

Date and Time September 26, 2019 at 10:00 am
Meeting Location City Hall, 4th Floor Media Room
Meeting Topic Stakeholder Working Group Meeting 3
Project Silver Lake Reservoir Complex Master Plan
Prepared by Marc Salette

ATTENDEES

AFFILIATION	ABB.	NAME	TITLE
Bureau of Engineering	BOE	Cyril Charles	Project Manager
		Mary Nemick	Director of Communications
		Deborah Weintraub	Chief Deputy City Engineer
Council District 13	CD13	Christine Peters	Policy Deputy
Los Angeles Department of Water & Power	LADWP	Christine Truong	Environmental Engineering Associate
		Dawn Cotterell	Senior Public Relations Specialist
		Scott Fajack	Architect
Hargreaves Associates	HAR	Meghen Quinn	Principal
		Megan Esopenko	Project Manager
Chee Salette	CS	Marc Salette	Community Liaison
The Robert Group	TRG	Isaiah Ford	Project Manager
Silver Lake Neighborhood Council	SLNC	Sarah Ullman	Representative
		Nicholas Fox Robbins	Representative
Silver Lake Reservoirs Conservancy	SLRC	Leslie Edmonds	Representative
Silver Lake Forward	SLF	Elaine Roark	Representative
		Richard Corsini	Representative
Silver Lake Now	SLN	Jill Cordes	Representative
		Andrea Horwath	Representative
Silver Lake Wildlife Sanctuary	SLWS	Mike Krose	Representative
		Janis Purins	Representative

See Minutes attached

MINUTES

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	
	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	
1	SCHEDULE	
1.1	COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 3	
1.1.1	Date and location: November 2 at Marshall High School.	
1.1.2	Starting time: 1:00 pm preferred over 1:30 pm.	
1.1.3	SLF is working with the schools to improve student turn-out.	
1.2	SWG MEETING 4	
1.2.1	Date: December 5.	
2	COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 2 DEBRIEF	
2.1	STAKEHOLDER IMPRESSIONS	
2.1.1	Reservoir Complex never felt crowded, though there were probably as many as 200 people walking around at a time.	
2.1.2	Some people didn't know about the Knoll and missed that opportunity – if future walks, signage pointing to Knoll should be provided.	
2.1.3	Shade is lacking, especially at the south end, more trees are needed. Can trees be planted sooner?	
2.2	VISITOR TESTIMONIALS	
2.2.1	Visitors expressed how powerful the experience of being inside the fence was.	
2.2.2	Many visitors asked why it cannot be opened now.	
2.2.3	Visitors also said that it should be opened now and not much else should be done.	
2.2.4	Interim steps should be considered. Potential phasing should be presented (SLF).	HAR
2.2.5	CD13 reminded the group that even a first phase consisting of only removing the fence and providing access is currently not funded.	
2.2.6	Visitors expressed that they would like to see the surface of the embankment improved	
2.3	QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS (see presentation attached)	
2.3.1	1,450 surveys were completed.	
2.3.2	Of the top 20, the top 6 activities/amenities are mostly about observation, relaxation and education, while the most active program items are in the bottom 6. The other 7 activities are compatible with the top 6, with the exception of human-powered boating.	

MINUTES

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	
2.4	QUESTIONNAIRE FOLLOW-UP	
2.4.1	The Flexible Field/Lawn Area should be considered even if less popular, as it can be used for passive activities if preferred (SLF).	HAR
2.4.2	Bicycle Parking should be considered even though it is less popular, as it does not significantly compete with other amenities (SLNC).	HAR
2.4.3	Swimming: HAR is surprised by its popularity, but not SLF and SNLC. It should be discussed in more detail during CW3 to better understand what type of swimming people are interested in: in the reservoir itself, in a pool floating within the reservoir, or in a in-ground pool at the reservoir complex for instance.	HAR
2.5	CONSEQUENCES & TRADE-OFFS	
2.5.1	The survey does not address the consequences and the trade-offs associated with the proposed activities and amenities (SLWS and SLN).	
2.5.2	A next step should be to find a way for the community to assign value to wishes (SLRC).	
2.5.3	HAR pointed out that the next questionnaire will include the expressions of the pros and cons.	
2.5.3	Nothing on the top 20 list is mutually exclusive; we should not make false choices, i.e. eliminate activities that are not incompatible with more popular ones (SLF).	
2.4.4	The consequences and trade-offs will also be explored through the Master Plan process.	HAR
2.4.5	SLNC would like social-media friendly versions of the flyer, for instance the text is too small and they would also like an Instagram format (Sarah Ulman is willing to work this out with the Design Team).	HAR
3	POP-UP AT THE FARMERS' MARKET	
3.1	Few people stopped at the booth. The Labor Day week-end crowd was generally small.	
3.2	The group suggests that the next pop-up be at the Reservoir Complex along the path to catch people who do not necessarily go to the Meadow.	HAR/TRG
	DESIGN	
4	CONCEPT DESIGN UPDATE	
4.1	DIAGRAMS	
4.1.1	The lead design drivers include the creation of a healthy eco-system, the expansion of the bird population, and the DWP water recirculation project.	
4.1.1	The proposed distribution of the program was illustrated on a site plan diagram.	
4.1.2	SLNC recommends that a different color than red be used to represent the people, or human activity.	
4.1.3	SLNC recommends that a different term than "program" should be used to designate human activities.	
4.2	GENERAL RESPONSE TO THE 3 SCHEMES	

MINUTES

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	
4.2.1	SLN believes that the scale of intervention proposed is appropriate and will be well received by the community.	
4.2.2	SLF thinks that the scale of proposed development is generally too timid, and that there is not enough differentiation between the 3 schemes.	
4.2.3	SLF suggests that one scheme study a larger intervention at the Ivanhoe reservoir and referred to the relationship between the Boston Commons, more cultural, and the Boston Public Garden, more natural.	
4.2.4	HAR pointed out that Ivanhoe is fairly constrained as it is surrounded by a narrow band of accessible land, the north bank is a dam, and there is little appetite in the community for a major refilling.	
4.2.5	SLNC suggested that the south end of the Silver Lake Reservoir may be appropriate for water activities.	
4.2.6	More context should be provided on the site plans: entry points should be more clearly indicated, the perimeter jogging path should be shown.	
4.3	WATER	
4.3.1	HAR explained that issue of water fluctuation is fundamental, and its is being discussed with LADWP.	
4.3.2	HAR explained that primary stormwater water treatment is needed to address sediments and dissolved pollutants in order for stormwater to support aquatic habitat. HAR is working with the BOE and DWP to address this.	
4.3.3	HAR explained that the proposed wetlands will further improve the quality of the water and will provide new habitat. HAR suggests that if the Ivanhoe water level is at 451, perhaps the large reservoir should be at 446 to see 5 feet of spill at the spillway.	
4.3.4	SLNC emphasizes the importance of being able to dip ones' toes in the water.	
4.4	HABITAT	
4.4.1	HAR described how all three schemes preserve 70% of the existing "upland" habitat and create a significant area of new "transitional" and wetland habitat.	
4.4.2	SLF asked why there is not more land created, more habitat created in the 3 schemes, and suggests that the habitat wetlands encompass the entire west bank in the Terrace scheme.	
4.4.3	SLF asked what drives the size of the islands.	
4.4.4	SLWS pointed out that the water surface is also an important aspect of the habitat.	
4.4.5	SLF asked what bird species are being targeted.	
4.4.6	SLWS inquired how much of the area of the Knoll would become accessible to the public, and expressed concern regarding how this existing habitat would be impacted.	
4.4.7	SLWS asked for clarification regarding the status of the perimeter fence. HAR pointed out that the all fence is proposed to be removed in all 3 schemes and replaced by a low habitat fence with a vegetated buffer to protect habitat areas.	
4.5	EMBANKMENT	
4.5.1	Can the embankment be planted (SLF, SLRC)?	
4.5.2	Can the embankments be perforated to plant trees (SLWS)?	

MINUTES

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	
4.5.3	Punching holes in the embankment would help naturalize the banks and provide more habitat (SLRC).	
4.5.4	SLNC asked if trees can be planted on the South Dam to provide shade. HAR explained that this is not possible because of the restrictions associated with the dam structure.	
4.5.5	SLRC suggested that the east embankment be moved westward in the souther portion of the Silver Lake Reservoir in order to create a wider buffer between the bank and Silver Lake Boulevard.	
4.6	REC CENTER & DOG PARK	
4.6.1	SLNC emphasized the importance of addressing needed improvements to the Dog Park.	
4.6.2	CS clarified that the Rec Center and Dog Park recommendations will be included.	
5	MASTER PLAN	
5.1	HAR asked that the Stakholders review the vision, goals and objectives chart and comment.	