COMMUNITY WORKSHOP SUMMARIES
Community Workshops are a recognized, successful way to solicit public input during Master Plan development. Rather than following standard presentation and open house formats, the Workshops included interactive sessions, facilitated conversations, and site walks. The goal of the Community Workshops was for participants to feel energized about the future of the SLRC and recognize that their input is valued and heard. Once a community member participated in one workshop, the hope was for them to remain engaged in the process with a reason to come back to subsequent Workshops.

The success of the Workshops stemmed from their level of attendance and participation. From the onset, The Robert Group developed an extensive email database to disseminate information about the project to the Community. This database included local community advocacy organizations, business, schools, civic groups, and residents. To the extent possible, special attention was given to ensure the database was culturally, ethnically, and intergenerationally diverse including families, youth, and seniors to capture a full spectrum of input for the Master Plan. Throughout the engagement process, the database was updated regularly by The Robert Group.

In addition to the project’s database, the Stakeholder Working Group was also integral in distributing information to their constituents.

To advertise each workshop, at a minimum, the following outreach methods were employed:

- E-mail – blasts to the project database (three weeks prior with weekly reminders)
- Printed Flyers – over 2,000 (English and Spanish) flyers distributed around the neighborhood by The Robert Group and the Stakeholder Working Group (printed flyers were omitted for Community Workshop 05 due to Covid-19)
- Banners – installed banners at the Silver Lake Dog Park and the corner of West Silver Lake Drive and Tesla Avenue to advertise each workshop
- Social Media – advertised on the BOE Instagram, Facebook and Twitter pages. Additionally, the Stakeholder Working Group actively advertised on their own social media accounts

The Project Team led four (4) in-person and one (1) virtual Community Workshop as outlined in Figure 4-2. These workshops were held on weekday evenings and weekend days to capture a full range of participants. Full questionnaire results for these meetings are available in the Appendix. Presentations and photography from each workshop, including break-out discussion table maps, are available on the project website.
Summary of the community outreach process

**COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 01**

**INTRODUCTION**

**Purpose...**

**OPPORTUNITIES & CHALLENGES**

**Approx...**

220 attendees

**Questionnaire Responses**

172

**JUN 27**

**COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 02**

**ACTIVITIES & USES**

**Purpose...**

**VISIONING**

**Approx...**

600 attendees

**Questionnaire Responses**

1432

**AUG 22**

**COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 03**

**DESIGN ALTERNATIVES**

**Purpose...**

**Present THREE DESIGN alternatives**

**Approx...**

450 attendees

**Questionnaire Responses**

2986

**NOV 2**

**COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 04**

**PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

**Purpose...**

**PREFERRED alternative**

**Approx...**

300 attendees

**Questionnaire Responses**

2966

**JAN 23**

**COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 05**

**MASTER PLAN DRAFT**

**Purpose...**

**PRESENT DRAFT MASTER PLAN**

**Approx...**

1,500 video views at the time the questionnaire closed

**Questionnaire Responses**

922

**AUG 21**

**VIRTUAL**

**COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 05**

**MASTER PLAN DRAFT**

**Purpose...**

**PRESENT DRAFT MASTER PLAN**

**Approx...**

1,500 video views at the time the questionnaire closed

**Questionnaire Responses**

922

*4 paper questionnaires
WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

As outlined in Figure 4-2, the Master Plan was developed within the framework of strong community participation – over 1,500 members of the community attended the Community Workshops and the Project Team received 8,478 responses to the questionnaires. In addition, a vast majority of participants are frequent visitors to the Complex and live nearby. They also represented a range of age groups.

On four of the five questionnaires, responders were asked to indicate their age group and provide the zip code where they live. Responses to these questions were similar across all four questionnaires. Respondents consistently reported living near the SLRC with 88% of respondents residing in a zip code within a 2-mile radius of the Complex and are frequent visitors, Figure 4-3. The majority of responders – 68% - were between the ages of 26 and 55 as shown in Figure 4-4.

On the questionnaires accompanying Community Workshops 02 and 05, participants were asked how often they visit the SLRC. As shown in Figure 4-5, 77% of responders visit the reservoirs at least once per week. In the final questionnaire, participants were asked how often they would visit the SLRC if the Master Plan is implemented. Respondents would increase their visits to the SLRC if the design is implemented with 86% anticipating they would visit at least once per week.
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 01 SUMMARY
Community Workshops are a recognized, successful way to solicit public input during Master Plan development. Rather than following standard presentation and open house formats, the Workshops included interactive sessions, facilitated conversations, and site walks. The goal of the Community Workshops was for participants to feel energized about the future of the SLRC and recognize that their input is valued and heard. Once a community member participated in one workshop, the hope was for them to remain engaged in the process with a reason to come back to subsequent Workshops.

The success of the Workshops stemmed from the level of attendance and participation. From the onset, The Robert Group developed an extensive email database to disseminate information about the project to the Community. This database included local community advocacy organizations, business, schools, civic groups, and residents. To the extent possible, special attention was given to ensure the database was culturally, ethnically and intergenerationally diverse including families, youth, and seniors to capture the full spectrum of future park. Throughout the engagement process, the database was updated regularly by The Robert Group.

In addition to the project’s database, the Stakeholder Working Group was also integral in distributing information to their constituents.

To advertise each workshop, at a minimum, the following outreach methods were employed:

- E-mail – blasts to the project database (three weeks prior with weekly reminders)
- Printed Flyers – over 2,000 (English and Spanish) flyers distributed around the neighborhood by The Robert Group and the Stakeholder Working Group
- Banners – installed banners at the Silver Lake Dog Park and on the NW corner to advertise each workshop
- Social Media – advertised on the BOE Instagram, Facebook and Twitter pages. Additionally, the Stakeholder Working Group actively advertised on their own social media accounts.

Hargreaves Jones has led four (4) of five (5) Community Workshops so far. These workshops were held on weekday evenings and
The challenges & opportunities of the SLRCMP were presented in the following five categories:

- HISTORIC DESIGNATION & DEFINING CHARACTER
- PROGRAMMING & USES
- TRAFFIC & CIRCULATION
- WATER QUALITY & QUANTITY
- WILDLIFE PROTECTION & ENHANCEMENT

Now, it’s your turn! Please tell us what you think are the top challenges and opportunities within the site:

top three CHALLENGES?
1. 
2. 
3. 

top three OPPORTUNITIES?
1. 
2. 
3. 

Additionally… Help us understand what makes SLRC special:

What are the defining characteristics of the SLRC to you? 

What is your favorite public open space that could be used as an example for the SLRCMP?

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

Other Comments:

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

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

#SLRCMP  #SilverLakeReservoirs

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1
WE LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING YOU THROUGHOUT THIS PROCESS!
Attended by over 230 members of the public, Community Workshop 01 focused on introducing the community to the Design Team, Stakeholder Working Group and presenting the overall project.

**WORKSHOP OVERVIEW**
The BOE and the design team, led by Hargreaves Jones, introduced the project and shared research and analysis of the site. The design team also discussed their assessment of the challenges and opportunities presented by various aspects of the reservoir complex. The SWG was also introduced and each group was given the opportunity to present their organization’s mission and goals for the Master Plan and discuss their work on related issues.
Following the team’s presentation, 22 breakout discussions began with approximately 12 participants in each, facilitated by members of the project team. Upon check-in, attendees were randomly assigned to tables to have the opportunity to hear from fellow community members who they may not know. Most participants sat at their assigned tables, though not all. At the breakout table discussions, attendees were asked to provide input as to what they thought were the most significant challenges and opportunities at the reservoirs.

Each table had an enlarged project site plan and post-it notes in two different colors – one for challenges and one for opportunities. Attendees were asked to write down challenges and opportunities on the post-it notes and place them on their site plan. Tables were also asked to identify one character-defining feature of the reservoir complex they could all agree upon. These were written on post-it notes in the shape of a light bulb.

NOTE: The table maps are primarily used as tools to facilitate discussion during the breakout sessions at the workshops prior to responding to the questionnaires, and do not yield empirical information.

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 01 FEEDBACK
Workshop Report Back

Each table was then asked to identify a table leader who would report back, to the entire room, giving a brief, two-minute summary of the challenges and opportunities discussed. Each table also attached their defining characteristics to a large plan at the front of the room and attendees were also asked to share what their favorite parks or open spaces are.

During the report back, common themes ranged from balancing human access and wildlife protection to improving habitat and increasing green space. The character-defining features identified by attendees included the vistas, openness, serenity, and the infamous “morning sparkle”.

Questionnaire

A questionnaire was distributed to complete at the workshop and to help facilitate discussion during the breakout session. The project team received 172 questionnaire responses in total. The questionnaire asked attendees to identify what they thought were the top three challenges and top 3 opportunities for repurposing the reservoir complex into a public park. It also asked participants to identify their favorite open space worldwide. The questionnaire responses identified balancing human access and active uses, traffic, removing fences, maintenance, and funding as challenges. Opportunities included adding more green space, increasing outdoor activities and recreation, improving pedestrian and bike access, improving habitat for wildlife, and creating more beautiful, serene spaces. Favorite parks ranged from highly urban spaces such as the Highline in New York to more wilderness spaces like...
Debs Park in Los Angeles.

**Synthesis**

Input from the community during the workshop and from the questionnaire was used to inform the visioning phase of the project and prepare for Community Workshop 02. Based on the broad range of opportunities and challenges identified by the community, the project team developed eight categories of activities and elements to more specifically access community preferences and aspirations for what they would like to see and do in their future park.

Attended by over 600 members of the public, Community Workshop 02 focused on visioning – imagining what the reservoir complex could be and what people would want to do and see in the future – to assist the design team in developing conceptual design alternatives for the Master Plan.

**OVERVIEW**

The SLRC is mostly closed to public access with limited moments available to experience the scale and power of the water bodies up close. To help the community understand the project site and catalyze creative thinking and bold ideas about what the park could be, the BOE and the design team, in collaboration with LADWP, opened the complex to the community for the second Community Workshop.

The project team created a walking map of the reservoir complex, which also doubled as an Activities & Uses Questionnaire. Five different information stations were set up around the reservoir complex along the water and at the Knoll, to provide information on
topics areas related to the questionnaire and were staffed by project team facilitators. The goal of the workshop and questionnaire was to empirically solicit and document community priorities regarding park vision and future uses, leading to a better understanding of the character of the park that would best serve the community.

Attendees included people who specifically came to participate in the event; and others who were walking or jogging around the reservoir complex and joined the workshop spontaneously.

VISIONING QUESTIONS AND TOPICS
The questionnaire asked participants to pick the top three Activities & Uses they would like to see in the future across the following eight categories:

**Nature and Beauty:** included passive activities that are associated directly with natural areas such as birdwatching, enjoying nature, gardening, habitat enhancement/expansion, sunset viewing, treatments wetlands, water conserving native gardens, and water features.

**Education:** included birdwatching and environmental classes, guided educational tours, outdoor environmental center,
outdoor art classes, and youth and school programs.

**Support and Mobility:** are all features that contribute the safety, security, access and maintenance of the park and its uses. This included bike parking, metro bike share, park information / interpretive signs, park rangers, park rentals, restrooms, security, vehicle parking, vehicle drop-off/ pick up.

**Water Activities:** included casting ponds, catch/release fishing, human-powered boating, model sailboat racing, rowing, stand up paddle boarding, swimming, viewing areas, decks and overlooks.

**Socializing, Gathering, and Eating:** included family gatherings, food kiosks / café, food trucks, grilling, local farmers market, outdoor birthdays and weddings, picnics, senior’s classes, volunteer programs.

**Arts and Culture:** included active and passive activities that contribute to overall wellness. Active activities include cycling, exercise circuits, roller blading and skating, running and jogging, walking, and workout classes. Passive activities included cloud watching, relaxing, finding peace, sitting, sunning, tai chi / yoga.

**Health and Wellness:** included active and passive activities that contribute to overall wellness. Active activities include cycling, exercise circuits, roller blading and skating, running and jogging, walking, and workshop classes. Passive activities included cloud watching, relaxing, finding peace, sitting, sunning, tai chi / yoga.

**Sports, Games and Play:** included active and passive recreational activities. Active activities included basketball, dog play (expanded), flexible sports fields, multi-use courts, nature playground, splash pad, skateboarding, and volleyball. More passive activities included bocce and horseshoes, chess and checkers and kit flying.

The questionnaire asked some additional open questions as well: What is your Favorite Park in Los Angeles?, What one word best describes what the Silver Lake Reservoir Complex (SLRC) should be or feel like?, How often do you visit the SLRC?, How do you typically get to the SLRC?, How would you like to get to the SLRC in the future?

---

*Community Workshop 02 Questionnaire results shows top three Activities and Uses in each category*
Community Workshop 02 Questionnaire results shows top three Activities and Uses in each category in relationship to all of the Activities and Uses. Shown in descending order.
The size of the word in this word cloud represents how many times a park was repeated. This data helps provide a frame of reference to understanding the results of the Activities & Uses questions. Key takeaways include a preference towards more natural, large open spaces (Griffith Park) but also for that of a more active park with human-powered boating (Echo Park). It’s also clear that the Silver Lake Reservoir and Meadow are already beloved by the community.

This word cloud represents the vision the community has for the reservoir complex. As shown, Peaceful, Natural and Nature were among the most frequently used words. Community and Neighborhood were also used frequently. Overall, these show a preference towards creating a balanced, inclusive open space for people and nature.
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 02 FEEDBACK

Questionnaire
Participants were given the opportunity to complete and turn in their questionnaires at the reservoir or complete it online. The questionnaire was open for three weeks and closed on September 14, 2019. Over 1,450 questionnaires were completed with 89% of respondents living in a zip code within a 2-mile radius and with over 66% visiting the SLRC at least once a day, representing significant participation by the Silver Lake Community.

Participants were asked to select their top three activities across each of the eight categories which is summarized in the chart below.

In general, a preference towards more passive Activities & Uses was favored with a focus on **Nature and Beauty** [Enjoying Nature (64.46%), Habitat Enhancement / Expansion (40.01%), and Water Conserving Gardens (37.36%)], **Health and Wellness** [Walking (59.5%), Running and Jogging (43.72%), Relaxing and Finding Peace (41.62%)], and **Education** [Environmental Classes (47.28%), Outdoor Environmental Center (40.43%), and Youth / School Programs(40.08%)].

POP-UP EVENT 01
A week after Community Workshop 02, on August 31, 2019, The Robert Group hosted a pop-up event at the Silver Lake Farmers Market. The purpose of the pop-up was to capture additional community members who might not be aware of the project. Maps and boards from the Community Workshop were used to facilitate an open discussion with the public and questionnaires were provided for individuals to complete in-person and/or submit online.
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 03 SUMMARY
Water Activities were also amongst the high-ranking activities ([Viewing Area / Deck / Overlook (49.65%) Human-Powered boating (40.01%) and Swimming (38.27%)]. Being able to get on the water, get in the water, and view the water were desirable to most respondents. Socializing, Gathering, and Eating showed strong support for Picnics (49.02%) as well as favorable support for Local Farmer’s Market (36.31%) and Family Gatherings (33.38%). Support and Mobility uses such as Restrooms (53.56%) received a strong preference, and Bicycle Parking (37.43%) and Park Rentals (34.85%) had moderate support.

Categories that ranked the lowest overall were Arts and Culture ([Outdoor Movies (35.89%), Temporary Art Installations (30.94%), and Permanent Art / Sculpture Garden (28.84%)]) and Sports, Games and Play ([Nature Playground (35.61%), None of the Above (24.44%), and Splash Pad (23.74%)].

The complete results of the questionnaire are shown in descending order of preference in the chart on the next page. The top three preferences from each category have been color coded to assist understanding how these related into the overall results. For instance, while some activities were the top three in their category, they were less popular overall against all other activities.

SYNTHESIS

The responses to the questionnaire indicated a range of preferences, such as enjoying nature, habitat enhancement and expansion, overlooks, picnicking, running and jogging, education, including an outdoor education center and youth programs, as well as accessing the water, including swimming and human-powered boating. These uses and activities were all preferred by 30% or more respondents with most preferred by 40% or greater.

The design team used these preferences as a guide for developing three conceptual alternatives that created spaces which tested the physical manifestation of the community’s aspirations. Some activities and uses, such as swimming require dedicated facilities, while others only need flexible open spaces. Each alternate was developed to be as inclusive of the community’s wishes as possible.

The questionnaire responses were also used to develop six Key Themes or goals for the Master Plan design – Enjoying Nature, Wellness, Education, Community, Family Friendly, and Water Access – against which each conceptual alternative was evaluated as it was developed.
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #3 QUESTIONNAIRE

At this stage in the Master Plan development, we have presented three conceptual alternatives. We would like your feedback in order to synthesize these into a single, preferred design. Below is a list of features and elements unique to each alternative. Please indicate whether you think these are PROS or CONS of each alternative.

### Island Overlooks
- **Pros:**
  - Preserves existing embankment alignment
  - Maximizes protected wetland habitat (habitat islands)
  - Habitat Islands break the open water view of the reservoirs, providing visual interest
  - Provides a single place to access the water (at wetland observation platform)
  - Offers most active uses and space
  - Creates a “Living Laboratory” at Ivanhoe Facilities
  - Offers guided kayak or canoe tours of wetland habitat led by an ecologist
  - Offers pool facilities and floating swimming pool
- **Cons:**
  - Does not offer human-powered boating

### Active Edges
- **Pros:**
  - Terraces step down to the water and provide generous seating and activity options
  - Habitat and people terraces hug the edges to maximize open water views
  - Habitat and people spaces are predominantly separated (east vs west side of reservoirs)
  - Creates a “Living Laboratory” at Ivanhoe Facilities
  - Offers guided kayak or canoe tours of wetland habitat led by an ecologist
  - Offers pool facilities and floating swimming pool
- **Cons:**
  - Does not offer human-powered boating

### Blended Spaces
- **Pros:**
  - Open lawn gently slopes to water
  - Integrates some habitat areas within seating terraces and walkways
  - Maximizes total wildlife space by combining Habitat Islands and habitat terraces
  - Provides most open lawn with shade trees
  - Integrates an education center at the base of the Knoll
- **Cons:**
  - Does not offer human-powered boating

### Community Workshops
- **The following KEY THEMES** were expressed by the community during the visioning process:
  - **Enjoying Nature**
    - The park should be a place to sit by the water, walk through a woodland or wetland, and observe wildlife.
  - **Wellness**
    - The park should be a place to walk, run / jog, but also offer spaces to sit, relax, and find peace.
  - **Family Friendly**
    - The park should create spaces for children to play and learn about their environment.
  - **Water Access**
    - The park should have an education center offering a range of classes and outdoor-based programs.

To what extent do you agree each of the conceptual alternatives reflect these ideas or themes?

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+

Thank you for participating in Community Workshop #3, we look forward to seeing you throughout this process!
During the development of the three alternatives, the design team met with the SWG two times to review the design options and garner feedback. Attended by over 450 members of the public, Community Workshop 03 focused on presenting three Master Plan Alternatives based on and building upon prior input for community review and feedback. The design alternates were titled: Island Overlooks, Active Edges, and Blended Spaces.

**OVERVIEW:**

**ALTERNATE 1: ISLAND OVERLOOKS**
- Maintains existing embankment
- Less active spaces
- Maximizes protected wetland habitat
- Least open water

**ALTERNATE 2: ACTIVE EDGES**
- Engages edges
- Most active spaces
- Least new habitat
- Most open water

**ALTERNATE 3: BLENDED SPACES**
- Balances spaces
- Most ecologically immersive
- Most new habitat
- Medium open water
A formal presentation led by Hargreaves Jones introduced each Alternative and described its unique spaces, design strategies, and the activities and uses it fostered. The presentation was followed by break-out sessions and report backs. Participants included students from King Middle School who were engaging in an environmental education curriculum related to the reservoir complex master plan. They brought drawings showing their own visions for the reservoir complex which were displayed in the room.

Attendees were randomly assigned to tables for the presentation and for the breakout discussions, which were facilitated by a member of the project team. Attendees were encouraged to sit at their assigned tables to have the opportunity to hear from fellow community members who they may not know. Fewer people sat at their assigned tables for this meeting, mostly due to the large attendance and tight room configuration which made it difficult to navigate to specific tables. Additionally, due the turnout, some attendees had to stand.

At the breakout table discussions, attendees were asked to identify what they perceived as the pros and cons of each concept design alternative. Each table had enlarged site plans of the three design alternatives, red and green post-it notes, and red and green sticky dots. “Green” was used to indicate a “pro” and “red” was used to indicate a “con.” Attendees were encouraged to write down “pros” and “cons” on the post-it notes and place them on their table maps. Attendees were also given five red and five green dots each and encouraged to use these on the maps to indicate a pro or con. Each table was asked to identify a table leader who would report back a brief, two-minute summary of their table’s discussion.

NOTE: The table maps are primarily used as tools to facilitate discussion during the breakout sessions and do not yield empirical data.
Total Space: 28.5 ac  
Total Recreation: 6 ac  
Increase (from current meadow) 3.0 ac; 75%

- FACILITIES = 9,000 sf
- OVERLOOKS = 35,000 sf
- SEATING TERRACES = 16,000 sf
- GREAT/FLEX LAWN = 3 ac
- PICNIC GROVE = 13,000 sf
- PLAYGROUND = 14,500 sf
- ORNAMENTAL GARDENS = 1 ac
- PROMENADE/FARMER’S MARKET = 21,000 sf
- HABITAT = 22.5 ac
- SWIMMING POOL = 0 sf
- FLOATING DOCK = 0 sf
- SCULPTURE GARDEN = 0 sf
- DOG PLAY = 0 sf

(left) Diagram of the Spaces within Alternative 1: Islands & Overlooks
(below) Rendering from the top of the Knoll in Alternative 1: Islands & Overlooks
**COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 03 SUMMARY**

TOTAL: 22.5 acres  
NEW: 12 acres; 115% increase

- **PROMENADE**: 2.3 miles  
- **PATHS & TRAILS**: 2.1 miles  
- **BUS STOP**  
- **PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS**  
- **BICYCLE NETWORK**

**UPLAND** 10.5 ac  
- (woodland)  

**TRANSITION** 3.5 ac  
- (coastal scrub)  

**WETLAND** 8.5 ac  
- (wet meadow, emergent, submersent, floating)

---

(above left) Pedestrian Circulation diagram for Alternative 1: Islands & Overlooks

(above right) Habitat Breakdown diagram for Alternative 1: Islands & Overlooks

(right) View from the Promenade looking out past the environmental education center to the floating islands and outdoor classroom in the distance Alternative 1: Islands & Overlooks

---

**THE EUCALYPTUS GROVE**

**THE SPILLWAY**  
- floating outdoor classroom  
- habitat islands
information. For instance, it was noted by table facilitators that some participants took more than five green or red dots, and that they sat at more than one table.

DESIGN ALTERNATIVES

Three Master Plan Alternatives were developed in order to illustrate and discuss various approaches to program distribution and design character. The purpose of the alternatives was to test ideas and elements the community showed support for in the previous meetings and questionnaires. For instance, the team consistently saw a strong preference for education based on the feedback from Community Workshop 02, so the three alternatives included educational facilities of differing sizes at various locations around the site. Similarly, the alternatives explored design options for playgrounds, picnic areas, a café, swimming and human-powered boating which were all elements and activities supported in Activities & Uses questionnaires and comments.

ALTERNATIVE 1: Island Overlooks

Islands and Overlooks is the most passive alternative with the least amount of active spaces throughout. The design focuses on upland and wetland habitat and provides minimal interaction between people and nature. The existing embankment is preserved in its entirety as a hard edge and several floating islands are introduced to create wetland habitat. With the insertion of floating islands within the reservoirs, open water views become altered and varied.

The floating islands are strategically placed throughout the reservoirs to maximize protected wetland habitat and create opportunities for people to observe wildlife. Small overlooks are located along the Promenade within the East and West Narrows. At the Meadow, a large overlook swings out over the water and above the floating islands. The only place where visitors can engage with the wetlands is located at the 3,500sf Education Center within the rehabilitated Eucalyptus Grove. Here, a bridge leads to an observational platform within one of the floating habitat islands – creating a highly immersive experience.

Rendering from the Promenade on the east side of the complex looking north. Seating and garden terraces step down a pool and generous boardwalk along the water’s edge. Alternative 2: Active Edges
Total Space: 28.0 ac  
Total Recreation: 10 ac  
Increase (from current meadow) 6 ac; 185%

- FACILITIES = 15,500 sf
- OVERLOOKS = 1 ac
- SEATING TERRACES = 1.3 ac
- GREAT/FLEX LAWN = 3.6 ac
- PICNIC GROVE = 15,000 sf
- PLAYGROUND = 41,000 sf
- ORNAMENTAL GARDENS = 1 ac
- PROMENADE/FARMER'S MARKET = 12,000 sf
- HABITAT = 18.5 ac
- SWIMMING POOL = 6,000 sf water / 16,000 sf total
- FLOATING DOCK = 8,000 sf
- SCULPTURE GARDEN = 8,500 sf
- DOG PLAY = 19,000 sf

(left) Diagram of the Spaces within Alternative 2: Active Edges

(below) View from the base of the Meadow within the people terraces looking out to the pool and pool facilities in Alternative 2: Active Edges
TOTAL: 18.5 acres
NEW: 8 acres; 76% increase

(above left) Pedestrian Circulation diagram for Alternative 2: Active Edges

(above right) Habitat Breakdown diagram for Alternative 2: Active Edges

(right) View from Ivanhoe Overlook which is used as a Living Laboratory with educational programming in Alternative 2: Active Edges
Park programming is concentrated in the Meadow and includes a large open lawn, picnic grove and gardens, a small nature playground, and a 2500sf café at the water’s edge. Small trails leading up to the top of the Knoll extend from the edge of the meadow through a restored upland habitat. At the top, the trail swings out as an overlook to amplify views out and over the water.

To provide additional outdoor learning experiences, two small shade pavilions are located at the Ivanhoe Overlook and at the Knoll.

**ALTERNATIVE 2: Active Edges**

Active Edges is the most actively programmed Alternative and focuses on engaging the edges of the Complex with spaces for people and habitat. The west edge expands and enhances habitat areas, while the east edge maximizes places for people. This alternative creates the least amount of new habitat and does not include any floating wetland islands, maximizing open water views.

On the west side of the Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs, habitat terraces extend out beyond the existing reservoir edge and provide a gradient of upland, transition and wetland habitat. At the Eucalyptus Grove, a large overlook extends out over the terraces, offering one point of human/nature interaction. At the Ivanhoe Reservoir, a Living Laboratory is proposed which could be used for research and to test establishing new wetland habitat at the reservoir complex. The Living Laboratory could include educations programs as well.

On the east side of the complex next to the existing Meadow, the embankment edge becomes a tapestry of viewing platforms, terraced seating, green edges and sloped walkways. These ornamental garden and seating terraces step down to the water to an outdoor pool. A 5,000sf boathouse, pool house and café are integrated into the terraces below the top of the embankment to preserve views from Silver Lake Boulevard into the site. A floating dock provides direct access to the water for human-powered boating, such as kayaking, for recreational purposes. The Meadow includes several actively programmed spaces including a large open lawn, a 40,000sf nature playground, dog play, picnic grove, and a dedicated outdoor sculpture garden.

Conditioned educational classrooms are located throughout the Reservoir Complex. These include a large 7,500sf education and recreation center annex located at the base of the Knoll, a 1,500sf indoor/outdoor classroom located at the top of the Knoll and a 1,500sf indoor/outdoor classroom located at the Ivanhoe Reservoir for testing and monitor purposes related to the Living Laboratory.

*Rendering from the Promenade on the east side of the complex looking north. Habitat slopes and terraces transition to seating along the water’s edge. A floating dock takes visitors through a wetland with floating habitat islands in the background. An Education Center is situated at the base of the Knoll beyond.*
Total Space: 32.0 ac  
Total Recreation: 8.0 ac  
Increase (from current meadow) 5 ac; 145%  

- FACILITIES = 10,000 sf  
- OVERLOOKS = 1.2 ac  
- SEATING TERRACES = 28,000 sf  
- GREAT/FLEX LAWN = 4.5 ac  
- PICNIC GROVE = 12,000 sf  
- PLAYGROUND = 16,000 sf  
- ORNAMENTAL GARDENS = 14,000 sf  
- PROMENADE/FARMER’S MARKET = 16,000 sf  
- HABITAT = 24 ac  
- SWIMMING POOL = 7,000 sf water / 27,000 sf total  
- FLOATING DOCK = 16,000 sf  
- SCULPTURE GARDEN = 9,000 sf  
- DOG PLAY = 0 sf  

(above) View from terraces as the bottom of the Meadow in Alternative 3: Blended Spaces  
(above) Diagram of the Spaces within Alternative 3: Blended Spaces
TOTAL: 24 acres
NEW: 13.5 acres; 130% increase

PROMENADE
2.5 miles
PATHS & TRAILS
2.3 miles
BUS STOP
PEDESTRIAN
CONNECTIONS
BICYCLE
NETWORK

UPLAND
11.0 ac
(woodland)
TRANSITION
4.0 ac
(coastal scrub)
WETLAND
9.0 ac
(wet meadow, emergent, submergent, floating)

(above left) Pedestrian Circulation diagram for Alternative 3: Blended Spaces
(above right) Habitat Breakdown diagram for Alternative 3: Blended Spaces
(right) View from the sloped lawn to the reservoirs in Alternative 3: Blended Spaces
ALTERNATIVE 3: Blended Spaces

Blended spaces achieves the most immersive experience between nature and people. The design balances active and passive programming throughout the complex and is the most ecologically diverse providing both wetland trays at the embankment edges and floating islands along the shores. Overall, this Alternative provides the most amount of new habitat and maintains some of the open water views.

This scheme offers the most open, flexible lawn and shade trees with two distinct lawn spaces. Along Silver Lake Boulevard, a large flat lawn extends to a picnic grove and gardens with a 2,500sf café located at the water's edge. A second lawn at the base of the Knoll gently slopes to the water bringing visitors to a series of seating and wetland terraces and walkways. At this lower edge, visitors can meander through wetland plant communities and learn about this critical ecosystem. A 1,500sf Pool House is nestled into the seating terraces and a floating dock leads down to a floating pool.

At the Eucalyptus Grove, restored upland habitat transitions to wetland with the expansion of habitat trays extending from the embankment edge. At an entrance along West Silver Lake Drive, a 1,500sf recreation building and nature playground is completely immersed within the upland habitat of the Eucalyptus Grove. At the base of the building, small terraces lead people closer to the water through the wetland terraces to a small viewing platform. The Promenade connects to an overlook bridge that hovers over the habitat terraces and connects to the Ivanhoe Spillway.

Additional protected wetland habitat is created by floating islands dispersed throughout the reservoir. At the south end, a large overlook extends out into the water above a floating island to maximize water vistas and observe wildlife. Additional, small seating terraces and overlooks are located along the reservoir edge to provide people with access to the water as well as interaction with habitat areas.

A large, 5,000sf environmental education center is incorporated into the base of The Knoll, overlooking the reservoir and a shade pavilion, located at the top of the Knoll, provides space for an outdoor classroom. A universally accessible nature walk connects Armstrong Ave and the Meadow to the top of the Knoll. Where walkways are located within habitat areas, wildlife-friendly fencing is incorporated to protect wildlife and sensitive habitats.

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 03 FEEDBACK

Workshop Report Back

During the report back, many of the “pros” included support for design ideas that maximized wildlife, created flexible gathering spaces, education-related structures, allowed for water-based activities such as swimming and human-powered boating, as well as existing recreation center improvements. Many of the “cons” revolved around swimming and human-powered boating, a free-standing café, and several of the proposed education center structures or their location.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire that was distributed for this workshop – to fill out at the meeting or later online – was open for four weeks online and closed on December 1, 2019. The project team heard comments from the community that there was some confusion about some of the questions, so the project team worked with the SWG to modify the format and extended the deadline by one week. The project team received 2,986 questionnaire responses in total.

For Alternative 1: Islands and Overlooks, the community strongly supported maximizing protected habitat provided by the habitat islands and incorporating an education center at the Eucalyptus Grove with “Maximizing protected wetland habitat (habitat
**ALTERNATIVE 1: Islands & Overlooks**

- Maximizes protected wetland habitat (habitat islands)
  - PRO: 10%, 302
  - CON: 73%, 2296
- Habitat Islands break the open water view of the reservoirs, providing visual interest
  - PRO: 22%, 660
  - CON: 70%, 2104
- Locates an education center and observation platform on west side of site
  - PRO: 28%, 840
  - CON: 66%, 1921
- Does not offer human-powered boating
  - PRO: 33%, 995
  - CON: 58%, 1744
- Does not offer swimming
  - PRO: 41%, 1222
  - CON: 55%, 1637
- Preserves existing embankment alignment
  - PRO: 33%, 992
  - CON: 57%, 1715
- Provides a single place to access the water (at wetland observation platform)
  - PRO: 46%, 1374
  - CON: 48%, 1430
- Provides the least amount of active uses and spaces
  - PRO: 43%, 1270
  - CON: 56%, 1684

**ALTERNATIVE 2: Active Edges**

- Facilities are located within the stepped terraces, minimizing impact on views
  - PRO: 20%, 589
  - CON: 73%, 2189
- Habitat and people terraces hug the edges to maximize open water views
  - PRO: 23%, 683
  - CON: 70%, 2089
- Creates a “Living Laboratory” at Ivanhoe
  - PRO: 24%, 707
  - CON: 68%, 2041
- Terraces step down to the water and provide generous seating and activity options
  - PRO: 26%, 763
  - CON: 50%, 1793
- Habitat and people spaces are predominantly separated (east vs west)
  - PRO: 31%, 992
  - CON: 57%, 1715
- Provides most active uses and space
  - PRO: 36%, 1085
  - CON: 57%, 1715
- Offers pool facilities and swimming pool embedded within the terraces
  - PRO: 41%, 1380
  - CON: 48%, 1430
- Offers facilities and floating dock for human-powered boating recreation
  - PRO: 57%, 1707
  - CON: 57%, 1703

**ALTERNATIVE 3: Blended Spaces**

- Maximizes total wildlife space by combining Habitat Islands and Habitat Terraces
  - PRO: 31%, 328
  - CON: 75%, 2257
- Provides most open lawn and shade trees
  - PRO: 16%, 464
  - CON: 75%, 2257
- Integrates some habitat areas within overlook terraces and walkways
  - PRO: 16%, 567
  - CON: 72%, 2145
- Open lawn gently slopes to water
  - PRO: 24%, 714
  - CON: 67%, 2013
- Locates Nature Play on west side of site (in Eucalyptus Grove)
  - PRO: 26%, 777
  - CON: 65%, 1930
- Integrates an education center at the base of the Knoll
  - PRO: 27%, 800
  - CON: 64%, 1012
- Offers guided kayak or canoe tours of wetland habitat led by an ecologist
  - PRO: 49%, 1487
  - CON: 42%, 1265
- Offers pool facilities and floating swimming pool
  - PRO: 45%, 1329
  - CON: 47%, 1407
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 04 SUMMARY

SILVER LAKE RESERVOIR COMPLEX MASTER PLAN
islands); “Habitat islands break the open water view of the reservoir, providing visual interest”, and “Locates an education center and observation platform on the west side of the site” viewed as pros by over 70% of respondents. Less favorably, 56% of respondents viewed “Having the least amount of active uses and spaces” as a con. Respondents were more neutral towards “Providing a single place to access the water” and “Preserving existing embankment alignment”.

For Alternative 2: Active Edges, the community strongly supported maximizing water views and creating a Living Laboratory at Ivanhoe with over 70% of respondents viewing “Facilities are located within the stepped terraces, minimizing the impact on views”, “Habitat and people terraces hug the edges to maximize open water views”, and “Creates a “Living Laboratory” at Ivanhoe” as pros. Least favorable activities in this Alternative included human-powered boating and swimming with 57% and 46% of respondents viewing these as cons.

Overall, Alternative 3: Blended Spaces was seemingly the most favorable with more pros than cons. The community strongly supported maximizing space for wildlife, increasing lawn and shade trees, and blending people and habitat spaces with over 70% of respondents viewing “Maximized total wildlife space by combining Habitat Islands and Habitat Terraces”, “Provides most open lawn and shade trees” and “Integrates some habitat areas within overlook terraces and walkways” as pros. Respondents felt neutral towards swimming choosing “Offers pool facilities and floating swimming pool” as a 45%/47% (pro/con) split. And while recreational human-powered boating was viewed as a con in Alternate 2, “Offers guided kayak or canoe tours of wetland habitat led by an ecologist” was viewed more favorably (49% pro).
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #4 QUESTIONNAIRE

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

1. THE ENHANCEMENT
   Replaces asphalt and adds planting, boulders, and small seating terraces.
   [ ] Strongly Support [ ] Support [ ] Neutral [ ] Oppose [ ] Strongly Oppose

2. THE PROMENADE (ORANGE LINE)
   Creates a continuous loop for walking and jogging around the interior of the Complex including shade trees, seating, and planting.
   [ ] Strongly Support [ ] Support [ ] Neutral [ ] Oppose [ ] Strongly Oppose

3. THE EDUCATION CENTER
   Provides space for classes, volunteer opportunities, community gathering, as well as restrooms and a potential snack bar.
   [ ] Strongly Support [ ] Support [ ] Neutral [ ] Oppose [ ] Strongly Oppose

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.
   [ ] Strongly Support [ ] Support [ ] Neutral [ ] Oppose [ ] Strongly Oppose

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

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 reservoirs.
   [ ] Strongly Support [ ] Support [ ] Neutral [ ] Oppose [ ] Strongly Oppose

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.
   [ ] Strongly Support [ ] Support [ ] Neutral [ ] Oppose [ ] Strongly Oppose

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.
   [ ] Strongly Support [ ] Support [ ] Neutral [ ] Oppose [ ] Strongly Oppose

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.
   [ ] Strongly Support [ ] Support [ ] Neutral [ ] Oppose [ ] Strongly Oppose

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.
    [ ] Strongly Support [ ] Support [ ] Neutral [ ] Oppose [ ] Strongly Oppose

OUT OF THESE TOP 10 ENHANCEMENTS, WHICH ONE ARE YOU MOST EXCITED ABOUT?

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+

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #4, WE LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING YOU THROUGHOUT THIS PROCESS!
SYNTHESIS
In general, the primary takeaways from the questionnaire results indicated that the Master Plan design should prioritize the following: habitat, water access, open flexible lawn, and some environmental education program as well as active spaces. Elements that were lower priorities or that many respondents viewed as cons were swimming and human-powered boating. There was, however, some preference for ecological kayak or canoe tours led by an ecologist. In general, respondents indicated that the three schemes were well aligned with the project “key themes” or goals.

These favored elements and approaches were then synthesized into a Preferred Alternative and presented
to the public at Community Workshop 04. During the development of the Preferred Alternative, the design team met with the SWG two times to debrief on Community Workshop 03 and the questionnaire results as well as provide design updates and garner feedback.

Attended by approximately 300 members of the public, Community Workshop 04 focused on presenting a single preferred Master Plan design based on synthesized feedback from Community Workshop 03 and to solicit community review and feedback.

OVERVIEW
A formal presentation led by Hargreaves Jones was followed by break-out sessions facilitated by members of the Design and Client Teams where participants were asked which elements and features they supported or opposed about the Preferred Alternative.

At the breakout table discussions, attendees were encouraged to use the questionnaire as a guide for discussion. Each table had an enlarged site plan of the preferred Master Plan design and yellow and blue post-it notes. “Blue” was used to indicate “support” and “Yellow” was used to indicate “oppose.” Attendees were encouraged to write down the names of elements or spaces they supported or opposed on the post-it notes and place them on their table maps. Each table was also asked to identify one thing they are most excited about and to write this on a star-shaped sticky note which was placed on a single, large site plan mounted to the wall at the end of the report back. Each table was also asked to identify a table leader who would report back a brief, 2-minute summary of their table’s discussion.

NOTE: The table maps are primarily used as tools to facilitate discussion during the breakout sessions and do not yield empirical information. Also, it was noted by table facilitators that some participants moved to different tables in a coordinated manner, presumably to control the direction of the conversation.

Preferred Alternative

Based on community feedback during the previous workshops, as well as the questionnaires, and in combination with feedback from multiple discussions and emails with the Stakeholder Working Group, the design team created a preferred Master Plan design. This new design removed swimming and human-powered boating and scaled back the education center to a single building. Given there was some interest in a café for the previous workshops, the team proposed a modest snack bar to be integrated into the education center. Habitat enhancement and expansion were prioritized on the western side of the site as well as the Knoll, and paths (i.e. human access) within these areas were significantly reduced. In the Meadow area, open lawn with shade trees as well as native gardens and picnic groves were prioritized. This Preferred Alternative was advanced into the final Master Plan design outlined in Chapter 05.

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 04 FEEDBACK
Workshop Report Back
During the report back, most tables strongly supported habitat enhancement and expansion, as well as the embankment, promenade, flexible lawns, and gardens. Tables were in less agreement about the education center and many strongly opposed it, although they supported using the reservoir for environmental education purposes. Some tables were concerned with the education center’s size and many were against including a snack bar. Although it was not a question on the questionnaire, many table facilitators indicated the perimeter fence was widely discussed during the breakout session. It was noted by the project team that a few people who spoke during the report back were not table leaders or associated with a table. In general, tables were most excited about increasing habitat, the promenade, and the embankment.

POP-UP EVENT 02
The following weekend, on Saturday, January 25, 2020, The Robert Group held another pop-up event at The Silver Lake Meadow. A map showing the Preferred Alternative was used to facilitate an open discussion and questionnaires were provided for individuals to complete in-person and/or submit online. Approximately 75 people attended, and sixteen questionnaires were completed at the pop-up booth. Many community members were given copies of the questionnaire to complete online and/or complete on their own and submit via mail or email.

Twenty comments were placed on the map board during the pop-up event and are illustrated below. Approximately 60% of attendees mentioned wanting to remove the perimeter fence around the reservoir complex.
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 05 SUMMARY
*VIRTUAL* Community Workshop 05

Video Launch on August 21, 2020

This final Community Workshop 05 was planned as a celebration of the final Master Plan design. The project team was unable to hold a final Community Workshop event due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In place of a large public meeting, the team developed two videos to celebrate and present the final Master Plan virtually. The videos describe the Master Plan process, showcase many of the key participants, and provide an overview of the design created in partnership with the community of Silver Lake.

OVERVIEW

The team posted two videos on August 21, 2020. The first video titled “THE PROCESS” is an approximately ten minute compilation of interviews with key participants in the development of the Master Plan including members of the SWG, educators and students, City of Los Angeles leaders, and project team. This video frames the Master Plan project goals and history. The second video titled “THE PLAN” is a narrated overview of the final Master Plan design. The video features “before” photos of the existing Complex paired with “after” artistic renderings of the proposed design. It also highlights key features of the design such as habitat creation. The videos were accompanied by downloadable PDFs files that describe the Master Plan design and project sustainability in more detail.

An online questionnaire also accompanied the videos which asked the community to help the project team prioritize short- and long-term features and elements of the Master Plan for implementation.
FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

During the Master Plan process, we received many questions about how the design might be implemented. As a first step, the Master Plan design has been broken into smaller projects or phases which could be implemented concurrently or separately as discrete projects. Now we’d like to hear what you would like to see happen first!

**QUESTION 1: PRIORITY AREAS**

The Master Plan will be implemented as funding and community support allow. A lot will need to happen before construction starts including detailed design, environmental clearance, and permitting which typically takes 2 to 3 years. We estimate each area will take an additional 1.5 to 2 years to construct. Multiple areas could be constructed simultaneously depending on funding.

To assist us in prioritizing projects for implementation, which of the following proposed areas of the Master Plan would you like to see implemented first? Choose your top three priority areas:

- **THE MEADOW** (includes sloped lawn, flat lawn, seating terraces, wetland habitat terraces, kayak launch, picnic grove, walking paths, ornamental grasses, internal city, recreation / street edge education center [including wetomino], and kayak regarging)
- **THE KNOLL** (includes walking path, slope regarging, upland habitat planting and shade pavilion)
- **THE IVAHOE OVERLOOK AND PROMENADE** (includes promenade and embankment enhancements)
- **THE IVAHOE OVERLOOK** (includes wetland habitat terraces & islands, lookout, shade pavilion, screened walk to water, and promenade)
- **THE EUCALYPTUS GROVE** (includes wetland habitat and seating terraces, promenade walk and overlook, and restored upland habitat)
- **THE HABITAT ISLANDS** (includes wetland habitat islands and introducing fish)
- **THE EAST & WEST NARROWS** (includes embankment enhancements, seating terraces, adult fitness, and promenade walk and overlook)
- **THE REC & PARK IMPROVEMENTS** (includes relocated picnic area and pool deck, updated rec center, new multi-purpose room, outdoor pool and seating, basketball court, soccer field, and expanded/bettered dog park)
- **NONE OF THE ABOVE** (I don’t want anything changed)

**QUESTION 2: SMALL PROJECTS**

As the City of LA works to take the next steps towards implementing the Master Plan, smaller projects may be possible to implement in the near term as funding permits. These projects, while smaller, are important in improving the overall experience. To help us prioritize small projects, please choose your top three, including the “other” answer choice.

**QUESTION 3: How often do you visit the SLRC now?**

- Once a day
- Once a week
- More than once a week
- Once a month
- Once a year
- Other:

**QUESTION 3: If the Master Plan is implemented, how often will you visit the SLRC?**

- Once a day
- Once a week
- More than once a week
- Once a month
- Once a year
- Other:

Zip code where you live:

Year age (choose one):

- Under 18
- 19-25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56-65
- 66+

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

Thank you for your participation throughout this process!

Please visit https://slrc.mp/slrcmp-home to learn more about the project and to stay involved!

#SLRCMP #SilverLakeReservers
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 05 FEEDBACK

Questionnaire
The questionnaire that accompanied this workshop shown in Figure 4-36 was open for two weeks online and closed on September 4, 2020. The project team received 922 questionnaire responses in total (4 were submitted as paper copies).

During the Master Plan process, the project team received many questions about how the design might be implemented. As noted in Chapter 01, the Master Plan design was broken into smaller projects or phases which can be implemented concurrently or separately as discrete projects. The questionnaire was developed to assist in prioritizing projects for funding and implementation by asking respondents to choose their top three priority areas for implementation. The questionnaire also assessed community preferences for smaller, initial projects that could be implemented in the near term as funding sources are identified and while the City works towards the next steps of implementing the full Master Plan. These smaller projects can be standalone projects or used to test larger ideas of the Master Plan vision. Respondents were asked to choose their top three preference and were also provided the opportunity to write in other suggestions for near-term smaller projects.

The highest priority Master Plan project identified in the first question was the Meadow with 48.7% selecting it as their top space for implementation as shown in Figure 4-37. The Eucalyptus Grove was also a top priority (42.8%). The third choice was close between the Knoll (34.2%) and improvements proposed at the Silver Lake Recreation Center (32.6%), followed by the Wetland Habitat Islands (28.0%) and Ivanhoe Overlook (24.2%). Participants were also given the opportunity to indicate if they did not want any of the Master Plan spaces implemented and for nothing to change which was selected by only 15.4% respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION 1: Choose your top three priority areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE MEADOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE EUCALYPTUS GROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE KNOLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE REC AND PARK IMPROVEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE HABITAT ISLANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE IVANHOE OVERLOOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE EAST AND WEST NARROWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE OF THE ABOVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE IVANHOE SPILLWAY AND PROMENADE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Workshop 05 Questionnaire Priority Areas
Top responses to the second question to prioritize smaller, initial projects showed a clear preference to undertake near-term initiatives that allow more access to the SLRC from “Opening the fence on a regular basis” (60.7%), “Creating an Ivanhoe Reservoir walking loop” (42.9%) and “Creating the walking path to the top of the Knoll” (42.5%). Also popular are habitat-focused initiatives such as implementing “Embankment planting test areas” (37.5%) and a “Floating habitat island test installation” (34.0%). Implementing the “Dog Park upgrades” (29.7%) was a popular initiative as well. See Figure 4-38.

Additional ideas that participants suggested included replacing the current fence with a more beautiful, wildlife-friendly fence, installing more garbage cans and having regular pick-up of trash, installing better lighting, opening the fences all the time, monthly full-moon walks with gates open for two hours in the evening, allow swimming, adding a restroom at the meadow, removing the fence entirely, installing a kayak launch and access, introducing pedal boat rentals, installing art, installing picnic tables and game courts, widening the existing running/walking paths, creating a co-op vegetable garden, bringing DASH service to the SLRC to connect to Sunset Blvd., water access, planting more trees, and fixing the dirt sidewalk on Van Pelt Place.

SYNTHESIS
Primary takeaways from participants responses to this final questionnaire indicated a clear desire to implement the spaces that will have the most impact in terms of creating more public park space as well as supporting habitat creation and wildlife (The Meadow and Eucalyptus Grove). Participants also showed a strong preference for smaller, near-term initiatives that open the Complex up for more access. This feedback will be used by the project team to select two grants to which to apply for funding as well as further funding and planning initiatives after Master Plan adoption by the City.