

Agenda Item B12 December 4, 2018 City Council:

Purchase of Play Equipment for Winchester II, Berkeley and Andamar and Fitness Equipment for Winchester I Park.

Comments from Inge Cox MD, MPH

It has come to my attention that the City is planning to change Winchester II open space. Currently the “play opportunity area” is 38’x31’ and staff is planning to increase it to 38’x110’, more than triple the current size. This costly and controversial item has been placed in the **Consent Calendar** as Agenda Item B12. It was only made available to the public last Thursday. I request this Item be pulled for discussion.

Why purchase “Play equipment” and pay for storage. The changes that will follow to the Winchester II open space are considerable and should require a plan that the public can see and comment before any equipment purchase is made. It should be treated like San Miguel Park and Santa Barbara Shores Park whose improvements fall under a separate Capital Improvement Project.

Regarding the Unitary PIP surface that will be used has the Fire Dept. been consulted? Staff provided me with three Safety Data Sheets. One an Isocyanate can release toxic fumes in fires and can contain Hydrogen cyanide. The other MSDS is Styrene-Butadiene Rubber. It was prepared in 2002. As I mentioned in my comments on the RFP August 21, 2018 the City should take into consideration the results of the federal multiagency study: The EPA, ATSDR (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry) and the CPSC (Consumer Product Safety Commission).

Staff states that “health related studies have not identified conclusive results”. Aren’t federal health studies of health treats from these surfaces still ongoing?

The 8-10 houses that are in direct contact with Winchester II Open Space will be dealing with a lot of construction, new placement of irrigation, exposure to chemicals and noise after all the construction is done. The added negative impacts to the houses facing the park could be: parking, night lighting, excessive noise, and increased illegal activity like: graffiti, drug and alcohol use.

Why is only one side of Winchester II being planned instead of the area as a whole? The west side of the park has a baseball back stop that needs repairs badly and is not even mentioned in the proposal. (See my comments and pictures on RFP Winchester I and II Open Spaces August 21, 2018)

Also all the requirements for ADA compatibility need to be evaluated.

Unitary surfaces according to staff are three to four times more expensive to install and they are costly to repair and/or replace and please do not forget removal and disposal. Can these surfaces go to a regular landfill? If in the negative, costs will increase accordingly.

Has the City of Goleta set aside money for the six parks that are in the pipeline? Aren't we talking at least millions of dollars?

Please make sure that any surfaces being considered do NOT contain lead, arsenic, styrene, butadiene, black carbon. Some are toxins and others are carcinogenic. Lead poisoning is the top pediatric environmental health problem in Los Angeles County. (Los Angeles Times Pg.C1 10-16-18)

According to the **Playground Safety Handbook of the US CPSC**, Age separation should be by a **buffer zone** because it "will reduce the chance of injury from older more active children running through areas." I do NOT see any separation zones. Have sight lines been taken into consideration?

The painting or computer graphics provided to the City of Winchester II open space by the equipment manufacturer selected is **deceptive**. Missing is the baseball back stop, missing are all the houses that connect with the open space on three fronts and could get impacted.

The open space has no more than 16 mature trees NOT over thirty as the graphic or drawing shows.

With all this construction and work with the irrigation will the City change to recycled water in Winchester II Open Space? We cannot forget that we are still in Stage III drought?

What will happen to the trees facing the houses if they do not have irrigation? What will happen to their roots when the area is dug out for placement of the Unitary Surface? What happens to the PIP/ Unitary surfaces if they get wet each time the trees and grass surface gets irrigated? Aren't we dealing with an impermeable surface, which creates runoff, another aspect not mentioned?

It is recommended that the top layer should be maintained to prevent crumb rubber in the base layer from being exposed. Surface should be inspected every 2-3 weeks to remove debris and look for areas that need patching. This is another cost that needs to be considered.

Why are the ADA access areas not provided in the picture depiction? Isn't the park being changed because of this requirement?

Please pull this item for discussion. The community surrounding the parks needs to be included in the discussion before any purchases of equipment and surfacing are made.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Victor Cox <[vic.cox.freelance@gmail.com](mailto:vic.cox.freelance@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** December 3, 2018 at 2:40:13 PM PST  
**To:** Paula Perotte <[pperotte@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:pperotte@cityofgoleta.org)>, Stuart Kasdin  
<[skasdin@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:skasdin@cityofgoleta.org)>, Kyle Richards <[krichards@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:krichards@cityofgoleta.org)>,  
Michael Bennett <[mbennett@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:mbennett@cityofgoleta.org)>, <[raceves@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:raceves@cityofgoleta.org)>  
**Subject:** comment on Consent Calendar for Dec. 4 session

Hello Mayor and Council members ,

Please note my objections to item B12 remaining in the Consent Calendar. This subject of buying playground equipment should be a discussion item.

I wish to address the proposed commitment, as I understand it, to purchase more than \$320,000 in playground equipment (plus extra for installation and debris removal) for four parks and open spaces. If storage of all this equipment is required it'll cost the City another \$15,000 a month, according to the contract breakdown.

Planning for the orderly preparation of land and installation time are not addressed in the staff report nor are the potential effects of fire on the "unitary surfaces" or the biological and geological impacts of substituting artificial surfaces for natural ones.

A thorough vetting of this proposal is mandatory if you consider that it may be a template for similar changes in other parks and open spaces.

Thank you for considering these points in switching B12 from the Consent Calendar to a discussion item.

Thank you,

Vic Cox

-----Original Message-----

From: Trevor Reid <[trevorchreid@gmail.com](mailto:trevorchreid@gmail.com)>

Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2018 10:23 AM

To: JoAnne Plummer <[jplummer@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:jplummer@cityofgoleta.org)>

Subject: Winchester 2 Park

JoAnne,

I'm emailing you regarding the Winchester 2 park in Goleta. I saw the plans for the new play structure and it looks amazing! Everyone on our block with kids seems very excited about it. My neighbor told me there is a meeting tonight regarding the plans? Unfortunately I work late today at Cottage Hosp so will not be able to attend. My only question/concern would be if it is possible for the perimeter of the playground to not extend so far north? This could be accomplished by moving one or two of the structures to the west so the perimeter would become more square and less rectangular. Does this make sense? The reason I ask is because for the last 5.5 years I have used this park to practice throwing Frisbees from the SW to the NE corner of the park and I don't want the Frisbees encroaching within the parameter of the play area. The only issues this may cause would be encroaching on the baseball field. If this is not doable no big deal, I just figured I'd ask just incase. Thank you JoAnne for all you do for Goleta!

Trevor Reid  
57 Warwick Pl.  
559-801-7683

Sent from my iPhone