

Prairie, Crystal

From: Lee, Will
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2017 2:56 PM
To: Prairie, Crystal
Subject: Fwd: Public Works Committee meeting - Bainbridge Park comments

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: k silva <hiksilva@mcn.org>
Date: February 8, 2017 at 11:52:51 AM PST
To: Mike Cimolino <MCimolino@fortbragg.com>, <Wlee@fortbragg.com>
Subject: Public Works Committee meeting - Bainbridge Park comments

Good morning Councilmembers ~

I'm a resident of Fort Bragg and I have some comments about the Bainbridge Park Master Plan. I plan to attend the Public Works and Facilities Committee meeting this afternoon but in case I don't make it, I'd like to share my comments here:

The consensus, after all of the public meetings, was to install a metal fence that matches or complements the Wiggly Giggly fence. That was the direction from the City Council for the Master Plan. It is both a security feature (to keep small children from easily running into the street and to deter criminal activity that currently occurs at the park) and it gives continuity to the park. Law enforcement has stressed the necessity of a fence that cannot be easily jumped or destroyed and park users want a fence that a young child cannot easily climb through. The metal fence fills both needs. I strongly disagree with the staff report that a matching metal fence would have an "inhibiting look" (except to those who need a quick getaway when performing illegal activities in the park) and I've heard no one say that the same fence surrounding Wiggly Giggly playground looks inhibiting at that location. I was surprised to see that a split rail fence was recommended by staff, as neither the community nor the Councilmembers desired that type of fence. It may be cheaper at the outset, but the result would be a fence that does not provide the purpose desired by our community and our police department. Please don't discount what our safety officers and families with young children would like to see surrounding the park.

The consensus was to build a pavilion that matches the existing architecture; no one considered a different style. An image or drawing of a pavilion that complements the Veterans Hall and the restrooms is not included in today's staff report, making it impossible to determine what the estimated costs will construct. The pavilion recommended by staff is of a style that doesn't complement its surroundings and is not favored by our community or by the City Council. Just because it can be built with funds available now is not a reason for the Committee to bring it forward. I think it will be worth the wait until more funds become available to build the type of pavilion that our

community wants and deserves. And since the current fencing estimate is about 26% of the original estimated cost (first estimated at \$50,000, then \pm \$31,500 and now \$13,175 as the high end cost to match the existing Wiggly Giggly fencing), perhaps the actual pavilion cost will be less than the current estimate when more details about the structure become available.

Thank you for considering my comments. I love our little park and I want to see it flourish and become more family-friendly beyond the Wiggly Giggly playground.

Sincerely~
Kathy Silva