

From: Victor Cox <vic.cox.freelance@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020 9:58 AM

To: Deborah Lopez <dlopez@cityofgoleta.org>

Subject: public record comment on Item A.7, Council agenda 12-1-20

Dear Deborah,

Please ask Councilmember(s) Richards or Kasdin to withdraw Item A. 7 from the Consent Calendar and discuss the holes in the RFP as detailed in my attached comments for the record.

Thank you,

Vic Cox

Consent Calendar Item A.7 (RFP specs)

My comment is for the Public Record and to be shared with all councilmembers.

Councilmembers:

With Item A.7, which should be discussed and not buried in a Consent Calendar, City Council is being asked again to rubber-stamp ill-considered ideas to change Goleta's major open space/park assets.

About two years ago Council was persuaded to authorize purchase of thousands of dollars of children's play structures for Winchester II. The goal of providing safe play areas for children was noble but no detailed design was published then, or even now, on environmental impacts of the changes to the present location or to surrounding neighborhoods, which all have cul-de-sacs. Crucial details, such as how to handle increased traffic or water drainage or how all this equipment in Win II's one-acre would alter existing view corridors apparently were not considered until residents pushed for answers. Visitor parking remains the undiscussed elephant in the room.

I understand the play structures were purchased, delivered and have been warehoused in the former Direct Relief headquarters on La Patera these past years. Though we still have no published layout design with specific location details for this equipment a few more Winchester II details have recently emerged--in the form of bid specifications.

Tonight, however, Council is now presented with a proposal to commit more public funds to three parks/open spaces in addition to Winchester II. These have selected locations but no fixed layout for any new equipment. Roughly \$650,000 to \$825,000 has been cited as available, but no budget has been publicized for the new investment.

Item A. 7 is a 930-page package of "specifications for Miscellaneous Park Improvements" covering Winchester II, Winchester I, Andamar and Berkeley open spaces and parks that leaves many of the above questions unanswered. As residents bordering Winchester II we have repeatedly raised critical issues and staff has come up with general ideas, like a "berm" to guide water away from homes, but few specifics.

Why hasn't the Parks and Recreation Commission been meaningfully involved before the bid was assembled? Yes, Commission members were briefed on staff goals and efforts at several bimonthly meetings but no analysis of the renovations was conducted before now.

Goletans' highest priorities are on preserving open space and maximizing "active park acreage without disturbing passive natural areas." Instead of the consideration due staff's suggested changes to four open space or park areas serving the western end of the City the Commission has received only brief "updates" from the staff recreation manager, and occasionally the recreation director. The one in October was 10 minutes long and did not mention the detailed RFP currently before the Council.

Please send this bid proposal back to staff for reworking. Thank you.
Vic Cox

From: Inge Cox <docoxie@gmail.com>

Date: November 30, 2020 at 11:27:23 AM PST

To: Paula Perotte <pperotte@cityofgoleta.org>, Kyle Richards <krichards@cityofgoleta.org>

Subject: Item A7 Consent Calendar

Dear City Clerk, Mayor and Councilmembers:

Please pull Agenda Item A7 "Authorization to Bid for Construction/Installation of New Play equipment at Winchester2, Berkeley and Andamar Parks and New Fitness equipment at Winchester 1 Park."

I want the attached comments to be placed as part of the record for this Item and I also want the attached comments to be read into the record. I hope that the Councilmembers ask the questions that need answered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Ingeborg Cox MD, MPH

City Council Meeting December 1, 2020

Agenda Item A7 Consent Calendar. Please pull Item for discussion.

Subject: Authorization to Bid for Construction/Installation of New Play Equipment at Winchester 2, Berkeley and Andamar Parks and New Fitness Equipment at Winchester 1 Park.

To: Paula Perotte Mayor, City Councilmembers and Mayor ProTem, Vyto Adomaitis, JoAnne Plummer

From: Ingeborg Cox MD, MPH

Improvements to Winchester II Open Space (WII OS) **should not** be categorized as **"Miscellaneous"**. Remember the **play surface** that currently is 38' x 31' is being expanded to more than **three and a half times** the length to 38' x 110'. Has an arborist been consulted for the effects on the trees that are the spirit of the area? We have already lost five trees. The huge expansion of the play surface will be close to the roots of at least five trees.

Up to date we have NOT seen actual architectural plans or site-specific plans or construction plans for WII OS. All that has been presented is a "Drawing" the latest dated 11/3/2020 and they do not depict the present reality.

On May 2019 according to Ms. Plummer when updating the Park Commission stated that WII OS is now **"a separate project given the expanded scope of work"**. CIP Budget 2019/2021 as **CIP No. 9108**.

Why is Staff now requesting that this project bid be with the rest **under CIP No. 9066** and no longer a separate project?

Removal of the four- foot chain link fence on the NORTH side is mentioned and replacing it with a six-foot vinyl coated steel chain link. The height of the fence might address the concerns about the balls heading into Calle Real but is a busy road and with no STOP signs or crossing lights near the park entrances on Calle Real since people living in Mountain View Estates, sometimes have infants and toddlers.

Please do NOT forget the birds, Red tail hawk, Red shoulder hawks, Egrets, Phobes and all nocturnal animals and all the flying visitors to this open space.

What is the effect to the raised foundation of all the houses surrounding the park because of ground vibrations during excavation? I asked this question back in 2019, still no answer.

On Page 916 of the attachment, you will find the MSDS for Spectra Thermoplastic Vulcanized Rubber (TPV), **the supplier** is Rosehill Polymers Ltd located in West Yorkshire, **United Kingdom**.

What recourse do the citizens of Goleta have if the supplier has to close?

Does the Thermoplastic Vulcanized Rubber (TPV) contain 1,3 Butadiene, Benzene, Phthalates, Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)? Any metal contaminants? Like zinc, selenium, lead or cadmium?

One of the products contains Diphenylmethane Diisocyanate (CAS No. 101-68-8) According to the SDS long term exposure to isocyanates has been reported to cause lung damage. Certain individuals could develop isocyanate sensitization (chemical asthma) symptoms mentioned are: chest tightness, wheezing, shortness of breath or asthmatic attack. Isocyanates also have been reported to cause hypersensitivity pneumonitis. Once sensitized an individual can experience these symptoms upon exposure to dust, cold air or other irritants.

Under Diisocyanate **decomposition products** you find: carbon monoxide, hydrogen cyanide, aromatic isocyanates.

The RFP states that to address the flow of water draining into the yards of the neighbors on Warwick Place, a small berm will be created. Since we are one of the neighbors impacted, we request to see the evaluation of the engineer or geologist.

We have also asked to see the reports of the soil samples and the drainage. To date **we have NOT received** this information from the City.

Just a reminder. According to a mechanical engineer from the **Consumer Product Safety Commission** (CPSC) the Selfie Swings would be considered multiple occupancy swings. On page 8 of their handbook, it states that “multiple occupancy swings are not recommended because of their greater mass, compared to single occupancy swings and present a risk for impact injury.

Please keep Winchester II as a separate project (CIP 9108), because of the scope of work. Why NOW?

Again, I request that staff answers the questions my family has regarding this project.

Please also see my comments for Agenda Item B4 Winchester II Playground Improvements to the City Council **dated February 19, 2019**. The equipment expenses for Winchester II were \$91,274. The PIP surface was not counted.

These surfaces have already been in need of repair at Bella Vista and Evergreen. What happens when the surface is broken and the materials below can contaminate the upper surface?

