



## Playground Standards Ad Hoc Advisory Committee

**Meeting Minutes #2**  
**April 20, 2021**

**Co-Chairs:** Curtis Lawyer, director, capital project and Jessica Sankey, executive director, operations

**Members Present:** Kristi Dominguez, Mylo Allen, Amy Berreth, Micah Smith, Margaret Gude, Ali Bonner, Nic Castona, Rodolfo Riviere, Meredith Gant, Sarah Catudio, Jenny Brice, Cindy Pearson, Corbin Anderson, Jen Mallet, Debbie Haney, Trevor Aeschliman, Corey Ayers, Brian Smart, Kristine Wilson, Patty Yunge, Kristi Wyandt-Varela, Gina Austin, Jonathan Schilk Joshua Cloud

### Introductions & Welcome

1. Committee Co-Chair Jessica Sankey, executive director of operations welcomed the committee members and introduced the days topics.
2. Jessica invited members to list which playgrounds they visited in the past week and to discuss their experience with surfaces. From the Zoom session chat:
  - a. Happy Valley
  - b. Larrabee
  - c. Lowell
  - d. Cordate
  - e. Sudden Valley
  - f. Lowell
  - g. Squaticum Park
  - h. Waypoint park
  - i. Options
3. Jessica introduced Gina Austin with the City of Bellingham. Gina will provide resources that the City of Bellingham has collected regarding playground surfaces and equipment, to be posted on the Committee webpage.

### Learning: Surfacing

1. Joshua Cloud presented information from the City of Portland's review of Playground Surfaces from 2018. Document reviewed 4 main product types and listed the pros and cons of each. Gina Austin also assisted in presentation providing experiences with each product. The product types discussed:
  - a. Engineered wood fiber tiles
    - i. PROS – Affordable, good slip resistance, made of natural material.
    - ii. CONS – Poorest mobility and accessibility ratings. Least accessible material. Not durable at all, lots of maintenance issues and most frequent maintenance required. Poorest permeability over time of all products reviewed. Highest life cycle cost.
  - b. Rubber Tiles
    - i. PROS – Great safety ratings, great accessibility and mobility ratings, lowest life cycle cost. Easiest to maintain and repair. Quickest to maintain/repair. Repairs are

- not obvious. Made of recycled material. Recyclable/reusable at end of product's life span. Cheaper than Poured in Place, about the same cost as Synthetic Turf.
- ii. CONS – Not a natural product. Needs to be installed on concrete or asphalt instead of crushed rock like other materials. Can sometimes be slippery when wet.
- c. Poured in Place Rubber
  - i. PROS – Looks great after installation. Good safety ratings. Great accessibility and mobility ratings. Can be poured over crushed rock, no concrete or asphalt needed for base.
  - ii. CONS – Doesn't wear well over time. Repairs are costly and require specialized labor. Most expensive to install. Difficult to maintain. Most expensive to replace. Not a natural material. Not recyclable at end of lifespan, straight to landfill.
- d. Synthetic Turf
  - i. PROS – Great safety ratings. Great slip resistance when wet. Cheaper than Poured in Place, about the same cost as Rubber Tiles. Looks 'natural' (but isn't). Best permeability at install and over time of all products reviewed.
  - ii. CONS – Doesn't rate as high as Rubber Tiles or Poured in Place Rubber regarding accessibility and mobility. Hard to maintain over time, replacement patches are needed in high wear areas and repairs often stand out. Difficult to replace. Medium life cycle cost. Can create static electricity when played on.
- e. Summary conversation included recommendation of Rubber Tile and Artificial Turf as two best playground surfaces for consideration.
- 2. Joshua Cloud presented information from a playground designer/manufacturer regarding surfaces.
  - a. Presentation discussed:
    - i. Safety standards
    - ii. Borders and drainage needs
    - iii. Focus on common high wear areas
      - 1. Swings
      - 2. Slides
      - 3. Merry-Go-Round's
    - iv. Surface types:
      - 1. Engineered Wood Fiber (BPS moving away from due to maintenance and accessibility issues)
      - 2. Rubber Mulch (No for BPS)
      - 3. Synthetic Turf
      - 4. Rubber Tiles
      - 5. Poured In Place Rubber
      - 6. Hybrid potential
        - a. Rubber Tiles & Synthetic Turf
- 3. Joshua Cloud presented photo examples of Turf and Rubber Tile Playgrounds surfaces.
  - a. Joshua presented sample playground surface and equipment designs from playground manufacturers.
  - b. Joshua provided a list of Playgrounds with Turf & Rubber Tile playground surfaces Members can visit:
    - i. Rubber Tiles
      - 1. Northshore SD



- a. Ruby Bridges ES
    2. Marysville SD
      - a. Kellogg Marsh ES
    3. Stanwood SD
      - a. Cedarhome ES
      - b. Stanwood ES
      - c. Utsalady ES
      - d. Twin City ES
      - e. Stanwood Lincoln HS ALC
  - ii. Synthetic Turf
    1. Lake Washington SD
      - a. Olde Redmond School House
      - b. Lakeview ES
    2. Seattle Public Schools
      - a. Lawton ES
      - b. Montlake ES
      - c. Lowell ES
      - d. Leschi ES
    3. Marysville SD
      - a. Quil Tulalip ES
      - b. Allen Creek ES
  - iii. Hybrid Surface Examples
    1. None provided. Josh will research and report back to team with examples of Hybrid Turf and Rubber Tile examples.
- 4. Take Home Learning for Members:**
- a. Attend a Recess! Ali Bonner can provide/organize access for members.
- 5. Meeting Adjourned 5:00pm**
- a. **Next meeting: Tuesday, April 27 3:30-5 via Zoom**