



Date and Time January 8, 2020
Meeting Location Public Works Building, 7th Floor Executive Conference Room
Meeting Topic Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #6
Project Silver Lake Reservoir Complex Master Plan
Prepared by Marc Salette

ATTENDEES

AFFILIATION	ABB.	NAME	TITLE
Bureau of Engineering	BOE	Edwin Rivera	
		Mary Nemick	Director of Communications
		Deborah Weintraub	Chief Deputy City Engineer
Council District 13	CD13	Christine Peters	Policy Deputy
Council District 4	CD4	Rachel Fox	Field Deputy
Los Angeles Department of Water & Power	LADWP	Christine Truong	Environmental Engineering Associate
		Dawn Cotterell	Senior Public Relations Specialist
Hargreaves Associates	HAR	Meghen Quinn	Principal
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	Alternate
Silver Lake Forward	SLF	Elaine Roark	Representative
		Rick Corsini	Representative
Silver Lake Now	SLN	Andrea Horwath	Representative
		Joe Mellis	Alternate
Silver Lake Wildlife Sanctuary	SLWS	Mike Krose	Representative
		Janis Purins	Representative

See Minutes attached

MINUTES

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	Action
	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	
1	COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #3 & QUESTIONNAIRE TAKEAWAYS	
1.1	Habitat is a top priority.	
1.2	Water access is important.	
1.3	Human-powered boating is not desirable,	
1.4	but guided tours might be OK.	
1.5	Swimming is not desirable, but it is close.	
1.6	Some active space is desirable...	
1.7	but flexible open lawn is best.	
1.8	There is some preference for programmed spaces on the west side of the reservoir.	
1.9	Preserving open water views and breaking them up are equally desirable.	
1.10	Integrating facilities into the terraces and the Knoll is desirable.	
1.11	Some environmental education or "living laboratory" is desirable.	
2	COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #4	
2.1	The proposed agenda, schedule and format were reviewed.	
2.2	SLWS commented on the difficulty to hear during the table discussions, and asked if smaller tables can be used. TRG confirmed that this table size is the only one available at this location.	
2.3	HAR asked the Stakeholders to offer thoughts on how the topics of homelessness, traffic and safety should be discussed at the meeting.	
2.4	In general, SLF recommends that these issues be addressed at the start of the presentation.	
2.5	Homelessness	
2.5.1	SLNC stated that the Council is currently working with the City on the homelessness issue, which the Silver Lake community is struggling to grapple with. The Council is seeking to prioritize access to services in the community, which will relieve pressure ahead of the implementation of the project.	
2.5.2	SLWS commented that the question of a perimeter fence, relative to homelessness and public safety issues, was "the elephant in the room".	
2.5.3	SLF suggested that the masterplan project be an opportunity to focus on the issue of homelessness, and that the development of the park should not trigger an effort to keep the homeless away.	
2.5.4	The group felt that the issue should be addressed by the Council Members at the start of the presentation, and that it needs to be considered in the context of an overall neighborhood infrastructure.	HAR/ Districts

MINUTES

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	Action
2.5.5	SLN noted that this single topic could take hours to discuss.	
2.5.6	SLF asked how homelessness was dealt with at Crissy Field. HAR explained that it is not a significant problem there because it is a very open landscape, which is not popular place for people without homes, and there is 24/7 oversight.	
2.5.7	The group asked if there will a security presence on site when the reservoir complex is opened to the public. BOE stated that this will depend on who is the operator of the park.	
2.5.8	SLWS suggested that a representative from the SELAH Neiborhood Homeless Coalition participate in the opening remarks. BOE stated that this should be handled primarily by the City Countil district offices.	
2.5.9	SLWS suggested that the table facilitators be equipped with information the address the issue if it comes up during the table discussions.	HAR
3	QUESTIONNAIRE	
3.1	The next questionnaire will focus on seeking feedback on the specific concept design presented.	
3.2	It will also seek input regarding priorities to inform design strategies in terms of cost and phasing.	
3.3	Question regarding Priorities	
3.3.1	SLF asked what the Design Team is hoping to get out of the responses. HAR responded that they seek this input to inform budget choices/recommendations.	
3.3.2	SLNC inquired if the respondant should be asked to rank the initiatives in order of priority, instead of simply expressing a degree of suppiort for each topic.	
3.3.3	CS suggested that the respondants be asked to select 3 from the list of proposed initiatives as priorities for them.	
3.3.4	A Stakeholder suggested that the question should aim to find out what people want to see implemented first. SLN commented that perhaps the respondants are not in the best position to comment on this, as it is not only a question of preference but also a question of logistics. HAR agreed that sequencing/phasing recommendations will come from the Design Team.	
3.4	HAR also asked the Stakholders to weigh in regarding the inclusion of certain specific questions, such as the removal of the perimeter fence and the inclusion of a café/snack bar.	
3.5	Perimeter Fence	
3.5.1	SLRC, SLF and SLNC feels strongly that the issue of the perimeter fence has already been addressed through this current process and that the majority has expressed its support for taking the fence down.	
3.5.2	SLNC added that this support is consistent with earlier surveys conducted by the SLNC.	

MINUTES

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	Action
3.5.3	SLWC argued that the question has not been directly asked and should. SLNC countered that the Design Team has consistently said that the design concepts studied propose to remove the fence and that is shown in the renderings.	
3.5.4	SLN agreed that the question should be asked directly to put the issue to rest.	
3.5.5	SLF recommended that if the question is included, the available questionnaire and survey data on the topic should be referenced. CS pointed out that the fact that the design is conceived to work with or without a fence needs to be made clear.	
3.6	Questions regarding the Proposed Design	
3.6.1	SLWS commented that these questions are clearer than the question regarding priority.	
3.6.2	HAR asked if the group agreed that the requirement to respond to all questions regarding the project be maintained, as it is much simpler to analyze only fully completed questionnaires.	
3.6.3	Nobody objected to this, and SLWS commented that fact that the preference questions include the option "neutral" provides in effect the ability for the respondent the ability to abstain from answering a specific question.	
3.7	Respondant Profile	
3.7.1	SLWS asked if the respondents should provide more than their zip code to identify their location.	
3.7.2	HAR made it clear that it would be inappropriate to ask for people's addresses.	
3.7.3	The rest of the Stakeholders questioned the need to know more specifically where respondents live, since location should not have any bearing on the weight of any individual response.	
3.7.4	CS inquired if the location question was necessary; HAR pointed out that it has been useful in establishing that the vast majority of respondents live with a 2-mile radius.	
	DESIGN	
4	PREFERRED CONCEPT	
4.1	Blended Spaces was established as the preferred concept and has been used as the base to develop the preferred plan.	
5	PREFERRED PLAN	
5.1	THE KNOLL	
5.1.1	HAR referred back to history and adjusted the design to better preserve the shape of the Knoll.	
5.1.2	A secondary pathway complementing the promenade was added at the bottom of the sloped lawn.	

MINUTES

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	Action
5.2.	THE COVE AREA	
5.2.1	The geometry of the stepped terraces south of the sloped lawn was also adjusted to create a deeper cove.	
5.2.2	A floating dock was added for potential guided kayak tours, at a location convenient to the Education Center, at the base of the Knoll.	
5.2.3	SLNC pointed out that the Picnic Grove (where the Meadow is currently located) needs to be properly screened from the noise and dust of busy Silver Lake Boulevard.	
5.3	THE EMBANKMENT	
5.3.1	The width of the promenade has been increased in certain areas, while maintaining a minimum of 15 feet.	
5.3.2	Different embankment treatments are proposed along the entire perimeter, from stepped habitat terraces, to rip-rap segments, to vegetated slopes to a simple concrete refinishing of the existing asphalt surface, similar to what has been done at the Ivanhoe Reservoir.	
5.3.3	The BOE asked what prevents people from falling in the water. HAR explained that there are the following measures:	
5.3.4	There are guardrails are overlooks and bridges.	
5.3.5	The habitat terraces constitute a safety buffer. Where steps come down to the water they also provide a way to get out.	
5.3.6	There is a buffer between the promenade and the embankment edge, which consists of trees seatwalls, and planting. Then there is a curb similar to today's at the very edge.	
5.3.7	SLWS explained that the Rose Bowl golf course installed wooden planks and railings on the bank of the Arroyo Seco where golfers go down to retrieve balls.	
5.3.8	SLF suggested that there be a rough surface to grab unto, such as boulders, in these areas where the risk of someone falling into the water is greater, and that this could visually tie the various sections of the embankment.	
5.3.9	CS pointed out that the places where people will be closest to the water will have a stepped edge making it easier to get out.	
5.3.10	SLWS expressed concern about the narrowest segment of the promenade, on the east side of the Silver Lake Reservoir. HAR confirmed that the promenade is never narrower than 15 feet.	
5.3.11	SLWS suggested that the embankment be perforated and planted with trees in the narrowest areas to make them feel wider. To be studied.	HAR
5.4	INFRASTRUCTURAL ELEMENTS	
5.4.1	SLWS inquired if the asphalt pad on top of the DWP pumping station, on the west side, could be better integrated in the landscape.	
5.4.2	SLF suggested that its shape in plan could be camouflaged by an overlying landscape treatment in the same vocabulary (such as the ovals) if a smaller, minimal service area can be established with the DWP. To be investigated.	HAR
5.4.3	SLF critiqued the treatment of the habitat areas in the Ivanhoe Reservoir and suggested that a tougher expression of the existing infrastructure be maintained there, as well as along the southern edge of the North Dam.	

MINUTES

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	Action
5.4.4	SLNC asked if it is possible to add trees to the North Dam. HAR explained that the DSOD requirements prevent us from planting trees or building foundations for shade structures. Temporary shading elements may be possible for special occasions. CS pointed out that permanent structures would not be desirable in terms of the viewshed.	
5.5	DIVISION OF SAFETY OF DAMS - REQUIREMENTS	
5.5.1	The DSOD restrictions, which apply mainly to the North Dams and the South Dam, have been addressed.	
5.6	LOS ANGELES FIRE DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENTS	
5.6.1	The DWP met with the Los Angeles Fire Department to better understand their requirements in terms of filling fire-fighting helicopters. The main issues are the free water area required and its proximity to habitat areas that could be significantly disturbed by the rotor wind.	
5.6.2	HAR identified the open area in the southern end as a potential dedicated space for the helicopters to refill, which may not be compatible with the southernmost island that is currently part of the preferred plan.	
5.6.3	To preserve the island, the possibility to move the landing zone further south was discussed. The Stakeholders are concerned that this may not leave enough distance for the helicopters to take off in a southerly direction and make the turn to head north. To be further studied and discussed with LAFD.	HAR
5.7	EDUCATION CENTER	
5.7.1	SLWS commented that the survey results were not favorable to a café. HAR reminded SLWS that, given that the community is almost evenly divided on this point, it was decided to have a small snack bar as part of the Education Center, which could be run by a non-profit, would promote healthy and locally grown foods and would compost.	
5.7.2	SLF suggested that the interior classroom space be complemented by a covered outdoor classroom. To be studied.	CS
5.7.3	Four schemes were studied, two at the base of the Knoll and two integrated in the terraces connecting the Picnic Grove to the Promenade. The consensus was that the Knoll location was best in terms of access, constructability and relationship to the overall landscape.	
5.7.4	Of the two schemes studied at the base of the Knoll, the design with individual elements with gaps open to the hill/water, linked by a common roof was preferred and will be further developed.	CS
5.8	RECREATION CENTER & DOG PARK	
5.8.1	Adjustments were made to the topography to comply with a preliminary understanding of DSOD requirements, as the Recreation Center grounds and the Dog Park are partially within the South Dam's zone of influence, which means that existing ground cannot be cut, and that fill is not permitted within 10 feet of the toe of the dam.	

MINUTES

#	CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item	Action
5.8.2	A basketball half-court was added, following up on a recommendation from the Stakeholders. All Stakeholders conveyed that this may not be sufficient and asked that the Design Team try to fit a full-size court. CS explained that there is room to do it, however the impossibility to cut into the existing topography means that the larger surface will have to be set significantly higher than the playfield. To be further studied.	CS
5.8.3	The BOE asked the DWP if it is still using the small building to the north of the Rec Center, and if it could be removed to create more room for the basketball court. To be investigated.	DWP
5.8.4	SLF suggested that perhaps Van Pelt Place could become pedestrian.	
5.8.5	SLF suggested that the Field House have roll-up doors. To be incorporated.	CS
5.9	Other Designs Concerns	
5.9.1	SLWS asks that maintenance needs be presented and discussed.	