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1. Executive Summary

Purpose of the Parks Master Plan

This document is a long-range plan that guides the development, operation, and maintenance of the City’s park and open space system. It is intended to be a “living document” that is regularly used by City Staff, Commissions, and Council as a tool for planning and decision making. Preparation and regular updating of the Parks Master Plan is required by the City’s General Plan. The policies contained in the General Plan create the basis upon which the Parks Master Plan recommendations are developed in greater detail.

The 1991 Parks Master Plan

The City’s first Parks Master Plan was adopted in 1991. It remains in effect until such time as this updated Parks Master Plan is adopted by the City Council. The 1991 Plan contains the following major actions and recommendations:

- The standard for park acreage was raised from the 3.33-acre standard contained in the General Plan to 5 acres per 1000 residents (2 acres of neighborhood parks and 3 acres of community parks per 1000 residents).
- The Parks Master Plan describes a complete system of recreation facilities to serve the ultimate build-out population.
- The recreation corridor concept was introduced to take advantage of the City’s unique geography.
- The parks development impact fee ordinance was updated based on the ultimate build-out parks system.
- New neighborhood parks were located to best serve existing and new development.
- Improvements to existing facilities were described.
- New special use facilities including senior centers, municipal swim centers, teen centers, community centers, and a sports complex were described.

Changed Conditions in West Sacramento

Conditions have changed in the ten years since the first Parks Master Plan was prepared. In many ways, West Sacramento is a different city than it once was. The City was in its infancy in 1991, having been recently incorporated in 1987. Today the City has grown and matured. The municipal government is well established. Planning and zoning frameworks are in place. Redevelopment of the City’s blighted areas is being implemented. Development impact fees are in place to ensure that new development finances for increased demand upon City services.

The City has gone through the recession of the early 1990’s, the recovery of the late 1990’s, and is now experiencing the recession of the early 2000’s. The City is experiencing major growth during the current recessionary economic time, however, due to pent-up demand for new housing construction. In addition, significant investment in new industry and commercial development is occurring. The Ziggurat, Raley Field, and the new River Walk Park have been recently implemented, spurring on the creation of a revitalized riverfront district.

Based on available census data, from 1990 to 2000, the City’s population increased by 18 percent, from 28,869 to 31,615. Much of this growth occurred within the last two years, in response to new infrastructure improvements that have made residential development in Southport more attractive.
The Southport Framework Plan was adopted shortly after adoption of the 1991 Parks Master Plan. The Framework Plan incorporated many, but not all, of the Parks Master Plan recommendations. The most significant variations from the Parks Master Plan include the omission of a dedicated sports complex, and designation of other, non-recreation uses for the proposed large community park located on federal property south of the barge canal and east of Jefferson Avenue. A goal of the current parks master planning process is to reconcile differences between the Southport Framework Plan and the Parks Master Plan.

Progress Made

Implementation of the 1991 Parks Master Plan recommendations was hindered by the economic recession of the early 1990’s. During this time, municipal tax revenues were significantly reduced to help make up shortfalls in the State budget, leaving limited funding for parks and recreation.

Significant new residential construction was expected to occur as the economy recovered during the second half of the 1990’s. However, development was delayed due to the lack of new infrastructure in Southport. Construction of the Harbor Boulevard widening in 1995 and the Palamides Bridge across the Barge Canal in 1997 opened the way for increased building activity. The new residential construction that has occurred in 2000, 2001, and 2002 has finally begun to generate the cash flow needed for new public services, including parks and schools. New residents of Southport are eagerly awaiting these improvements.

The City has made significant progress in the face of these difficulties, however. These achievements include:

- River Walk Park
- Club West Teen Center
- Improvements to the Broderick Boat Ramp
- Development of Summerfield Park
- Construction of the Alyce Norman/Bryte youth sports complex
- Dedication of new neighborhood park sites in the Bridgeway Island subdivision
- Raley Field (private investment)
- School open space improvements at Elkhorn, Golden State, Westfield, and Westacre
Opportunities and Assets

West Sacramento is blessed with many opportunities for the creation of a premier system of park and recreation facilities. There are many underdeveloped natural, political, and economic assets that may be taken advantage of as the City moves forward:

- **The Sacramento River**: The river is central to the identity and image of the City. The confluence of the American and Sacramento Rivers is one of the unique places that attract many people. However, opportunities to enjoy the river are hampered by the lack of developed public access. Historically, the river was a threat due to flooding. Tall levees were constructed to keep the floodwaters out, and in the process also served to separate the people from the river. Providing convenient and safe public river access that is also sensitive to the natural environment is a key opportunity.

- **Other Waterways**: The Deep Water Ship Channel, Turning Basin, and Barge Canal are other underutilized water resources. Improved public access to these waters is another key opportunity.

- **Existing Corridors**: The City has many natural corridors that represent underutilized assets (Figure 1-2). In addition to the river and Deep Water Channel, other corridors exist along the Yolo and Sacramento Bypass, the Main Drainage Canal, other minor canals, and utility rights-of-way. These corridors are an opportunity for development of pedestrian and non-motorized linkages that can be used for transportation as well as recreation. They are assets that may be used to tie together a community that has been divided by roads, geography, and development patterns.

- **Significant Natural Resources**: In addition to its water resources, West Sacramento contains riparian forests and wetlands. These areas are assets worthy of protection. They are also an opportunity to provide public access for enjoyment and education/natural history interpretation.

- **Undeveloped Land**: Land suitable for development of new parks remains available, especially in Southport.

- **Redevelopment**: Opportunities for park improvements in the older sections of the City may be available through the Redevelopment Agency.
The Planning Process

The current planning process involves five main components:

1. Inventory and analysis of existing parks and recreation facilities.
3. Identification of goals and priorities to guide the development of the system.
5. Creation of an implementation plan to quantify costs, funding, operation, and maintenance of the system.

The planning process (Figure 1-3) includes four phases. The following meetings have been conducted to facilitate public involvement in the planning process:

- City Council
- Community Workshop Meeting
- Youth Focus Group
- Active Recreation Focus Group
- High School Leadership Group
- Meadowdale Neighborhood Meeting
- Washington Neighborhood Meeting
- Parks and Community Services Commission Meeting
- Community Workshop
- Bridgeway Island Neighborhood Meeting
- Washington Unified School Board
- Parks and Community Services Commission
- City Council
- Sacramento/Yolo Port Commission
- Planning Commission
- Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan Update

In addition, meetings were held with the City Manager, Redevelopment Agency, Department of Community Development, Port of Sacramento, Reclamation District 900 and the West Sacramento Police Department to gather input. Moving forward, the Draft and Final Master Plan will be brought to the Parks and Community Services Commission, the School Board, and the City Council. These meetings will be open to the public who will be given the opportunity to comment.
Regional Setting

West Sacramento is located on Interstate highway 80 midway between the San Francisco Bay Area and Lake Tahoe. The city of Sacramento lies to the east across the Sacramento River. The Sacramento Bypass to the north and Yolo Bypass to the west are large land reserves that carry winter floodwaters, provide wildlife habitat, and are used for agricultural production. To the south lies farmland along the Sacramento River. West Sacramento is part of the metropolitan Sacramento Area. Nearby recreation resources include the City of Sacramento parks system and County of Sacramento parks system. Regional recreation destinations include Folsom Lake and Lake Berryessa.

Local Setting

West Sacramento is geographically defined by its water resources and has been historically influenced by its proximity to the confluence of the American and Sacramento Rivers. The rivers offer many recreational activities, including boating and fishing. Several privately operated marinas, and the publicly operated Broderick Boat Ramp, provide river access. The Deep Water Ship Channel and Turning Basin at the Port of Sacramento provide additional opportunities, including sailing and rowing. The Deep Water Channel also divides the City into two parts: the northern half which is made up of established residential neighborhoods, the Port of Sacramento, and developed industrial areas; and the southern half, which is largely undeveloped with farmlands, three established residential areas and three new subdivisions.

Sacramento River
Key Factors

West Sacramento is a unique community. Several factors have direct bearing on the formulation of recommendations contained within the Parks Master Plan:

• West Sacramento is a city of opportunity, characterized by an abundance of underdeveloped assets.

• The City is surrounded by major waterways that give it much of its character.

• West Sacramento is a diverse community that reflects its historical formation from several unincorporated communities and a large rural land area.

• The City is divided into two halves by the Shipping Channel and Barge Canal. The southern half is largely undeveloped, with an ample supply of available land for park development. The northern half is largely built out, with few opportunities for new park development.

• The City’s population is expected to reach 75,000 by the year 2025, more than double the current population. The Parks Master Plan’s recommendations are based on an anticipated build-out population of 77,000.

• Most of the population growth will occur in Southport in the form of suburban-style development, and in the Triangle Specific Plan Area, in the form of high-density urban development.

• New housing development will generate development impact fees and land dedications to provide for the recreation needs of new residents. The Southport Framework Plan includes a system of parks and recreation corridors that are based on the 1991 Parks Master Plan.

• The City has emerged from its infancy and has greater financial resources than it did at the time the 1991 Parks Master Plan was prepared.

Park and Recreation Facility Types

The facilities described by the Parks Master Plan can be organized into seven primary categories based on National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) standards:

• Regional Park: A regional park is a large park, typically organized around a significant geographical feature such as a lake, mountain, forest or coastline, and that serves several communities within a one-hour driving time. Regional parks are typically administered by the state, counties, or other park agencies rather than municipalities due to their large size and unique nature.

• Central Park: A large urban park that contains a wide range of facilities and that serves the entire city. A central park is essentially a community park that has an elevated status due to its central location, unique features, historic characteristics, or great size. West Sacramento does not currently have a central park.

• Community Park: A large park (typically over 20 acres) that contains a wide range of facilities and that serves several neighborhoods or the entire community. The Bryte Park/Golden State Middle School/Alyce Normand-Bryte Playfields complex are collectively considered to be a...
community park. River Walk Park, although not of the typical size, serves the entire community.

- **Neighborhood Park:** A medium sized park (4 to 10 acres) that serves the informal recreation needs of a single neighborhood. An example is Elkohm Park.
- **Mini Park:** A small tot lot or passive sitting area (under 1 acre) that serves the daily recreation needs of a small area. An example is Redwood Park.
- **Special Facility:** A recreation facility that serves a specific need or user group, such as a community center, senior center, municipal gymnasium or swim center. Examples include the West Sacramento Senior Center and the pools at Golden State Middle School and River City High School.
- **Recreation Corridor:** A linear park that includes multi-use pathways for recreation and non-motorized transportation.
- **Open Space Area:** Undeveloped natural areas that contain significant natural resources.

**NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING AREAS**

The Parks Master Plan subdivides the City into 20 neighborhood planning areas (Figure 1.4). Geographic features such as the river, deep water channel, canals, highways, major arterial roadways, and railways define these areas. Each neighborhood planning area should contain at least one neighborhood park or community park within walking distance of each resident.

**Existing Parkland Acreage and Acreage Standards**

West Sacramento has 104 acres of developed city parks. This equates to 3.06 acres of parkland for every 1000 residents, based on a current estimated population of 34,000. This total includes parks that provide for daily recreation needs: neighborhood, mini, and community parks.

The 1991 Parks Master Plan established a standard of 5 acres per 1000 residents. On a citywide basis, 170 acres are required by this standard, leaving the City with a current shortfall of approximately 69 acres.

In the year 2025, a total of 375 acres of parkland would be required to serve the pro-
The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is federal legislation enacted to protect the rights of disabled people in employment, public accommodations, telecommunications, and state and local government services. The California State building code requires conformance with the ADA for all public buildings, parks, and outdoor spaces. The Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) has established safety guidelines for public playgrounds. A survey of existing facilities for compliance with the ADA and CPSC is outside the scope of this document.

Demand for Park and Recreation Facilities
As a provider of public services, it is important for the City to determine the community’s demand for those services. If demand is underestimated, facilities deteriorate through overuse. Conversely, if demand is overestimated, facilities are underused and represent wasted resources. The following techniques were used to determine demand:

- Analysis of demographics.
- Analysis of trends surveys.
- A telephone opinion survey.
- Comparison with other communities.
- Parks Master Plan standards.
- Public involvement workshops (several).
- Written questionnaires.
- Professional judgement.

The demand analysis is discussed in greater detail in the Appendix. The reader is encouraged to review the opinion survey report document (available under separate cover through the Parks and Community Services Department). Based on the various components of the demand analysis, the following summary of demand is presented (not in order of importance):

- **A Central Park**: West Sacramento currently lacks a large park containing a variety of facilities that can be used as a community gathering space. Participants in the Community Workshop rated this as a high priority, and expressed a desire for a single park that would provide facilities for all age groups and interest. They also viewed such a facility as a means to improve the image of the City and provide an enhanced community identity.

- **Improved water access**: Residents value the water resources available in West Sacramento. They desire improved access to water-related recreation such as fishing, boating, swimming, and passive use.

- **Increased number and variety of facilities**: The City received low scores in the opinion survey relative to other California communities for the number and variety of facilities available.

- **Improvements to existing parks**: Participants expressed the perception that the City’s parks are tired and old. Safety of park users is also of concern.
Recreation corridors and trails: The corridor concept was supported in the public meetings and through the high scores received in the survey for bicycling, walking, and horseback riding.

Programs and activities for children and youth: A high level of importance was expressed for providing after-school and sports programs for children and teens. Construction of a high school age teen center was also highly rated. The youth workshop participants expressed a desire for skatepark facilities.

Swimming: Swimming is a very popular activity. A high level of support for a family aquatic park with swimming pools and water play was expressed.

Landscape entrances: Beautification of gateways to the community with landscaping was rated highly in the survey.

Classes: A high level of interest exists in organized classes for activities such as cooking, computer use, arts and crafts, and gardening.

Senior programs: Senior nutrition and diet programs are considered to be very important.

Active recreation: Facilities and leagues for youth sports were considered to be very important, while adult sports were not as highly rated.

Fishing and water access: The community expressed great interest in fishing and additional water access opportunities.

Action Plan

The action plan recommendations as described in chapter 2 are derived from an analysis of existing conditions, assessment of demand, evaluation of opportunities for new facilities, and analysis of existing and future financing resources. Public participation also plays an important role in determining priorities.

Implementation Plan

The Implementation Plan described in chapter 3 provides estimated costs, describes potential funding sources, and discusses operation and maintenance. The implementation plan is based on the priorities that surfaced during the planning process.

Monitoring Process

This document is a flexible planning tool intended to be periodically reviewed and evaluated in light of changing conditions. The plan should be updated at approximate five-year intervals.
II. Action Plan
II. Action Plan

The Action Plan outlines specific recommendations to guide the improvement and development of the City’s park system. The recommendations are the culmination of the planning process. They are based on an analysis of existing conditions, assessment of demand, and the participation of the community, neighborhood groups, user groups, City staff, City Council, School Board, and Commissions.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The following strategies are responsible for the physical distribution, location, and amount of park and recreation facilities that make up the master plan. These strategies were created in response to the demand assessment which forms the basis of the plan.

- Expand existing parks where feasible to provide additional acreage
- Continue joint City/School District cooperation and City/Port Cooperation to maximize the utility of existing resources, and to provide park space in areas such as the north half of the city where opportunities for new land acquisition are limited
- Acquire and develop parks to meet the standard of 2 acres of neighborhood park and 3 acres of community park per each 1000 residents
- Acquire and develop a central park to serve the entire city
- Build new community centers, senior centers, gymnasiums, teen centers and indoor soccer facilities to support the demand for recreation programs and classes.
- Construct new swimming pools and sports fields to support the demand for active recreation
- Acquire and develop recreation corridors located along watercourses and railroad right-of-ways to link the park system and provide additional recreation opportunities
- Locate new parks to take advantage of the city’s natural resources, including the river and other watercourses
- Provide improved river access for boating and fishing
- Develop open space areas to protect significant wetlands and riparian forests, and to provide passive recreation opportunities
- Improve existing parks to maximize the utility of existing resources

ACTION PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

The Action Plan describes a complete system of park and recreation facilities to serve the needs of the City of West Sacramento at its ultimate build-out population. It provides specific recommendations for the following types of facilities:

- Regional Park
- Central Park
- Community Parks
- Neighborhood parks
- Mini Parks
- Recreation Corridors
- Open Space Areas
- Special Facilities
- Sports Facilities
Future Park and Recreation Planning Process

Further planning is required for implementation of the projects outlined within this plan. The planning and design process will be similar for each specific project, with the following general sequence:

1. Secure project funding.
2. Prepare master plans for specific parks or park facilities.
3. Prepare environmental documentation.
4. Prepare preliminary design.
5. Prepare construction documents.
6. Construct the project.
7. Operate and maintain the facility

Most improvement projects will require professional design and planning services. The entire planning sequence will be open to public review. The early master plan and preliminary phases will involve public participation workshops to help determine overall direction and specific details. Compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) will be required for each project.

Approval by the Parks and Community Services Commission, the City Council, and possibly the Planning Commission, Redevelopment Agency and School Board will be required. Public review and comment will be an integral part of these meetings. The public will be notified of all meetings and workshops by the Parks and Community Services Department through a variety of methods. Such methods may include posting notices at the project site, notifying homeowners’ associations, and publication in the local press.
The plan is intended to achieve a balance of park types best suited to City residents. Both active and passive recreation is considered equally important. The plan describes improvements to existing parks, and creation of new park and recreation facilities. These facilities are described in the following text, organized by category. Letter designations given for each facility are keyed to the park master plan diagram (Figure 1-1). Detailed development standards for each category of facility are presented in Appendix E

REGIONAL PARK

Governors Residence (R1)

A regional park is a large park, typically organized around a significant geographical feature such as a lake, mountain, forest or coastline, and that serves several communities within a one hour driving time. Regional parks are typically administered by the state, counties, or other park agencies rather than municipalities due to their large size and unique nature. When people speak of a “Regional Park” in West Sacramento, they typically are referring to a Community Park or Central Park as defined by the Parks Master Plan.

There are currently no regional parks in West Sacramento. However, regional usage of local parks is common. Residents of West Sacramento utilize park facilities in Sacramento and other communities. West Sacramento experiences usage in its parks by residents of other communities as well, especially at Bryte Park and the Broderick Boat Ramp, as well as along the Sacramento River, Turning Basin, and Yolo Bypass.

In 2003 the City of West Sacramento may contribute the 43-acre East Riverfront property to the State of California for Governor’s residence and State Park purposes. Current plans call for 10-12 acres to be dedicated for the residence itself which would be off-limits to the general public. The remaining 31-33 acres is intended to be developed as a State Park. It is important to ensure that a continuous recreation corridor is developed along the entire waterfront of this parcel.

CENTRAL PARK

Central Park (CE1)

The community has clearly expressed a desire for a special community park that would serve the entire city and become the flagship facility for the city’s park system. The following benefits of such a facility were identified:

- Provide unique recreational opportunities
- Have a unique identity
- Provide a place for active recreation
- Provide a community gathering place
- Provide for people of all ages and interests
- Take advantage of the city’s waterfront
- Central location to bridge the gap between the north and south halves of the city
- Improve community image and esteem; reinforce West Sacramento's unique identity

Central Park would include active sports fields for baseball, softball, and soccer; picnic areas; tennis courts; a skate park; playgrounds; and passive green open space suitable for group gatherings and
festivals. Central Park would also provide a setting for special facilities such as a swim complex or family water park, gymnasium, and community center. A waterfront setting would be ideal for rowing and sailing clubs, and for fishing access. Once the park has been master planned, land acquisition and construction could occur in phases. The first step in the process will be to determine a suitable location.

Private recreation facilities such as a marina, improved boat ramps, and boat storage could be worked into the park setting. Opportunity exists to extend a recreational corridor along the Deep Water Ship Channel and to provide an open space buffer for Southport residents adjacent to land slated for future port expansion. These opportunities should be explored in future City plans for this region.

Creation of such a park from scratch is a large undertaking that will require significant financial resources, multi-agency cooperation, public-private cooperation, and political will.

**Between the Bridges**

This approximately 30 acre parcel along the Barge Canal between the Jefferson Blvd. and Palamidessi Bridges is envisioned as the location for a mix of community uses that could include a family aquatic center, general use meadows, water edge promenades, concessions, rowing club venues with a sailing harbor and parking. It would be connected to the rest of Central Park via trails and an internal parkway system that travels under the Jefferson Blvd. Bridge. This parcel would also provide an important link to the Northern Easement and Main Drain Recreational Corridors.

*Figure 2-1: Central Park Concept*

*The Central Park Concept and the ideas presented are for consideration and inclusion in a central park, regardless of its actual physical location.*
East Port Property

The Port is currently exploring different water-related commercial development scenarios for the Port-owned land between Jefferson Blvd. and the river along the south bank of the Barge Canal (shown in green hatch pattern in figure 2-1) such as a marina, public boat launch, retail, residential, dry stack boat storage and park space. This parcel is a key waterfront edge and connective link in the proposed Central Park concept, therefore the City and Port should work together to ensure that continuous public access along the water and public access parking are incorporated into the development of this parcel.

Federal Property

This approximately 40 acre parcel is currently under control of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and is being envisioned as the eastern extent of Central Park if acquired by the City. Significant public support was expressed for a sports complex in Central Park and the master plan illustrates how this program could be accommodated on the Federal property. The parcel could also accommodate a levee trail, parking and an internal parkway that could connect to the remainder of Central Park. Other options for accommodating the sports complex could be explored if this land is not acquired.

Stone Locks

The City West Sacramento and the City of Sacramento are currently collaborating on an updated plan for the Sacramento Riverfront. Strong support was voiced during this process for Stone Locks Park, a bluff top open space on the north side of the Barge Canal at its confluence with the Sacramento River. Stone Locks is envisioned as a component of Central Park in this plan. Development of Stone Locks Park is contingent on the abandonment of the existing wastewater treatment plant, slated for closure approximately 2008.

Other unique facilities such as a museum, fish hatchery, or an overlook/viewing tower could help draw people to the area and enhance community identity. Potential park expansion could include Lake Washington, where an educationally based eco-park could be developed. This would provide community-wide opportunities for nature study, and would create a nice compliment to the Southport Elementary School located just south of the Main Drain.
COMMUNITY PARKS

West Sacramento currently has two community parks and one special facility (the Broderick Boat Ramp) that together provide 46 acres of land. Bryte Park, Alyce Norman-Bryte Playfields, and the fields at Golden State Middle School can be considered as one community park that together provide 38 acres that meet the community park definition. River Walk Park is the second community park, and contains 4 acres. The Broderick Boat Ramp provides 4 acres that serve the entire community. At present, 56 additional acres of community park land are required to meet the 3 acre per 1000 population standard to serve the current population of 34,000. At buildout, a total of 231 acres (185 additional) would be required to meet the demand of a projected 77,000 population.

Joint use of existing school grounds is necessary to provide improved community park space in the northern half of the city. It should be noted that the existing grounds at River City High School are not included in the totals for existing community park acreage, because they are not cooperatively maintained through a joint use agreement between the City and the School District. Should the school grounds be improved under such an agreement, the acreage total would then be added to the existing supply of community park land.

The following existing and new community parks are proposed:

Bryte Park /Golden State Middle School (C1)
The playfields and park facilities at Bryte Park and Golden State Middle School provide 21 acres of community park space. In addition, Bryte Park serves as the only source of neighborhood park amenities for the Bryte neighborhood. An opportunity exists to increase the amount of community park acreage by extending Bryte Park to the Sacramento River. This would provide an additional 23 acres with formalized public access to the river, pathways, and picnic areas. This would also connect Bryte Park to the proposed Recreation Corridor RC1. Recommendations for improvements include:

• Address deferred maintenance items within the park, such as play equipment, picnic areas, benches, and pathways
• Install additional play areas for use by neighborhood children
• Install group picnic area for 300 people
• Incorporate adjacent levee and riverfront into the park design. Create river access and connection to riverfront recreation corridor

The following existing and new community parks are proposed:
Alyce Norman/Bryte Playfields (C2)
The playfields at Alyce Norman-Bryte Schools provide baseball, soccer, and softball fields for youth. No new improvements are required.

River Walk Park (C3)
The city’s newest park is a successful riverside open space that provides pathways, sitting areas, a grand staircase, and space for community gatherings. No improvements are required.

River City High School (C4)
The high school currently functions as a community park in a limited sense by providing for public use of the swimming pool, tennis courts, and baseball fields. Of note, senior little league uses the field at River City for games and practice. Field conditions are substandard. The swimming pool design is outdated, making competitive meets difficult. Recommendations for improvements include:

- Continue joint use agreement with school district for maintenance and capital improvement projects
- Construct new community/school joint use swim pool with dressing facilities
- Reconstruct the turf fields and little league fields
- Reconstruct the tennis courts
- Add night lighting to baseball, pool, and tennis courts

Sports Complex (C5)
A 50-acre sports complex should be constructed adjacent to the future high school in Southport. Several potential school locations are currently being considered. Ongoing coordination with the School District will be necessary to achieve this goal. The complex should provide up to 12 night-lighted baseball, softball, and soccer fields. It should have appropriate support facilities including concessions, restrooms, dressing rooms, and playgrounds. It could incorporate other features such as batting cages, tennis courts and sand volleyball courts and bicycle motocross to enhance revenue generation.

NOTE: The location of C5 on the Park Master Plan map is not an endorsement of a high school in this location, but to indicate the plan’s philosophy of locating a large community park adjacent to the future high school, wherever it is eventually constructed.
Southport Community Park (C6)
50 acres in southeastern Southport would be developed into a riverfront community park, and would tie into the riverfront recreation corridor.

Bridgeway Lakes Community Park (C7)
A new 41.5 acre (11.5 acres of land, 31 acres of water) community park currently being planned for the Bridgeway Islands neighborhood. Amenities will include a boathouse and paddleboats, a rose garden, a playground and open meadow play areas. This park will also serve as the neighborhood park for this neighborhood.

NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS
Existing and proposed neighborhood parks are described in the following text, organized by neighborhood planning area (figure 1-4).

Plans are currently under review to include the total number of units with Lighthouse Marina by over 200 units.

BRYTE PLANNING AREA A2

Existing neighborhood park acreage: 0
Existing population: 6,616
Buildout population: 6,616
Existing deficiency: 13.2
Buildout deficiency: 13.2

Bryte planning area A2 contains no neighborhood parks. Because the area is built out, no opportunities exist for development of new neighborhood parks within this planning area. The existing Bryte Park (C1 - classified as a community park) provides for local recreation needs. Therefore, neighborhood park facilities such as children’s play areas and family picnic areas should be further developed at Bryte Park, fourteen acres of which may be considered as neighborhood park.
BRODERICK PLANNING AREA B1

Existing neighborhood park acreage: 5.2
Existing population: 4,015
Buildout population: 5,990
Existing deficiency: 2.8
Buildout deficiency: 6.8

Broderick planning area B2 is served by Elkhorn Neighborhood Park (N1) and the Elkhorn School fields. At buildout, an additional 6.2 acres of neighborhood park will be required. Approximately one acre of land exists on the north side of Elkhorn School which could be leased by the City and improved to provide additional facilities such as play and picnic areas. Other opportunities for providing additional neighborhood park space are limited within this planning area.

Extension of River Walk Park (C3) northward to the Broderick Boat Ramp will provide additional park space that can be used by the neighborhood. The City-owned East Riverside Property located north of the Broderick Boat Ramp (F5) should also be developed to include park and recreational amenities. The Washington Specific Plan proposes a new, 2.9 acre Washington Neighborhood Park (N2) be established on the block bounded by D, E, 5th, and 6th Streets. This location, at the border of planning areas B1, B2, and B3, would be an effective place to create a new neighborhood park that would serve the Washington neighborhood. The proposed Governors Residence (R1), although classified as a regional park, would provide additional park resources that would serve this neighborhood.

BRODERICK PLANNING AREA B2

Existing neighborhood park acreage: 0
Existing population: 989
Buildout population: 2,399
Existing deficiency: 2.0
Buildout deficiency: 4.8

No neighborhood parks are located within this planning area, which is not expected to grow in population beyond the approximate 1000 existing residents. The 2.9 acre Washington Neighborhood Park (N2) proposed by the Washington Specific Plan would provide enough acreage to satisfy the demand of planning areas B2 and B3, discussed below.
BRODERICK PLANNING AREA B3

Existing neighborhood park acreage: 0
Existing population: 270
Buildout population: 1,326
Existing deficiency: 0.5
Buildout deficiency: 2.6

No neighborhood parks are located within this planning area, which is not expected to grow in population beyond the 270 existing residents. The 2.9 acre Washington Neighborhood Park (N2) proposed by the Washington Specific Plan would provide enough acreage to satisfy the demand of planning areas B2 and B3. The area is also served by its proximity to the River Walk Park (C3).

WEST SACRAMENTO PLANNING AREA C2

Existing neighborhood park acreage: 4.0
Existing population: 2,083
Buildout population: 2,083
Existing deficiency: 0.2
Buildout deficiency: 0.2

Planning area C2 is served by Meadowdale Park (N5). No other opportunities exist to provide additional park acreage within this planning area.

WEST SACRAMENTO PLANNING AREA C3

Existing neighborhood park acreage: 0
Existing population: 2,800
Buildout population: 2,806
Existing deficiency: 5.6
Buildout deficiency: 5.6

Although planning area C3 contains no neighborhood parks, it is served by the Westfield School Playfields (N3) which is located on the border of planning areas C3 and C4. The Westfield School Playfields (N3) and Westacre Playfields (N6) together provide 11.9 acres. This total is reasonably close to the 12.6 acres required to meet the standard for planning areas C3 and C4 combined, therefore no new parks are proposed for planning areas C3 and C4.

WEST SACRAMENTO PLANNING AREA C4

Existing neighborhood park acreage: 12.0
Existing population: 3,439
Buildout population: 3,524
Existing deficiency: (-5.0) (surplus)
Buildout deficiency: (-5.0) (surplus)

Planning area C3 is served by the Westfield School Playfields (N3) and the Westacre Playfields (N6), which together provide 11.9 acres. This total is reasonably close to the 12.6 acres required to meet the standard for planning areas C3 and C4 combined, therefore no new parks are proposed for planning areas C3 and C4. Open space improvements are currently being explored for the Evergreen Elementary site.
WEST SACRAMENTO PLANNING AREA C6

- Existing neighborhood park acreage: 0
- Existing population: 15
- Buildout population: 9,221
- Existing deficiency: 0
- Buildout deficiency: 18.4

Planning area C6 is the “Triangle”. This area is expected to develop into an urban core characterized by high and medium-density housing. The Triangle Specific Plan proposes urban park development in the form of the “Park Blocks” (N7). The area would also be served by the extension of River Walk Park southward along the Sacramento River.

WEST SACRAMENTO PLANNING AREA C9

- Existing neighborhood park acreage: 9.3
- Existing population: 3,667
- Buildout population: 3,667
- Existing deficiency: (-2.0) (surplus)
- Buildout deficiency: (-2.0) (surplus)

Planning area C9 is well served by Memorial Park (N8), Circle Park (M2), Pennsylvania Park (M3), Sam Combs Park (N9), and the facilities at River City High School (C4). No new parks are proposed for this area. Open space improvements are currently being explored for the Westmore O’aks Elementary School site.

SOUTHPORT PLANNING AREA D1

- Existing neighborhood park acreage: 21.2
- Existing population: 4,223
- Buildout population: 9,725
- Existing deficiency: (-12.8) (surplus)
- Buildout deficiency: (-1.7) (surplus)

Planning area D1 is well served by Linden Park (N12), Touchstone Lake Park (N13), and Summerfield Park (N18). Also located in this planning area is Patwin Park (M4), an undeveloped mini park that should be developed to provide access from the neighborhood to the Main Drain Recreation Corridor (RC4) via a pedestrian bridge that would cross the Main Drain. Additional parks planned for the Bridgeway Island neighborhood (N16, N17, and N20) will meet the demand for neighborhood park acreage.

The Arlington O’aks neighborhood currently has no convenient access to any park facilities because it is surrounded by barriers including Jefferson Boulevard, Lake Washington Boulevard, and the Barge Canal. Creation of a new neighborhood park within this neighborhood should be pursued, at a location to be determined.
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SOUTHPORT PLANNING AREA D2

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing neighborhood park acreage:</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing population:</td>
<td>1,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout population:</td>
<td>18,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing deficiency:</td>
<td>(-0.4)surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout deficiency:</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning area D2 is currently served only by Redwood Mini Park (M5). When the area is built out it will be served by parks planned as part of new housing developments (N10, N11, N15, N19, N21, and N22). It will also be served on its northern edge by the proposed Central Park (CE1) to be located on the federally-owned parcel. Other facilities planned for this area include Recreation Corridors RC1 and RC3, Bee Lakes Open Space (OS2), and the proposed Sports Complex (C5).

SOUTHPORT PLANNING AREA D3

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing neighborhood park acreage:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing population:</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout population:</td>
<td>3,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing deficiency:</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout deficiency:</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning area D3 will be served by new parks included with new subdivision development. The recently adopted Bridgeway Lakes plan includes 13.2 acres of land to be developed as one community park, Bridgeway Lakes (C7). This exceeds the projected 7.8 acre demand for neighborhood park space to meet the standard. Bridgeway Lakes will also include 45.4 acres of open space, largely occupied by lake surface, which will provide additional recreational amenities.

SOUTHPORT PLANNING AREA D4

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing neighborhood park acreage:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing population:</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout population:</td>
<td>5,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing deficiency:</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout deficiency:</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning area D4 will be served by new parks (N23 and N24) included with new subdivision development. In addition, a large Community Park (C6) proposed for this area will provide additional recreational opportunities for neighborhood residents.
MINI PARKS

West Sacramento currently has five mini parks, two of which are traffic circles, two that are undeveloped residential lots, and the Roland Hensley Bike Park located on West Capitol. Mini parks generally provide limited sitting and play areas. This can be appropriate in high density developments and in areas where larger parks are not feasible. However, development and maintenance costs are relatively high. Therefore, it is recommended that no new mini parks be developed other than the two mini parks that have already been accepted as part of the Bridgeway Lakes subdivision.

RECREATION CORRIDORS

Recreation corridors are proposed for the city’s water edges, along a utility easement, and along a rail corridor. These corridors feature multi-purpose pathways that can be used for recreation and as alternative transportation. They can be used for walking, jogging, biking and, where appropriate, equestrian use. They also help tie the community together by linking people with their destinations such as parks, recreation facilities, schools, churches, and the workplace. The proposed recreation corridor system would create several loop routes. These loop routes are typically more enjoyable than linear pathway systems that require back-tracking. The loop routes would also be attractive to cycling races and community trail rides.

Design of the recreation corridors is organized around the multi-purpose pathway as the primary feature. Recreation corridors may also include landscaping, benches, small picnic areas, small play areas, or other recreational features. These features may be further developed where the recreation corridor forms the edge of a park, such as at the proposed Bryte Park expansion and the proposed Central Park. Formalized access to the river and other waterways should be incorporated at logical locations into the design of waterside recreation corridors.

Design standards for Recreation Corridors are contained in the Southport Design Guidelines, as revised August 5, 1998. The Southport Framework Plan also describes “through-block trails”, which are minor pedestrian/bicycle linkages that feed the recreation corridors. Appendix E of this Parks Master Plan reproduces the applicable portions.
Recreation Corridors are also encouraged on the west side of West Sacramento, and access to the Yolo Wildlife area is encouraged. The following corridors are proposed:

**RC1 Sacramento River/Barge Canal**
13.1 miles 192 acres
This corridor would provide a continuous recreation corridor along the entire length of the Sacramento River within the City limits. The corridor shall extend from the water’s edge to include the publicly owned right-of-way gifted by property owners for the existing sections of River Walk, the future extension of River Walk from the Tower Bridge south to the Pioneer Bridge and interior paths in other areas along the Sacramento Riverfront. It would link together all of the City’s community parks with the exception of the proposed sports complex. The multi-purpose path will utilize the South River Road pavement once this road is replaced by a new arterial. Construction of bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly bridge crossings of the Barge Canal at Jefferson and at the proposed River Road Bridge will be critical to maintaining the continuity of the recreation corridor.

**RC2 Northern Easement**
1.7 miles 12 acres
This corridor would occupy the existing drainage easement and extend from the railroad tracks on the north to Park Boulevard on the south. Design of the recreation corridor should be pursued in coordination with the sanitary sewer main project so that the new utility improvements do not preclude the construction of the trail. Ample space exists within the easement for construction of the sewer line and pathway. Additional neighborhood-serving amenities such as tot lots and picnic areas could be incorporated into the design of the recreation corridor. The existing open drain- age ditch could be designed as an attractive feature with native vegetation and other enhancements.

**RC3 Short Line Trail**
3.5 miles 46 acres
A multi-purpose path would be constructed along the existing railroad corridor that extends south to Clarksburg. This corridor would be an example of the “rails-with-trails” concept. Appropriate safety measures would be incorporated into the design of the path to address the proximity of the active railroad.

**RC4 Main Drain**
5.8 miles 48 acres
This corridor would be constructed along the Main Drain from the barge canal on the north to the Deep Water Shipping Channel on the south. It would provide convenient access for Southport neighborhoods and would become part of the loop systems. A pedestrian/bicycle bridge should be constructed over the Main Drain to connect the Bridgeway Island neighborhood with Summerfield Park.
RC5 Deep Water Channel
5.3 miles 123 acres

This corridor would tie in to Recreation Corridor RC1 on the north at the barge canal, and again at the south at the southern city limits, forming a loop system. It would also connect to Recreation Corridor RC4, creating an additional loop.

Through Block Trails

The Southport Framework Plan defines Through Block Trails as “predominantly pedestrian, non-street adjacent trails that link individual neighborhoods to village centers, schools, parks, day care centers and transit stops.” The plan illustrates the location of existing trails. Future trails will guided by future specific development plans subject to the review and approval of the city.

Equestrian Trails

The Southport area is undergoing transformation from rural to suburban land use. There is currently some equestrian activity in Southport. As the area is developed, accommodation should be made to allow for appropriate equestrian use of the recreation corridor system. Recreation Corridors RC1, RC3, RC4, and RC5 should be designed to incorporate equestrian trails.

Equestrian activity is more typical in rural rather than suburban areas, due to the potential conflicts that arise between equestrians, vehicles, and others in developed areas. The design of the recreation corridors in Southport would need to incorporate several key features to minimize conflicts between equestrians and other trail users. A separate riding pathway off-limits to bicycles and hikers would be necessary. Trailhead areas that provide horse trailer parking, tie-up areas, and other support facilities would also be required. The bicycle and pedestrian master plan should address in more detail equestrian trails, staging areas and include appropriate mapping.

OPEN SPACE AREAS

The Parks Master Plan includes two open space areas, the 41-acre Turning Basin Open Space Area (OS1), and the 23-acre Bee Lakes Open Space Area (OS2). These riparian and wetland areas are characterized as having significant natural resources that warrant protection and that can provide for passive recreation use. Open space area development should be limited to pedestrian-only trails (no horses, vehicles, or bicycles), interpretive facilities, and limited picnic facilities. Sensitive habitat areas should be protected by preventing human intrusion through the use of fencing, boardwalks, railings, or other design solutions.

The city also contains significant trees and groves in areas outside of the two open space areas. The city’s tree preservation ordinance (chapter 8.24 of the municipal code) provides protection for all “heritage” and “significant” trees greater than 100 inches in circumference. The City may also protect any tree or grove considered worthy by designation as a “landmark tree”.

---
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SPECIAL FACILITIES

The greatest deficiency within the existing park system lies within this category. The City currently has seven special facilities: Club West (F1), the Golden State Pool (F2), the West Sacramento Senior Center (F3), the Broderick Boat Ramp (F5), the River City High School Pool (F6), the Senior Center (F7), and the Civic Center (F16). There are also three private special facilities that the city uses: the Lighthouse Golf Course (F15), the Russian Church of Evangelical Baptists (F17) and Raley Field (F18). Lacking are community centers, high school-age teen centers, City-owned and operated swimming pools, and community gymnasiums. A freshwater aquarium on the Sacramento River is also a special facility to consider.

Community Centers

The opinion survey indicated a high demand for City-run classes and recreation programs. Currently there are no community centers that provide sufficient indoor space in which to administer the programs. Three community centers (F4, F9, and F11) would be required to serve the projected population of 77,000. One community center (F4) should be located in the Bryte or Broderick areas, to serve the population in the northern half of the city. A specific location for this community center has not been identified. A second community center should be constructed within the proposed Central Park (CE1). This would serve both the northern and southern halves of the city. A third community center should be constructed in Community Park (C6) to serve the southern part of the City. Additional community facilities are included in the new Civic Center (F16) and joint use facilities in the Russian Church of Evangelical Baptists (F17). These facilities will include large meeting rooms, classrooms and conference rooms. There is also the possibility of a community center at the former Wastewater Treatment Facility to be abandoned in 2008.

Senior Centers

West Sacramento has a significant senior population, which will continue to increase as the baby boomers age. The opinion survey indicated that senior programs are in high demand. A total of three senior centers would serve the projected population of 77,000. The existing West Sacramento Senior Center (F3) will be relocated to a new facility on Merkeley Ave. Senior Center (F7) would serve the West Sacramento community and the northern portion of Southport. Senior Center (F13) would serve the southern portion of the city.
Teen Centers

Activities and programs for youth were rated as very highly desirable in the opinion survey. Currently, middle school-age youth are served by Club West (F1). Teen Center (F10) should be constructed in the proposed Central Park (CE1), and should provide for the recreation needs of both middle school- and high school-age youth. Teen Center (F22) should be constructed in the proposed Community Park (C6), and should also provide for the recreation needs of both middle school- and high school-age youth. The City of West Sacramento is working very closely with the Frances and Chuck Collings non-profit group to construct a teen center for high school-age students on Merkeley Ave.

Swimming Pools and Community Gymnasiums

Demand for swimming is high in West Sacramento. The general population values swimming as a recreational activity, especially in the hot summer months. Also, the local swim club engages in competitive swim meets. Two existing pools, at Golden State Middle School (F2) and River City High School (F6) are open to the public during the summer months. However, the City lacks a pool facility that is open to the public on a consistent, year-round basis. The two existing pools are also not satisfactory for competitive purposes, being too shallow for modern swimming take-off techniques.

The City should make improvements to the pools at Golden State and River City schools to serve the needs of the northern half of the city. The City should also construct two new pools or pool complexes, one at Central Park (Swim/Gym F8) and one at the Southport Community Park (Swim/Gym F12). The new pools should be indoor facilities to provide year-around recreational and competitive swimming. The combination “swim-gym” concept would make efficient use of resources and provide varied recreation opportunities. At build-out, a total of four pools would provide for the needs of the projected 77,000 population.

The gymnasium, meeting rooms, and multi-purpose room portions of the two new swim/gyms would provide facilities for recreation programs such as community basketball, gymnastics, dance, and classes.
SPORTS FACILITIES

Additional active recreation facilities should be provided within community parks, at improved school sites, and at a dedicated sports complex.

Baseball

Youth league play is currently held at Alyce Norman/Bryte Playfields (C2), and Memorial Park (N8). A total of 11 diamonds are provided. Five other diamonds exist at local school grounds. These are used for league practices and for informal play. The demand for the projected population in the northern half of the city is satisfied. In the Southport area, up to 10 new fields will be required. The community has also requested an American Legion size baseball field. These should be provided at the proposed Central Park (CE1), at future schools, and the proposed Community Park (C6).

Raley Field (F18) is a privately owned and operated Triple A professional baseball stadium that make available to the City of West Sacramento 20 days annually free use of the ballpark to local not-for-profit groups. They also make 1,500 ticket vouchers available to community youth every year.

Softball

Adult league play is accommodated at the two lighted fields at Bryte Park (C1). At buildout, a total of 10 fields will be required. The new fields should be constructed at the dedicated Sports Complex (C5). Night lighting is recommended. The sports complex could attract teams from within West Sacramento and from outside the city, and could become a source of revenue for City recreation programs.

Soccer

Existing demand is met by the fields at Summerfield Park (N18) and Bryte Park (C1). Turf areas at schools provide additional space for practice and games. Additional soccer fields should be constructed at new community parks, and at the dedicated Sports Complex (C5).

Football

Demand for competitive football is generated by the high school and the Youth Tackle program. Large, multipurpose turf fields should be developed in the community parks. These fields could be used for flag football, soccer, or casual use.

Basketball

Existing courts at school sites are in substandard condition, and should be improved to satisfy current demand. New basketball courts should be included in the design of new neighborhood and community parks. New swim/gyms would provide indoor gymnasium space for basketball and other sports.
Tennis

The existing courts at River City High School (C4) should be reconstructed through a cooperative agreement with the Washington Unified School District. Additional courts should be constructed at Bryte Park expansion (C1) and at new community and neighborhood parks.

Golf

One golf course open to the public exists at the Lighthouse development. Additional public golf courses would be beneficial to meet the demand of the projected 75,000 population. Construction of new golf courses would be feasible only if a market analysis indicated that a positive economic cost/benefit existed. New courses may be included in future residential developments in Southport. Such facilities should be made available to West Sacramento residents. It is not recommended that the City itself build new municipal courses due to the large expense of such development. Should the community place a priority on construction of a new municipal course, the City could initiate a public/private partnership with a golf course developer.

Skatepark

A skatepark should be constructed within the proposed Central Park, away from residential areas. One is being constructed in Westacre Park.

Public Safety

Future park and recreation facilities should conform to the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design or CPTED. The City of West Sacramento Police Department is highly knowledgeable on this subject and should be an active participant in the park design process.

Restrooms

New parks 4-acres and greater in size should contain permanent restroom buildings.
Table 2-1: Sports Facilities Recommendations

Table 2-1 provides recommended service levels for sports facilities. In this table, existing service is compared to the national standard, and to “comparison service” (the average of the five comparison cities described in Appendix B). The comparison service levels give a picture of current levels only, rather than desired levels, because the communities have not met all of their goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Existing Service</th>
<th>Comparison Service</th>
<th>National Standard</th>
<th>Recommended Service</th>
<th>Existing Number</th>
<th>Recommended Number</th>
<th>Additional Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation Softball</td>
<td>15,808</td>
<td>11,012</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation Baseball</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>19,774</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation Soccer</td>
<td>5,270</td>
<td>5,922</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,135</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Basketball Court</td>
<td>7,904</td>
<td>6,715</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball Court</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,527</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>15,808</td>
<td>32,138</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Gym</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,572</td>
<td>(not given)</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>31,615</td>
<td>50,136</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:
1. Existing population served per each facility in West Sacramento, based on 2000 population of 31,615
2. Average population served per each facility in five comparison cities (Pleasanton, Roseville, Davis, Rocklin, and Lodi)
3. National Recreation and Park Society standard expressed in population served per each facility
4. Recommended population served per each facility
5. Based on projected population of 77,000
6. The National Standard is high relative to Western U.S. cities. 5,000 would be more appropriate.
7. Although only 10 additional baseball fields would be required to meet the 3,000 population service level, most existing fields are located on school grounds. New baseball fields should be constructed in new community parks and at the proposed sports complex to provide dedicated community facilities.
8. Although only one additional pool would be required to meet the 25,000 population service level, the two existing pools are located at public schools and therefore have limited availability for the public. Therefore, the Parks Master Plan recommends two new community swimming pool complexes to be constructed in the proposed Central Park and the proposed Southport Community Park.
NORTH RIVERFRONT AREA RECREATION PLANNING ISSUES

North Riverfront Recreation Cluster

The north riverfront contains a concentration of public and privately operated open space and recreational facilities that include:

§ Bryte Park
§ Alice Norman/Bryte Playfields
§ Golden State Pool
§ Governors Residence
§ Lighthouse Golf Course
§ Club West
§ West Sacramento Senior Center

When combined with the opportunities presented by the Governors Residence State Park, the Riverfront Trail and proximity to the Sacramento-American River Confluence and Discovery Park, all the pieces are in place for a diverse and high-quality mixed-use community amenity. Efforts should be made to establish physical and programmatic linkages between these facilities to capitalize on potential synergies and the diversity of recreation and facilities that are available to residents of the surrounding neighborhoods and the city at large. In addition, efforts should be made to establish a connection to the Northern Easement (RC2) recreation corridor to connect this area into the larger park system and Central Park to the south. Figure 2-9 illustrates the potential for a north riverfront recreation cluster.

Figure 2-9: North Riverfront Recreation Center
OTHER FACILITIES OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE PARKS MASTER PLAN

Community Gateways

The 1991 Parks Master Plan described a system of community gateways, landscape features that
announce entry into the city. The City has developed several such gateways. Because community
gateways are visual elements, similar to landscaped medians and roadway landscaping, that do not
provide for any sort of recreational use, they are not parks. Therefore, they are more appropriately
addressed by the City’s public works landscaping programs than by the Parks Master Plan. This plan
supports the continued creation of Community Gateways.

Industrial Recreation Parks

The 1991 Parks Master Plan encouraged the construction of privately-financed recreation facilities
within industrial and business developments. These facilities would then be available to the general
public during non-business hours. No such facilities have been developed in the ten years subsequent
to adoption of the Parks Master Plan. The expectation that private corporations would construct parks
that are open to the public turned out to be unrealistic. These facilities are outside the scope of the
City park system, and are therefore no longer included as a priority in the Parks Master Plan.
III. Implementation Plan
III. Implementation Plan

The City of West Sacramento Parks Master Plan presents a long range vision for development of a system of park and recreation facilities that will serve an ultimate population of approximately 77,000. Implementation of this plan will require funding, design, and construction of individual projects within the framework of the City’s Capital Improvement Program. This chapter outlines estimated costs, discusses funding sources, and discusses priorities for development of the park system.

Estimated Costs of Park System Development

Estimated costs for acquisition and development of the park system are presented in Table 3-1. The costs include design, construction, and inspection. All figures are in 2002 dollars. The figures include estimated costs of construction, plus design and administration at 20% of the construction cost. Projects that correct existing deficiencies are indicated in the table with an asterisk.

The following cost figures were used to develop the estimates:

- Central Park $200,000/acre
- Community Parks $150,000/acre
- Neighborhood Parks $175,000/acre
- Mini Parks $175,000/acre
- Athletic Fields $125,000/acre
- Recreation Corridors $500,000/mile
- Community Centers $4,500,000 each
- Senior Centers $2,500,000 each
- Teen Centers $2,500,000 each
- Swim/Gym $4,000,000 each
- Land Acquisition $125,000/acre

Table 3.1 Estimated Costs for Park System Development (at Buildout)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE1</td>
<td>Central Park Phase 1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$3,750,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$9,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE1</td>
<td>Central Park Phase 2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$8,125,000</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>$21,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE1</td>
<td>Central Park Phase 3 (private)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE1</td>
<td>Central Park Phase 4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$5,625,000</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$14,625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$17,500,000</td>
<td>$28,000,000</td>
<td>$45,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Bryte Park improvements*</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Bryte Park expansion*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,725,000</td>
<td>$1,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Alyce Norman/Bryte Playfields</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>River Walk Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>River City High School*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Sports Complex</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$6,250,000</td>
<td>$6,250,000</td>
<td>$12,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Southport Community Park</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$6,250,000</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>$13,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Bridgeway Lakes Community Park</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>$5,187,500</td>
<td>$6,225,000</td>
<td>$11,412,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>178.5</td>
<td>$17,687,500</td>
<td>$24,950,000</td>
<td>$42,637,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Neighborhood Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Acquisition cost</th>
<th>Development cost</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>Elkhorn Park/Ellihorn School*</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Washington Neighborhood Park*</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$362,500</td>
<td>$507,500</td>
<td>$869,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Westfield School Playfields</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Central Business District Park*</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$287,500</td>
<td>$402,500</td>
<td>$690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5</td>
<td>Meadowdale Park*</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6</td>
<td>Westacre Playfields*</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7</td>
<td>Triangle Park Blocks</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td>$1,225,000</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N8</td>
<td>Memorial Park*</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N9</td>
<td>Sam Combs Park*</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N10</td>
<td>Southport Gateway Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N11</td>
<td>Southport Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>$412,500</td>
<td>$577,500</td>
<td>$990,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12</td>
<td>Linden Park*</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N13</td>
<td>Touchstone Lake Park*</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N14</td>
<td>River Ranch Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$187,500</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$562,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15</td>
<td>Newport Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>$1,562,500</td>
<td>$2,187,500</td>
<td>$3,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N16</td>
<td>Bridgeway Island Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17</td>
<td>Bridgeway Island III Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>$537,500</td>
<td>$752,500</td>
<td>$1,290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18</td>
<td>Summerfield Park*</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N19</td>
<td>Parlin Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>$562,500</td>
<td>$787,500</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20</td>
<td>Bridgeway Island II Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>$762,500</td>
<td>$1,067,500</td>
<td>$1,830,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21</td>
<td>Southport Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>$2,337,500</td>
<td>$3,272,500</td>
<td>$5,610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22</td>
<td>Southport Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td>$1,890,000</td>
<td>$3,240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23</td>
<td>Southport Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>$1,912,500</td>
<td>$2,677,500</td>
<td>$4,590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24</td>
<td>Southport Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>$637,500</td>
<td>$637,500</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25</td>
<td>Westmore Oaks Playfield*</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,787,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,860,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,902,200</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mini Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Acquisition cost</th>
<th>Development cost</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Roland Hensley Bike Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Circle Park*</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Park*</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Patwin Park*</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Redwood Park*</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Pheasant Hollow Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$387,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$450,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Open Space Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Acquisition cost</th>
<th>Development cost</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>Turning Basin Riparian Area</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS2</td>
<td>Bee Lakes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$800,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$800,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recreation Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Acquisition cost</th>
<th>Development cost</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>Sacramento River/Barge Canal (13.1 mi.)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,550,000</td>
<td>$6,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC2</td>
<td>Northern Easement (1.7 mi.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC3</td>
<td>Short Line Trail (3.5 mi.)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$2,625,000</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$4,375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC4</td>
<td>Main Drain (0.8 mi.)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,980,000</td>
<td>$2,980,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC5</td>
<td>Shipping Channel (5.3 mi.)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,650,000</td>
<td>$2,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,625,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,700,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,325,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FINANCING**

This section contains the City’s policies for financing acquisition and development of park land and recreation facilities. These policies address the financing of parks, recreation facilities, and special facilities, such as an indoor swimming and gymnasium facility, a cultural arts facility, and community centers. The park fee also funds recreation corridor land acquisition and development.

The Master Plan establishes the relationship, or nexus, between new residents and the provision of new park and recreation improvements.

**Major Conclusions**

The City’s parks constitute a citywide system. Residents travel widely within the City to use various parks and recreation facilities.

- This Master Plan includes an acreage standard for park acquisition and standards and guidelines for park development. The standards are expressed in terms of acres of parkland to serve the residential population. In addition, local parks provide recreation opportunities that serve employees and patrons of local businesses, many of which are non-residents.
• Special facilities, including community centers, an indoor swimming and
gymnasium facility, or community center, are most appropriately financed by
city-wide mechanisms or external funding sources and not by development
impact fees.

• State and federal grants, gifts, and bequests, and other external sources of funds
will, to the maximum extent possible, be sought to finance special facilities.
These sources shall also be used to acquire land to meet the City’s goal of 5.0
acres per 1,000 residents, relative to the existing population.

Public Finance Considerations

Like most municipalities in California, the City of West Sacramento is under substantial fiscal pressure
due to limits on property taxes (Proposition 13), the economic slowdown in California, state and
federal cutbacks in local grant programs, and recent pressures at the state level to reduce local rev-

eues.

The ability of local governments in California to finance public improvements has been increasingly
circumscribed over the last 25 years. In June 1978, the voters of California amended the state consti-
tution to limit the ability of local governments to impose property taxes. That amendment, commonly
known as Proposition 13, added Article XIIIA to the state constitution, which limits the maximum ad
valorem tax on real property to one percent of the assessed value of that property. Proposition 13 also
limited annual assessed value increases to 2 percent or the inflation rate, whichever is smaller, until a
property is sold.

Since the passage of Proposition 13, more than a dozen other statewide propositions have been
passed that restrict how local revenues can be raised or spent. While many measures were passed
during the late 1980’s and early 1990’s, the measure that has had the most widespread impact since
Proposition 13 was passed in 1996 as Proposition 218. This measure adds Articles XIIIC and XIIID to
the state constitution. Proposition 218 does the following:

• Limits authority of local governments to impose taxes and property-related assessments, fees
  and charges, requires that a majority of voters approve increases in general taxes and reiterates
  that two-thirds must approve a special tax;

• Requires that assessments, fees, and charges must be submitted to property owners for ap-
  proval or rejection, after notice and public hearing;

• Limits the amount of an assessment on a property to the “special benefit” that is conferred on
  the property;

• Limits fees and charges to the cost of providing the service and establishes that such fees and
  charges may not be imposed for general governmental services that are generally available to
  the public.

Development-Related Financing

In response to the new fiscal realities heralded by Proposition 13, local governments in California
have increasingly turned to various forms of development-related financing to provide the public
improvements required to serve new development. In return for the right to develop property, a
developer provides land, improvements, and/or fees required to provide services to the new residents who will live in the new development.

Section 66000 (et seq.) of the State of California Government Code establishes a demanding set of requirements for development impact fees. This section of the Government code (enacted as AB 1600) requires a local agency that establishes, increases, or imposes a development impact fee as a condition of development after 1 January 1989 to do the following:

- Identify the fee’s purpose.
- Identify the fee’s uses.
- Establish a reasonable relationship between the fee’s use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.
- Determine whether there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.

Current Funding Mechanisms

The City of West Sacramento has adopted fee requirements for parks and recreation improvements under its general authority over land use, codified by AB 1600. These fees apply to both subdivided and non-subdivided residential land, as well as to commercial and industrial development. The fees can be used for land acquisition and development. All new development pays a development impact fee for development of parks and recreation facilities.

Exactions from new development can only be used to fund the acquisition and development of parks and recreation improvements that are acquired or constructed to serve new residential development. Any new park or recreation improvement needed to serve existing residents (to satisfy the “existing deficiency”) must be funded from sources other than future development impact fees.

Development Impact Fees Collected from Future Development

These funds can only be used to pay for park land and recreation facility needs created by new residents. They cannot be used to rectify deficiencies in park land or facilities existing at the time of fee adoption. However, a portion of the fees could be used for improvements to existing parks which expand the recreation capacity of the parks and recreation facilities for the new residents.

Development impact fees are the City’s primary source of funds dedicated for acquisition of park land and development of facilities. Currently, these fees are based on an average land cost for the entire city. Park land may be more (or less) expensive than this average figure. Therefore, the actual number of acres which could be purchased with development impact fees may be less than (or greater than) assumed by the development impact fee. Upon adoption of the Master Plan, the City will undertake an update of development impact fees for parks and recreation facilities. This update will include an analysis of the current average cost for acquisition of park land.
The update of the impact fees will be based on the analysis of the costs of development of parks, based upon the park standards contained in the Master Plan. This will allow the City to project the costs of park development related to additional population growth, and to examine the ability of the fees to achieve the standards of the Master Plan. This review is important for responsible decision-making regarding the quality of the parks system currently enjoyed by West Sacramento residents. This review will also ensure that future residents bear their fair share of the costs for the parks and recreation system.

The park development impact fees as of this writing are as follows:

- Single family residence $5,282 per unit
- Multi family residence $4,331 per unit
- Commercial space $0.459 per square foot
- Office space $0.742 per square foot
- Industrial space $0.318 per square foot

Applying these fees to the current buildout projections yields a total estimated revenue of $ . The fee update is necessary to ensure that future development pays its fair share of park system development costs.

**Acquisition and Development of Special Facilities**

Special facilities tend to be unique and are relatively expensive to develop. An indoor swimming and gymnasium facility, a cultural arts facility, and new community centers, all of which have been discussed in West Sacramento over the years, are examples of special facilities.

The development of special facilities, while not a standard, is a goal of the City. As such, special facilities do not contribute to the City’s standard of 5.0 acres per 1,000 new residents. Only that portion of special facilities required to serve new development may be financed with development impact fees. Therefore, the City will seek broad-based mechanisms to finance the land acquisition and development of such facilities. State and federal grant monies, gifts, bequests; city-wide sources, and other external sources of monies will, to the maximum extent possible, be used to fund such facilities. The City will pursue such external funding sources as opportunities arise.

The City will also explore public-private cooperative mechanisms, such as public ownership coupled with private operation. In the future, the City may wish to consider using revenues from development impact fees to finance some portion of the cost of special facilities. In order for this to occur, a financing plan providing for the current community’s funding obligation for such facilities would need to be prepared.

**Resident’s Willingness to Pay for Parks and Recreation Facilities**

In addition to federal and state grant programs, gifts and bequests, and public-private cooperative mechanisms, there are several ways to fund special facilities. Such mechanisms include special
benefit assessments (e.g., Landscape and Lighting Districts), General Obligation bonds, general taxes (such as utility taxes) and special taxes earmarked by the City Council for parks and recreation purposes. While requirements for voter approval vary among such mechanisms, strong resident support will be required for such new funding sources.

The Master Plan makes no recommendation about new taxes or assessments for recreation facilities at this time.

Potential Funding Sources for Facilities to Serve Existing Development

This section describes the funding sources that could be used to finance the acquisition and development of special facilities and other park improvements to serve existing development in West Sacramento.

Federal and State Grants

Given the difficulties in locally financing costly public improvements that were discussed earlier, a preferred approach where feasible is to use external grant funding. State and Federal grants have historically provided important sources of funding for park and recreation improvements. However, under current economic conditions, they cannot be relied upon for substantial on-going resources.

General Revenues

General revenues are revenues that the city receives that may be used for any valid municipal purpose. General revenues flow into the General Fund. The General Fund covers the cost of most ongoing municipal services such as police and fire services and general governmental services. The largest municipal general revenue sources are sales taxes and property taxes. Budget surpluses and reserves, if available, could provide some funds for park improvements.

Without substantial new general revenues, relatively few California municipalities are in a position to make substantial on-going commitments to pay for major capital improvements from the General Fund. However, with majority voter approval, municipalities can increase or impose certain new general taxes such as a ½ cent sales tax override.

General Obligation Bonds (GO bonds).

General Obligation (GO) bonds may be issued by cities, counties and certain other local government entities to finance specific projects. Debt service for GO bonds is provided by an earmarked property tax above the one percent general property tax mandated by Proposition 13 (often called a “property tax override”). These overrides typically show up on the annual tax bill as “voted indebtedness”. The proceeds from GO bonds can be used to finance the acquisition, construction and improvement of real property, but cannot be used to pay for equipment, supplies, operations or maintenance costs. GO bonds require a 2/3 majority vote by registered voters.

Gifts and Bequests

Contributions from private individuals and businesses are an attractive source of financing. They are normally accompanied by some gesture of recognition to the donor. Although fundraising through donations is unpredictable, it can provide a useful supplement to other sources of finance.
Special Benefit Assessment

Special Benefit assessments can be levied on real property by municipalities, counties and special districts to acquire, construct, operate and maintain public improvements which convey an identifiable special benefit to the defined properties. Prior to issuing bonds, the City Council would conduct a set of proceedings to establish the scope and cost of the improvements to be financed, identify the land parcels that are benefited, determine a fair and equitable allocation of the costs to the benefitted parcels, and conduct a landowner approval process.

Proposition 218 establishes a strict requirement for formal landowner approval before such assessments can be put in place. Each landowner votes in proportion to the amount of any assessment that would be levied on his or her property. The assessment must be approved by a simple majority of the weighted ballots cast. Under Proposition 218, public properties are treated the same as private properties in a benefit assessment.

Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance Districts

The Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 (and amended in 1984) provides for local governments (cities, counties and certain special districts) to raise funds for developing, maintaining and servicing public landscaping and lighting facilities. Public landscaping and lighting can include parks, recreation and open space acquisition and improvement, landscaping, street lighting, sidewalks, curbs and gutters. The revenue to pay for these facilities comes from special assessments levied against the benefitted properties. The establishment of the assessment is subject to the requirements of Proposition 218, and the assessment is collected as a separate item on the annual property tax bill.

Special Tax

The Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act permits various local governments to establish a Community Facilities District (CFD) to finance new facilities and/or to pay for operations and maintenance through the levying of a special tax. The Act (as well as Proposition 218 discussed earlier) requires a two-thirds vote for approving the special tax.

Redevelopment Tax Increment

A California city or county can establish a redevelopment agency to undertake the revitalization of an area that it finds to be “blighted”. The redevelopment agency can incur indebtedness to finance improvements needed to accomplish the goals of its redevelopment plan. The property tax base in the redevelopment area is “frozen”, and increments in property taxes after the tax base is frozen go into the redevelopment fund to be used for the financing of improvements. Voter approval is not required for tax increment financing. Such financing can be used only for improvements to support the needs of redevelopment.

Business Improvement Districts

There are two types of Business Improvement Districts authorized under California law. Each is authorized under a separate law.

Under the Parking and Business Improvement Law of 1989, a BID can be established and business owners can be assessed to pay for a limited range of improvements and services. These eligible improvements and services include parking facilities, parks, benches, fountains, street lighting, promo-
tion of public events, promotion of tourism, and music in public places.

Under the Property and Business Improvement District Law of 1994, a BID can be created and a special benefit assessment can be levied against real property to finance a variety of downtown improvements. Districts created under this law are often referred to as “property-based business improvement districts” (or PBIDs). Since neither type of district is authorized to issue bonds, BIDs are more appropriately used to pay for on-going services than for large capital improvements. BIDs established under the 1989 law must be reestablished annually while PBIDs can be established for up to five years. Hence, they are not, in general, appropriate for financing large, long-term improvements.

Operation and Maintenance

Historically, West Sacramento’s General Fund has provided the primary support for the maintenance of parks and supervision of parks and recreation buildings. The General Fund will continue to fund operations and maintenance of West Sacramento’s park facilities.

Priorities

Implementation of the Master Plan proposals will be carried out by the City’s professional staff through the Capital Improvement Program process. Projects to be implemented in a given year will be prioritized and matched with available funding. The recommendations of this Master Plan are based on the community’s expression of demand for services. In general, the most significant priorities include:

- Central Park
- Aquatics facilities
- Facilities for classes such as would be available in a community center
- Facilities and programs for seniors such as would be contained in a senior center
- Large community parks that provide a wide range of activities for all age groups in an integrated setting
- Improved water access for fishing and boating
- Facilities for youth sports
- Programs for youth
- Recreation corridors
Appendix
Appendix A: Existing Conditions Analysis

Development of West Sacramento’s Park System

Prior to the establishment of the East Yolo Community Services District in 1976, provision of park and recreation services was limited to efforts by local schools and private clubs. Sam Combs Park, Memorial Park, and the Pennsylvania Street traffic circle were the only developed parks at that time.

In 1977, the East Yolo Community Services District prepared a park master plan to cover the period from 1977 to 1987. The plan addressed the need for neighborhood parks, joint use of school property, river access, bicycle trails, and other recreation services. Many of the plan’s goals were achieved, particularly with regard to neighborhood parks and school ground improvements. These achievements included Bryte Park, Elkhorn Park, Circle Park, Linden Park, Meadowdale Park, Touchstone Lake Park, and Redwood Park.

In 1987 the City of West Sacramento was incorporated, and the Department of Parks and Community Services established. During the next few years, the City improved the Westfield School Playfield, constructed the Westacre Playfield Site park improvements, and installed turf at the Summerfield Park site.

In 1991, the City prepared its first long-range park system master plan. Implementation of the improvements described by the plan was hampered by the economic recession of the early 1990’s. During the middle and late 1990’s, many achievements occurred. Nine youth sports fields were constructed at the Alyce Norman/Bryte Elementary School site. Two soccer fields, basketball courts, a dog run, and a children’s play area were installed at Summerfield Park. The Broderick Boat Ramp area was upgraded. Most recently, the first phase of the River Walk Park was implemented, providing the City with a significant community park resource. Raley Field, a privately funded minor league baseball stadium, opened in 2001.

The existing park and recreation system is illustrated in figures 2-2, 2-3, 2-5.

City-School District Agreements

The City and the Washington Unified School District have enjoyed a cooperative arrangement through joint use agreements that allow the City to construct improvements and maintain portions of local school grounds and facilities. The joint use agreements directly benefit the community by facilitating use of school recreation facilities by the general public at certain times. For example, the pools at Golden State Middle School and River City High school are available to the public during the summer months. Capital improvements made by the City have included turfed playfields at the Westfield School site, and development of the Alyce Norman/Bryte youth sports complex.
Park Acreage and Standards

West Sacramento contains approximately 101 acres of developed parkland. Based on a current estimated population of 34,000, this equals 3.0 acres for every 1,000 residents. This figure includes community, neighborhood, and mini parks, but excludes specialized areas such as open space, golf courses, marinas, and wildlife areas. It also excludes school property that is not maintained by the City and that is not typically available for general community use.

This figure provides a measure of the City-controlled area available for traditional recreation pursuits. This measure is also useful in comparison with similar statistics available from other cities. The 1991 Parks Master Plan established a goal of 5 acres per 1000 residents, broken down into 3 acres of community parks and 2 acres of neighborhood parks.

Table A-1: Current Acreage Deficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Acres Required</th>
<th>Existing Acreage</th>
<th>Existing Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>12.6 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>56.0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acreage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>68.6 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For comparative purposes, the table below presents the acreage deficiencies at the time of the 1991 Parks Master Plan.

Table A-2: 1991 Acreage Deficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>12.9 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>63.2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acreage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>144.3</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>76.1 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Buildout” refers to the population expected to occupy the city once all planned residential development has been completed. The acreage required at buildout is presented in the table below:

Table A-3: Required Buildout Acreage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIRED BUILDOUT ACREAGE</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Acres Required</th>
<th>Existing Acreage</th>
<th>Additional Acreage Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>98.8 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>185 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acreage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>283.6 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School grounds can also provide recreational open space that is available to the public on a limited basis. For example, youth sports leagues utilize school fields in many communities, and school pools are often open to the public when school is not in session. The West Sacramento public schools
contain approximately 63 acres of turf fields and hardcourt play areas. When this figure is added to the City’s supply (101.4 acres existing), the service level rises from 3.0 to 4.8 acres per 1000 residents, based on a current population of 34,000.

In the older portions of West Sacramento, the school system has historically played an important part in the City’s ability to provide recreation services. Looking forward, the public school grounds will continue to be important sources of recreation land for the communities of Bryte, Broderick, and West Sacramento.

**Neighborhood Planning Areas**

Provision of adequate park space within walking distance of community residents is a fundamental goal of park planning. The Parks Master Plan organizes the community into defined neighborhood planning areas (Figure 2-2) for the purpose of analyzing the neighborhood and mini park acreage available to residents within each neighborhood planning area. The planning areas also make possible the forecasting of population on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis, which is necessary for planning the amount of park acreage required within each neighborhood.

The planning areas defined in the 2001 Parks Master Plan are similar to those in the 1991 plan with the following modifications:

- The Broderick neighborhood has been reunited into one planning area
- The portion of West Sacramento located between highway 80 and the railroad grade have been reorganized to provide a better fit with the available census data and the emerging central business district.
- The organization of Southport reflects the four villages of the Southport Framework Plan.

A neighborhood is defined by many factors, including subdivision development patterns, topography, and vehicular circulation. An idealized neighborhood would be a contiguous area free of significant barriers to pedestrian movement that contains a population of up to 5000 people. The four Southport Villages will each exceed 5000 population. The Southport Framework Plan has identified smaller neighborhood areas within each of these four villages.

Table A-4 on the following page provides an analysis of neighborhood and mini park acreage provided within each neighborhood planning area.
### Table A-4: Neighborhood Park Acreage Requirements (by planning area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Planning Area</th>
<th>Existing Acreage</th>
<th>2000 Population</th>
<th>Existing Deficiencies</th>
<th>2025 Requirements</th>
<th>Additional Acreage Required 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Deficiency in Year 2000</td>
<td>Total Acreage Required 2000</td>
<td>Total Acreage Required 2025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,616</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6,616</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broderick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(-1.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(-1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2,806</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3,439</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>3,524</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,221</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>30,756</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>76,317</td>
<td>152.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnote:
Population figures are based on the 2000 census and projected year 2025 population as forecast by SACOG, with amendments to reflect the Washington Specific Plan and West Capitol Action Plan.

Proximity to Local Parks
Most residential areas of the City are located within walking distance of a local park. Figure 2-3 illustrates those areas that lie within one-half mile of a park (approximately a ten-minute walk).
Distribution of Parks and Parkland Acreage within Neighborhoods

Parks and school grounds are distributed throughout the City. While some neighborhoods are better served than others, almost every neighborhood has access to a local park or school ground. Planning areas that contain no city parks include area A1 in Bryte, area B2 in Broderick, areas C3, C5, C6, C7, and C10 in West Sacramento; and areas D3 and D4 in Southport. Most of these planning areas are commercial, industrial, or undeveloped portions of the City that contain no or few residents. A discussion of the availability of parks in each neighborhood planning area follows:

Bryte

A1 is not a residential area. 
A2 contains a population of 6616. It is served by Bryte Park and the Alyce Norman/Bryte Playfields, but does not contain a neighborhood park.

Broderick

B1 has a population of 4,015, with an estimated buildout of 5,638. It is served by Elkhorn Neighborhood Park. 
B2 has no parks, and is comprised of the Central Business District. 
B3 has access to the River Walk Park.

West Sacramento

C1, C5, C7, C8, and C10 do not contain significant residential populations. 
C2 is served by Meadowdale Park. 
C3 has no parks within its area. However, the Westfield School Playfields are located on the area’s eastern border. 
C4 is served by the Westfield School Playfields and the Westacre Playfield. 
C6 is expected to experience dramatic residential growth as the Triangle Specific Plan is implemented. 
C9 is served by Memorial, Pennsylvania, Circle, and Sam Combs Parks

Southport

D1 is served by Linden, Touchstone Lake, and Summerfield Parks, and the future parks in the Bridgeway Island project. 
D2 currently contains only Redwood Mini Park. 
D3 and D4 are largely undeveloped.

Figure A-1: Park Service Areas

Distribution of Parks and Parkland Acreage within Neighborhoods
Sports Facilities

Table A-5 provides a comparison of sports facilities in West Sacramento and other comparable communities.

**Table A-5: Sports Facilities Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>West Sacramento</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>Redding</th>
<th>Rocklin</th>
<th>Roseville</th>
<th>Pleasanton</th>
<th>Lodi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility # (Service) 1</td>
<td># (Service)</td>
<td># (Service)</td>
<td># (Service)</td>
<td># (Service)</td>
<td># (Service)</td>
<td># (Service)</td>
<td># (Service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation Softball 2</td>
<td>2 (15,808)</td>
<td>6 (10,051)</td>
<td>1 (36,330)</td>
<td>18 (4,440)</td>
<td>15 (4,243)</td>
<td>3 (18,999)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation Baseball 3</td>
<td>16 (1,976)</td>
<td>2 (30,154)</td>
<td>11 (3,302)</td>
<td>16 (3,978)</td>
<td>1 (56,999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation Soccer</td>
<td>6 (5,270)</td>
<td>9 (6,700)</td>
<td>6 (6,055)</td>
<td>6 (13,321)</td>
<td>18 (3,535)</td>
<td>0 (5,181)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32 (1,884)</td>
<td>6 (1,477)</td>
<td>3 (12,110)</td>
<td>6 (13,321)</td>
<td>20 (3,182)</td>
<td>11 (5,181)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Basketball Court 4</td>
<td>4 (7,904)</td>
<td>6 (10,051)</td>
<td>6 (6,055)</td>
<td>13 (6,148)</td>
<td>20 (3,182)</td>
<td>7 (8,143)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball Court</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (20,102)</td>
<td>0 (18,165)</td>
<td>1 (79,929)</td>
<td>4 (15,912)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>2 (15,808)</td>
<td>4 (15,077)</td>
<td>2 (40,432)</td>
<td>1 (36,330)</td>
<td>3 (26,643)</td>
<td>17 (63,645)</td>
<td>3 (18,999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Gym 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (79,929)</td>
<td>3 (21,215)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Golf Course</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (60,308)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (39,965)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:
1. # = total number provided; (service) = total population served per each facility, based on 2000 census population
2. Adult softball
3. Includes adult baseball, boy's baseball, and girl's softball fields; does not include practice fields
4. Includes courts in city parks only
5. Includes city facilities only
6. Roseville utilizes a “multipurpose” field approach that can be used for youth and adults softball and baseball
7. Four pools located at one swim complex
Park Classification System

The West Sacramento park system is composed of seven main types of parks and recreational facilities, each with a distinct function:

Regional Parks
A regional park is a large park, typically organized around a significant geographical feature such as a lake, mountain, forest or coastline, and that serves several communities within a one hour driving time. Regional parks are typically administered by the state, counties, or other park agencies rather than municipalities due to their large size and unique nature. However, regional usage of local parks is common. Residents of West Sacramento utilize park facilities in Sacramento and other communities. West Sacramento experiences usage in its parks by residents of other communities as well, especially at Bryte Park and the Broderick Boat Ramp, as well as along the Sacramento River, Turning Basin, and Yolo Bypass.

Central Park
A central park is a large, unique park that serves the entire city. A central park is essentially a community park that has an elevated status due to its central location, unique features, historic characteristics, or great size. Central parks typically contain a wide variety of active and passive recreational facilities, and may contain unique features such as zoos, aquariums, museums, waterfront access, or other features.

West Sacramento does not currently have a central park.

Community Parks
Community parks are large parks with a typical size of 20 acres or more. They serve the needs of people from several neighborhoods or the entire city. Community parks contain a wide variety of facilities for active and passive recreation, organized sports, and night use. They also provide facilities typical of neighborhood parks for use by the surrounding residents.

Neighborhood Parks
Neighborhood parks provide for the daily recreation needs of nearby residents, with primarily passive and informal recreation facilities. The typical size is 4 to 10 acres. Active recreation use of neighborhood parks can create conflicts with local residents, and should be limited to informal practice fields and hard surface playing courts.

Mini Parks
Mini parks are small (under one acre) facilities that accommodate the daily recreation needs of nearby residents. They typically include children’s play areas, sitting areas, and limited green space, but are not large enough to contain play fields. Mini parks are not large enough to provide for the recreation needs of an entire neighborhood.

Special Facilities
Special facilities serve a specific need or population group. In West Sacramento, this category includes community centers, senior centers, teen centers, community pools, and indoor gymnasiums.

Recreation Corridors
Recreation corridors are linear parks that include one or more types of pathways for non-motorized transportation, typically developed along a linear geographic feature such as a river, canal, railroad...
corridor, or utility easement. Pathways are typically designed for multiple uses such as bicycling, walking, jogging, and rollerblading. Equestrian pathways are separated from multi-use paths. Other names commonly used for recreation corridors are greenways and bikeways.

Open Space Area
Open Space areas are lands set aside for preservation of significant natural resources, open space, and public education. West Sacramento contains wetland and riparian forest areas zoned for open space.

Other Facilities

Trails
The West Sacramento Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan describes a citywide system of multi-use trails and bicycle routes. Ultimately, these trails will link with other regional trails, such as the American River Greenway and the bicycle path connecting West Sacramento with Davis.

ADA Compliance

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was signed into law on July 26, 1990. On January 26, 1992, federal regulations defined in the ADA took effect. These regulations are intended to protect the civil rights of individuals with disabilities in employment, public accommodations, state and local government services, and telecommunications. Title III of the ADA (Public Accommodations) states that, "persons with disabilities are to be provided accommodations and access equal to, or similar to, that available to the general public."

The ADA is civil rights legislation. There are no code requirements, only guidelines that must be interpreted and applied in a reasonable manner. However, state building codes typically require conformance with ADA in all new construction. In California, Title 24 of the state building code requires conformance for all public buildings, parks and other outdoor spaces. The ADA requires retrofitting of existing facilities to conform to the state building code. Retrofitting was required to be completed by the year 1995. However, many public agencies are still working to meet the requirements.

West Sacramento’s existing park system contains play structures, picnic areas, drinking fountains, and parking areas that must be modified to comply with the ADA. The list of improvements contained in the Action Plan chapter of this Master Plan includes budget amounts to cover these expenses.

CPSC Compliance

The United States Consumer Products Safety Commission (CPSC) has established safety guidelines for playgrounds. California Senate Bill 2733 required all public playgrounds to conform to the minimum guidelines described in the CPSC Handbook for Public Playground Safety.

Many of the existing playgrounds contained within the City’s park system do not meet these standards, and therefore must be upgraded. The list of improvements contained in the Action Plan chapter of this Master Plan includes budget amounts to cover these expenses.
Appendix B: Demand Analysis

Summary of Demand for Parks and Recreation Services

Cities provide public services in response to residents’ perceived needs, or “demand”. The following actions were taken to determine the current demand for park and recreation facilities in West Sacramento:

- Opinion survey
- Public meetings and focus groups
- Demographics analysis
- Comparison with comparable communities
- Review of standards
- Review of available trends literature
- Informal written questionnaire

The results of these initiatives are described in greater detail in this chapter. The reader is encouraged to review the opinion survey report document (available under separate cover through the Parks and Community Services Department). Based on the various components of the demand analysis, the following summary of demand is presented (not in order of importance):

- **A Central Park**: West Sacramento currently lacks a large park containing a variety of facilities that can be used as a community gathering space. Participants in the Community Workshop rated this as a high priority, and expressed a desire for a single park that would provide facilities for all age groups and interest. They also viewed such a facility as a means to improve the image of the City and provide an enhanced community identity.

- **Improved water access**: Residents value the water resources available in West Sacramento. They desire improved access to water-related recreation such as fishing, boating, swimming, and passive use.

- **Increased number and variety of facilities**: The City received low scores in the opinion survey relative to other California communities for the number and variety of facilities available.

- **Improvements to existing parks**: Participants expressed the perception that the City’s parks are tired and old. Safety of park users is also of concern.

- **Recreation corridors and trails**: The corridor concept was supported in the public meetings and through the high scores received in the survey for bicycling, walking, and horseback riding.

- **Programs and activities for children and youth**: A high level of importance was expressed for providing after-school and sports programs for children and teens. Construction of a high school age teen center was also highly rated. The youth workshop participants expressed a desire for skatepark facilities.

- **Swimming**: Swimming is a very popular activity. A high level of support for a family aquatic park with swimming pools and water play was expressed.

- **Landscape entrances**: Beautification of gateways to the community with landscaping was rated highly in the survey.
Classes: A high level of interest exists in organized classes for activities such as cooking, computer use, arts and crafts, and gardening.

Senior programs: Senior nutrition and diet programs are considered to be very important.

Active recreation: Facilities and leagues for youth sports were considered to be very important, while adult sports were not as highly rated.

Demographics

West Sacramento's population grew from 28,869 in 1990 to 31,615 in 2000, according to the U.S. Census. The City of West Sacramento Community Development Department estimates the current population to be approximately 34,000. The City's population could increase to approximately 75,000 by the year 2025, as forecast by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). The 2001 State of the City Report provides a summary of relevant Census data.

Public Involvement

The planning process was organized to encourage a significant level of public participation. All meetings were open to the public, and were advertised to attract attendance. To date, two community-wide public workshops, a youth focus group, a sports user's focus group, several neighborhood meetings, and the high school leadership focus group have been facilitated.

A public opinion survey was conducted to obtain a statistically valid sample of opinion regarding the need for park and recreation services in West Sacramento. The survey results are presented in a separate document available from the Department of Parks and Community Services.

In addition, a written questionnaire was distributed that has attracted 23 responses to date. The questionnaire is available through the Department of Parks and Community Services for those desiring to provide written public input. Finally, interviews were conducted with the City's professional staff, as well as representatives of the Washington Unified School District and the Port of Sacramento.

Opinion Survey

A random survey of West Sacramento residents' opinions regarding parks and community services was conducted in September and October 2001. The survey instrument included open- and closed-ended questions, with interviews averaging 12 minutes in length. 401 surveys were conducted, resulting in a margin of error between 2.91 and 4.85 percent. The survey had four main goals:

- Determine residents' overall satisfaction with the City's efforts to provide park and community services
- Ascertain both the level of importance and the degree of satisfaction residents assign to recreation programs and activities provided by the City
- Determine the specific recreational activities residents use most and are most interested in
- Profile the demographic, attitudinal, and behavioral characteristics of residents in the City of West Sacramento

The full text of the survey report is available at the Department of Parks and Community Services.
Community Workshop #1

The first citywide workshop session was held on October 9, 2001. The workshop was widely advertised and was open to all interested people. All comments were recorded and transcribed. Thirty community members participated, and several City staff members were present. All adult age groups were represented. No minors chose to attend.

The participants were divided into two groups to discuss the needs of the northern and southern halves of the City. Then the entire group reassembled to report their findings. A complete record of the public comments is included in the Appendix. The following points summarize the improvements and types of facilities desired:

- A large, Central Park in a significant, central location, with a variety of facilities and space for large gatherings
- Extension of River Walk Park
- Improved maintenance levels of existing parks
- Sports complex
- Sports fields in parks
- Teen center
- Aquatic center
- Community center
- Swimming and basketball facilities at other than school locations
- Restrooms in every park
- Bicycle Trails
- Equestrian Trails
- Fishing access to Deep Water Channel
- Public access to waterfront at the Port property
- Dog park
- Construct parks in Southport

Sports User’s Focus Group

A focus group session was held on October 10, 2001 with ten participants representing youth baseball, soccer, and swimming. A complete record of the public comments is included in the Appendix. The following points summarize the improvements and types of facilities desired:

- **Swimming**: Noncompetitive and potentially dangerous conditions at the public schools were cited. A municipal aquatic complex that could serve the needs of swim leagues and the general public was desired.
- **Baseball**: A lack of full-size hardball practice and playing facilities was cited. A lighted sports complex to serve all ages was desired. Combining soccer and baseball fields at the same facility was seen as advantageous.
- **Soccer**: The soccer representatives also supported development of a lighted sports complex for soccer and baseball.
- **Other facilities**: Included improved fishing access to the City's waterways, equestrian paths, a community center, and a new golf course.
Youth Focus Group

Twenty-four students from local middle schools attended the youth session on October 10, 2001. The students all use West Sacramento’s parks on a regular basis for a wide range of activities. The parks are used for organized recreation, informal recreation, and socializing. A complete record of the public comments is included in the Appendix. The following points summarize the improvements and types of facilities desired:

- Skatepark/bicycle park
- Fun challenging play structures, swings/etc.
- BMX bicycle course
- Large community park with recreation center
- Gymnasium
- Swimming pool
- Rock climbing wall
- Dance classes/socials
- Improved safety in the parks

High School Leadership Focus Group

A meeting was held with the River City High School leadership class on October 19, 2001. Thirty-five students attended. A complete record of the public comments is included in the Appendix. The following points summarize the improvements and types of facilities desired:

- Playgrounds with challenging apparatus
- Trees and shade
- Gymnasium
- Skatepark
- Soccer, baseball, basketball, and volleyball
- Dog park
- Fishing access
- Pool/waterslides
- Restrooms in the parks

Written Questionnaire

An informal questionnaire was distributed to City staff, school officials, and the general public to gather additional information. While the results are not statistically valid, a number of interesting comments and suggestions were gathered.

Desired facilities include soccer fields, a skatepark, a dog park, a gymnasium, walking trails, an aquatic park, equestrian trails, baseball fields, soccer fields, a central park, water access, tennis courts, playgrounds, bicycle paths, pools, and a sports complex.

Top issues of concern include safety, maintenance, clean restrooms, activities for youth, off-street parking, providing flexible open green space, and maintaining a balance of opportunities.
Comparable Communities Review

Table B-1 illustrates the amount of parkland provided in West Sacramento as compared with several other California cities. The table also indicates the “standard”, or desired goal adopted in each community. For comparison reasons, population levels are as reported by the 2000 census.

Table B-1: Comparable Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year 2000 Population</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Acres/1,000</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
<td>31,615</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville</td>
<td>79,929</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>60,308</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocklin</td>
<td>36,330</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>63,654</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>(no standard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redding</td>
<td>80,865</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:
1. Population as reported in 2000 U.S. census
2. Existing developed park acres in community, neighborhood, and mini parks (school ground acreage excluded)
3. Existing developed park acres per each 1,000 residents
4. Community goal for acres/1,000 residents
5. Redding standard includes developed open space areas. Redding has 614 acres total including open space (7.6 acres/1000)

Non-Resident Demand

Just as residents of West Sacramento take advantage of other greater Sacramento Area parks, residents of other nearby communities use West Sacramento’s park system. The Broderick Boat Ramp and the softball and soccer fields at Bryte Park receive a significant amount of non-resident use.

The City contains a significant employment base within its borders, with approximately one job per resident. Non-resident workers utilize the City’s park and recreation system, creating additional demand. The City’s General Plan recognizes this demand and requires new commercial, industrial, and office development to pay park impact fees to help offset the demand.

General Plan Standard

The 2000 General Plan has been updated to reflect the 5 acre/1000 resident standard.
Statewide Recreation Trends

The most recent statistically reliable statewide data concerning recreation desires and attitudes are presented in Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California 1992, by the State Department of Parks and Recreation. This publication details the results of a public opinion survey conducted in 1992. The ten activities with the highest adult participation rates (defined as one or more days per year participation in each of 42 listed activities) were:

1. Walking (88.0%)
2. Visiting museums or historic sites (75.7%)
3. Beach activities (69.4%)
4. Driving for pleasure (68.7%)
5. Use of open turf areas for casual and unstructured activities (66.9%)
6. Visiting zoos and arboretums (65.6%)
7. Picnicking in developed sites (63.9%)
8. General nature study & wildlife viewing (56.0%)
9. Trail hiking (54.8%)
10. Camping in developed sites with tent or vehicle (53.9%)

By contrast, participation rates for organized, active sports were much lower:

1. Softball and baseball (34.0%)
2. Basketball (21.0%)
3. Golf (19.4%)
4. Tennis (15.2%)
5. Soccer (10.2%)

Another question asked adult respondents for the number of days per year each activity was engaged in. The ten activities with the greatest activity days were:

1. Walking (103.8 days per year)
2. Driving for pleasure (30.5)
3. Bicycling on paved surfaces (23.1)
4. Use of open turf areas for casual and unstructured activities (19.8)
5. Jogging and running (17.6)
6. Beach activities (14.6)
7. General nature study and wildlife viewing (14.5)
8. Swimming in outdoor pools (12.6)
9. Picnicking in developed sites (10.4)
10. Swimming in lakes, rivers, and the ocean - not in pools (10.2)
The ten activities with the highest youth activity days per year were:

1. Walking (94.7 days per year)
2. Bicycling on paved surfaces (61.0)
3. Use of open turf areas for casual and unstructured activities (57.5)
4. Jogging and running (51.8)
5. Basketball (37.4)
6. Use of play equipment, tot lots (34.9)
7. Swimming in outdoor pools (27.7)
8. Soccer (17.0)
9. Football (15.9)
10. Beach activities (11.0)

A separate (written) survey of youth aged 8 to 17 was conducted by the State concurrently with the adult survey. The ten activities with the highest participation rates were:

1. Use of open turf areas for casual and unstructured activities (93.2%)
2. (tie) Walking (89.5%)
2. (tie) Bicycling on paved surfaces (89.5%)
3. Picnicking in developed sites (83.4%)
4. Beach activities (81.8%)
5. Jogging and running (81.1%)
6. Visiting museums, historic sites (80.9%)
7. Basketball (80.1%)
8. Softball and baseball (79.0%)
9. Use of play equipment, tot lots (73.6%)

It can be seen that active sports such as basketball, softball, baseball, soccer, and football have a greater participation rate among youth than among adults. However, general outdoor activities such as walking, bicycling, and open turf use, are important to both youth and adults.

National Sporting Goods Association Survey

The National Sporting Goods Association (NSGA) conducts an annual survey of recreation activity participation. In 1993, the top ten (of 49) activities, as measured by percentage of respondents participating at least one day per year, were:

1. Exercise waking (64.4%)
2. Swimming (61.4%)
3. Fishing (51.2%)
4. Bicycle riding (47.9%)
5. Camping (42.7%)
6. Bowling (41.3%)
7. Exercising with equipment (34.9%)
8. Basketball (29.6%)
9. Billiards/pool (29.4%)
10. Aerobic exercising (24.9%)
Appendix C - Summary of Public Comments

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1
October 9, 2001

GROUP NORTH
- West Sacramento has no significant parks
- No place for large gatherings
- Want riverpark to continue to Todhunter
- **Need a large sports complex**
- Sports complex should be lighted
- Keep sports complex away from residential
- Interest in a marina in north part
- Have not done enough with riverfront
- Need teen/youth center
- Need transportation for kids
- We are too reliant on schools for:
  - swimming pools
  - pool tables
  - basketball courts
  **facilities not always available**

Aquatic center needed
- Swimming pools
- Therapy pools
- Swim lessons
- First Aid
- Water/boating safety
- Special facilities should have surveillance cameras
- Theater
- Dance hall

General Comments
- Improve parks – make beautiful to encourage people to come to West Sacramento
- Theme park – to attract people
- Mark Twain theme/paddle wheel/history pony express
- Central park needed
- Include library in a park
- McKinley Park in Sacramento – good example
- Each park should be designated for certain types of use.
- Parking needed at Bryte
- Keep all mature trees!
- Replace trees as they die
- **Need parking at River Walk**
- All parks need permanent restrooms (HC Accessible)
- Keep them open
- Enforce curfews
- Enforce park rules (ordinanc
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1 (continued)

- New development should pay for maintenance
- Incorporate a water fountain – feature of beauty and significance
- Triangle near library would be a good park (nears Carol’s)
- Would work well with new city hall
- Incorporate drought – resistant trees and shrubs
- Parks should have better signage
- Vandalism, drub, gang issues
- Bike trails, buses can help with parking
- Fishing pier, possibly with a restaurant like in L.A.
- Need better communication – Re: meeting notification
- More adult evening classes
- Big central park - #1 need
- Big shopping area!
- Pony rides
- Eating places!
- Use community volunteers to help maintain parks

GROUP SOUTH

General Comments

- Look at big picture
- Not just parks at schools
  - need diversity
- Need community gathering place
  - events
  - farmers market
  - youth programs
- Funding is often short
- Want places for group functions with appropriate facilities
  - toilets
  - meeting rooms
  - etc.
- Condition of parks reflective of city efforts for public
- West Sacramento parks lacks quality amenities/conditions
- Need beauty
  - “an old town” – tired looking
- Currently no bike trails
- Funding – it’s there in south – why aren’t parks being built?
- Bait ‘n’ switch in south
- No parks as promised by city
- Same with schools
- Who is responsible to get parks built as promised?
- Need to hold developments to promises (promise to build parks and schools)
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1 (continued)

Recreation

Fishing
- Can’t get to it at Deep Water Channel
- Need public access to Deep Water Channel
- Need park adjacent to it on south

Horses
- Need plan for equestrian uses in rural residential zoned areas
  Themes
  - waterfronts
  - paths as connection
  - watching boats

Central Park
- Need to develop one but West Sacramento is not ready
- River Walk is a possibility, more targeted to business however
- Needs to link north and south
  - symbolic

Neighborhood Parks
- Priority should be neighborhood park
  - kids play everyday
  - safe
  - would indicate investment in community

Community Center Criteria/Needs
- conference/banquet rooms
- gym
- theater
- pool
- in a park
- skating
- indoor soccer
- rock climbing
- jogging
- tennis: indoor and outdoor

Other Considerations
- Need dog park - as new park
  - Sacramento had them
- Look at scale
  - need range of scales
    - big/community/regional
    - neighborhood
  - open space
  - small parks with multiple uses/attractions
  - “people scale”
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1 (continued)

- Serving kids is key
  - bikes
  - safety
  - skaters
- New bike/pedestrian crossing over canal
- Look at Southport plan
- Start with just getting parks built before attempting major actions (Central Park/Community Center)
- No reason to go to parks

Good Models to Study
- Davis is good example
  - Davis spends money on maintenance and has greenbelt system
  - Want same for West Sacramento
- City of Roseville
  - Proactive park development prior to homes – forced upon developers
  - Good model for West Sacramento
- Portland is a good model

High Priority South Needs/Opportunities
- Activities close to downtown
  - Provide bike access from Southport to downtown to attract those residents
- Need soccer/hardball/softball in new parks
- Extend light rail and put parks near stations (park and rides)
- Concerned reservation areas with toilets in every park, also walking trail
- Exercise training trail
- Improve and maintain parks that have already been built

Port Area Needs/Opportunities
- Public access
- Trail – all users
- Boat ramp
- Open grass areas/picnic areas
- Toilets
- Aquatic centers
- 4th of July happens there (on bridge)
  - Expand to have more events
  - Get off the bridge, put on land
- Boat viewing
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1 (continued)

South Group Summary

Good Examples
- Davis
- Roseville
- Portland

Problems
- Bait-n-switch
- Maintenance of existing parks

Opportunities/Needs
- Trails
- Canal
- Riverfront
- Port (possible temporary use)
- New blood will force political change
- Regional Park/Recreation Center/Complex
SPORTS USERS FOCUS GROUP
October 10, 2001

Swimming
Competition: 174 kids - up to 200 on swim team
-Had to close registration - lack of facilities
-Use River City School
-Old
-Racing styles have changed but pool won’t accommodate "deep" diving at start
-One conference school refusing to use starting blocks at River City pool

Recreation: Very short summer season program
-Poor choice of times/lack of available pool time
-Aquatic center would benefit all
-Need to accommodate all ages (families) and serve competition needs
-Swim team draws from across county
-Currently need to rent competitor’s pools now.

Community aquatic center planning criteria:
- school use
- public/recreation
- flexible
- rental opportunities
- revenue generating
- serve seniors/fitness needs
- multi-use
- lots of parking
- indoor/outdoor
- accommodate swim lessons for very young
- do it right for future

Baseball
There are no hardball parks in West Sacramento and none planned
- We need a baseball facility
- Now need to pay to play in Davis
- Need lighted fields
- Need senior kids fields
- Add lights to memorial park - neighbors would allow it
- Parents maintain facilities with fundraisers, work parties. City does not maintain
- 2 little leagues - Wash.L.L/W.S.L.L. (400 kids)
- Need practice fields - currently use elementary schools
- River City High School field not available until June when school is out
- One complex to serve all ages - to keep kids interested
- Shared parking baseball/swimming
- OK to share fields between soccer and small kids fields (no fences needed).
SPORTS USERS FOCUS GROUP (continued)

Soccer
- 550 kids in league
- 100 added each year
- West Sacramento Soccer Club
  Bryte Park - Needs:
  - Bathrooms
  - Snack bar
  - Parking
  - Equipment storage
  - Fields are in good condition
  - Not enough fields
  - Need lighted fields – can’t practice in fall

Basketball
- Very popular
- City league - uses Golden State Middle School and River City High School
- Can’t practice during week
- No league for older kids
- Portable classrooms have taken up basketball courts
- Don’t forget basketball-no gym/facilities

Fishing
- Need access to water, HC dock, elderly
- Should have fishing docks at port or river for the disabled

Bowling
  - Serve existing leagues

Equestrians
- There are lots of users in Southport need riding areas

Community Center
  - Need meeting rooms

Golf
  - Need golf per existing plan

General Comments
- Need bathrooms in each park
- Central large sports complex is desired (Bring community together - don’t split people up)
- Need all the other services as well
- Community doesn’t feel support from city/parks
- Is there a focus on creating/focusing on a Central Park?
YOUTH FOCUS GROUP
October 10, 2001

Wants

Water park
Skate park - street course
Bike - Motocross
   - street/vertical
Community park
   - recreation center but outdoor
   - arts and craft
   - sports
   - big park
Velcro Wall
Gymnasium/wrestling room
Walkway for elderly
Small tree groves
   - shade areas but not the whole park
New pool
Snack bars
   - soda, ice cream, candy, hot food
Music
Tagging/Art wall
   - cleaned monthly
Clean bathrooms
More electrical outlets
Video arcades in buildings
   - secure
   - TV
   - couches
   - "like this place"
Dance floor/club
   - by am/pm by McDonalds
   - by money store
   - in stadium
   - by golf
   - in Southport
   - in neighborhood, not too far
   - Elkhorn Park
Go carts
Play structures like McKinley Park
Pond - kind of like a pool "swimming pond" with fountain in middle
Race Track - with no cars - for bikes and boards.
Go to Yolo High School now for this
   - bike jumps, etc.
YOUTH FOCUS GROUP (continued)

Parks You Like

100’ Slide
Curly-Q slides -like at McDonalds
Teeter-Totters-big ones
Lots of benches in shade
Handrails in skate park
Fishing education
  -stocked regularly
  -loaner poles
Centrally located with other things to do (shopping, etc.)
Board wild – skate park in Woodland

Things You Don’t Like

Scooters
Gang writing (graffiti)
Boring parks – nothing to do
  -targeted to young kids only, not middle school
Not enough basketball courts, don’t like waiting

Top Priority

Big skate park/bikes
Dance floor
Fishing pond
Dog park
Swirly slides
Jungle gym
Velcro wall
Rock climbing wall
Play structure like McKinley Park
Something for all ages
HIGH SCHOOL LEADERSHIP FOCUS GROUP
October 19, 2001

When asked what do you like or want in parks, they said:
- Sand, not bark, in playgrounds
- Swings
- Slides, spiral slides
- Older kid playground, like at McKinley Park in Sacramento
- Rainbow park
- Large trees
- More trees
- More shade
- Tree swings
- Zipline
- See-saw
- Spring animals
- Merry-go-round playground
- Skate park
- Soccer field
- Baseball field
- Clean restrooms, no portables
- Water fountains
- Basketball courts
- Tennis courts
- Dog park
- Pond for boats, fishing
- Bridge playgrounds together
- Ropes course
- Swimming pool with slide
- 2 sections in playgrounds, one for kids, one for older kids. Age appropriate
- Nothing in parks is too inviting. Existing parks old, tired, dirty
- Monkey bars
- Have community unity day to clean parks up
- Better picnic areas
- Volleyball
- Safety lighting
- Jungle gyms
- Handball
- Tetherball
- Flowers and landscaping
- Recycle parts of park
- Gymnastics
- A gym
- Indoor pool
- Water park
- Better pest control
- Rose garden
- Tic tac toe blocks
- Space ship playground
- Crack ban
WASHINGTON NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP
November 13, 2001

When asked what do you like about your neighborhood or want in your parks, they said:

- Feeling of a small town
- Close to the river
- A "Mayberry" feeling
- River Walk Park is beautiful
- I like the people
- It is close to Sacramento
- Freeway access
- Close to the airport
- Feels safe
- A mellow feeling
- Harmony on the River is an excellent program
- Good summer programs
- Jazz and Pancakes is fun
- Put more trees in the parks
- Need a City Activities Center
- Need soccer fields
- Need paddleball courts
- I go to Raley Field
- Jogging
- Cycling
- Have better bike path
- Need park polices
- Need heavier trash cans in parks
- West Sacramento is multi-cultural. We need a multi-cultural fair and market pavilion. Give multi-cultures a chance to share with all.
- Skateboard park
- Roller blades
- BBQ areas
- Tennis courts
Appendix D - Inventory of Existing Facilities

COMMUNITY PARKS

Alyce Norman/Bryte Playfields

Type: Community Park  
Location: Todhunter @ Carrie Street  
Neighborhood Planning Area: Bryte-A2  
Size: 17 acres

Inventory
Baseball fields (3 - youth)  
Softball fields (4 - youth)  
Soccer fields (1)  
Scoreboards (2)  
Bleachers (6)  
Restrooms/concession building  
Trash receptacles and recycling bins  
Off-street parking (unpaved)

Programmed Activities
West Sacramento Girls Softball  
Washington Little League  
NFL Flag Football  
Junior San Francisco Giants Baseball

Bryte Park/Golden State Middle School

Type: Community Park  
Location: Todhunter @ Carrie Street  
Neighborhood Planning Area: Bryte-A2  
Size: 21 acres (11.4 Bryte Park, 9.6, Golden State turf fields)

Inventory
Baseball fields (2 - youth)  
Softball fields (2 - lighted, adult)  
Soccer fields (7)  
Basketball court (1- full court)  
Bicycle rack (1)  
Drinking fountains (3)  
Group picnic area with shade structure  
Lawn area  
Picnic tables (5)  
BBQ’s (3)  
Play area  
Restrooms  
Trash receptacles and recycling bins
Programmed Activities
Adult softball
Youth soccer
Youth baseball

River City High School
Type: Community Park
Location: Clarendon Street
Neighborhood Planning Area: West Sacramento C9
Size: 22 acres

Inventory
Football field
Track
Baseball fields (4)
Tennis courts (6)
Basketball courts (6 hoops)
Volleyball courts, asphalt (3)
Swimming pool, diving pool, wading pool, changing house

Programmed Activities
Senior Little League baseball

River Walk Park
Type: Community Park
Location: Riverfront between Tower and I Street bridges
Neighborhood Planning Area: Broderick B3
Size: 4 acres

Inventory
Riverfront promenade/pathway
Union Square
Veteran’s Memorial Plaza
Grand Staircase amphitheater
Picnic tables (8)
BBQ’s (3)
Lawn area
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

Elkhorn Park

**Type:** Neighborhood Park  
**Location:** Cummins Way @ Greenwood Avenue  
**Neighborhood Planning Area:** Broderick B1  
**Size:** 5.2 acres

**Inventory**
- Barbecues (6)
- Drinking fountain (1)
- Horseshoe pits (1)
- Lawn area
- Pathway lighting
- Picnic tables (6)
- BBQ’s (6)
- Play area - tot lot (1)
- Restrooms (portables)
- Trash receptacles and recycling bins

**Programmed Activities**
- Little League (at adjacent Elkhorn School fields)

Linden Park

**Type:** Neighborhood Park  
**Location:** Linden Avenue @ Summerfield Drive  
**Neighborhood Planning Area:** Southport D1  
**Size:** 4.0 acres

**Inventory**
- Barbecues (2)
- Drinking fountain (1)
- Horseshoe pits (1)
- Lawn area
- Pathway lighting
- Picnic tables (4)
- BBQ’s (2)
- Play area - tot lot (2 structures)
- Trash receptacles and recycling bins
- Bike rack

**Programmed Activities**
- Youth soccer
Meadowdale Park

**Type:** Neighborhood Park  
**Location:** West Capitol at Interstate 80  
**Neighborhood Planning Area:** West Sacramento C2  
**Size:** 4.0 acres

**Inventory**
- Drinking fountain (1)
- Lawn area
- Pathway lighting
- Off-street parking lot (20 spaces)
- Picnic tables (5)
- Benches (2)
- Shade structure
- Play area - tot lot (1 structure)
- Trash receptacles and recycling bins
- Bike rack

**Programmed Activities**
None

Memorial Park

**Type:** Neighborhood Park  
**Location:** Bounded by Regent, Alabama, Euclid, and Delaware  
**Neighborhood Planning Area:** West Sacramento C9  
**Size:** 4 acres

**Inventory**
- Basketball (half-court)
- Baseball fields (4 - youth)
- Drinking fountain (1)
- Horseshoe pits (2)
- Picnic tables (2)
- Play area - tot lot (2 structures)
- Trash receptacles and recycling bins
- Restrooms

**Programmed Activities**
West Sacramento Little League
Sam Combs Park

Type: Neighborhood Park
Location: Stone Boulevard @ Jefferson Boulevard
Neighborhood Planning Area: West Sacramento C9
Size: 4.5 acres

Inventory
Barbecues (2)
Drinking fountain (1)
Horseshoe pits (1)
Lawn area
Shade trees
Picnic tables (6)
BBQ’s (2)
Play area - tot lot (2 structures)
Trash receptacles and recycling bins
Off street parking lot (12 cars)
Restrooms (portables)
Clubhouse building

Programmed Activities
None

Summerfield Park

Type: Neighborhood Park
Location: Linden Avenue near Diane Drive
Neighborhood Planning Area: Southport D1
Size: 8.9 acres

Inventory
Soccer field (2)
Basketball (1 full court)
Restrooms (portables)
Baseball backstops on turf area (3)
Dog run (fenced)
Trash receptacles and recycling bins
Play area - tot lot (1 structure, 1 swing)

Programmed Activities
Youth soccer
Little league practice
Touchstone Lake Park

**Type:** Neighborhood Park  
**Location:** Linden Avenue near Independence Avenue  
**Neighborhood Planning Area:** Southport D1  
**Size:** 4.0 acres

**Inventory**
- Picnic tables (2)
- BBQ’s (2)
- Drinking fountain
- Lawn area
- Shade trees
- Pathway lighting
- Bench (1)
- Trash receptacles and recycling bins
- Play area – tot lot (1 structure, 1 swing)
- Lake

**Programmed Activities**  
None

Westacre Playfield

**Type:** Neighborhood Park  
**Location:** Evergreen Avenue @ Westacre Road  
**Neighborhood Planning Area:** West Sacramento C4  
**Size:** 5.0 acres

**Inventory**
- Picnic tables (2)
- Drinking fountain
- Lawn area
- Shade trees
- Bench (1)
- Trash receptacles and recycling bins
- Play area – tot lot (1)

**Programmed Activities**  
None
Westfield School Playfields

**Type:** Neighborhood Park  
**Location:** Poplar Avenue @ Oxford Street  
**Neighborhood Planning Area:** West Sacramento C4  
**Size:** 7 acres

**Inventory**  
Soccer fields (3 - youth)  
Baseball field (2 - youth)  
Lawn area  
Play area - tot lot (1)

**Programmed Activities**  
Youth soccer

**MINI PARKS**

Circle Park

**Type:** Mini Park  
**Location:** Alabama Avenue @ Circle Street  
**Neighborhood Planning Area:** West Sacramento C9  
**Size:** 0.3 acre

**Inventory**  
Picnic tables (4)  
Heritage oak grove  
Trash receptacles  
Lawn area

Patwin Park

**Type:** Mini Park  
**Location:** Summerfield Drive at Betty Way  
**Neighborhood Planning Area:** Southport D1  
**Size:** 0.2 acre

**Inventory**  
Undeveloped residential lot, potential link to recreation corridor
Pennsylvania Park

**Type:** Mini Park  
**Location:** Pennsylvania @ 17th Street  
**Neighborhood Planning Area:** West Sacramento C9  
**Size:** 0.5 acre

**Inventory**  
Picnic tables (3)  
Trash receptacles and recycling bins  
Lawn area

Redwood Park

**Type:** Mini Park  
**Location:** Redwood Avenue  
**Neighborhood Planning Area:** Southport D2  
**Size:** 0.5 acre

**Inventory**  
Picnic tables (2)  
Horseshoes (1)  
Drinking fountain  
Bench (1)  
Trash receptacles
SPECIAL FACILITIES

Broderick Boat Ramp

**Type:** Special Facility  
**Location:** A Street @ the Sacramento River  
**Neighborhood Planning Area:** Broderick B1  
**Size:** 4 acres

**Inventory**
- Boat launching ramp (1 lane)
- Off-street parking (24 cars and 60 cars with trailers)
- Restroom/concession building
- Parking lot lighting
- Drinking fountain
- Picnic tables (2)
- Interpretive signage
- Benches (2)
- Trash receptacles and recycling bins

West Sacramento Senior Center

**Type:** Special Facility  
**Location:** 644 Cummins Way  
**Neighborhood Planning Area:** Broderick B1

**Inventory**
- Senior center building and office
- Library
- Multi-purpose room
- Kitchen
- Art room

**Programmed Activities**
- Classes and other programs
- Nutrition meals
- Social events
Appendix E - Suggested Park Standards

Central Park Standards
A central park is a unique facility and as such has no standards. As envisioned for West Sacramento, the Central Park should contain unique recreational opportunities, should be oriented to the water, should be centrally located, and should generally otherwise conform to the standards given below for community parks.

Community Park Standards
Definition
• Large park that includes passive and active recreation facilities that serve the entire City or a substantial portion of the City.
• A community park should include the facilities that are also typically found at neighborhood and mini parks.

Service Area
• Up to four-mile radius.

Size
• 20 acres or larger.

Site Characteristics
Configuration
• Contiguous usable (non-linear) shape, with level terrain to accommodate active recreation.

Access/Location
• Locate on an arterial or collector street.
• Provide at least two major street frontages.
• Provide connection to pedestrian and bicycle routes.
• Locate to minimize conflicts with residential areas.

Character
• Has desirable visual and natural attributes for passive recreation, such as waterway frontage or significant vegetation.

Basic Requirements
Outdoor Sports
• Regulation facilities for organized league practice and play for softball, baseball, and/or soccer.
• Bleachers, restrooms, and concession stands at league sports facilities.
• Tennis courts, basketball courts, volleyball courts, handball courts, and practice wall.
• Lighting for outdoor sports facilities.

Passive Recreation
• Jogging path, minimum two miles long.
• Open turf area for casual games, minimum two acres.

Special Facility
• Community parks should include at least one special facility such as a pool, community center, gymnasium, or amphitheater.
Community Park Standards (continued)

Play Areas
- Tot lot for ages 2-5, minimum one.
- Play lot for ages 6-12, minimum one.
- Should include climbing structures, other apparatus, and sand play.
- All play experiences must be accessible to the disabled (ADA) and meet CPSC guidelines.

Family Picnic Areas
- Shaded and wind-protected area.
- Tables for 6-8 people each.
- Barbeque facilities.
- Locate adjacent to open turf or play areas.

Group Picnic Areas
- Shaded and wind-protected area.
- Picnic tables, serving tables, and barbeque facilities for 200 persons minimum.
- Restroom facilities nearby.
- Play area nearby.
- Locate adjacent to open turf area and away from nearby residential areas.

Parking
- Off-street, minimum 100 spaces.

Restrooms
- Permanent restroom buildings, minimum one per each 10 acres.

Lighting
- Provide lighting at athletic fields and courts, parking lots, and pathways.
- Design to prevent glare and spillover into adjacent residential areas.

Telephone
- Provide public phones accessible at all times.
- Locate throughout park at reasonable intervals for safety.

Bicycle Parking
- Lockable parking at suitable locations throughout park.

Pathway System
- Provide multi-use paved paths, minimum ten-foot wide, for service and emergency access and police surveillance.

Optional Elements
- Exercise course, 12 or 24 stations.
- Specialized sports facilities such as bocce ball courts or putting green.
- Food concessions building.
- Community garden area.
Neighborhood Park Standards

Definition
• Medium sized park that provides basic recreational activities for a specific neighborhood.
• Typical neighborhood park facilities may be included as a portion of a larger community park.

Service Area
• 1/2-mile radius to serve a single neighborhood, or populations up to 5000.

Size
• Two to ten acres.

Site Characteristics

Configuration
• Contiguous, usable (non-linear) shape, with level terrain to accommodate casual (non-organized) sports activities.

Access/Location
• Locate on a collector or arterial street.
• Provide two major street frontages if possible.
• Provide connection to pedestrian and bicycle routes.
• Locate centrally within neighborhood.
• Locate adjacent to schools where possible.

Character
• May contain natural features for passive recreation, such as water body or significant vegetation.
• Should contain large trees for shade and windbreak.

Basic Requirements

Restrooms
• Minimum 3 stalls each side.
• Separate mens and womens restrooms

Passive Recreation
• Open turf area for non-organized sports, minimum one acre, two acres or more desirable.
• Pathway system for walking/jogging.

Play Areas
• Tot lot for ages 2-5.
• Play lot for ages 6-12.
• Should include climbing structures, other apparatus and sand play.
• All play areas must be accessible to the disabled (ADA) and conform to CPSC guidelines.

Family Picnic Areas
• Shaded and wind-protected area.
• Minimum three tables for 6-8 people each.

Drinking Fountain
• Minimum one, accessible to the disabled.

Bicycle Parking
• Lockable parking, minimum one location.
Neighborhood Park Standards (continued)

Lighting • Pathway lighting only.
Telephone • Provide public phone.
**Optional Elements** • Tennis courts, basketball courts, volleyball courts, handball courts, or practice wall.
• Barbeque facilities at family picnic tables.
• Off-street parking for 10 to 30 cars.
• Exercise course or cluster.
• Practice baseball diamond not lighted.

Mini Park Standards

**Definition** • Small parks located within residential areas that provide play areas for small children or passive sitting areas.
• Mini park facilities may be provided within a neighborhood or community park.

Service Area • 1/4-mile radius.

Size • 1/4 to 2 acres.

**Site Characteristics** • Level areas accessible to the disabled.
• Located within neighborhoods and in close proximity to high density residential or housing for the elderly.

**Basic Requirements** • Benches in shaded area.
• Tot lot for children under age 2-5.
• Trash receptacle, minimum one.

**Optional Elements** • Drinking fountain.
• Small turf area.
• Picnic table(s) to accommodate 6-8 people.
• Play area for children age 6-12.

Special Facility Standards

**Definition** • A facility such as a community center, athletic complex, aquatic center, or other cultural or athletic facility that services a specific need for a portion of the City’s population.

Service Area • The entire City.

Size • Varies.
### Special Facility Standards (continued)

**Location**
- May be included within a community park or may be at a separate location.

**Facility Types**
* (may be combined)
- Community center, with auditorium, meeting rooms, classroom space, offices, indoor recreation space, crafts room, exercise space, etc.
- Indoor gymnasium.
- Aquatics complex.
- Combined “swim/gym”.
- Childcare facility.
- Community theater, indoor.
- Outdoor theater.
- Sports complex for adults, youth, or both.
- Senior center.
- Teen center.
- Community art center

### Recreation Corridor Standards

**Definition**
- Linear Corridors designed for recreational travel, non-motorized transportation, and passive use.
- also called Greenways and Bikeways

**Service Area**
- Located to serve the entire City and link residential areas with parks, schools, places of worship, places of employment, and commercial destinations.

**Size**
- Sufficient width to accommodate the use and protect the adjacent natural resource, if present

**Site Characteristics**
- Open space corridors adjacent to rivers, canals, utility easements, and railroad corridors.
- Minimum of 30 feet wide

**Basic Requirements**
- Multi-use paved pathway for bicycling, walking, running, roller-skating.
- Trailhead areas with benches, picnic tables informational and regulatory signage, trash and recycling receptacles.

**Optional Elements**
- Equestrian path, soft surface, separated from multi-use path.
- Pathway lighting
- Interpretive signage
- Passive use park elements such as small play areas, seating and picnic areas