

Subject: Council Agenda: 10/27/20, File: 20-1282, Item: 7.1

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers,

As a 20-year resident who came from the South Bronx NY, as a single mother to raise four children in this neighborhood of the Cadillac-Winchester, to give them a better and healthier life. I did not only had work to support my family, but I got involved in many different non-profit groups. Winchester soccer league as a coach, ACUDIR, which help to organize, to put the streetlights down Eden Ave in this same neighborhood. Also involved at school programs, Sunday teacher and many more, food bank volunteers, and many more. So, my kids feel safe and accepted, but this is not about me. This is just for you to understand that I know what is going with my Latinos' neighborhood, And specially, with the teenagers and kids. I would like to be the voice for them. and to please request that you defer the vote on Item 7.1.

Simply, the outreach by the City of San has been uneven and there are too many open questions.

I was a long-time member of Pueblo de Dios Church who also was Co-Chair of the build for the Sharks' Playground.

That project exemplified the way grassroots community building should occur. We had to raise funds, attract volunteers, and organize an array of activities to make that project a success. Not only was it just for the park but we would constantly do outdoor activities for the neighbor to be a part of. Our hope is for the same kind of community-spirit as the city began imagining the new park.

Some of the open questions include:

- The ***playground's concrete footings meet the specifications*** outlined in the Vice Mayor's Memorandum, according to Kaboom! Council should be aware of this before they vote. Unfortunately, the Parks Commission did not have this information for their vote.
- Further, the playground has many more decades of useful life. The core structural elements have 25-year limited warranties. <https://puebloplay.wordpress.com/2020/08/31/the-sharks-playground-as-a-centerpiece-of-a-new-park/>
- We should be focusing on connecting people in the Cadillac Winchester with services that exist today. This website is a start. By understanding what is available, then we will know what is needed both in terms of services and building requirements. <https://wnacomunity.wordpress.com/>
- If a new building is required, there are many alternatives, some of which might even be possible within the phase 1 budget. <https://puebloplay.wordpress.com/2020/10/05/why-should-we-have-to-wait-for-the-community-services/>

The City already has what the community needs and they have it closed to the public. The more time goes by the more the building will go to waste which brings another alternative that should be explored. Refurbishing the existing Social Hall. The church is not in bad shape because it's old but because it got abandoned. Constructed in 1989, it was useful as a community center of sorts for the greater Pueblo de Dios community up until the time the city bought the property.

<https://puebloplay.wordpress.com/2020/10/19/what-about-refurbishing-the-social-hall/>

Again, please defer the vote until these and other questions brought up by the public are addressed.

In Community,

Maria Veliz



October 26, 2020

To: Honorable City of San Jose Councilmembers

From: Cadillac Winchester Neighborhood Association (CWNA)

RE: City of San Jose, Council Agenda 10/27/20, Item 7.1: Approval of Park Master Plan at 3275 Payne Ave.

Dear Councilmembers:

On behalf of the Cadillac Winchester Neighborhood community, we respectfully urge you to voice support for the proposed Master Plan by the City of San José's Parks, Recreation, and Neighborhood Services (PRNS) Department. Our community has distinctly expressed the need and desire for a community center in our neighborhood. It is imperative that our community has a space to gather within the vicinity of our neighborhood. After multiple community meetings, PRNS released the Master Plan which included two phases. The first phase includes building a park with new amenities and picnic spaces. The second phase, which will occur once funding is available, includes a new community center.

Our neighborhood has one of the highest crime rates in San José Council District 1. Our children are at risk of gang activity and drug use. We desperately need a space that provides our children access to counseling, computers with internet access, and youth programs. Our senior citizens need access to health services, classes, and resources. Those who are struggling to pay rent or put food on the table need a place where they can access financial services and food assistance.

There are members of the community who are opposed to a community center and have suggested that members of our neighborhood walk to other libraries and centers in the District. Not only do we feel uneasy about walking several blocks, we do not feel safe sending our children through areas of high gang activity and drug use, to other neighborhoods and other cities in order to access critical resources. We are residents of the City of San José and we deserve a safe space, where we can send our children, where we can gather as a community with ease, and where we can provide our community with resources that they need.

On behalf of our neighborhood, we urge you to please support the proposed Master Plan for Payne Ave Park. The Cadillac Winchester Neighborhood thanks you in advance for your consideration and time.

Respectfully on behalf of the CWNA,

Maria Ines

President, CWNA

City of San Jose

200 East Santa Clara Street, Third Floor

San Jose, CA 95113-1905

Subject: Comments regarding the plans for a new park at 3257 Payne Avenue

Council Agenda 10/27/2020 Item 7.1

First, I'm extremely grateful and happy to have a park brought into our neighborhood. We live between Winchester Blvd and San Tomas Exp. And there is literally no open space here. Thank you.

My concern is that the plan being submitted to you is based on the premise that sometime in the future the city will have the money to build and staff a new community center. Several years ago the city built a police substation in our neighborhood. It included space for community activities such as the Winchester NAC meetings, a dance class etc. Owing to a lack of funds, that public space was leased to a nonprofit Korean group. I'm not questioning the good work that this group might be doing. I'm questioning if it's right to take the property out of public use. Right now it looks like private property. It serves just the Korean community. Similarly, our two closest parks, Marijane Hamann Park and Starbird Park have been leased to nonprofit groups because the city couldn't afford to staff them. So I can't understand why we should be planning and building our park with the intent to dismantle it in a few years to build a community center that, if built, would probably be leased to another non-profit, thus limiting its neighborhood park status.

Again, I really am happy to have a new park, but I think we should plan it for today's use. I go by the park nearly every day. I hardly ever see anyone there—and I think it's because it still looks like

private property. The church is still there. There is a private school there with a fenced in play area. It doesn't look like a neighborhood park. I'd like to see PRNS look at how to open up the space, make it like a neighborhood park with green grass, benches etc. We have some very high density areas in the neighborhood. People don't have backyards. We need a place to run, throw a ball, have a picnic etc. We have a good start. The playground that neighbors helped to build can be expanded. Not only would that be a recognition of all the work volunteers to put into planning, fundraising and maintaining, it would also let people know that their work is not in vain. We would have a neighborhood park that is inviting to all of our neighbors. Thank you.

Betty Kabanek,
Resident, Eden Neighborhood

Fw: Would You Have Changed Your Vote on the Park at 3257 Payne Avenue? COUNCIL AGENDA: 10/27/20, FILE: 20-1282, ITEM: 7.1

City Clerk

Tue 10/27/2020 3:30 PM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>;

From: Ken Pyle [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2020 8:38 AM
To: Parks and Recreation Commission 1 <PRC1@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 2 <PRC2@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 3 <PRC3@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 4 <PRC4@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 5 <PRC5@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 6 <PRC6@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 7 <PRC7@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 8 <PRC8@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 9 <PRC9@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 10 <PRC10@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission CW <PRCCW@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: info@WinchesterN [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; District 1 Leadership Group <[REDACTED]>; 280 Cap Vision Team <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Would You Have Changed Your Vote on the Park at 3257 Payne Avenue? COUNCIL AGENDA: 10/27/20, FILE: 20-1282, ITEM: 7.1

[External Email]

Dear City Clerk,

Please include this in the public record for COUNCIL AGENDA: 10/27/20, FILE: 20-1282, ITEM: 7.1

Dear Parks Commissioner,

At the September 2nd, 2020 Parks Commission Meeting regarding the park at 3257 Payne Avenue, PRNS made several statements that were wrong or, at best, subjectively true.

Why were we told that the concrete footings for the Sharks Playground at the new park at 3257 Payne Avenue (aka Pueblo Play) did not meet city specifications? (footnote 1)

That was the first time this author had heard of the supposed shortcoming, even though I had supplied the engineering documentation to PRNS on April 13th, 2020. Further, we asked for evidence of the shortcomings, multiple times, but never received a response. (footnote 2)

The only way we learned about the specification was from the [memo issued by the Mayor, Vice Mayor, and Councilmember Perelaz](#) late Friday, 10/23/20, four days before the Council vote on this project. Fortunately, we had time to find the answer and indeed, the **FOOTINGS EXCEED SPECIFICATION.** (footnote 3)

Would your vote had been different if you had known this critical piece of information?

Further, PRNS's data and the data the WNAC collected in its placemaking efforts provide polar opposite conclusions. As stated at the meeting by PRNS, (footnote 4)

“The Community Center was actually the number one priority for the community and a close second was to not lose all the parking that's available now.”

JASON CONDIT, PRNS AT THE 9/2/20 PARKS COMMISSION MEETING

The WNAC has had 250+ placemaking touchpoints compared to PRNS' 165+ purported interactions. (footnote 5) Our placemaking was onsite, we received online input, and through a just-completed survey. Our results indicate that, (footnote 6)

The majority want open space, augmentation of the Sharks' Playground, and delivery of community services today.

SUMMARY OF WNAC OCTOBER 2020 SURVEY OF COMMUNITY

Would you have asked for a delay had you known the stark difference in the results of PRNS's and the community-led placemaking efforts of the WNAC?

There have also been questions about the life of the playground. The core elements that are planted in the ground with concrete footings appear to live up to the limited [25-year warranty](#) that Playworld System has for those components.

Lastly, would your vote have been different if you have had a chance to see the playground in person or, at least, watch this video of its current condition?

<https://puebloplay.wordpress.com/2020/08/31/the-sharks-playground-as-a-centerpiece-of-a-new-park/>

In Community,

Ken Pyle,

D1LG Chair, Vice President of the WNAC, District 1 Airport Commissioner (views are my own)

1 Please see 7:00 into this video <https://puebloplay.wordpress.com/2020/10/23/footings-dont-meet-standard-9-2-20-parks-commission-11539-12345/>

2 For example this video, shown in the 9/26/20 D1LG meeting <https://puebloplay.wordpress.com/2020/09/25/and-about-that-community-built-sharks-playground-at-the-park-at-3257-payne-avenue/> and via email follow-up to the Vice Mayor in this email <https://puebloplay.wordpress.com/2020/10/14/a-community-services-are-needed-more-than-a-community-center/>

3 Please see <https://puebloplay.wordpress.com/2020/10/26/footings-exceed-specifications/>

4 Please see <https://puebloplay.wordpress.com/2020/10/23/why-not-reuse-the-sharks-playground-excerpt-from-9-2-20-parks-commission-meeting/>

5 Please see this missive about how PRNS' reported attendees were off by approximately 100%+ <https://puebloplay.wordpress.com/2020/10/23/those-are-brown-mms-in-my-candy-bowl/>

6 Please see <https://puebloplay.wordpress.com/2020/10/26/survey-says-keep-the-sharks-playground-open-space-community-services-today/>

--

Ken Pyle
Managing Editor

[REDACTED]

M. Martin
San Jose Resident
October 27, 2020

To: Mayor Liccardo, Vice Mayor Jones, and City Council District Members
Re: COUNCIL AGENDA: 10/27/20, FILE: 20-1282, ITEM 7.1

Tearing down the Pueblo Play Playground and aiming to replace it with a new playground and community center is a waste of time and money. I would go as far to say that it's reckless. You have the facts about the structure but unfortunately have provided baseless reasons to tear it down with statements that are untrue and Kaboom! Has been able to provide you with the truth, which seems as though you have refused to accept. It is quite the shame that our city government has opted to reject the truth. As a lifelong community member, it feels to me as though you are simply doing this for a future photo opportunity.

As you are fully aware, this project will cost \$30M. During a time when unemployment is ravaging the residents of San Jose, spending an unnecessary amount of money for what appears to be for the sheer sake of spending money feels like a slap in the face. Those funds could be much better allocated to any services to better provide for the surrounding communities, especially the neighborhood between Payne and Hamilton. To tear down this playground that serves a community of color during a time when racial tensions are high, so high in fact that Mayor Sam Liccardo imposed a city wide curfew (which he subsequently broke) to attempt to keep protests and riots from continuing, is loathsome.

I sincerely hope that you opt to save the Pueblo Play Playground. There is no need to tear it down along with the church, which can be converted into a community center for significantly less than tearing it down and building an entirely new structure. Residents with children need a safe place to play and ridding them of that is despicable.

Sincerely,
M. Martin

Fw: COUNCIL AGENDA: 10/27/20, FILE: 20-1282, ITEM: 7.1 - Sharks' Playground Exceeds Specifications

Gregory, Barbara

Wed 10/28/2020 7:12 AM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Thank You,

Barb Gregory



Analyst II

Office of the City Clerk

200 E Santa Clara St FL T-14

San Jose, C-A 95112

408-535-1272 Fax: 408-292-6207

e-mail: [REDACTED]

[How is our service? Please take our short survey.](#)

From: Ken Pyle <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2020 5:30 PM
To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]> CouncilMeeting <CouncilMeet[REDACTED]>
Cc: Jones, Chappie <[REDACTED]> Gomez, David <[REDACTED]> Helen M. Chapman <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> Sandoval, Vanessa <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> Ramos, Christina M <christina.ramos@cityofsanjose.org> District3 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> Herbert, Frances <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> District 6 <[REDACTED]> Groen, Mary Anne <[REDACTED]>
District7 <[REDACTED]> Kaspar, Nick <[REDACTED]> McGarrity, Patrick <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9 <[REDACTED]> Hughes, Scott <scott.hughes@cityofsanjose.org>
<[REDACTED]> Connolly, Shane Patrick <[REDACTED]> Khamis, Johnny <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> Reed, Jim <[REDACTED]> The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> Green, Scott <scott.green@cityofsanjose.org>
<[REDACTED]> District 1 Leadership Group <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> Parks and Recreation Commission 1 <[REDACTED]> Parks and Recreation Commission 2 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> Parks and Recreation Commission 3 <[REDACTED]> Parks and Recreation Commission 4 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> Parks and Recreation Commission 5 <[REDACTED]> Parks and Recreation Commission 6 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> Parks and Recreation Commission 7 <[REDACTED]> Parks and Recreation Commission 8 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> Parks and Recreation Commission 9 <[REDACTED]> Parks and Recreation Commission 10 <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]> Parks and Recreation Commission CW <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: COUNCIL AGENDA: 10/27/20, FILE: 20-1282, ITEM: 7.1 - Sharks' Playground Exceeds Specifications

[External Email]

Unfortunately, this item did not make it into the public record. It was sent well before this morning's deadline. The Mayor, Vice Mayor's and Councilmember Peralez's memo should have been updated, accordingly.

THIS ITEM IS MATERIAL (pun intended) to the discussion; both last month at the Parks Commission meeting (maybe this item wouldn't have advanced, had this information been known), as well as tonight.

Thank you,

Ken

On Mon, Oct 26, 2020 at 2:07 PM Ken Pyle <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Honorable Mayor, Councilmembers, et. al,

Please include the following as part of the public record for COUNCIL AGENDA: 10/27/20, FILE: 20-1282, ITEM: 7.1.

As seen in the email below, 4,000 PSI concrete was used for the footings for the Sharks Playground at the park at 3257 Payne Avenue (aka, Sharks Park, Pueblo Play), which greatly exceeds the specification of 3,000 PSI cited in their memo.

The Memo from the Mayor, the Vice Mayor, and Councilmember Peralez incorrectly states that 2,500 PSI was used for the footings.

It is unfortunate that no one reached out to either myself or Kaboom! asking for this information prior to the release of that memorandum.

In Community,

Ken

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ted Friedman** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, Oct 26, 2020 at 1:38 PM
Subject: RE: Urgent - What PSI Concrete was used?
To: Ken Pyle <[REDACTED]>

Hi Ken,

Thank you for your email. We use Quikrete on our playground projects. In researching the Quikrete website, the type we use has a 4,000 psi after 28 days (please see the attachment). This came from the [Quikrete website](#).

Thank you,

Ted Friedman
Director of Project Management
[REDACTED]

From: Ken Pyle <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, October 23, 2020 8:58 PM
To: Ted Friedman <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Urgent - What PSI Concrete was used?

Hi Ted,

Just now, on Friday before the Tuesday vote, the city finally says where the footings are deficient. They say the 2,500 LB PSI specification on the Engineering Drawings don't meet code, which, according to the Vice Mayor's

memo is 3,000 lb PSI.

The engineering document clearly states it was designed for the 2013 code. I suspect that maybe there was a code change and they are applying the new code.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1azm71xG-YjAABgtV9PMnDqKxQjErMdbS/view?usp=sharing>

Here is the exact quote from the Vice Mayor's memo.

"The KaBOOM! playground foundation is constructed of 2500 PSI (pounds per square inch) concrete. 2500 PSI concrete has less cement, which acts as an adhesive agent, and does not provide the level of strength or stability offered by the City's 3000 PSI specification. Swings, slides, and play upon structures places force upon the playground structure. The lateral motions are absorbed by the footings to prevent instability or collapse over time. The City adheres to a 3000 PSI concrete standard for playground footings for public safety and longevity of structures. In terms of liability, assuming the playground as a City facility will create a documented instance of not meeting minimum City specifications for playground installations."

Here is the rest of the memo

<https://puebloplay.files.wordpress.com/2020/10/memorandum-from-mayor-jones-peralez-10232020.pdf>

Thanks,

Ken

--

Ken Pyle
Managing Editor

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

o

Fw: Delay the Vote – Council Agenda 10/27/20, Item 7.1, File: 20-1282 Vote No, Re-Examine, and Improve PRNS's Plan

City Clerk

Mon 11/2/2020 9:00 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>;

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: Mabel Cheng <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, October 31, 2020 4:01 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Delay the Vote – Council Agenda 10/27/20, Item 7.1, File: 20-1282 Vote No, Re-Examine, and Improve PRNS's Plan

[External Email]

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers,

Regarding Council Agenda 10/27/20, Item 7.1, File: 20-1282, we ask that you vote no on PRNS's proposed plan for the new park at [3257 Payne Avenue](#).

We request that the city integrate the community-built, Sharks' playground into the master plan. This alone would save hundreds of thousands of dollars that could be used for other amenities either at this new park or at Hamann Park.

It is important to point out that Hamann Park also falls within the nexus of the funding that made the park at [3257 Payne Avenue](#) possible. Some examples of improvements that could be made are given in the article in the following link.

<https://puebloplay.wordpress.com/category/community-event-2/letters-of-support/>

Further, portions of Hamann Park fall within the catchment area of the new park at [3257 Payne Avenue](#). These citizens were not noticed by PRNS in its outreach process.

As usual, the HPNA stands ready to help create win-win solutions. In fact, this new park wouldn't be happening without the efforts, starting in 2013, of several of our HPNA residents. This video provides a brief history of those

efforts.

https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLnoBT9w_v8Xs-Ki1hINWJngr0B24K402e

Sincerely,

Mabel Cheng

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Fw: COUNCIL AGENDA: 10/27/20, FILE: 20-1282, ITEM: 7.1 - Footing Specification Code

Gregory, Barbara

Fri 12/11/2020 7:39 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>;

[REDACTED]

Thank You,

Barb Gregory



Analyst II

Office of the City Clerk

200 E Santa Clara St FL T-14

San Jose, C-A 95112

408-535-1272 Fax: 408-292-6207

e-mail: barbara.gregory@sanjoseca.gov

[How is our service? Please take our short survey.](#)

From: maria veliz [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2020 4:22 PM

To: Ken Pyle [REDACTED]

Cc: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 6 <PRC6@sanjoseca.gov>; Gomez, David <David.Gomez@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 4 <PRC4@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 1 <PRC1@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 2 <PRC2@sanjoseca.gov>; Condit, Jason <Jason.Condit@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 3 <PRC3@sanjoseca.gov>; Garcia, Diana <Diana.Garcia@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 10 <PRC10@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 7 <PRC7@sanjoseca.gov>; Meyer-Calvert, Teresa <teresa.meyer-calvert@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission 5 <PRC5@sanjoseca.gov>; Maria Ortega <[REDACTED]>; Parks and Recreation Commission 8 <PRC8@sanjoseca.gov>; Mariana Damian <[REDACTED]>; Parks and Recreation Commission 9 <PRC9@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks and Recreation Commission CW <PRCCW@sanjoseca.gov>; Daphna Woolfe <[REDACTED]>; ENA Board Members <[REDACTED]>

>; ccornejo <>; mfitcjian <>;
<>; jhoarte <>; samah.sohrab <>;
<s >; Ramona Snyder <>; Livezey, Doris <>; Kabanek,
Betty <>; Kelsey Bassanini <>; Roma Dawson <>;
Tracy Huang <>; Burnham, Nicolle <nicolle.burnham@sanjoseca.gov>; Yotam, Avi
<Avi.Yotam@sanjoseca.gov>; Zsutty, Yves <Yves.Zsutty@sanjoseca.gov>; O'Reilly, Torie <Torie.O'Reilly@sanjoseca.gov>;
Espino, Leticia (Barajas) <leticia.espino@sanjoseca.gov>; Maciel, Mario <mario.maciel@sanjoseca.gov>; Montes, Xochitl
<Xochitl.Montes@sanjoseca.gov>; Williams, Olympia <Olympia.Williams@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales, Hilda
<hilda.morales@sanjoseca.gov>; Canjura, Israel <Israel.Canjura@sanjoseca.gov>; Mendez, Zacharias
<Zacharias.Mendez@sanjoseca.gov>; David Rubin <drubin >; Mark Slichter
<mslichter >; info <>; Jerry Giles
>; Justin Lardinois <>; Steve Ling <>; District 1
Leadership Group <>; James Reber <>
Subject: COUNCIL AGENDA: 10/27/20, FILE: 20-1282, ITEM: 7.1 - Footing Specification Code

[External Email]

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 24, 2020, at 2:23 AM, Ken Pyle <> wrote:

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers,

Please enter the attached document and this email string into the public record for the 10/27/20 Council Meeting, FILE: 20-1282, ITEM 7.1.

This email string and attachment was also my submission to the 9/2 Parks Commission Meeting. Several questions asked in that document were never addressed. The main focus of this email is this question, which seems to be getting closer to being addressed.

Where is the evidence that the existing playground does not meet code as suggested in Figure 10 of page 6?

It was mentioned in the 9/2 Parks Commission meeting that the "footings" were not to standard. There was no evidence, however, of where they were lacking. Further, we brought this up in the D1 Leadership Group Meeting on September 26th.

<https://puebloplay.wordpress.com/2020/10/01/park-highlights-from-09-26-20-d1lg-meeting/>

Finally, this afternoon, *only four days from the vote by the City Council and almost two months since my original query*, there is some written evidence in the Memorandum released by the Mayor, the Vice Mayor, and Councilmember Peralez as to why the footings don't meet specification.

"The KaBOOM! playground foundation is constructed of 2500 PSI (pounds per square inch) concrete. 2500 PSI concrete has less cement, which acts as an adhesive agent, and does not provide the level of strength or stability offered by the City's 3000 PSI specification."

Request/Questions/Comment

1. I haven't been able to find the specification on the city website. Please provide it or send a link. I am curious, as a Professional Engineer with whom I have worked suggested that "2,500 psi concrete is capable of supporting axial loads of 360,000 psf... FYI... after 56 days the concrete strength is likely 3000 psi."
2. Was the specification different in 2014 when the playground was built?

3. If so, do older (e.g. 2014 and older) City of San Jose playgrounds meet current specifications, or are they grandfathered?
4. Finally, the minimum specification outlined in the [engineering document](#) for the concrete used in the footers is 2,500 PSI. That isn't to say that's what Kaboom! used, as they may have used 3,000 PSI. I sent Kaboom! an email this evening to see if they have a record of what strength concrete was actually used.

Assuming that there is some way that the concrete meets specifications, then the argument against the Playworld structure will be "useful life". Again, I refer to the attached document and the reference to the limited 25-year warranty that Playworld Systems provides for the core components.

I encourage the Councilmembers to check out the playground for themselves this weekend. And if you don't have time for that you can watch this brief video showing the current state of the playground.

<https://youtu.be/dWnL1wsO5nM>

Thank you,

Ken

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

On Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 8:38 PM Ken Pyle [REDACTED] wrote:

Thanks, Jason,

My comments are in the attached PDF. There is a lot that I agree with in the plan.

Still, I believe that we can leverage the efforts and money invested by the Sharks Foundation and the hundreds of volunteers by building around the existing' playground. The attached document describes such an approach. It also points to many links which document much of what the community did starting on August 16th, 2013 when we answered the call to build a playground in San Jose (and achieved that goal 6-months later).

https://youtu.be/algNd8C_Ssl

There is a lot to digest in all the links in the attached, so my apologies, but it is difficult to shrink 7-years into a few pages.

In Community,

Ken

On Tue, Aug 25, 2020 at 12:30 PM Condit, Jason <Jason.Condit@sanjoseca.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon Vice Mayor Jones, David Gomez, and Community leaders,

Attached is the agenda for the upcoming September 2, 2020 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting which will include the presentation of the Payne Ave. Park Master Plan.

All items are linked from the attached agenda, and the agenda can also be found online: <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/prc>

The meeting will be held virtually over Zoom Webinar beginning at 5:30 P.M.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Jason

Jason Condit | Acting Senior Landscape Architect
Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services

City Hall, 9th Floor | P. 408-793-4189

200 East Santa Clara Street, San Jose CA, 95113

Building Community Through Fun

[Website](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#)

<Outlook-1475529044.png>

--

<Ken Pyle comments on PRNS Park at Payne September 2nd 2020 Plan.pdf>