

**Date and Time** December 5, 2019  
**Meeting Location** Public Works Building, 7th Floor Executive Conference Room  
**Meeting Topic** Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #5  
**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
Chee Salette	CS	Marc Salette	Community Liaison
Silver Lake Neighborhood Council	SLNC	Sarah Ullman	Representative
		Nicholas Fox Robbins	Representative
Silver Lake Reservoirs Conservancy	SLRC	Andrew Thomas	Representative
		Leslie Edmonds	Alternate
Silver Lake Forward	SLF	Rick Corsini	Representative
		Jocelyn Hayes-Simpson	Alternate
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	Action
	<b>COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT</b>	
1	COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #3	
1.1	Attendance	
	410 people signed in. It is estimated that over 450 attended.	
1.2	Questionnaire Participation	
	Over 2,900 responses were received.	
1.3	Questionnaire Results Summary	
1.3.1	89% of the respondents live within a 2-mile radius. 1,000 respondents live within a mile.	
1.3.2	The age profile of the respondents is similar to the first questionnaire, with the exception of the 19 to 25 group, which went up to 5%.	
1.3.3	Habitat is a top priority.	
1.3.4	Access to the water is important.	
1.3.5	Human-powered boating is not desired, though guided tours may be acceptable. The possibility to have guided tours should be provided in the Master Plan.	
1.3.6	Swimming is not desired by the majority, however by a very close margin.	
1.3.7	Some active spaces are desired, and primarily a flexible open lawn.	
1.3.8	Environmental education is desired, as well as a living laboratory.	
1.3.9	The integration of facilities into the stepped terraces and the slope of the Knoll, in order not to block views, is desired.	
1.3.10	Preserving the existing open water views and breaking them up with islands are equally desired.	
1.3.11	There is a preference for having some program on the west side of the reservoirs.	
1.3.12	The combined results show a general endorsement of the 3 design concepts. The preference profile is very similar in each concept, with the predominance of the "Enjoying Nature", "Wellness" and "Community/Family" themes.	
1.3.13	Rec Center improvements ranked in order of priority: Dog Park improvements, Rec Center expansion, picnic tables relocation, play field improvements.	
2	DISCUSSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS	
2.1	Education	
2.1.1	SLRC emphasizes that the educational component of the reservoir complex should not become simply an extension of the LAUSD.	
2.1.2	SLRC is concerned by the potential size and frequency of school field trips. Field trips should be scheduled only on certain days (SLNC).	
2.1.3	SLNC suggests that field trips should be scheduled on certain days of the week.	
2.1.4	All agree that the educational component should be for all ages.	

## MINUTES

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	Action
2.2	Café	
2.2.1	SLNC believes that it is important for the park to have a social hub, a place where people can gather and get food.	
2.2.2	SLWS explained that commercial activities do not fit in the character of the Reservoir Complex. CS described how this opinion was expressed by various participants in the CW#3 table discussion. SLWS also has a concern regarding the infrastructure needed to support a food service (truck access, employee parking), the addition of built structures in general, and the potential for littering and people feeding animals.	
2.2.3	SLF and SLNC said that the ethos of the Reservoir Complex should also be about inclusivity and equity.	
2.2.4	HAR and CS suggested that the Café or snack-bar can be part of the Education Center, promote healthy food, use local ingredients, and provide education regarding environmental aspects of food production and consumption.	
2.2.5	SLNC knows of a group promoting local composting and suggested that the food facility could be become a composting hub for the neighborhood.	
2.2.6	SLNC suggested that the facility should offer food at lower price point and promote equity.	
2.3	Swimming Pool	
2.3.1	The Master Plan will not recommend the inclusion of a swimming pool, though there are as many as 48% of the respondents who supports it. All agree that majority support is needed to pursue an amenity of this level of cost and operational requirements.	
2.3.2	HAR proposed that the Master Plan not preclude the inclusion of a swimming pool in the future.	
2.4	Human-powered Boating	
2.4.1	As a permanent facility is not desired by the community but occasional use is acceptable, the Master Plan should make guided kayak tours possible. The tours should be free if possible.	
2.6	Nature Play	
2.6.1	SLNC and SLN emphasized that the nature playground should be integrated in the landscape and should be an environmentally-focused play center, fostering interaction with nature and education.	
3	COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #5	
3.1	Format	
3.1.1	The table discussion format should be maintained. Stations should be in addition to, not in lieu of.	
3.1.2	The presentation should be shorter to leave more time and attention level for the table discussion.	HAR

## MINUTES

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	Action
3.1.3	The presentation could be divided in 2 parts with a table discussion in between.	
3.2	Communication	
3.2.1	SLNC requests that the design be presented and discussed through a narrative framing.	
3.2.2	HAR indicated that the single, more detailed design will be expressed through a sequence of renderings telling the story of a visit to the Reservoir Complex.	
	<b>DESIGN</b>	
3	FEEDBACK ON THE 3 CONCEPTS	
3.1	Preferred Concept	
3.1.1	HAR is leaning towards Blended Spaces concept as a base, incorporating desired aspects of the other two.	
3.2	Defining Features	
3.2.1	Nature and Education are the confirmed as the defining features of the Master Plan.	
3.3	Sloped Lawn	
3.3.1	It makes soil available for terrace building in addition to providing a gentle, generous access to the water.	
3.1.2	SLWS suggested that it should be better connected to the adjacent flat lawn.	
3.4	The Knoll	
3.4.1	Access to the top of the Knoll is desirable for views of the reservoir and the meadow.	
3.4.2	The paths should be limited to the minimum to leave as much space as possible for habitat.	
3.4.3	SLWS asked if an easier path be found on DWP property? HAR explained that the existing path along the DWP's access road adjacent to Armstrong Avenue is steeper than 2% and adjacent to car traffic.	
3.5	Education Center	
3.5.1	HAR asked what minimum amenities are required: shelter from sun and rain, classrooms, office, restrooms, bus parking and accessible parking.	
3.5.2	CS suggested that it should be a "net zero" facility. The performance criteria should be established in the Master Plan.	
3.5.3	SLF recommended that it include an interpretive center, which simply consist of maps and information boards.	
3.5.4	SLN suggested that all staff be located in one place for efficiency (see 2.2 Café).	
3.5.5	SLN said that the William O'Douglas Outdoor Classroom, run by the MRCA, is a good reference.	

## MINUTES

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	Action
3.6	Accessible Island	
3.6.1	It is desirable to be able to access one of the proposed islands, which will offer a different perspective of the water body.	
3.6.2	Should it be located on the west side, as shown in the Islands concept, or on the east side, where the island-pool is in the Blended Spaces concept? SLNC thinks that a southern location, where all 3 concepts show no specific activity, would be desirable.	
3.6.3	SLRC prefers a location access from the Eucalyptus Grove.	
3.6.4	SLRC is concerned about a dead-end path. HAR clarified that access would be controlled and limited to daytime hours.	
3.7	Nature Play	
3.7.1	The proposed location is on the west side, in the eucalyptus grove.	
3.7.2	There is a concern about taking habitat area away from the eucalyptus grove.	
3.8	Eucalyptus Grove	
3.8.1	Is there a succession for the aging trees of the grove? The Master Plan will propose tree replacement species with a focus on food sources, such as coastal oaks.	
3.9	Viewshed	
3.9.1	SLF suggested that the views out from within the reservoir complex be studied and developed as part of an overall cinematic experience.	
3.10	Terrestrial Habitat	
3.10.1	SLWS inquired about the scope and protection of the terrestrial habitat.	
3.10.2	HAR clarified that the design concepts propose that habitat for terrestrial spaces be preserved and enhanced at the Knoll and at the Eucalyptus Grove, through habitat fences and food-producing plants.	
3.10.3	HAR explained that habitat areas within public parks need to taken human safety into account by avoiding vegetation at eye level with low plants below 3 feet in height and trimming tree branches below 7 feet above ground.	
3.11	Ivanhoe Reservoir	
3.11.1	The Living Laboratory may make more sense closer to the Education Center, with Ivanhoe as a station in lieu of home base.	
3.11.2	The idea of Ivanhoe as testing ground and first phase of the project still makes sense.	
3.12	Fence	
3.12.1	SLWS pointed out that the scope of perimeter fencing or access control may impact the DWP's perimeter treatment.	

**MINUTES**

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	Action
3.12.2	SLWC asks if the appearance of the various types of fences, and the absence of the perimeter fence will be represented in the renderings.	
3.12.3	CD 13 suggests that SLWS focus less on the fence, which is a topic that will be discussed and addressed for each individual project/phase.	
3.12.4	HAR reiterated that the Master Plan will propose to remove the perimeter fence, however the design will be developed to function properly with or without a fence. The specific security and access control needs will be assessed when the Master Plan will be implemented.	
	<b>PROCESS</b>	
5	SCHEDULE	
5.1	SWG Meeting #6: moved from January 9th to the 8th.	
5.2	Community Workshop #4: on January 23 at Friendship Hall	