



DEPARTMENT OF
PARKS AND RECREATION

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
CALIFORNIA

915 I Street, 5th Floor
SACRAMENTO, CA
95814-2997

PARK PLANNING, DESIGN &
DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

(916) 808-8529
FAX 808-8266

Meeting Notes from the Lewis Park Community Meeting Regarding Proposed Picnic Area Improvements at the Park

Meeting Date 10/30/07

City Staff Members: Patricia Clark, Council District 7
Janet Baker, Operations and Maintenance Manager
Gary Hyden, Supervising Landscape Architect
Jonathan Rewers, Program Analyst
Julia Cox, Junior Landscape Assistant, 808-8671, jcox@cityofsacramento.org
Robert Conroy, Park Safety Ranger

Thank you to the North West Pocket Neighborhood Watch Association for inviting Parks to use their meeting as a venue for this Lewis Park meeting.

Kathi Windheim introduced City staff to the meeting attendants, followed by a second introduction from Pat Clark.

Gary Hyden presented the meeting content, including the following:

1. Explanation of the PRPG process and how this project was selected.
2. Explanation of funding mechanism for the project
3. Explanation of amenities proposed for the project
4. Discussion of the proposed locations for the improvements

Feedback from meeting attendants included:

1. Community members would like to see more trees planted in the park

10/31/2007

1 of 2

- a. Trees are most desirable near the play area to provide shade
2. Concerns about gophers in the park and the surrounding properties were raised
 - a. Janet noted this to later discuss with Maintenance staff
3. Concerns about illicit activity in the adjoining vacant lot were raised
 - a. Staff suggested using the PRPG process to propose acquiring the lot in the future
4. Community members were curious about the number of tables proposed in the picnic area
 - a. Julia commented that 6-10 tables would be included in the project, depending on what other amenities would be included
5. A request was made for the existing drinking fountain near the tennis court to be repaired
 - a. Staff will follow up on this
6. Community members commented that a steeper roof to prevent kids climbing on top of the structure would be desirable
7. Concern about stability of surface-mounted furniture was raised; community members are very concerned about furniture being well-secured and immobile
 - a. Community members suggested a larger diameter bolt for surface-mounting
 - b. Staff suggested in-ground mounting
8. ADA accessible table is desired
9. Some community members advocated adding security lighting at the park
 - a. Janet again recommended this as a future PRPG item, as it is not budgeted or scoped for this project
 - b. One member suggested using brighter bulbs in the existing fixtures
 - c. Another member commented that she did not want to see any further lighting in the park, as this could encourage night time park use
 - d. Another member commented that she would like to see the existing lighting at the park entry maintained, as it helped maintain security
10. Community members suggested relocating existing benches around the play area to shaded areas and out of the sun
11. Community members requested stone cladding on the shade structure posts
12. Community members requested colors of the shade structure and site furniture to match or compliment those of the school
13. Community members were generally interested in adding an additional drinking fountain near the play area and proposed picnic area
14. Community members were generally more interested in a plain hipped or gabled roof, rather than a roof with a cupola added to the top
15. The location near the play area was generally more desirable for the picnic area
16. Community members suggested reusing the existing BBQ and replacing the table on the existing concrete pad.
17. Next steps include final design and bidding this winter (which will be posted on the website), and construction in the spring.