

# Racial Equity and Social Justice Initiative RESJ Tool: Comprehensive Version



## INSTRUCTIONS

*Use this tool as early as possible in the development of City policies, plans, programs and budgets.*

*For issues on a short timeline or with a narrow impact, you may use the RESJ Tool – Fast Track Version.*

*This analysis should be completed by people with different racial and socioeconomic perspectives. When possible, involve those directly impacted by the issue. Include and document multiple voices in this process.*

*The order of questions may be re-arranged to suit your situation.*

**Mission of the Racial Equity and Social Justice (RESJ) Initiative:** To establish racial equity and social justice as core principles in all decisions, policies and functions of the City of Madison.

**Equity** is just and fair inclusion into a society in which all, including all racial and ethnic groups, can participate, prosper, and reach their full potential. Equity gives all people a just and fair shot in life despite historic patterns of racial and economic exclusion ([www.policylink.org](http://www.policylink.org)).

The persistence of deep racial and social inequities and divisions across society is evidence of bias at the individual, institutional and structural levels. These types of bias often work to the benefit of White people and to the detriment of people of color, usually unintentionally or inadvertently.

**Purpose of this Tool:** To facilitate conscious consideration of equity and examine how communities of color and low-income populations will be affected by a proposed action/decision of the City.

The “*What, Who, Why, and How*” questions of this tool are designed to lead to strategies to prevent or mitigate adverse impacts and unintended consequences on marginalized populations.

## BEGIN ANALYSIS

Title of policy, plan or proposal:

Brittingham Park playground decisions

Main contact name(s) and contact information for this analysis:

RESJI analysis team:

Jordan Bingham, Public Health Madison & Dane County [jbingham@publichealthmdc.com](mailto:jbingham@publichealthmdc.com)

Toriana Pettaway, Department of Civil Rights [tpettaway@cityofmadison.com](mailto:tpettaway@cityofmadison.com)

Jason Glozier, Department of Civil Rights [jglozier@cityofmadison.com](mailto:jglozier@cityofmadison.com)

Lara Mainella, City Attorney's Office [lmainella@cityofmadison.com](mailto:lmainella@cityofmadison.com)

Erin Stenson, Human Resources Department [estenson@cityofmadison.com](mailto:estenson@cityofmadison.com)

Names and affiliations of others participating in the analysis:

Kay Rutledge, Parks Division [krutledge@cityofmadison.com](mailto:krutledge@cityofmadison.com)

Janet Schmidt, Parks Division [jschmidt@cityofmadison.com](mailto:jschmidt@cityofmadison.com)

See section 2b for additional information on people and groups involved in the analysis.

**1. WHAT**

a. What is the policy, plan or proposal being analyzed, and what does it seek to accomplish?

Development of a plan for a new barrier-free playground on the west side of Brittingham Park, and decisions regarding whether to update, modify or eliminate existing play structures in Brittingham Park, including the one near the community garden. (There is currently one set of playground equipment at Brittingham Park near the community gardens in the center of the park, a swingset near the boathouse on the east side of the park, and a swingset near the parking lot and the proposed site for the barrier-free playground.)

RESJI consideration: Does the siting, location and number of playgrounds at Brittingham Park impact people of color and low-income people disproportionately?

b. What factors (including existing policies and structures) associated with this issue might be affecting communities of color and/or low-income populations differently?

1. Lack of playground equipment (public and private) available within walking distance to residents in the Bayview neighborhood.

2. Parks Division's current methodology for park planning precludes (or strongly discourages) the placement of two playground structures within close proximity.

3. Brittingham Park is a centrally-located community park, located near the highest density of residents with disabilities.

4. The playground at the Bayview apartments (privately owned) was removed due to safety concerns.

5. Park impact fees (approx. \$230,000) from this area would be used to offset the increased cost of building a barrier-free playground within the Vilas-Brittingham Park Impact Fee District.

6. Identified space for expansion of the existing community garden is limited to an area including the site of the existing play structures.

7. The City is continuing to work, with some success, to improve safety and usability in Brittingham Park. This includes cleaning up the shelter, increasing enforcement on illegal activities and increasing programming in the park.

8. There is a need to create safer street crossing of W Washington Ave from Bayview to Brittingham Park. City Traffic Engineering is considering ways to accomplish this.

9. The City received a grant from EPA's Greening America's Capitals project to develop a plan to improve access and sustainability in this area.

c. What do available data tell you about this issue? (See page 5 for guidance on data resources.)

1. The surrounding neighborhood includes a higher proportion of renters, people of color (esp Asian), people with disabilities.

2. The highest density of children in this neighborhood reside in the Bayview apartments. Fewer children reside in the single family homes on the north and south ends of the neighborhood.

d. What data are unavailable or missing?

1. It might be informative to have health data for nearby residents (diabetes, physical activity, asthma and obesity)
2. We do not have demographic data for an area smaller than the Monona Bay NH Assoc. Data (including Bayview/Triangle residents)
3. Data on park impact districts (boundaries) from the Parks Div. and where fees come from.

e. Which focus area(s) will the policy, plan or proposal primarily impact?  
Please add any comments regarding the specific impacts on each area:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community/Civic Engagement | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Access & Affordability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Criminal Justice                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Government Practices                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Early Childhood            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Housing                                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning & Development                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employment                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service Equity              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Environment                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)               |   |

Comments:

**2. WHO**

a. Who (individuals or groups) could be impacted by the issues related to this policy, plan or proposal?  
Who would benefit?

1. People with disabilities (potentially throughout the City) would benefit from the use of the barrier-free playground.
2. The Parks Division would benefit from executing the plan as originally developed (meeting current parks planning best practices regarding play structure proximity and maintenance.)
3. If developed as originally proposed by Parks, residents near West Shore Dr and Proudfit/North Shore Dr would benefit from increased access to new play structures.
4. Business owners (e.g. Brittingham Boats) could benefit from increased usage and revenue.
5. If business expands at Brittingham Boats, this could present an employment opportunity for nearby residents, particularly youth.
6. If the plan allows for expansion of the community garden, nearby residents who are currently waiting for a garden plot could benefit.
7. Improvements to the east end of the park (near the boathouse) could benefit people who live nearby and people who come to use that part of the park.
8. Improvements to the park shelter near the parking lot could lead to increased shelter rentals and increased revenue for Parks.
9. Improvements to the parking lot could benefit people who ice fish.

### Who would be burdened?

If the existing play structure near the garden is removed, the following groups could experience burdens:

1. Among elders who bring their young relatives to play at the playground while they work in the garden
2. Children who currently use the playground (especially Bayview residents)
3. Families with children; especially those who do not have transportation to reach other play destinations
4. Current residents who enjoy the diverse user groups at Brittingham Park (this was mentioned by multiple residents)
5. Teens could be given more responsibilities for child care due to the inability of elders to care for young children while gardening
6. Families could experience increased child care costs due to inability to care for children while gardening
7. Safety concerns include distance of young children from supervision, proximity to water, and perception of "stranger danger" with increased park use
8. If gardeners' ability to spend time gardening is limited due to their need to care for children, this could limit their ability to provide fresh, healthy food for their families and create economic burdens related to food costs

### Are there potential disproportionate impacts on communities of color or low-income communities?

Yes. See "burdens" section above.

The play structure near the community garden is the only playground within walking distance of the Bayview apartments and the Triangle area. If this playground is removed, the impact could be that these residents engage in less physical activity and social interaction.

The Hmong elders who work in the garden have voiced the need for their young children to have a place to play while they work in the garden. Many of these elders are the childcare providers for their families. Safety concerns: the elders indicated that the placement of the barrier-free playground is too far away for them to garden and supervise their children at the same time. Elders have also expressed concern about the proximity of the barrier-free playground to the water.

The garden meets several needs for the gardeners who are predominantly low-income people of color, including healthy and affordable food, continuing cultural traditions, and physical activity, for their families. They need to garden and provide childcare at the same time.

- b. Have stakeholders from different racial/ethnic and socioeconomic groups—especially those most affected—been informed, involved and represented in the development of this proposal or plan? Who is missing and how can they be engaged? (See page 6 for guidance on community engagement.)

Yes.

- Parks held three community meetings between Nov 2014-April 2015 (see email attachment from 7/14/15)

- The City held an additional meeting, planned by the RESJI analysis team and Parks staff, on Nov 18, 2015, which was attended by over 40 residents representing a variety of races, ages and socioeconomic statuses. Specific questions (attached) were prepared to gather input from residents, and several meeting participants (including Hmong and African American youth and Hmong elders) provided prepared remarks to the full group. Hmong and Spanish interpreters were provided, as requested in the previous community meeting.

RESJI was asked to conduct this analysis by the Parks Division resulting from a request by representatives of Freedom, Inc. in summer 2015.

Since becoming involved, RESJI team members identified and discussed outreach with key neighborhood leaders. Representatives of Freedom Inc., the Bayview Foundation, the Monona Bay Neighborhood Association, the City Alder, the MPD neighborhood officer and other interested neighbors made efforts to advertise the November 2015 meeting within their circles. The meeting was advertised at CDA Triangle Housing and Bayview Apartments with flyers created by RESJI. There was noted to be a lack of representation of nearby residents with disabilities at the Nov 18 2015 meeting. Therefore, we cannot be certain that all affected communities have been well-represented over the 4 different meetings. However, the combination of input from the first 3 meetings and the Nov. 18, 2015 meeting should provide a broader cross-section of input than was previously obtained. To the extent the goal of the RESJI analysis is to seek out and emphasize the viewpoint of people of color and low income persons, to the best of our knowledge, such persons were present at the Nov 2015 meeting.

c. What input have you received from those who would be impacted and how did you gather this information? Specify sources of comments and other input.

1. Community engagement: See section 2b for information about how information was gathered. Video footage highlighting comments from youth of color and Hmong elders at the Nov 18 meeting can be found here:

<https://youtu.be/TlkgHW3o0Xs>

<https://youtu.be/UqiGnZZjAYo>

(If these links cannot be copied and pasted, visit Freedom, Inc.'s channel on YouTube)

2. In addition to the meetings, several emails from community members have been received by RESJI team members.

3. Parks Staff: RESJI staff have met with Parks staff throughout the process, including the Assistant Parks Superintendent of Planning, Development and Finance, Parks Superintendent, and Parks Planning & Development Manager.

4. Other City Staff: this scenario was used in a RESJI training for City staff on December 2, 2015. Participants completed the Fast Track version of the racial equity tool in small groups, and their answers have been incorporated into this analysis. Approximately 25-30 City staff from many departments and levels of employment participated.

5. Overarching themes stated by community members are as follows:

- Do not tear down the playground near the gardens
- Why can't we have both playgrounds?
- The proposed plan is a downgrade for low-income people of color who use the playground and garden area
- It is very important for residents to be able to walk to the gardens and playground from their homes
- The decision to remove the playground near the gardens would be racist
- We already have opportunities for natural play in the Triangle area and in the gardens; the proposed nature-based play would be a downgrade from the current playground
- If another playground is built at the end of the park near the boathouse, it would serve populations other than the low-income people of color in the neighborhood
- All residents, regardless of demographics, expressed appreciation for the diversity of users in the park
- All residents expressed support for the new barrier-free playground, and do not want the decision to pit people and groups against each other
- From a Hmong elder at the Nov 18 meeting: "Please care about us as elders and people of color...we are treated like children compared with people of privilege and access"

### 3. WHY

- a. What are the root causes or factors creating any racial or social inequities associated with this issue?  
(Examples: Bias in process; Lack of access or barriers; Lack of inclusive engagement)

Housing inequity: distribution of low-income housing has led to concentrations of poverty and limited access in and around the Triangle area.

Transportation inequity: low access to transportation limits residents' ability to access other parks and natural areas.

Income inequity: the above factors, combined with limited fresh & affordable food options.

Inequity in public engagement: some residents know better how to navigate City systems, and have the ability and resources to advocate for what they want and need; the City's existing processes for resident engagement do not always produce adequate input from marginalized communities.

Park planning methodologies: there is no existing policy to govern decisions about play structure placement; existing methods are based on concepts of equality vs. equity (if we do something in one park or neighborhood, we have to do it in all parks and neighborhoods), without strongly factoring in the different needs and resources in neighborhoods

- b. What are potential unintended consequences? What benefits or burdens may result?  
(Specifically consider social, economic, health and environmental impacts.)

Many of these can be found under "burdens" and "disproportionate impacts" in section 2a.

Specifically (and keeping in mind that unintended consequences are not always necessarily negative)

- Social interactions between age, race and socioeconomic groups could diminish.
- Young children could experience less social interaction, less physical activity, and less contact with nature if elders make other childcare arrangements for them.
- Low-income residents could experience diminished ability to grow fresh, healthy food for their families. This could have health and economic impacts on individuals and families.
- Conversely, if the playground is removed, there could be an increase in children gardening with their families.
- Perceptions of safety in the park could diminish due to decreased social interactions and increased usage of the park by residents who do not live in the neighborhood.
- Conversely, increased usage of the park around the barrier-free playground could lead to improved safety in the area.

A major potential unintended consequence could be that residents will lose trust for the City, if they participate in the public meetings engagement process but feel that their voices are not heard or acted upon. This could lead to diminished will to participate in future City public processes and decisions and, ultimately, further disenfranchisement of already marginalized people and groups.

c. What identified community needs are being met or ignored in this issue or decision?

If the project proceeds as currently proposed, the following needs would likely be met:

- Need for people with disabilities to have a safe and accomodating place to play
- Need for residents to use park equipment for physical activity

If the project proceeds as currently proposed, the following needs would likely be ignored or compromised:

- Need for gardeners to keep young children nearby while gardening
- Need for gardeners to work in gardens for extended periods of time to produce food for their families
- Need for social interaction between people of different ages, races and socioeconomic status
- Need for residents to be able to egage in a public process and feel as through their voices, needs and desires are being heard

4. WHERE

a. Are there impacts on geographic areas? (Select all that apply.)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> All Madison neighborhoods    | <input type="checkbox"/> Park Edge/Park Ridge          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Allied Drive                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Southside          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Balsam/Russet                | <input type="checkbox"/> East Madison (general)        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Brentwood/Northport Corridor | <input type="checkbox"/> North Madison (general)       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Darbo/Worthington            | <input type="checkbox"/> West Madison (general)        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hammersley/Theresa           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Downtown/Campus    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Leopold/Arbor Hills          | <input type="checkbox"/> Dane County (outside Madison) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Owl Creek                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Outside Dane County           |

Comments:

Bayview community, Triangle community, Monona Bay Neighborhood Association



**5. HOW: RECOMMENDATIONS SECTION**

- a. Describe recommended strategies to address adverse impacts, prevent unintended negative consequences and advance racial equity (program, policy, partnership and/or budget/fiscal strategies):

The following recommendations are intended for consideration and implementation by the Parks Division, with support and technical assistance as needed from RESJI.

1. Keep the existing playground near the garden for the remainder of its useful life, then work with residents to design its replacement.
2. Accurately communicate with residents the impacts of playground size and location on future expansion of the community gardens.
3. Build the barrier-free playground as proposed.
4. If nature-based play is desired for this park, place it in the area near the boathouse rather than the area near the community garden, while retaining traditional play structure (as informed by residents per item #1 above) near the garden.
5. Develop methods for park planning, especially playground replacement and maintenance, grounded in principles of racial equity, acknowledging different needs and resources in different neighborhoods; this should happen with clear support from City elected officials and leaders.
6. Develop outreach methods that are focused on meaningful engagement of diverse groups of residents, listening to and acting on input from marginalized communities to ensure an equitable balance of input.

\*\*\*This decision is an opportunity to take an explicit stand on the importance of racial equity and social justice in Parks planning, and can set an example for the rest of the City of Madison. This is an example of how the City can utilize resources (e.g. Park Impact Fees) to improve conditions for marginalized communities.\*\*\*

- b. Is the proposal or plan:

- Realistic?
- Adequately funded?
- Adequately resourced with personnel?
- Adequately resourced with mechanisms (policy, systems) to ensure successful implementation and enforcement?
- Adequately resourced with provisions to ensure ongoing data collection, public reporting, stakeholder participation and public accountability?

If you answered "no" to any of the above, what resources or actions are needed?

Parks may not currently be adequately resourced to regularly conduct this level of public outreach, participation, and analysis (such as utilized and recommended in this project.) Increased resourcing for RESJI staffing would ensure adequate city staff for increased public engagement as recommended here.

As described in the answer to 5.a. (item 5) we recommend development of a policy or guidelines for Parks' decision making regarding playground placement & removal decisions. Having such a policy in place will support Parks' efforts by providing the necessary backing to incorporate racial equity in decision-making.

- c. Who is accountable for this decision?

(meet w/ Parks to complete this)

d. How will impacts be documented and evaluated? What are the success indicators and progress benchmarks?

e. How will those impacted by this issue be informed of progress and impacts over time?

## DATA RESOURCES FOR RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE IMPACT ANALYSIS

### City of Madison

---

- Neighborhood Indicators (UW Applied Population Lab and City of Madison):  
<http://madison.apl.wisc.edu>
- Open Data Portal (City of Madison):  
<https://data.cityofmadison.com>
- Madison Measures (City of Madison):  
[www.cityofmadison.com/finance/documents/madisonmeasures-2013.pdf](http://www.cityofmadison.com/finance/documents/madisonmeasures-2013.pdf)
- Census reporter (US Census Bureau):  
<http://censusreporter.org/profiles/06000US5502548000-madison-city-dane-county-wi>

### Dane County

---

- Geography of Opportunity: A Fair Housing Equity Assessment for Wisconsin's Capital Region (Capital Area Regional Planning Commission):  
[www.capitalarearpc.org](http://www.capitalarearpc.org)
- Race to Equity report (Wisconsin Council on Children and Families):  
<http://racetoequity.net>
- Healthy Dane (Public Health Madison & Dane County and area healthcare organizations):  
[www.healthydane.org](http://www.healthydane.org)
- Dane Demographics Brief (UW Applied Population Lab and UW-Extension):  
[www.apl.wisc.edu/publications/Dane\\_County\\_Demographics\\_Brief\\_2014.pdf](http://www.apl.wisc.edu/publications/Dane_County_Demographics_Brief_2014.pdf)

### State of Wisconsin

---

- Wisconsin Quickfacts (US Census):  
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/55000.html>
- Demographics Services Center (WI Dept of Administration):  
[www.doa.state.wi.us/section\\_detail.asp?linkcatid=11&linkid=64&locid=9](http://www.doa.state.wi.us/section_detail.asp?linkcatid=11&linkid=64&locid=9)
- Applied Population Laboratory (UW-Madison):  
[www.apl.wisc.edu/data.php](http://www.apl.wisc.edu/data.php)

### Federal

---

- American FactFinder (US Census):  
<http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- 2010 Census Gateway (US Census):  
[www.census.gov/2010census](http://www.census.gov/2010census)

# CITY OF MADISON RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CONTINUUM

Adapted from *Community Engagement Guide: A tool to advance Equity & Social Justice in King County*

The continuum provides details, characteristics and strategies for five levels of community engagement. The continuum shows a range of actions from county-led information sharing that tends to be shorter-term to longer-term community-led activities. The continuum can be used for both simple and complex efforts. As a project develops, the level of community engagement may need to change to meet changing needs and objectives.

The level of engagement will depend on various factors, including program goals, time constraints, level of program and community readiness, and capacity and resources. There is no one right level of engagement, but considering the range of engagement and its implications on your work is a key step in promoting community participation and building community trust. Regardless of the level of engagement, the role of both the City of Madison and community partners as part of the engagement process should always be clearly defined.

Levels of Engagement				
<b>City Informs</b> City of Madison initiates an effort, coordinates with departments and uses a variety of channels to inform community to take action	<b>City Consults</b> City of Madison gathers information from the community to inform city-led projects	<b>City engages in dialogue</b> City of Madison engages community members to shape city priorities and plans	<b>City and community work together</b> Community and City of Madison share in decision-making to co-create solutions together	<b>Community directs action</b> Community initiates and directs strategy and action with participation and technical assistance from the City of Madison
Characteristics of Engagement				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primarily one-way channel of communication</li> <li>One interaction</li> <li>Term-limited to event</li> <li>Addresses immediate need of City and community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primarily one-way channel of communication</li> <li>One to multiple interactions</li> <li>Short to medium-term</li> <li>Shapes and informs city projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two-way channel of communication</li> <li>Multiple interactions</li> <li>Medium to long-term</li> <li>Advancement of solutions to complex problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two-way channel of communication</li> <li>Multiple interactions</li> <li>Medium to long-term</li> <li>Advancement of solutions to complex problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two-way channel of communication</li> <li>Multiple interactions</li> <li>Medium to long-term</li> <li>Advancement of solutions to complex problems</li> </ul>
Strategies				
Media releases, brochures, pamphlets, outreach to vulnerable populations, ethnic media contacts, translated information, staff outreach to residents, new and social media	Focus groups, interviews, community surveys	Forums, advisory boards, stakeholder involvement, coalitions, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony, workshops, community-wide events	Co-led community meetings, advisory boards, coalitions and partnerships, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony	Community-led planning efforts, community-hosted forums, collaborative partnerships, coalitions, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony

**NOTES**

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, occupying most of the page. It is intended for handwritten or typed notes.



## **Bingham, Jordan**

---

**From:** Rutledge, Kay  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2015 10:56 AM  
**To:** Bingham, Jordan; Mainella, Lara; Kratowicz, Karalyn  
**Cc:** Glozier, Jason  
**Subject:** FW: Brittingham Park playground meetings  
**Attachments:** Brittingham Park Play Areas Concept - Overall.pdf

Here's a brief summary of the project to date, thank you for helping us on this project. See you at 1 PM in the Parks office.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Rutledge, Kay  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2015 10:54 AM  
**To:** Eskrich, Sara  
**Cc:** Knepp, Eric; Sturm, Michael  
**Subject:** FW: Brittingham Park playground meetings

Hello Adler Eskrich,

Thank you for discussing the Brittingham Park playground project with us. Per your request Mike Sturm has provided an updated project summary below for email distribution; this builds upon an email previously sent by Kate Kane. The summary provides a thorough description of the project's public input process and the last paragraph includes an update regarding Freedom Inc.'s concerns. There is also a link to our website where all of the presentation materials for each of the meetings can be found.

Please let us know if you have any further questions at this time.

Kay and Mike

The Brittingham Park playground replacement project has included a lengthy public meeting process beginning back in November with our first meeting at the city's Water Utility Building. This meeting had just 4 attendees, which was surprising given that we worked with both Alder Verveer and Alder Dailey to schedule and promote the meeting in addition to mailing over 4300 postcards to residents within a 1-mile radius of the park. At that meeting, we presented information regarding the proposed improvements at Brittingham Park playgrounds - to expand the play area at Brittingham Beach (where the boat rental operation is located) and provide what would be Madison's first fully accessible playground in the main park area. At this meeting we discussed what would be our standard playground options for the Beach Park location and explained how the fully accessible playground would differ in both equipment type and surfacing. Feedback that we received from attendees at this meeting included a strong preference for holding subsequent meetings at a location within the Triangle Neighborhood so that residents there would have easier access to the meetings, providing interpretive services in Hmong and Spanish languages and expanding our meeting notification outreach to attract more attendees.

Our second meeting, which you were able to attend, in January 2015, was held at the Bayview Center and had at least 27 people attend per the sign-in sheet. We worked with the Bayview Center to help promote the meeting and met in advance with Andy Heidt, who recommended physical flyer locations within the Triangle and also recommended contacting Officer Kim Alan

and Sally Spaeni to assist with posting them in the lobbies of surrounding buildings. Additionally, we worked with Jason Glozier, the city's Disability Rights Specialist, to conduct a site visit to the park and discuss the Disability Pride event at Brittingham and gaps in accessible playground offerings in the area. At this meeting a vote was held for the equipment to be installed at the Brittingham Beach location and the concept for the accessible playground area was presented. Following the meeting discussion and subsequent communications we received via email and phone, Parks staff recognized that the attendees were interested in seeing a revised concept at the next meeting to discuss the project - particularly one which addressed the concerns of keeping the playground area away from the bike path and shoreline. Additionally, it seemed that there was concern that a plan for the area where the main playground is currently located was called for - attendees did not want to see this area vacated after the playground equipment was removed.

At the 3rd meeting on April 20th, also held at the Bayview Center, we utilized the same approach for promoting the meeting but had just 8 attendees- although many more "regrets" from folks who knew that they would be unable to attend were very interested in receiving updates. Several families associated with the Disability Pride event typically held at Brittingham Park were able to attend and they provided valuable insight on what works and what doesn't in accessible equipment. We also had many of the attendees from the original meeting at this last session so it was nice to see that continuity and ongoing commitment to the project from the neighborhood. At this meeting, staff presented a revised concept for the accessible playground including a new location proximate to the parking lot off of W. Washington Avenue. This concept (which is attached for your reference) includes significant changes to the layout of the current lot, offering the opportunity to open access between the east and west sides of the park while creating a space for the playground that provides visibility from the existing shelter in response to interest expressed at previous meetings to establishing site lines between the shelter and play area. The revised concept also keeps the playground off of the commuter bike path and away from the shoreline. We also presented a concept for the future of the current playground area next to the community gardens after the equipment is removed that will include earthen mounds, pea gravel, boulders and low-mow turf, offering an addition to the park landscape that would provide a different opportunity for play. We received very positive feedback on the concepts at the meeting including requested changes and additions to the accessible equipment shown to the group (also attached) - primarily to make the offerings even more universally accessible, which we are working with the manufacturer on now. The information from this meeting and the others that we have held to-date is up on our Parks website at:  
<http://www.cityofmadison.com/parks/parks/park.cfm?id=1139>.

After the third public meeting the Parks Division was contacted by representatives of Freedom Inc. regarding the proposed park improvements. The group's primary concern is the project's potential impact on minority families that live adjacent to the park. The Parks Division is currently working with the Department of Civil Rights and the Racial Equity and Social Justice Initiatives Team to begin the equity analysis process of this project as a whole. More information regarding the project's next steps will be provided as the process continues; improvements to the playgrounds at Brittingham Park are on hold pending the outcome of this process.



**Brittingham Park input session – racial equity discussion**

**Wednesday, November 18, 2015**

**Bayview Neighborhood Center – 601 Bayview**

**6:45 – 8:30 pm**

<b>Item &amp; Time</b>	<b>Facilitator(s)</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Welcome, introductions, and meeting purpose</b> 6:45 – 6:55	Tori	
<b>Parks: overview of possible changes and timeline</b> 6:55 – 7:05	Janet	Include option of nature-based play with pictures
<b>RESJI: explanation of racial equity analysis</b> 7:05 – 7:10	Jordan	
<b>Small group discussion with questions</b> 7:10 – <del>7:15</del>	Lara, Erin, Linette, Tori, Jordan, Janet, Kate (depending on attendance)	Organize groups by language as needed; ideally 3-5 people per group; hand out list of questions to each person
<b>Report out and full-group discussion</b> 7:50 – 8:20	Tori and Jordan	Ask a participant from each group to report out if comfortable doing so
<b>Next steps and closing</b> 8:20 – 8:30	Tori, Parks staff	

Supplies: laptop, projector, handouts w/questions

Sue Hoffenberg  
suehoffenberg@gmail.com

Steve Hoffenberg

everchanging851@gmail.com

Both unpaid neighborhood volunteers

Diane Schwartz

~~gets~~

~~getts~~  
gettsoutsider@gmail.com

marybenjaminagard@mac.com

M Frackenstein @ Madison College, Edu  
Fraquid@att.net

Mauhinjay Mow - mow353@gmail.com

Kabzway Vay

Zon Mow - mowazon@gmail.com

Gregg Kopish Gulkopish@gmail.com

Ferr Kopish@gmail.com

Gregg Kronberg - kronberg@clanet.org  
Theodora Zehner - theodora@chorus.net

Dorold Rebaudet JK@robaidetk.com

(1) Tell us how you use the park. *go to the garden - we pine w/ our kids*

- A) What do you do when you go to the park? Who comes with you?
- B) What are their ages? What do they do at the park? *60 years middle age.*
- C) What times of day or days of week do you use it most?

*7 people - our children, grandchildren  
2, 3, 5 years old  
our teens too  
- can't drive to other places  
We go everyday - summer  
on kids and others*

(2) What makes you value the park most? -

A) What would make your experience with the park better?

B) Are there changes to what would be there?

C) Do you think the park is safe?

D) Is it more safe at some times as compared to others?

*we can't drive need transportation to use the park*

*far from the lake makes it safe for*

*walking - when we are stressed - swings children make children happy -*

*- garden - makes us happy - stress free - our grandchildren get to play there - animals/ducks*

(3) What keeps you from using the park? Physical barriers? Other people?

*- it's in our neighborhood we love the park - children get to play w/ them*

*• Fix the playground -*

*• Respect us - we are poor we need better playground.*

(4) What about the park makes you feel at home or Feel Connected?

A) What about the park makes you feel that you belong in the community?

B) What could be done in the park to make you feel more connected?

*near our home - we can come home  
We can't drive easy to access  
- they have the swings -  
there is a playground.  
if you destroy the park/playground*

# 315 Bayview

My name is Kalena Vang, I have lived in Bayview all <sup>my life</sup>  
My friends and I go to the ~~park~~ playground  
in the summer and we get time  
~~hangout~~, It's basically a tradition  
~~and~~ ~~and~~ ~~we~~ learn new things  
from ~~older~~ ~~kids~~. If ~~the~~ ~~park~~ ~~is~~ ~~too~~ ~~old~~ then re build a NEW  
one. Not let us play in dirt/rocks. We  
have enough of natural play. (The plot)  
When my grandparents were able to  
walk they use to take my cousins and I  
to play at the park. If the park is  
teged now, with just natural play,  
then the kids won't get to play while  
elders garden. Lots of among elders are  
disabled, they can't walk long distance.  
Also, we <sup>chose</sup> just the plot/garden across  
the street (brittaniham) on purpose,  
so elders, teens & small kids could  
play at the playground

523 Bayview

Hey, ~~My~~ My name is Mai Thao.  
I've lived in Bayview for 7 years  
~~now~~ now. The <sup>Playground</sup> park across the  
street means a lot to me. ~~That~~  
That place is a place where  
I can ~~have~~ have my alone time  
and ~~get my stress out~~ ~~let out my stress~~  
let out my stress. That  
is a place where I can go when  
my parents aren't around to take me to  
places. I go over when I check  
our youth plot. I usually go there  
with my mom or ~~my~~ my  
friends. When I go with my  
mom, my brothers come along  
to play on the park. When I go  
with my friends, we check  
on our youth plot and decides if  
~~we~~ ~~was~~ ~~to~~ ~~stay~~ ~~at~~ ~~the~~ ~~park~~ ~~or~~ ~~not~~.  
When I go ~~over~~ ~~to~~ I can see  
a lot of people that take <sup>their</sup> ~~the~~  
~~and~~ children ~~to~~ to play on the  
playground. ~~We~~ ~~put~~ ~~the~~ ~~garden~~  
~~there~~ ~~near~~ ~~the~~ ~~park~~ so when  
our elder people take their grand-  
kids they can play at the park →

Goodevening everyone.

My name is Nanceney and I have lived here in Bay View all my life. I am currently the president of bay view teen council. As a bay view resident, I have grown up with the diverse culture, the supportive community, and the beautiful lake in our backyard. I have also grown up with the Brittingham park just like all the kids here at bay view. Please, don't tear down our park. Brittingham playground has always been a place for not only Bay View kids, but for the children of this area, such as the houses by the lake and the apartment complexes, to play and have fun at. As a child I remember playing on the playground often. Growing up, on warm summery days, my father would take us to the lake. While he fished, a short distance away, my friends and I would run around on the playground. This was convenient for him because not only he could fish peacefully, but he had us in sight. I also remember when my grandmother <sup>Lyuz</sup> would take us to the lake. She is an avid gardener and tended to her spot in the community garden often. Being older, she couldn't really run after us and play with us like we wanted. Having the playground placed so close to the garden allowed her to keep an eye on us while doing what she loved. If you ask, the kids at bay view about how they use the park, their stories would be similar to mine. Many of us would have been stripped of the joy of using the playground if it was across the park by the pavilion. Even now, the young kids who accompany their grandparents to the park, look forward to playing at the playground. If the playground were to be torn down, many kids who have family working in the garden would not be allowed to play at a playground across the park where they would be almost out of sight and out of earshot.

I know plans have been made to put a rock structure in the playgrounds place for kids to play on but I know many parents would view it as unsafe. I know as a big sister, I would not be comfortable with any of my younger siblings climbing on a rock structure that they could slip and