



DEPARTMENT OF  
PARKS AND RECREATION

PARK PLANNING AND  
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

LANDSCAPE  
ARCHITECTURE SECTION

CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
CALIFORNIA

## MEETING NOTES

915 I STREET  
5<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR  
SACRAMENTO, CA  
95814-2933

PH 916-808-5540  
FAX 916-808-8266

Re: Jefferson Park Master Planning Workshop

Date: January 28, 2009

Location/Time: South Natomas Community Center / 6:30 PM

Attendees: Councilmember Ray Tretheway, City of Sacramento  
Randi Kay Stephens, City of Sacramento  
Officer Kurt McCray, Neighborhood Watch Officer  
Alicia Bramble Schulz, City of Sacramento  
Gary Hyden, City of Sacramento  
Community Members, see sign in sheet

---

Item:

### **Welcome / Introduction**

Gary Hyden introduced himself and the other City Staff. He noted that the purpose of the meeting was to obtain input from the community.

### **Presentation**

Gary presented the community with the project schedule and 2 park design concepts. Gary stated that an additional \$200,000 will be added to the project budget. Gary also informed the community of the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting on 4-6-09 and encouraged everyone to attend.

Meeting notes will be posted on the City's Parks website. CPTED will review safety issues at park.

### **Review of Both Plans (Concept A & B) by Kurt McCray, Neighborhood Watch Officer**

- Walkways
  - Sufficient for Police Patrol
  - Linear pathways desirable or minimal winding
  - Desire good connectivity
  - Desire bench set back
- Seating

- Suggested to eliminate the seating area behind the playground and improving lighting which many neighbors agreed.
- Skate Plaza
  - Supportive of location and setback away from walkway.
  - Moving the skate plaza to the back of the park is a bad idea since the end of Roma Court is currently a hang out problem area.
- Existing Trees
  - Supportive of existing trees along Bannon Creek to be pruned & thinned.
- Community Garden
  - Supportive of Garden
  - Prefers Garden to be closer to street – not in back of park

### **Community Participation**

The community members provided City staff with the following comments:

#### 1. Proposed Plan “Concept A”

- Tear out lighting?
- 10’ walkway around the whole playground for safety?
  - CPTED and Neighborhood Watch Officer’s comments
- Design is expansive - are we within budget?
  - We can build it all with the extra \$200K.
- Tile walls will stick out like they do not belong. Solutions to blend?
- Interpretive garden
  - No interpretive gardens in both designs? Both can have the garden. Concept “A” makes it easier to build.
- Move all tiles to Fort Natomas?
- Build a very short path or route from school to streets.
- Build the pathways to be functional for bicyclists and pedestrians.
  - Circulation efficient for shortest route per entry.
  - Limit poor circulation paths. Build a shorter path of travel form school connection to school.
- Skate Plaza
  - Gary suggested automatic lighting.
  - Move skate plaza to back and add lighting.
  - Skate plaza will promote loitering along Roma Court.
  - Locate closer to the central play area.
  - Skate plaza safety issues with this design.
  - Propose to move skate plaza to main area in back.
  - Skate plaza will promote graffiti, poor safety and liability.
  - Skate plaza popular among young kids only, no risk of bullying.
  - Will be a safety liability.
  - Back off of the walkways.
  - Moving the skate plaza to the back of the park was mentioned by the neighbor closes across the street from its current location), but most neighbors including Officer Kurt McCray agreed that moving the skate plaza to the back of the park is a bad idea since the end of Roma Court is currently a hang out problem area.
- Trees block existing SMUD lights?

- Randi Kay stated that CPTED will address this.
- Gary stated tree shade is needed during summer.
- Trees to be pruned for safety lighting or to keep summer shade and enforce park hours.
- Seat wall will provide too much seating and additional hiding opportunities once again?
- Want a decomposed granite trail along the existing walkway.
  - Jim Bacchini stated possible drainage issues with the decomposed granite becoming muddy. Dog owners like the idea and said their dogs would not mind the mud.
  - Add decomposed granite trail alongside the paved walkway (park perimeter).
- What will the height of the rock climbing wall be?
  - Gary stated 6' max.
- Existing Restroom
  - Remove for ADA compliance and safety issues.
  - Keep for convenience and removal costs. Existing restroom grandfathered in?
- Proposed additions with extra budget
  - Decomposed granite pathways with concrete header as an additive alternate item as suggested by Gary.
  - Add exercise stations along walkway.
  - Add benches along the west side of park.
  - Community garden.

## 2. Proposed Plan "Concept B"

- Volunteer efforts could fundraise for park development to reduce costs to build-will increase construction time.
- Keep the same footprint of "Concept A" playground to save costs.
  - Preferred concept "A"
  - Saves costs
  - Save money if we do a community built playground. Need a volunteer coordinator, Julie Mier, for the project.
- Existing Trees
  - Remove existing tree grove by shade structure to make another playground feature.
  - Trees become visual obstructions into park.
- Put a community garden in the master plan
  - Note: some community gardens are not used due to poor convenience to street, i.e.: toting soil, supplies
  - Community garden collaboration with school.
  - Revisit community garden. Where is it convenient to get to?
  - Will become an illegal dumping ground like Bannon Creek.
- Eliminate visual obstruction with tile walls.
- No doggie bags at park.
- More trash cans in the park.
- Benches set back from the walkways.

- Keep open space in the park for sports activities.
- Young kids want a playground soon.

The community preferred “Concept A” along with the proposed changes as discussed.

### **Next Steps**

Gary thanked the public for their participation and informed them that the next step is to develop the park master plan from “Concept A” including the ideas as discussed. The park master plan will be reviewed by the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting on 4-2-09.

The meeting adjourned.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

### **City of Sacramento**

Department of Parks & Recreation

Landscape Architecture Section

Tin-Wah Wong,

Associate Landscape Architect

Tel: (916) 808.5540

Fax: (916) 808.8266