per day.
- iii. Other districts in conference play have synthetic fields, having a synthetic turf field in the ADM CSD would provide ADM athletics better experience in playing on such a field. Even some districts that have recently installed natural turf fields are finding themselves in the position of needing a synthetic turf field for increased stadium activities.
- iv. Improvements to the stadium being considered by this Athletics Masterplanning Committee will become a draw for families considering moving into the district. A synthetic turf might be an important component of the stadium improvements in this regard.
- v. Committee members felt strongly that a monofilament turf by FieldTurf was preferred due to its performance and due the fact that it has been shown to be better for soccer.
- vi. A synthetic turf field eliminates the need for lines to be painted on the field and it has less maintenance requirements.
- vii. A synthetic turf field is not adversely affected by unfavorable weather. By contrast, 2015 was a particularly bad year for the existing natural turf field due to significant rainfall and little opportunity to adequately maintain the field, especially re-seeding efforts.
- viii. With a synthetic turf field the athletics department will not have to make

the kinds of judgment calls dictated by a natural turf field as to whether or not to cancel an event based on weather. At times the natural turf field has been used under less than ideal conditions due to the fact that it was not advisable to cancel an event.

- ix. The timing of the work at the stadium is determined by the type of field to be installed. A natural turf field will not be able to be bid until fall of 2016, which means work on the stadium (track and field) would not occur until 2017. Installing a synthetic turf field means that work can be done in 2016. It was also pointed out that this time frame is will allow for more favorable bids due to the fact that earthwork contractors are not often in a good position to bid fall work.

d. Upgrade Lights at the Varsity Baseball and Softball Fields: confirmed

Rationale:

- i. The need for upgraded lighting at these two fields is important for player safety.

8. **Phase Two Consensus** The committee reviewed the items related to Phase Two work as outlined on pages 17, 19 and 20 of the Draft Athletic Masterplanning Report in order to reach consensus for moving forward and making their recommendation to the School Board, particularly with regard to the items that impact the design of the stadium area and the resultant earthwork that would be part of the construction.

7

a. Phase Two – A Stadium Team Building Separate.

- i. The committee chose to reject this option in favor of a combined Concessions/Toilet/Team building as described in Phase Two – B.

b. Phase Two – B Stadium Concessions/Toilet/Team Building Combined – preferred option.

Rationale:

- i. A combined building offers more efficiency for mechanical, electrical and plumbing infrastructure.
- ii. Having the proposed Team building closer to the field and entrance to the stadium reduces amount of paving and shortens the circulation distances.
- iii. A combined building offers more helpful crowd control for all the

functions of the stadium, separating visitors and home for big games or providing separate entrances into the stadium for athletes and spectators for track/field events.

- iv. The size and the cost opinion of a combined building will be evaluated further for potential value engineering
- c. Stadium Storage – a single storage building located at some point east of the home bleachers was considered. Final location to be determined.
- d. Ball Field Improvements including dugouts, batting cages, bullpens, and baseball practice facility will be addressed during the design phase for Phase Two work.

9. Phase Three Consensus Little discussion was held regarding Phase Three work since it is several years in the future. As part of the Athletics Facility Masterplanning Report this work would be follow as outlined in the proposed project schedule.

10. Other Discussion Items

- a. All costs associated with each phase will be updated for the Final Athletics Facility Masterplanning Report.
- b. The committee preferred that the scoreboard stay on the west side of the stadium
- c. The ideal location of the shot put venue would be in the SE or the SW corner of the stadium complex outside of the track. Less ideal would be to have shot put be on the new field.
- d. The discus field should remain in its present location but be upgraded. This work would be part of Phase One work.

The notes above constitute our understanding of the matters discussed, and the conclusions reached, at this meeting. If there are discrepancies between these notes and your understanding of the matters discussed or conclusions reached, please contact this office immediately

frk project no 1047E01