

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).

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

Toriana Pettaway, Department of Civil Rights tpettaway@cityofmadison.com

Jason Glozier, Department of Civil Rights jglozier@cityofmadison.com

Lara Mainella, City Attorney's Office lmainella@cityofmadison.com

Erin Stenson, Human Resources Department estenson@cityofmadison.com

Names and affiliations of others participating in the analysis:

Kay Rutledge, Parks Division krutledge@cityofmadison.com

Janet Schmidt, Parks Division 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. Hmong 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 could be 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 - this could change with the different and more spread out location of playground equipment
- Need for residents to feel able to engage in a public process and feel as though 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. Examine Parks' current community engagement methods, and develop enhanced methods 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. RESJI will work with Parks to provide tangible suggestions for how to accomplish this, including different methods of announcing meetings, identifying community leaders to assist in outreach, and different methods of gathering resident input.

- 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?

Eric Knepp, Parks Superintendent
City of Madison Parks Commission

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

Impacts will be documented by Parks with assistance from RESJI. Evaluation should include a description of the racial equity analysis process, Parks' decision making process as well as the actual decisions made relating to this project, and the ways in which these decisions affect residents, especially people of color and those with low incomes living near the park.

Success indicators include:

1. The ultimate status of the small playground near the community gardens: the playground remaining available and reflective of the needs and desires of nearby residents.
2. The ultimate status of the larger, barrier-free playground, to be built in the park: the playground being well-utilized and reflective of the needs and desires of nearby residents as well as those who may travel from outside the immediate area to utilize it.

Progress benchmarks include:

- Inclusive engagement of residents, especially people of color and those with low incomes living near the park, in decisions related to the playgrounds;
- Inclusive, accurate and timely communication from the City with residents and stakeholders about decisions, including regular status updates, related to the playgrounds

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

See the last "progress benchmark" in section d. above.

Communications should take place in multiple forms (in-person, email, phone, etc), especially utilizing the ways in which residents have indicated they would like to receive communications.

Efforts should continually be made to identify neighborhood leaders who are able to assist with communications and identifying the best ways in which to keep residents informed and involved.

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
- 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
- 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
- Dane Demographics Brief (UW Applied Population Lab and UW-Extension):
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
- Applied Population Laboratory (UW-Madison):
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

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				
City Informs City of Madison initiates an effort, coordinates with departments and uses a variety of channels to inform community to take action	City Consults City of Madison gathers information from the community to inform city-led projects	City engages in dialogue City of Madison engages community members to shape city priorities and plans	City and community work together Community and City of Madison share in decision-making to co-create solutions together	Community directs action 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"> Primarily one-way channel of communication One interaction Term-limited to event Addresses immediate need of City and community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primarily one-way channel of communication One to multiple interactions Short to medium-term Shapes and informs city projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-way channel of communication Multiple interactions Medium to long-term Advancement of solutions to complex problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-way channel of communication Multiple interactions Medium to long-term Advancement of solutions to complex problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-way channel of communication Multiple interactions Medium to long-term Advancement of solutions to complex problems
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 the user to write notes.