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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

### 1 COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #4 & QUESTIONNAIRE TAKAWAYS

#### 1.1 PARTICIPANTS

1.1.1 Approximately 300 people attended the workshop.

1.1.2 Over 2,966 questionnaire responses were received.

1.1.3 87% of the respondents live within a 2-mile radius.

1.1.4 Under 25 years-old is still the smallest group (6%).

1.1.5 A pop-up event was held in the Meadow on the Saturday after the Community Meeting. Approximately 200 people showed up. Most of them were already familiar with the plan. About 20 questionnaires were filled at the event.

#### 1.1 MAIN FEATURES

1.1.1 Embankment: 83% support overall; 77% at meeting and 83% online.

1.1.2 Promenade: 84% support overall; 76% at meeting and 85% online.

1.1.3 Education Center: 56% support overall; 35% at meeting and 53% online. 27% oppose overall. This is the least popular feature. It also has a higher Neutral % than other topics. SLRC thinks it may reflect the position of people whose support depends on the potential size of the facility.

1.1.4 Upland Habitat: 87% support overall; 85% at meeting and 87% online.

1.1.5 Knoll footpaths and shade: 61% support overall; 53% at meeting and 61% online.

1.1.6 Lawns: 74% support overall; 68% at meeting and 75% online.

1.1.7 Picnic grove, gardens, etc.: 70% support overall; 66% at meeting and 71% online.

1.1.8 Wetland Habitat: 82% support overall; 80% at meeting and 82% online.

1.1.9 Ivanhoe overlook: 68% support overall; 58% at meeting and 68% online.

1.1.10 Rec Center and Dog Park: 71% support overall; 67% at meeting and 71% online.

#### 1.2 KEY THEMES

1.2.1 Enjoying nature: 64% just right overall; 66% at meeting and 64% online.

1.2.2 Wellness: 66% just right overall; 69% at meeting and 65% online.

1.2.3 Family-friendly: 55% just right overall; 52% at meeting and 56% online.

1.2.4 Education: 46% just right overall; 33% at meeting and 47% online. This is the only theme that did not reach majority support.

1.2.5 Community gathering: 58% just right overall; 51% at meeting and 59% online.

1.2.6 Water access: 51% just right overall; 53% at meeting and 51% online.

#### 1.3 OPEN COMMENTS

1.3.1 The comments were sorted and analyzed. They are generally more positive that negative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>GENERAL STAKEHOLDER REACTIONS TO QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>SLWS is concerned that the online results differ from the meeting results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>HJ &amp; CS pointed out that this only the case for the Education Center, which did not get majority support on the in-person questionnaires, but did so for the online questionnaires.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>SLRC opined that this may due to the people at the meeting having more info.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>SLNC thinks that there was self-selection bias at the meeting, and SLRC pointed out that the community meeting attendees did not represent the diversity of the entire community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Regarding the Open Comments, SLRC proposed that the process of coming up with a classification may be more valuable than a ranking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>SLRC also asked what we should do with this information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>HJ stated that they read the open comments to look at whether the comments generally align with the questionnaire results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>SLF stated that the questionnaire results validate the plan as a consensus document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>SLWS believes that it is not right to give equal weight to the online responses and the in-person responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLRC responded by saying that the reservoirs are not Silver Lake's, that the DWP customers are paying for it, and that, if anything, the neighborhood's opinions have been overweighted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>EDUCATION CENTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>CS posited that the lower degree of support for the Education Center may be mostly related to the idea of a new building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>SLWS said that if the Education Center classrooms are described more as multi-purpose spaces, this will be perceived as a bait &amp; switch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLWS asked if a building is really needed, and why the classroom cannot be the site itself. SLF responded that the reservoir complex is indeed meant to be the larger educational space, with a series of learning stations, and that the enclosed classroom(s) would be used to gather the students/visitors at the start or at the end of the visit, in a single station. SLF also explained the importance of having a controlled interpretative space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>SLN also asked why we need another classroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>SLWS asked if there is a clear mandate, a clear show of support from the LAUSD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>The City and SLF stated that the LAUSD sent a letter in of support of an Education Center at the Reservoir Complex in late 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>SLWS stated that it would be helpful for people to trust that the Education Center will be managed by a Conversancy like exists at Crissy Field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>SLWS asked if we are not simply duplicating facilities, such as the multi-purpose room at the Recreation Center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>SLRC said that it is the idea of an intrusive building, parking the buses, bus loads of kids, that is frightening a portion of the community. SLRC suggest that we talk about the benefits, and asked if it can be smaller.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>SLF pointed out that at its most intense use there would not be more than 2 or 3 buses at a time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MINUTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>SLWS echoed that a prominent structure is the concern, in terms of stewardship of the land, that people are not against an educational component, which would be better received if it was a pop-up, temporary structure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>SLWS said that it would be better received if was not part of the important view of the Knoll and closer to Silver Lake Boulevard, which would also make it more easily accessible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>SLF suggested that the Tree People facilities should be looked at as a reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>HJ proposed that the plan could include an alternate smaller facility.</td>
<td>HJ/CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>SLRC cautioned that the temporary DWP buildings that will be constructed next door in the near future should be taken into account because it will significantly change the point of reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 NEXT STEPS

#### 4.1 COMMUNITY EVENT #5

4.1.1 The next community event will take place on 05/30 at the Reservoir Complex, which will be open to the public for approximately 6 hours. A celebration will be planned at the Meadow with stations set up on topic areas. In addition, stations will be set up around the reservoir complex at the key views represented in the project renderings.

4.1.2 SLWS suggests that ribbons and stakes could be used to outline the extents of features, and the entry points could be marked on the perimeter fence.

#### 4.2 WEBSITE

4.2.1 The FAQs will be updated                         HJ/TRG

4.2.2 SLWS suggested that the topic of phasing be added to the FAQs.

#### 4.3 COMMUNICATION

4.3.1 SLWS commented that latest SWG minutes have not posted. TRG will rectify. TRG

4.3.2 SLWS complained that the community workshop table discussions have not been documented. HJ explained that they are tools to facilitate discussion during the breakout sessions at the workshops prior to responding to the questionnaires, and do not yield empirical information.

4.3.3 SLWS replied that it creates the impression that the workshops do not have a meaningful impact, and requested that their substance be better reported.

4.3.4 SLRC expressed that the minority of people who are against any kind of change cannot be given the power to decide for everyone else.

### 5 MASTER PLAN REPORT

5.1 The Master Plan Report table of contents was presented.

5.2 SLF recommended that proposed safety and security measures be well explained.

5.3 SLWS recommended that the O&M section be well vetted before the release of the report.

5.4 SLF suggested that clear graphics illustrating the timeline be included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CATEGORY, TOPIC, Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>FUNDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1</td>
<td>SLF asked if funding will be addressed. HJ confirmed that it will recommend a range of options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2</td>
<td>SLRC made the point that a park planned for the community will have access to more funding than a neighborhood park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.3</td>
<td>SLF pointed out the Education Center can attract funding, perhaps better than any other aspect of the plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CULTURAL COMMISSION REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>The main concern of the committee are the habitat islands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>HJ will provide a memo regarding their habitat value, as well as additional, specific viewshed studies.</td>
<td>HJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>SLWS inquired if an island can be mocked-up?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>SLWS asked if they said anything about the floating dock? HJ responded that it was not discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>SLF asked if they have the power to reject the plan? HJ responded that they have decision-making power but can ask for mitigation measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PERIMETER FENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>HJ restated that the proposed design works with or without the fence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>CD13 reiterated that its removal will require a specific operational plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>SLRC stated that removing the fence in phases would be odd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>SLWS said that the position that it can with or without is not satisfactory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>SLWS requested that the Council District response that removal will be carefully considered, and the community consulted be mentioned in the report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>HJ said that the report will contain a recommendation for a low perimeter habitat fence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>SLRC asked how do request for funding in relation to fence? A nicer looking fence would be expensive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>SLWS worried about what would a 24/7 access would do for maintenance? The concern is that in turns into Echo Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>CD13 explained that it is against the law to camp in a park, and that Echo Park is a special case.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>HJ suggested can there be could 24/7 security.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>HJ will make recommendations regarding lighting, and suggested that some areas may be close after sunset in order to avoid habitat-disturbing lighting.</td>
<td>HJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #4 RECAP

FOR STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP PURPOSES ONLY
Overall Community Process

Community Workshop #1
Date: June 27; 6-8pm
APPROX. 220 PARTICIPANTS

Community Workshop #2
Date: August 22; 8-11am
APPROX. 600 PARTICIPANTS

Community Workshop #3
Date: Nov 2; 1-3:30pm
APPROX. 450 PARTICIPANTS

Community Workshop #4
Date: Jan 23; 6-8pm
APPROX. 300 PARTICIPANTS

= approx. 1570 participants total
Overall Community Process

Community Workshop #1
Date: June 27; 6-8pm
APPROX. 220 PARTICIPANTS

Community Workshop #2
Date: August 22; 8-11am
APPROX. 600 PARTICIPANTS

Community Workshop #3
Date: Nov 2; 1-3:30pm
APPROX. 450 PARTICIPANTS

Community Workshop #4
Date: Jan 23; 6-8pm
APPROX. 300 PARTICIPANTS

= 7,556 responses total
SLRCMP: Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #7

CW #4 Questionnaire results

2,966 QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES
CW #4 Questionnaire results

Who participated?
(2,588 people answered this question)

87% of respondents live in a zip code that is within a 2-mile radius.
CW #4 Questionnaire results

Your Age?
(2,642 people answered this question)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66+</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CW #4 Questionnaire results

SILVER LAKE RESERVOIR COMPLEX MASTER PLAN

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #4 QUESTIONNAIRE

Based on prior community input, we have identified the following enhancements, which are for the Master Plan design. Please help us refine & prioritize these by indicating your level of support for each of them.

1. THE EMBANKMENT
   Replaces asphalt and asphalt seating, boulders, and small seating terraces.

2. THE PROMENADE (ORANGE LINE)
   Creates a potential loop for walking and jogging around the interior of the Complex, including shade trees, seating, and planting.

3. THE EDUCATION CENTER
   Provides spaces for classes, volunteer opportunities, community gathering, as well as restrooms and a potential snack bar.

4. UPLAND HABITAT (KNOLL & EUCALYPTUS GROVE)
   Tree replanting program as well as ground cover planting to increase habitat value at the Eucalyptus Grove and Knoll.

5. THE KNOLL
   Small footpaths leading to a shade structure at the top of the Knoll which can be used as an outdoor classroom.

6. GREAT & SLOPED LAWNS
   Generous flat and sloped open lawns with shade trees create flexible spaces for a variety of uses and diverse ways to experience the reserves.

7. THE PICNIC GROVE, GARDENS & INFORMAL PLAY WALK
   Picnic seating under shade trees and drought tolerant gardens are combined with a meandering path and informal play for all ages.

8. WETLAND HABITAT
   Floating islands and wetland terraces provide shallow wading habitat for local and migratory birds and enable the addition of fish to the reservoirs.

9. IVANHOE
   An overlook, shade structure, wetland terraces and islands, as well as footpaths to an observation platform create an immersive ecological experience and can be used as an outdoor classroom.

10. SILVER LAKE RECREATION CENTER & DOG PARK
    Renovating and expanding the dog parks, building a new multi-purpose recreation building, and relocating and upgrading the existing play field and basketball court.

OUT OF THESE TOP 10 ENHANCEMENTS, WHICH ONE ARE YOU MOST EXCITED ABOUT?
CW #4 Questionnaire results

01 THE EMBANKMENT  Replaces asphalt and adds planting, boulders, and small seating terraces

**Paper (at meeting - 229)**

- Strongly Support: 60%
- Support: 17%
- Neutral: 10%
- Oppose: 1%
- Strongly Oppose: 10%

**Online (2,737)**

- Strongly Support: 66%
- Support: 17%
- Neutral: 6%
- Oppose: 2%
- Strongly Oppose: 9%

**Combined Results (2,966)**

- Strongly Support: 66%
- Support: 17%
- Neutral: 6%
- Oppose: 2%
- Strongly Oppose: 10%

- = 83% (2451 respondents)
- = 6% (167 respondents)
- = 12% (343 respondents)
02 THE PROMENADE Creates a continuous loop for walking and jogging around the interior of the Complex including shade trees, seating, and planting

**CW #4 Questionnaire results**

**Paper (at meeting - 229)**

- Strongly Support: 57%
- Support: 19%
- Neutral: 5%
- Oppose: 4%
- Strongly Oppose: 14%

= 76% (173 respondents)

**Online (2,737)**

- Strongly Support: 73%
- Support: 12%
- Neutral: 5%
- Oppose: 4%
- Strongly Oppose: 10%

= 85% (2311 respondents)

**Combined Results (2,966)**

- Strongly Support: 72%
- Support: 12%
- Neutral: 4%
- Oppose: 2%
- Strongly Oppose: 10%

= 84% (2484 respondents)

= 4% (114 respondents)

= 12% (366 respondents)
SLRCMP: Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #7

CW #4 Questionnaire results

03 THE EDUCATION CENTER Provides spaces for classes, volunteer opportunities, community gathering, as well as restrooms and a potential snack bar

- **Paper (at meeting - 229)**
  - Strongly Support: 16% (80 respondents)
  - Support: 24% (55 respondents)
  - Neutral: 24% (55 respondents)
  - Oppose: 8% (93 respondents)
  - Strongly Oppose: 16% (53 respondents)

- **Online (2,737)**
  - Strongly Support: 10% (1589 respondents)
  - Support: 16% (426 respondents)
  - Neutral: 16% (426 respondents)
  - Oppose: 7% (722 respondents)
  - Strongly Oppose: 20% (722 respondents)

**Combined results (2,966)**

- Strongly Support: 38% (1669 respondents)
- Support: 18% (481 respondents)
- Neutral: 16% (481 respondents)
- Oppose: 7% (815 respondents)
- Strongly Oppose: 21% (815 respondents)
04 UPLAND HABITAT (KNOLL & EUCALYPTUS GROVE)  
Tree replanting program as well as ground cover planting to increase habitat value at the Eucalyptus Grove and Knoll

SLRCMP: Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #7

CW #4 Questionnaire results

Paper (at meeting - 229)

- Strongly Support: 64%  
- Support: 21%  
- Neutral: 2%  
- Oppose: 2%  
- Strongly Oppose: 7%

= 85% (193 respondents)

Online (2,737)

- Strongly Support: 66%  
- Support: 21%  
- Neutral: 7%  
- Oppose: 7%  
- Strongly Oppose: 5%

= 87% (2383 respondents)

Combined results (2,966)

- Strongly Support: 66%  
- Support: 21%  
- Neutral: 7%  
- Oppose: 1%  
- Strongly Oppose: 5%

= 87% (2576 respondents)

= 7% (208 respondents)

= 6% (178 respondents)
**CW #4 Questionnaire results**

**05 THE KNOLL**  
Small footpaths leading to a shade structure at the top of the Knoll which can be used as an outdoor classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper (at meeting - 229)</th>
<th>= 53% (120 respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Support</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper (at meeting - 229)</th>
<th>= 14% (31 respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Support</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online (2,737)</th>
<th>= 61% (1679 respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Support</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined results (2,966)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined results (2,966)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>= 61% (1799 respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 17% (509 respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 22% (653 respondents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
06 GREAT & SLOPED LAWNS  Generous flat and sloped open lawns with shade trees create flexible spaces for a variety of uses and diverse ways to experience the reservoirs

**Paper (at meeting - 229)**
- Strongly Support: 44%
- Support: 24%
- Neutral: 12%
- Oppose: 4%
- Strongly Oppose: 16%

= 68% (154 respondents)

**Online (2,737)**
- Strongly Support: 52%
- Support: 33%
- Neutral: 10%
- Oppose: 4%
- Strongly Oppose: 11%

= 75% (2044 respondents)

**Combined Results (2,966)**
- Strongly Support: 51%
- Support: 23%
- Neutral: 10%
- Oppose: 4%
- Strongly Oppose: 12%

= 74% (2198 respondents)

= 10% (310 respondents)

= 15% (457 respondents)
07 THE PICNIC GROVE, GARDENS & INFORMAL PLAY WALK
Picnic seating under shade trees and drought tolerant gardens are combined with a meandering path and informal play for all ages.

CW #4 Questionnaire results

**Paper (at meeting - 229)**
- Strongly Support: 55% (124 respondents)
- Support: 22% (51 respondents)
- Neutral: 10% (24 respondents)
- Oppose: 7% (16 respondents)
- Strongly Oppose: 15% (34 respondents)

= 66% (150 respondents)

**Online (2,737)**
- Strongly Support: 48% (1,338 respondents)
- Support: 23% (637 respondents)
- Neutral: 12% (324 respondents)
- Oppose: 5% (87 respondents)
- Strongly Oppose: 12% (324 respondents)

= 71% (1,927 respondents)

**Combined results (2,966)**

- Strongly Support: 47% (1,390 respondents)
- Support: 23% (689 respondents)
- Neutral: 12% (356 respondents)
- Oppose: 5% (148 respondents)
- Strongly Oppose: 13% (384 respondents)

= 70% (2,077 respondents)

= 12% (348 respondents)

= 18% (537 respondents)
**08 WETLAND HABITAT** Floating islands and wetland terraces provide shallow wading habitat for local and migratory birds and enable the addition of fish to the reservoirs.

**CW #4 Questionnaire results**

**Paper (at meeting - 229)**

- **Strongly Support**: 59% (183 respondents)
- **Support**: 21% (20 respondents)
- **Neutral**: 9% (20 respondents)
- **Oppose**: 2% (23 respondents)
- **Strongly Oppose**: 8% (23 respondents)

**Online (2,737)**

- **Strongly Support**: 65% (2247 respondents)
- **Support**: 14% (375 respondents)
- **Neutral**: 10% (275 respondents)
- **Oppose**: 2% (215 respondents)
- **Strongly Oppose**: 8% (215 respondents)

**Combined results (2,966)**

- **Strongly Support**: 64% (2,430 respondents)
- **Support**: 18% (536 respondents)
- **Neutral**: 10% (295 respondents)
- **Oppose**: 2% (60 respondents)
- **Strongly Oppose**: 8% (238 respondents)
09 IVANHOE An overlook, shade structure, wetland terraces and islands, as well as footpaths to an observation platform create an immersive ecological experience and can be used as an outdoor classroom

**CW #4 Questionnaire results**

**Paper (at meeting - 229)**
- Strongly Support: 95%
- Support: 22%
- Neutral: 16%
- Oppose: 7%
- Strongly Oppose: 29%

**Online (2,737)**
- Strongly Support: 45%
- Support: 23%
- Neutral: 12%
- Oppose: 6%
- Strongly Oppose: 14%

**Combined results (2,966)**
- Strongly Support: 45%
- Support: 23%
- Neutral: 12%
- Oppose: 6%
- Strongly Oppose: 14%

= 58% (132 respondents) + 16% (36 respondents) = 25% (58 respondents) + 68% (1872 respondents) = 12% (334 respondents) = 19% (531 respondents) = 68% (2004 respondents) = 12% (370 respondents) = 20% (589 respondents)
CW #4 Questionnaire results

10 SILVER LAKE RECREATION CENTER & DOG PARK Renovating and expanding the dog parks, building a new multi-purpose recreation building, and relocating and upgrading the existing play field and basketball court.

Paper (at meeting - 229)
- Strongly Support: 42%
- Support: 27%
- Neutral: 15%
- Oppose: 6%
- Strongly Oppose: 9%
= 67% (152 respondents)

Online (2,737)
- Strongly Support: 47%
- Support: 44%
- Neutral: 16%
- Oppose: 6%
- Strongly Oppose: 8%
= 71% (1943 respondents)

Combined results (2,966)
- Strongly Support: 47%
- Support: 24%
- Neutral: 16%
- Oppose: 6%
- Strongly Oppose: 8%
= 71% (2095 respondents)
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CW #4 Questionnaire results

QUESTIONS 1 – 10 OVERALL combined results (2,966)

O4 Upland Habitat
- Support: 87.0% (2576)
- Neutral: 6.0% (178)
- Oppose: 7.0% (208)

O2 Promenade
- Support: 83.0% (2484)
- Neutral: 12.0% (366)
- Oppose: 4.2% (114)

O1 Embankment
- Support: 82.8% (2451)
- Neutral: 11.6% (343)
- Oppose: 5.6% (167)

O8 Wetland Habitat
- Support: 82.0% (2430)
- Neutral: 8.0% (238)
- Oppose: 10.0% (295)

O6 Lawn
- Support: 74.1% (2198)
- Neutral: 15.0% (457)
- Oppose: 10.9% (310)

10 Rec Center
- Support: 70.8% (2095)
- Neutral: 13.0% (397)
- Oppose: 16.2% (467)

07 Picnic Grove
- Support: 70.1% (2077)
- Neutral: 18.1% (537)
- Oppose: 11.7% (348)

09 Ivanhoe
- Support: 67.6% (2004)
- Neutral: 19.9% (589)
- Oppose: 12.5% (370)

05 The Knoll
- Support: 60.8% (1799)
- Neutral: 22.1% (653)
- Oppose: 17.2% (509)

03 Ed Center
- Support: 56.3% (1669)
- Neutral: 27.5% (815)
- Oppose: 16.2% (481)
CW #4 Questionnaire results

QUESTION 11 – WHAT ARE YOU MOST EXCITED ABOUT?

- The Promenade (Orange Line): 1,144 (20.5%)
- Wetland Habitat: 814 (16.9%)
- The Embankment: 700 (14.5%)
- Upland Habitat: 547 (11.3%)
- Recreation Center & Dog Park: 499 (10.3%)
- Great & Sloped Lawns: 375 (7.7%)
- The Picnic Grove, Gardens & Playscape: 335 (6.9%)
- The Education Center: 247 (5.1%)
- The Knoll: 212 (4.4%)
- Ivanhoe: 119 (2.46%)
CW #4 Questionnaire results

Based on your input throughout the Master Plan process, we developed six Key Goals or themes for the design. Please indicate how well the Preferred Plan addresses these goals.

**A. ENJOYING NATURE**
With the promenade, overlooks, small seating terraces along the embankment at habitat areas, and the enhanced and expanded upland and riparian habitats areas, the preferred plan offers the right balance between connecting people with nature and providing protected habitat.

**B. WELLNESS**
With the promenade, walking path and trails, sloped and flat lawns, and expanded recreation center, the preferred plan offers the right amount of open, flexible space to promote wellness-based activities.

**C. FAMILY FRIENDLY**
The picnic and play areas, visitor center (at education facility), restrooms, informal play areas, and expanded Recreation Center in the preferred plan provide the right amount of spaces for all ages.

**D. EDUCATION**
The single education facility with indoor/outdoor classroom spaces and the shade structures and observation platforms which can serve as outdoor classrooms included in the preferred plan are the right amount of education facilities for the park.

**E. COMMUNITY GATHERING**
The generous, flexible lawns (which can be used for occasional large events), variety of seating areas throughout the park, and centrally located education facility in the preferred plan are an appropriate combination of places to meet and connect with friends and neighbors.

**F. WATER ACCESS**
With the sloped lawn, seating terraces, and small walkways to observation platforms and floating dock, the preferred plan offers the right amount and variety of opportunities to enjoy the water.

We want to hear more! Please let us know if you have any other comments:

Other Comments:

Zip code where you live: __________

Your age (choose one): ☐ Under 18 ☐ 19-25 ☐ 26-35 ☐ 36-45 ☐ 46-55 ☐ 56-65 ☐ 66+

TO BE ON OUR PROJECT MAILING LIST & KEEP UP-TO-DATE ON THIS PROJECT, SIGN UP BELOW:

Name: ____________________________

E-mail: ____________________________

Please visit [https://eng.lacity.org/slrcmp-home](https://eng.lacity.org/slrcmp-home) to learn more about the project and to stay involved!

#SLRCPM #SilverLakeReservoirs

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #4, WE LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING YOU THROUGHOUT THIS PROCESS!
QUESTION 12 – ENJOYING NATURE

With the promenade, overlooks, small seating terraces along the embankment at habitat areas and the enhanced and expanded upland and wetland habitats areas, the preferred plan offers the right balance between connecting people with nature and providing protected habitat.
QUESTION 13 – WELLNESS  With the promenade, walking paths and trails, sloped and flat lawns, and expanded recreation center, the preferred plan offers the right amount of open, flexible space to promote wellness-based activities.

paper (at meeting - 229)

- TOO MUCH 22% (44)
- JUST RIGHT 69% (138)
- NOT ENOUGH 4%
- NO OBJECTION 5%

online (2,737)

- TOO MUCH 20% (510)
- JUST RIGHT 65% (1691)
- NOT ENOUGH 8%
- NO OBJECTION 9%

combined results (2,966)

- TOO MUCH 20% (554)
- JUST RIGHT 66% (1829)
- NOT ENOUGH 6%
- NO OBJECTION 8%
QUESTION 14 – FAMILY FRIENDLY  
The picnic grove, flexible lawns, visitor center (at education facility), restrooms, informal play walk, plus expanded Recreation Center in the preferred plan provide the right amount of spaces for all ages.

**paper (at meeting - 229)**
- **Too Much:** 38% (75)
- **Just Right:** 52% (103)
- **Not Enough:** 5%
- **No Objection:** 6%

**online (2,737)**
- **Too Much:** 30% (780)
- **Just Right:** 56% (1437)
- **Not Enough:** 5%
- **No Objection:** 9%

**combined results (2,966)**
- **Too Much:** 31% (855)
- **Just Right:** 55% (1540)
- **Not Enough:** 5%
- **No Objection:** 9%
QUESTION 15 – EDUCATION  
The single education facility with indoor/outdoor classroom spaces plus the shade structures and observations platforms which can serve as outdoor classrooms included in the preferred plan are the right amount of education facilities for the park.

Paper (at meeting - 229):
- Too much: 59% (118)
- Just right: 33% (67)
- Not enough: 1%
- No objection: 6%

Online (2,737):
- Too much: 36% (930)
- Just right: 47% (1216)
- Not enough: 3%
- No objection: 14%

Combined results (2,966):
- Too much: 38% (1048)
- Just right: 46% (1283)
- Not enough: 3%
- No objection: 13%
QUESTION 16 – COMMUNITY GATHERING

The generous, flexible lawns (which can be used for occasional large events), variety of seating areas throughout the park, and centrally located education facility in the preferred plan are an appropriate combination of places to meet and connect with friends and neighbors.

- **Paper (at meeting - 229):**
  - Too Much 37% (74)
  - Just Right 51% (102)

- **Online (2,737):**
  - Too Much 26% (679)
  - Just Right 59% (1515)

- **Combined results (2,966):**
  - Too Much 27% (753)
  - Just Right 58% (1617)
QUESTION 17 – WATER ACCESS  

With the sloped lawn, seating terraces, and small walkways to observation platforms and floating dock, the preferred plan offers the right amount and variety of opportunities to enjoy the water.
SLRCMP: Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #7

CW #4 Questionnaire results

combined results (2,966)

02 Wellness
- 19.91% (554) [65.72% (1829)]
- 6.00% (167)
- 8.37% (233)

01 Enjoying Nature
- 83.8% (543) [54.2% (1786)]
- 8.17% (227)
- 8.06% (224)

05 Community Gathering
- 27.08% (753) [58.14% (1617)]
- 5.65% (157)
- 9.13% (254)

03 Family Friendly
- 55.38% (1540) [55.38% (1540)]
- 5.14% (143)
- 8.74% (241)

05 Water Access
- 22.63% (630) [50.75% (1413)]
- 18.68% (520)
- 7.94% (221)

04 Education
- 37.66% (1048) [46.10% (1283)]
- 3.20% (89)
- 13.04% (363)
"No one is listening to us"
master plan schedule
SLRCMP: Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #7

master plan schedule

FOR STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP PURPOSES ONLY

STAKEHOLDER INTRODUCTION MEETINGS (4)
APR 25 & MAY 9
MAY 22
JUN 26
JUL 18
AUG 24
SEP 26
OCT 17
NOV 2
DEC 9
JAN 8
FEB 8
MAR 8
APR 8
MAY 8
JUN 8

FORM STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1
STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS
JUNE 27

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #2
GUIDED RESERVOIR VADY / VISIONING

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #3
DESIGN OPTIONS WORKSHOP
NOV 2

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #4
DESIGN REFINE WORKSHOP

FOCUSED MEETING #6
POP-UP - SURVEYS/ENGAGEMENT

SURVEY OPEN ONLINE

FOCUSED MEETING ADD
STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP #6

FOCUSED MEETING #7
POP-UP - SURVEYS/ENGAGEMENT

FOCUSED MEETING ADD
STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP #7

FOCUSED MEETING #5
STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP #8

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP
#5 & 6
FINAL DESIGN CELEBRATION
(PRESENTATION & ON-SITE)

DRAFT MASTER PLAN
Open Reservoir Walk  
Saturday, May 30  
9am – 3pm (TBD)

Celebration in the Meadow:  
• stations on topic areas  
  (water, habitat, phasing, etc)

Reservoir Walk  
• stations at rendering views
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cultural heritage commission

Presented project Jan 16, 2020

Formed CHC subcommittee

- Met Feb 12, 2020
- General support of MP design
- Some concern about habitat islands
- Scheduling next meeting
website updates

After SWG Meeting (targeting Mar 13)

• CW#4 “What We Heard”
• SWG meeting minutes

FAQ Update?

• Perimeter Fence
• Other topics?