

North Natomas Regional Park

Public Workshop #2 Public Comment Summary – Wednesday June 14, 2006

the "Comment Card #2" Summary will be posted when all cards are collected.

Volunteers, City staff and consultants in attendance included:

- Ron Spingarn, Friends of the Park
- Randi Kay Stephens and Daniel Roth, City of Sacramento, District One Council Office
- Janet Baker, Dennis Day and Steven Giguere, City of Sacramento, Parks and Planning Department
- Benjamin Woodside, Christine Talbot, and Joy Reinsch, Callander Associates Landscape Architecture

This was the second of two community workshops held for the Natomas community for North Natomas Regional Park at Inderkum High School. The workshop provided recaps of workshop one, and the next phases proposed by the City.

After the formal presentation, the public was given the opportunity to express their thoughts and concerns about the park in a comment period. The following items were discussed during this time. Additional comments are being collected and will follow in the form of a comment card summary.

1. Pathway/Bikeway

- A vote was taken and 33 attendees would like to see a perimeter path constructed first.
- Decomposed granite, asphalt, and rubber surfacing were suggested as jogging surfaces.
- A jogging path around the pond was requested.
- Pathways and trails should be built before a dog park.
- Pathway from Creekside to Inderkum High is important for school.
- Connectivity is important for pedestrians/bikes to travel through the park.
- Fitness stations/par course, benches, and a simple splash play water fountain were requested.
- Completion of a perimeter path would show commitment to the park by the City.
- Design an 8' or 10' bikeway instead of the standard 12' bikeway to save money for other improvements.

2. Dog Park

- Concerns that adequate access and parking for the dog park would be provided.
- Requests were made for a human park before a dog park.
- Concern for small dogs if dog park is all decomposed granite. Decomposed granite is hot and can get stuck in their paws.
- Provide a variety of surfaces, elevations, and spaces with adequate drainage within the dog park.

- Want dog park to be a special place that is different from other City dog parks.
- Separated small dog/big dog areas were requested.
- A shade shelter for people and heat sensitive dogs was suggested.

3. Workshop #1 Comment Card

At Workshop #1 a comment card was passed out with 2 options for Phase One development. Option A included pedestrian improvements along the west side of Natomas Blvd. Option B included pedestrian improvements from Natomas Blvd. along the south side of the pond and canal to the proposed bikeway. Since the first workshop on March 11th, some developments have come to the City's attention. Option A is being constructed by the City Street Department and Option B is located on the Department of Utilities property which will require additional coordination between Utilities and Parks for development of this area.

- Concerns were raised that it was not made clear in the previous workshop that if Option A and Option B were not built, then the City would automatically look to the priority list and build the top prioritized item.
- Concerns that the due date of the comment card from Workshop #1 (June 15th) makes priorities indeterminable because the information has not yet been fully tabulated.
- A suggestion that due to Option A and Option B not being possible, a decision on priorities should not be made based on the March 11th comment card because neighbors assumed A or B would be constructed.
- A request was made for an up-to-date comment card showing new options to be produced for review and voting.
- It was pointed out that the comment card listed the next meeting as being June 29th and many thought this was confusing as the meeting was changed to June 14th. A suggestion was made for an additional meeting on June 29th.
- It was pointed out that the issue with Option A & B could have been avoided if the City departments communicated better.
- Most at the meeting thought a dog park would be great as the Second Phase, but that trails and pedestrian improvements along the edges were more important.

4. Kid's Park

- Since there are many new play areas in Natomas Neighborhood Parks, the community would like to have something different built here.
- One neighbor likes the "Seven Wonders of the World" and literature ideas.
- Suggestion was made to put the kid's park where the botanical area is proposed to place it closer to the school.
- It was requested the skate park be developed in conjunction with the kid's park because both are equally important and fundraising could be done together.

5. Funding/Phasing

- Is there is a time limit on current funding for Phase One? Answer was no.

- Is there a timeline for Options A & B? The City response was that the plans for Option A are being created and the City parks staff and utilities staff are coordinating for Option B.
- Can the City assure Option A and Option B are going to occur so that additional portions of the park could be funded more quickly?
- Neighbors want trees to be planted now so the canopy can start growing.
- Can phase one funding still be earmarked for Option B?
- Was funding for the Natomas Regional Park used on other park projects? Dennis Day explained currently that there are no “Regional Park specific” funds. Neighbor then suggested funding could shift from neighborhood parks to the Regional Park.
- One community member asked about a re-sale fee that could be assessed to homes sold in the Natomas area. She explained that San Jose had a similar fee.

6. General

- One neighbor asked that natural grasses be avoided. Another neighbor requested native grasses. A third attendee suggested the park was large enough for a variety of environments and landscapes to suit everyone’s preferences.
- Contractors have been dumping on the park site. City staff requested that the next time someone sees this, to gather information and contact the City police.
- Attendee wants a clean and safe park that utilizes volunteers for safety.
- Trail maintenance and a designated maintenance crew for the park were requested.
- A request for electric car plug-in stations was made.
- Concerns over parking were made. Community wants adequate parking in the park.
- Will there be vehicle access in the park?
- Original MP is not accurate when coordinating with actual built community features.
- Lighting was requested to deter vandalism.
- A neighbor on the north end of the park has concerns with the mound locations. Suggestions were made to move the mounds, lower them, or make them part of the children’s play area.
- Group picnic/barbeque areas were requested.
- The street sweeping crew needs to do a better job around the park.

7. Next Steps

- Review neighbor comments.
- Begin construction documents for Phase One bikeway.
- City to post any other follow-up information on City website.

- END -