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1: Project Background: Budget and Schedule

2: Assessments to Date

3: Design Concepts

4: Break Out Groups

5: Next Steps
Purpose of Meeting

To Provide an opportunity for public input on the future improvements planned for the George Christopher Playground Project

(Please direct maintenance questions to Steven Cismowski at 415-831-6358 or steven.cismowski@sfgov.org. Thank you)
Ground Rules

• Keep to the agenda
• Turn off cell phones
• No disruptions
• Please hold all questions for the end; there will be time for questions and discussions during the breakout group time.
• Please be courteous and respectful

Working together will make this a productive meeting
Project Team

Matt Jasmin, Project Manager – RPD
Steven Cismowski, Area Manager – RPD

Jasmine Kaw, Landscape Architect – SFPW
Brandon Johnson, Landscape Arch. Assistant – SFPW

Will Kwan, Architect, SFPW
1: Project Background
Project Budget

$2.8 Million

2012 “Clean and Safe” Park Bond

- Project Budget: $2,800,000
- Construction w/ Contingency: $1,965,000
- Soft Cost: $835,000
  ~ Project Management
  ~ Design, Planning and Engineering Services
  ~ Construction Management
  ~ Permits, surveys, miscellaneous fees
Project Schedule

2015

2016

2017

2018
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- **Community Meeting (3)**
- **TBD**
- **RPD Commission**
- **PLANNING (6 MO)**
- **SEPTEMBER 24, 2015**
- **Community Meeting (1)**
- **Community Meeting (2)**
- **Dec 12, 2015**
- **DESIGN (12 MO)**
- **BID (6 MO)**
- **CONSTRUCTION (12 MO)**
- **Project Opening**

Building Design & Construction
Project Scope

• Replace play structures & surfacing

• Renovate (1) clubhouse restroom interior for accessibility compliance

• Landscape and Irrigation System:
  – Tree management in select areas adjacent to the playground
  – Renovate landscaping and irrigation in select areas adjacent to the playground
  – Existing pathways adjacent the playground area will be repaved to provide accessible circulation
  – Evaluate and improve drainage conditions

• Replace or renovate existing site furnishings, including:
  – Benches, picnic tables and signs
Project Scope
**Unisex Restroom Renovation Scope**

Renovation of existing unisex restroom to be accessible from the playground

Interior of existing unisex restroom to be fully renovated for accessibility compliance with new fixtures and finishes. Fixtures will be sized per “adult” standards. Exterior door will be locked from inside by user.

The Noe Valley Nursery School restroom will have interior entry only from the clubhouse. No additional upgrade work planned for this restroom at this time.
2: Assessments to Date
Why renovate the playground?

• Existing play equipment tested positive for unsafe levels of arsenic.

• The playground is not currently on an accessible path of travel.

• The playground does not meet current and updated safety and fall zone requirements.

• The playground was identified by RPD and community as needing renovation.
Community Input on Existing Playground:

• Existing Playground needs a few updates.
  
  Metal slides and metal features can get too hot.
  Sand gets too hot and super dirty.
  Needs more shade or shade structures.

• Like the risk of “castle playground” and “old fashioned equipment”

• Physically challenging and exciting.

• Only playground in the neighborhood suitable for older age kids (7-12)

• Like the perimeter walk and surrounding paths.

• Existing features we like: Big slides; swings; money bars; balancing beams; climbing ladders; fire poles and saucer.
Community Vision for Future Playground:

Nature Based Theme / “Natural” play structures / “Walk in the Tree Trunks”
More greenery; Fitting Glen Canyon Context

More seating/tables in shade

Challenging playground with risk element for ages 7 and up
Desired play stimulus for children: Vestibular (swinging, spinning);
Proprioceptive (joint compression, climbing and jumping); Sensory (tactile
digging).

Playground for imagination

Specific defined areas for specific age groups
Design Considerations:

- Community Vision/Input
- Site Analysis – Physical Site
- RPD Program Requirements
- RPD Maintenance and Operation Requirements
- Safety Standards (ADA-Americans with Disabilities Act, ASTM-American Society for Testing and Materials) and Code (DBI) Requirements
- Aesthetic
- Budget
3: Design Concepts

Village Concept

Tree House Concept

Zipline Concept
Village Concept

Building Design & Construction
Village Concept
Pre-school Equipment

Pre-school Age Structure

Tire Swing
Bridge
Playhouse
Whirl

Building Design & Construction
Village Concept

School-Age Equipment

School Age Structure
Tree House Concept
Tree House Concept

Pre-school Equipment

Pre-school Age Structure

Pre-school Age Structure

Playhouse

Bucket Swings

Building Design & Construction
Tree House Concept

School-Age Equipment

- Belt Swings
- Hillside Slide
- School Age Structure
- Whirl

Building Design & Construction

RPD | George Christopher Playground
Community Meeting (2) | December 12, 2015
Zipline Concept
Zipline Concept
Pre-school Equipment

Climb / Crawl Tunnels

Playhouse

Hillside Slide
Zipline Concept
School-Age Equipment

Hillside Slide Structure

Disk Swings

Building Design & Construction
Village Concept

Imagination Garden

Tree House Concept

Zipline Concept
Animal Friends

Crossing the “River”

Contemplation

Water Play

Imagination Garden

Balancing / Stepping

Crawl / Climb

Garden Fence

Building Design & Construction
4: Breakout Groups

- Break out into smaller groups of 3-5
- Discuss the concept plans
- Vote on the preferred plan
- Summarize and report back to the larger group
Breakout Groups - Discussion Considerations:

- **Overall Design** – Does it meet the community’s vision?

- **Aesthetic** – Does it fit the Glen Canyon Context?

- **Circulation** – How does one flow through the space?

- **Connectivity to Clubhouse and Restroom** – Does the plan feel whole and well connected to its surroundings?

- **Age Groups** – Does the plan meet different age groups’ requirements?

- **Play Features / Equipment** – Are the proposed equipment challenging?

- **Vegetation** – Does it look appropriate?

- **Seating** – Is there enough?
George Christopher Playground Renovation Concepts

Village Concept

Tree House Concept

Zipline Concept
## 5: Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Meeting #</th>
<th>Intent</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Meeting (1)</td>
<td>Introduction &amp; Public Input</td>
<td>September 24, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Meeting (2)</td>
<td>Draft Plans and Public Input</td>
<td>December 12, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting (3) Final Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>TBD – January / February 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank You

Contact Information

Matt Jasmin, Project Manager

Recreation and Parks Department
30 Van Ness Ave., 3rd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 581-2552
E-Mail: Matt.Jasmin@sfgov.org
Website: www.sf.parks.sfgov.org