

DENTON ISD PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT CYCLE PHASE I

PHASE I

PRICE DOES NOT INCLUDE SURFACING

\$94,488.39

\$80,019.95

\$95,693.16

- Rivera Elementary
- Evers Elementary
- Houston Elementary
- Hodge Elementary
- W.S. Ryan Elementary

- Providence Elementary
- Cross Oaks Elementary
- Ginnings Elementary
 - Ann Windle

SURFACING OPTIONS

COVERING 3850 SQ. FT.

Engineered Wood Fiber

Poured-in-Place Rubber

Initial installation

9 total top-offs

\$8,662.50 \$31,500.00
 Concrete Slab
 \$34,650.00

 Poured Rubber
 \$59,551.80

<u>Total Cost</u>

\$40,162.50

 Sub Total
 \$94,201.80

 Credit for timbers
 -2,349.00

 Total Cost
 \$91,852.80

SURFACING OPTIONS

COVERING 3850 SQ. FT.

Bonded Rubber

Artificial Turf

Site Compaction	\$5,775.00	Excavate soil	\$7,700.00
Bonded Rubber	\$68,283.60	Concrete border	\$9,000.00
		Drainage system	\$9,625.00
Sub Total	74,058.60	Artificial turf	\$52,456.25
Credit for Timbers	-2,349.00	Sub Total	\$78,781.2
Total Cost	<u>\$71,709.6</u>	Credit for Timbers	-\$2,349.00
		Total Cost	<u>76,432.25</u>

PHASE II

• Ann Windle-South (2001)

- Houston-South (2001 or older)
- Evers-East (2001)
- Borman-South (2002)
- E.P. Rayzor-South (2002)
- Pecan Creek-North (2003)
- Hodge-Exercise&Dome (2003)
- McNair-North (2003)
- Alexander-North (2005)
- Borman-North (2005)
- Hawk-North (2005)
- Pecan Creek-South (2005)

PHASE III

- Rivera-South (2006)
- Savannah-Gametime (2006)
- Paloma-North (2007)
- Blanton-East (2008)
- Pecan Creek-West (2008)
- Providence-Northeast (2008)
- Alexander-South (2005)
- Hawk-West (2005)
- McNair-South (2005-2007)
- Nelson-2 Play Areas (2007)
- Paloma-South (2007)
- Gallian-North & Pre-K (2008)

PHASE IV

- Stephens-3 Play Areas (2008-09)
- Ann Windle-East & Acoustic (2009)
- Houston-West (2009)
- Cross Oaks-East (2010)
- Gonzalez-5 Play Areas (2010)
- Adkins-West (2014)
- Adkins-East (2014)
- Blanton-South (2014)
- Bell-2 Play (2016)
- Hodge-Roundabout (2017)
- Pecan Creek-Roundabout (2017)
- Pecan Creek-Plastic Climber (2017)

PHASE V

- Savannah-East (2017)
- Hodge-Climbing Wall (2018)
- E.P. Rayzor-North (2018)
- Union Park-2 Play Areas (2019)

Rivera Elementary



- Manufacturer: Miracle 1995 or Older
- Condition: Poor



Manufacturer: Landscape Structures Inc 1992
Condition: Poor



Wood Fibers 9 Top-offs

Poured-in-place Rubber

 \$135,213.39
 Bonded Rubber
 \$165,634.19

 \$189,151.79
 Artificial Turf
 \$179,113.89

Evers Elementary



- Manufacturer: Miracle 1995 or Older
- Condition: Poor



- Manufacturer: Unknown
- Condition: Poor



Wood Fibers 9 Top-offs

Poured-in-place Rubber

 \$137,538.81
 Bonded Rubber
 \$159,608.69

 \$175,860.53
 Artificial Turf
 \$163,161.56

HOUSTON ELEMENTARY



- Manufacturer: Little Tikes 1995 or Older
- Condition: Poor



Wood Fibers 9 Top-offs Poured-in-place Rubber

 \$135,855.66
 Bonded Rubber
 \$167,402.76

 \$187,545.99
 Artificial Turf
 \$172,125.41



August 22, 2019

PROS AND CONS OF PLAYGROUND SURFACING SYSTEMS:

Poured In Place:

- I. Pros
 - a. Does not have particulate that will travel.
 - b. Seamless system.
 - c. Little regular maintenance required.
 - d. Lots of color options.
 - e. Not susceptible to melting near Low-E glazing.
- II. Cons
 - a. Ideally needs a concrete base Potential cost increase.
 - b. More apt to inadequate installation.
 - c. Costly reseal every 3 years.
 - d. Color fading in high traffic areas.
 - e. Less durable warranty not as long as synthetic turf.
 - f. More susceptible to variations in temperature than synthetic turf.
 - g. Gets hard due to freezing during the winter.
 - h. More susceptible to scraping injuries during falls.
 - i. Susceptible to expansion/contraction.

Synthetic Turf:

- I. Pros
 - a. Does not require a concrete base Potential cost savings.
 - b. Less apt to inadequate installation than poured in place.
 - c. Less color-fade than poured in place.
 - d. More durable longer warranty than the poured in place system.
 - e. Cooler than poured in place (dependent on infill).
 - f. Less susceptible to scrapes during fall.
 - g. Less maintenance costs during product life cycle because there is no need to do costly reseals.
 - h. Less susceptible to color fade.
 - i. Not as susceptible to expansion/contraction as poured in place system.
- II. Cons
 - a. Not a seamless system.
 - b. Potential for particulate to travel.
 - c. More regular maintenance than the poured in place system.
 - d. Limited color options.
 - e. Potential for melting near Low-E glazing (polyethylene is more susceptible than nylon).