

**City of Oakdale  
OAKDALE POLICE DEPARTMENT  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF**

**Memorandum  
*Working together to improve the quality of life in Oakdale***

Date: April 11, 2002

To: California Police Chief's Association  
Website

From: Steve Krull  
Chief of Police

Subject: Skate Park Data Summary

---

This is a summary of the data I received from various cities relative to my request to all chiefs via the e-mail system. Thanks to all who responded. My request had a couple of structured questions but there were many additional comments and information offered. I will try and provide all the feedback possible. Not all questions were answered.

**RESPONSES**

39 total responses

**FENCING**

23 Responses indicated their facilities were fenced. Most indicated this is the single most effective method of controlling use and, to some degree, behavior. At most facilities, police and/or park personnel had authority to lock up the park if there were vandalism, graffiti or flagrant rule violations.

14 of the fenced facilities were opened and closed by park staff. The remainder were controlled by private security or police departments

**LOCATION**

Most all facilities were located well away from any populated areas. The majority were in parks, some in industrial type areas. Several were located adjacent to police facilities and those agencies indicated they had no problems with their parks.

**ORDINANCES**

25 of the agencies indicated they had ordinances in place re: hours, use of safety equipment, behavior etc.

There is a split on ordinance enforcement. Some City Attorneys had advised to not enforce the ordinances unless you were always going to do so. The majority of the responses indicated either strict enforcement or an as needed basis.

### **SUPERVISION**

18 of the skate parks had on-duty park staff supervising activities during regular hours. Several were done in conjunction with YMCA's etc which provided supervision. Only one agency actually provided police personnel to supervise activities. Some of those that supervised full-time charged a use fee.

### **SAFETY EQUIPMENT**

Most all responses agreed getting compliance with this was an ongoing issue. Stricter enforcement and closing of the park until compliance improved seemed to be very effective. There were some agencies that actually provided equipment for use.

### **GENERAL ISSUES**

Several skate parks have the parks on video cams to web sites for general viewing and an additional means of monitoring.

One agency used motion sensors to activate overhead lighting if there was park use after hours.

Skate parks should not mingle skaters and bikes at the same time.

### **PLANNING**

Most all responses strongly encouraged anyone (police) building a park to be seriously involved in the design from the start in order to site it correctly as well as design out any problems where possible (CPTED). It appeared that involving skaters in the process of planning and ordinance development helped with the buy-in.

### **OBSERVATIONS**

It may be stating the obvious, but my assessment is that the more involvement in the planning stages of police in site selection, design and ordinances the fewer problems occurred when built.

The more successful (or less problematic) skate parks were located away from populated areas but where there was excellent 360-degree visibility. The parks were locked and fenced with regular hours and ordinances regarding behavior and use of safety equipment. Regular and appropriate enforcement of those ordinances assisted in gaining and/or maintaining compliance. Ongoing regular supervision of facilities positively impacts rules compliance etc. but raises the liability issues. As stated earlier, the ability for police or park staff to lock down the park for specific reasons seemed to be a very effective tool.