

City and County of San Francisco  
Recreation and Parks Department  
**Failing Playgrounds Task Force**  
**Meeting #3 NOTES**  
**Tuesday May 27, 6-8 PM**  
**City Hall, Room 278**

**AGENDA ITEM 1: Background Briefing**

Three maps of Playgrounds distributed to Task Force members

- 1<sup>st</sup> map of all RPD Playgrounds
- 2<sup>nd</sup> map of scheduled or recently renovated Children's Play Areas (recent means in the last 10 years)
- 3rd map of playgrounds that have not been renovated recently or scheduled for renovation.

Answer to questions pending from the last Task Force meeting:

- Question: what is the policy on lobbying of task force members? It is the Task Force members' choice how to respond to lobbying from the public. There is no policy at RPD; however, the Task Force can adopt their own policy. One option is inviting lobbyists to public comment at Task Force meetings.
- Question: does RPD have playgrounds fully accessible to children in wheelchairs? Yes. Still researching list. Note that an "accessible playground" generally refers to access to get to the play equipment, but not necessarily that the equipment itself is accessible for use.
- Question: could you provide more detail on CCA treated wood?
  - All pressure treated wood isn't toxic, the only way to know for sure is to test it
  - Comprehensive testing done in 2003; not renovated playgrounds were retested in 2014 for Task Force
  - Concern, based on California Division of Industrial Relations (CalOSHA) standard, is levels of more than 200 parts per million of arsenic
  - In compliance with California State regulations, CCA treated wood in our playgrounds is sealed every 2 years
- Question: could you provide more information on how and why some scores changed between the two assessments?
  - Reassessment grades are an average of the two grades produced by surveys conducted by a Rec and Park staff person as well as an SFPA staff person or a community volunteer
  - Grade changes may occur due to human error or differing perspectives. Surveyors may miss certain aspects of a playground that would result in a lower or higher grade or more notice some problems for than others.
  - The playground reassessment grades are just one data point among many that the Task Force will consider.



**Failing Playgrounds Task Force**  
[sfrecpark.org/failing-playgrounds-2012-bond](http://sfrecpark.org/failing-playgrounds-2012-bond)

In partnership with



## **AGENDA ITEM 2: How to Structure a Prioritized List of Playground Projects**

- Simple ranked list wasn't practical—listing projects in order 1-50 would require very detailed analysis to distinguish each playground from the one before it and after it. Also doesn't reflect reality of developing projects, which isn't as predictable as 1, 2, 3....
- Tiers is the best way to prioritize (see tiering chart)
- This system is setting up a capital plan to guide future decision-making for resource allocation with bond dollars and other money
- Prioritizing within first tier doesn't seem to matter (because all will be done) but prioritizing the second tier would be helpful
  - Will be good to return to this later in the process
- Tier system allows for more flexibility, so we have that room during the community planning process
- Sizes of tier one and two (6 and 8 projects) came from past experience with cost and fundraising for playground renovations
  - Playgrounds usually cost between 1-2 million. With soft costs added in, a playground would cost \$2 million at the most. Given the \$15.5 pool this gives us at least 6 playgrounds.
  - Added the second round of 8 by factoring in the potential that many in first round could be closer to the 1 million level and that additional funds could be raised from philanthropy

## **AGENDA ITEM 3: Developing Criteria for Prioritizing Playgrounds**

- Task Force will come up with initial list of criteria, then staff will apply the criteria to the universe in different ways and bring the results back at the next meeting—this will allow the task force to refine their criteria based on how they impact the prioritization of projects.
- Task Force added 5 new criteria to the list brainstormed from Meeting 1 and grouped the criteria into 3 main categories: Demographics, Context and Condition
  - New Criteria:
    - Play value
    - Interactivity of Playground
    - Suitability/Viability of Playground site
    - Suitable for multi-generations
    - Kid shed: area from which the playground draws usually around a quarter mile and the demographics of who it serves
  - The Task Force voted on which criteria they considered most critical. All criteria can still be considered; the voting is to direct staff where to start in gathering and analyzing data.
    - Level 1 (number of votes)
      - Lack of Play value (9)
      - Presence of CCA treated wood (8)
      - Actual physical condition (Report Card, Prop C Scores) (7)
      - Access to next closest playground and it's condition (7)
      - Who it serves-kid shed (1/4mile or better measure) (7)
      - Demographic trend lines (6)
      - Concentration of low-income families (6)
      - Level of community stewardship and support (\*)
    - Level 2
      - Potential to transform or positively impact community (5)
      - Level of use (5)
      - Growth/new development (5)
      - Capacity to be funded by other sources (4)
      - Level of crime (4)

- Children safety (4)
- Need for playground/suitability as play area (4)
- Proximity to school or other youth destination (3)
- History of condition over time (3)
- Sustainable for multi generations (3)
- Level of ADA accessibility (2)
- Bang for buck (1)
- Context of surrounding park (1)
- Public transportation access (1)
- Density (1)
- Topography (0)
- Supervisorial Districts (0)
- Security (0)
- Pedestrian safety (0)
- Availability of local money (0)
- Neighborhood health indicators (0)

\*This criteria is the result of the group combining two other criteria after the voting. Exactly how to count the votes is not clear, but the topic was clearly a priority.

- Having design goals that fulfill the criteria is all important. A Community forum on Playground Objectives is planned for after Task Force deliberations to give everyone input on what objectives our playgrounds should fulfill.

**Task Force Members in Attendance:**

Julia Brashares, Director of Street Parks, SF Parks Alliance  
 Alejandra Chiesa, Project Manager - Parks for People, Trust for Public Land  
 Rob Connolly, President, Boys & Girls Club of San Francisco  
 Anthony Cuadro, D7 Representative, PROSAC  
 Dawn Kamalanathan, Director of Planning & Capital Management, SF Recreation & Park Department  
 Eric McDonnell, Commissioner, Recreation and Parks Commission  
 Doreen Pacini, Youth Representative, GreenAgers  
 Albert Ko, Executive Vice President, SF Parent Teacher Association  
 Michelle Parker, VP Communications, SF Parent Teacher Association  
 Mark Scheuer, D8 Representative, PROSAC  
 Lee Anne Weldon, Council Member, Policy Council, SF Parks Alliance

**Task Force Members not in Attendance:**

Katie Albright, Executive Director, San Francisco Child Abuse Prevention Center  
 Chelsea Boilard, Director of Programs, Coleman Advocates  
 Mario Paz, Executive Director, Good Samaritan Family Resource Center