

Public Workshop #2 for DF-50 Park Site

June 16, 2026 at Riley Community Library, Meeting Room #1

Attendees: 14 residents

1) Introductions

- a) Tara Gee, Park Planning & Development Manager
- b) Jill Nunes, Parks, Recreation & Libraries Director (not present)
- c) Heather Buck, Sr. Park Development Project Manager
- d) Joel De Jong, Park Development Project Manager
- e) Josh Cervantes, Park Development Project Manager
- f) Diana Vazquez, Park Development Project Manager
- g) Jennifer Adona, Park Development Office Assistant

2) Project Info

- a) DF-50 is a 1.8-acre park site located in Sierra Vista, the surrounding streets are Brookleigh Drive and Canyonland Court. It is across from Glacier Bay and Arches Way. It is adjacent to an open space area.
- b) Construction Budget: \$763,000

3) Purpose of the Meeting

- a) To share the concept sketch developed based on the feedback received to date

4) Background

- a) Neighborhood Park
 - 1-1 ½ hour “stay and play” value
- b) We are still in Step 1 (Public Workshops) of the Park Planning Process. (Graphic shown)
 - Reminder building a park is a 24–36-month process
- c) We held the first meeting virtually on December 2, 2025
 - 1) Concerns discussed
 - Dogs
 - Be different than nearby JM-50 (Byouk Park) *Response: Focus on teen or adult geared activities?*
 - Seeing Costco from the park (Residents added that the noise from Costco was also an issue)
 - Traffic/ stop signs
 - 2) Top Items identified at the first meeting (not in any priority order)
 - Shaded picnic area

- Shade trees
- Sports court
- Outdoor play area

5) Concept Sketch, shown, is over the budget. (Brooksleigh Dr. on top and Canyonland Circle is on the left with existing open space at on the right. Costco is located on the bottom far right.)

- a) Amenities include (base bid): Mulch and planting pockets, walking path (shown as dashed line), ½ basketball court/activity wall, trees, shaded picnic area with tables (Shown as two red squares) and turf grass and native areas.
- b) Because the number of park features exceed the budget, we have shown some that are labeled “as budget allows”. This allows us to include these features in the design and to obtain bids for them. If we receive competitive bids and have room in the budget, we can add elements as budget allows. This is a “menu-style” type of bidding. Included in the menu are:
- 1) Additional turf grass areas instead of the native area
 - 2) Additional walking paths (shown as dotted line)
 - 3) Additional planting pockets/bark much instead of the native area along the open space side
 - 4) Interactive seating component (shown in red circle) *Response: This incorporates additional seating and additional play-value component. Example of a net-like feature, shown.*
- c) Discussion on Activity Wall Concepts
- 1) Examples studies shown. This is a way to use minimal materials and enhances the play value. The ½ basket court is proposed to be on one side and the other side of the wall could have different activities depending on our focus. It could be:
 - Fitness focus concept, which would engage a wide range of park users and may include fitness activities such as: Pull up/chin bar, wall sit/squat workout circuit, vertical jump measurement, and a stretching station.
 - Interactive play focus concept, encourages play, games, rebound sports and activities. It could include a variation of targets, shapes, colors and use of different types of balls.
- d) If budget allows, we might be able to add one or more of the following amenities, depending on the bids. For example, we recently bid out 4 parks close to the same time. One needed to be rebid because it was very over-budget, for two parks, we were able to include two of the four “as budget allows” components and the fourth park, we received a very competitive bid and was able to include all of the “as budget allows” features. This shows how varied the bid results can be. If you had to pick **one** of the “add-on” features labeled “as budget allows” which would you choose?
- 0 votes for interactive seating

- 6 votes for additional walking paths (ensure looped trail and connection to the future bike trail)
- 5 votes for grass
- 0 votes for additional planting pockets
- Request for more trees as 3rd choice

6) Public Comments/ Questions

- a) Is this park funded by the developer? *Response: A neighborhood park development fee is assessed when the building permit is pulled to construct your home. These costs are passed onto you as part of your home purchase, so it's funded by you. We have about \$760K for construction costs.*
- b) Why not pickleball or tennis? *Response: Due to the nature of play, these types of amenities (noise, traffic, parking and longer use) are planned for a park that is more appropriate, like Pistachio Regional Park. Pistachio Regional Park is not next to a neighborhood, is larger and located off of a major road. Larger parks with no neighbors have a longer "stay and play" value and can handle more parking, noise and traffic. DF-50 is a neighborhood park and parking, noise and traffic is a neighborhood concern. Also, these types of courts (pickleball and tennis) are very expensive to build. This concept is also already over-budget.*
- c) Is there exercise unit at JM-52 (Hawk's Landing)? *Response: Yes*
- d) Comment that they are surprised we put in basketball here? *Response: Feedback indicated a desire for s sports court. A 1/ 2 court is a less expensive option and the type of play is more family orientated than full court. Plus, ½ court is a flexible space and can be a social gathering space. Another local park that has it uses it as a neighborhood gathering space once a month when they bring in food trucks.*
- e) Is there an activity wall anywhere else here? *Response: No*
- f) Comment that it's great that you took feedback from meeting 1 that it's not competing with the nearby JM-52 and has something different.
- g) Comment that this is a good balance to the nearby park.
- h) Usually, a park will have a play equipment for the grandkids? *Response: The feedback shared is that JM-52 is only 3 blocks away and has a play structure for kids and that the desire is for DF-50 to provide something different for older children, teens and adults. In this area, we are fortunate to have so many parks so close to one another. This allows parks to be looked at as a bigger network and to provide a wide variety of recreation features to meet the needs of all. Roseville strives to have a park accessible within a 10-minute walk. There is also 2 more parks with varying amenities that are yet to be built in the area. JM-52 is 3 blocks away. (You can actually see JM-52 from DF-50).*
- i) Comment about developing a park for families who don't have small children. For those who do have small children, what will they have? *Response: This park will still have grass that kids can run and play games on. The activity wall could also accommodate games, but yes it may be utilized more by older kids and adults.*
- j) Comment on back of the activity wall, too much text may take away from the natural aspect of nature. Try not to make it too busy with text and use more graphics. *Response: noted.*

- k) Comment that we not only don't want to see Costco, we don't want to hear Costco, with the noise of the carwash, etc. Request for trees on the edge to buffer the sound? *Response: noted.*
- l) In a park this size, what other options besides basketball fit the budget, since there is already basketball nearby? *Response: Sports courts in general are costly. Short of a concrete area for four square or hopscotch, there are no comparable options.*
- m) Is basketball the cheapest hardcourt to complement the park? *Response: Yes*
- n) What the material/ length for the walking/ jogging path? *Response: It's still conceptual. The exact surfacing has not been finalized, but pending funding, the surfacing may be paved concrete. For the length, it is a ¼ mile loop, so 4 laps would be a mile.*
- o) Will the post and cable remain? *Response: Yes, that is where the future bike trail will be. JMC will connect, from Fiddymont to Market.*
- p) What is the material of the bike trail? *Response: It will be the standard bike trail, which will be a ten-foot-wide asphalt path with a two-foot decomposed granite or aggregate base shoulders.*
- q) Bike trail, where and when? *Response: The existing bike trails, at the neighboring park will connect. It is currently in plan review and subject to funding. Last we heard the estimates were coming in over budget. The Parks, Recreation & Libraries is not involved in bike trail development. Our Public Works/ Alternative Transportation department oversees this and can provide a more specific update.*
- r) Was there a Plan B if everyone hated basketball here? *Response: \$760,000 doesn't get you very far. Nothing else is comparable that has the same benefits. However, if this isn't a preferred amenity, we can look at alternatives. Additionally, after all the parks in the area are built, if we have a balance remaining, we may make additional improvements such as the "as budget allows" items.*
- s) Is basketball the cheapest hardcourt to complement the park? *Response: Yes*
- t) Have we considered installing bike racks? *Response: there is zero use of bike racks in neighborhood parks. We do install them at city-wide parks, where they have more of a probability of usage, but at neighborhood parks we would rather spend money on things that will be used there.*
- u) Seems like there should be a side walk and the path, why not both? *Response: Concrete is expensive and it would be repetitive to have a parallel walking path and sidewalk so close. We could look at moving the path a bit closer to the street so it can double as a sidewalk and also be part of the park's looped pathway. We can also look at the connections to the path from the street and sidewalk for easier access.*
- v) So it can be for all ages, would you consider adjustable height basketball hoops? *Response: That is hard to do, plus opens up the door for vandalism and misuse.*
- w) Will it have cameras? *Response: No. Perhaps, in the future we will have them at our larger facilities.*
- x) Will we have a drinking fountain? *Response: Yes*
- y) What is the activity wall height? *Response: Size not determined yet.*

- z) Will there be lights? Stadium lighting? *Response: No sport/stadium lighting, but we will have security lighting in key areas (not throughout the park). This will allow Police to easily surveil the park.*
- aa) Will there be grading? *Response: We will look at grading and drainage when we prepare the construction plans.*

Are we moving in the right direction?

- 10 shared their approval
- Discussion on the basketball court, 4 people supported the ½ court. Others indicated that it is less important than other add-on features, such as the walking loop.

bb) Next Steps

- a. In about a week, the meeting minutes and the slide deck will be posted on the City's web site at www.roseville.ca.gov/parksintheworks
- b. Meeting attendees were asked to share this information with their neighbors.
- c. We will review the feedback from today and any from emails and refine the sketch into a rendering. That refined master plan will be posted online for a 2-week comment period. We will need to know if you like it or not. There was an instance where we didn't hear comments and had to have another meeting. People were confused why we had to prolong the process. This is important that we receive your feedback of support or additional comments.
- d. The faster we get to a level of comfort for support, the sooner we can move on to the City Council to approve the Master Plan.
- e. If approved, we will develop construction plans.
- f. We hope to break ground in the Late Spring/early Summer 2027.
- g. Reminder: We will have status updates on our park projects online. When the park gets to the establishment period it may look done, but isn't as we are conducting safety inspections, permit sign-offs and making sure the grass is tough enough to endure heavy foot traffic. Please respect the fences and let your neighbors know that entering the park before it's ready can postpone opening.