## Public Input

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Series</th>
<th>No. of C. W.</th>
<th>Public Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1st Series** | 1<sup>st</sup> C. W. | ✓ Overall Support for the Master Plan  
 ✓ Improve Water Quality  
 ✓ Flood Control Remains a Priority  
 ✓ Enhance Access to the LA River  
 ✓ Improve Safety Around the River  
 ✓ Enhance Wildlife Habitat  
 ✓ Green the River!  
 ✓ Connect Communities via the River  
 ✓ Enhance Recreation Opportunities  
 ✓ Economic Development has pluses and minuses  
 ✓ Address Homelessness  
 ✓ Raise River Awareness  
 ✓ Who is Responsible for the River?  
 ✓ Who will pay for the River to be revitalized?  
 ✓ Let Education be a “hook” for River Revitalization  
 ✓ Incorporate Public Art |
|               | 2<sup>nd</sup> C. W. | ✓ Green the River  
 ✓ Treat the Tributaries  
 ✓ Create Off-line Habitat  
 ✓ Green Streets to Connect to the River  
 ✓ Activate Commercial Streets to the River  
 ✓ Re-orient Buildings to face the River  
 ✓ Consolidate Rail to make the River Accessible  
 ✓ Homelessness and Security need to be Addressed |
| **2nd Series** | 3<sup>rd</sup> C. W. | ✓ Area along the LA river are lacking cultural landmarks, so  
 River revitalization should provide an important opportunity to offer new “destinations”  
 ✓ Consider density increases adjacent to the River carefully, and on a neighborhood-buy-neighborhood basis  
 ✓ Provide nesting areas for native birds  
 ✓ Create, expand and connect wildlife habitats  
 ✓ Connect open space areas, so people can walk uninterrupted along the River  
 ✓ Emphasize recreation and open space in the Plan  
 ✓ Work with the communities to transform portions of the area along the River into urban parks, and look for opportunities for community gardening  
 ✓ Improve water quality  
 ✓ Consider inflatable dams to create standing bodies of water  
 ✓ Take into account the concerns about gentrification |
|               | 4<sup>th</sup> C. W. | ✓  |
|               | 5<sup>th</sup> C. W. | ✓  |
| **3rd Series** | 6<sup>th</sup> C. W. | ✓  |
|               | 7<sup>th</sup> C. W. | ✓  |
|               | 8<sup>th</sup> C. W. | ✓  |
50 written comments received
2 comments related to equestrian and pedestrian trails
2 comments were related to addressing homelessness
2 comments urged providing low and moderate income housing, and addressing gentrification.
Several comments expressed support for landscaping with native plants.
Safety features supported included police and water rescue patrols, railings, multi-lingual signage, lighting and gates; of concern was access to water.
15% of all comments received related to Taylor Yard, ranging from including Fletcher Drive in the Opportunity Site to support for parks and recreation in the area.
10% thought parts of the presentation and questionnaire were confusing
Other concerns on-site include flood-control, property rights, ground water, extent of LARRMP, public safety, affordable housing, undercrossings and bike paths etc.

Canoga Park
1. Respondents overwhelmingly supported Alt B in categories related to clean water, flood safety, greening the City and building community by an approximate 4-1 margin.
2. Over 50% of respondents were satisfied with the amount of green space and ability to access the channel.
3. Only 1/3 identified restoration of steelhead habitat as a priority.
4. Respondents preferred a mix of residential, commercial and industrial uses.

Verdugo Industrial Green Park
1. Respondents supported Alt B across all categories by an approximate 4-1 margin.
2. Residential development is the leading preference among respondents.
3. Ponded, open water areas are important to respondents in this area.
4. Only 1/3 identified restoration of steelhead habitat as a priority.

Cornfields-Chinatown
1. Alt B overwhelmingly supported by respondents (4-1).
2. 50% of respondents felt steelhead habitat restoration is a priority.
3. Over 50% support residential development, with 33% also supporting commercial development

Taylor Yard
1. Alt B supported by 5-1 margin.
2. Overwhelming satisfaction for amount of green space and channel access.
3. No support for development at this site.

Downtown
1. Only limited support for either Alt A or B; 75% supported neither option
2. 2-1 margin of support for development of residential and industrial buildings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5th Series</th>
<th>12th C. W.</th>
<th>13th C. W.</th>
<th>14th C. W.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Where will we get all that water from?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Physical design considerations have so far trumped the social-cultural concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Any other public transit opportunities besides walking and biking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ How to resolve the problem of gang violence along the River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ How to protect the native plants during the construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ This is not a vote of the people; whether this was a done deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Who is accountable for the future implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ How to maintain the construction of LARRMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The sequential administrative activities of the LARRMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Justice and priority of the distribution of tax money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Other focuses include homeless problem, safety issue during rainy season, water quality, financing and cost of the plan, social-economic impact, the process of informing the public etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6th Series</th>
<th>15th C. W.</th>
<th>16th C. W.</th>
<th>17th C. W.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ 計劃可能的執行時間：評估參與範圍的不足；預算規劃的優先性，例如可 以通過教育、警政、社會安全、啟民等公共事務的支持，實現社會及教育與公衆會議制度及社會，整個計劃的保護似乎已不再是難關。擔心的是一個，防範 功效的變動會有所改善；預算來源與持續維護的問題；犯罪、暴力暴力與警 力不足的問題；水晶製作的改革等。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 計劃負面難度的構建：預算預算是否會急用的防範功能；基 地、綠地的後置問題及具相關工程專業問題；要求資訊透明化，提供其他 相關會議的資料；關係計劃如何應用後，公共參與如何持續的問題；實施 所謂，判斷關係人會議，存在的問題；強調部門合作及計劃成功的重 要性；各種計劃的實現進度數字的問題；要求具體說明計劃進度；對於 預算來源的估算提出質疑，特別是相關稅收收入增加的多寡估計等。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 報告此，本段的發展基本尚可符合預期，傾向支持者多數提案內容觀手 計畫的具體內容；例如景觀設計，綠地、河岸美化等，實現者多數對計 程，參與等層面的問題提出挑戰。在此階段的發展過程中，主持人的明確技 術出阻止計畫成員繼續回應相關問題，一方面可能是資源的問題，其次也 凸顯宣傳的程序性作。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 尚可歸納自 comment &amp; responses (online pdf. file)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

資料來源：http://www.lariverrmp.org/（retrieved on 2007/01/20）。
Instruction

Please read the instructions carefully before you start to complete this survey.

---The survey tool saves a page or response whenever the "Next or Done" link is clicked.

---The survey allows your responses to be edited; you may go back and update existing responses until the survey is finished.

---Clicking "Done" indicates that you have finished the survey. After clicking “Done” you will not be able to re-enter the survey.

---Multiple respondents can complete the survey using the same computer and/or Internet Protocol (IP) address.

---Investigator adds a “comment column” for the survey and most of the questionnaire items. You are welcome to provide your comments for them, such as “is the question clear enough for you”, “are the answer choices sufficient for you”, “is the question appropriate”, “any other question you want to add on” and etc.

If you understand the instructions above and are ready to proceed with completion of the survey, please click "Next."
Section I: Institutional Arrangements & Problems

The questions in this section focus on your observations or opinions about what happened in the LARRMP meeting(s) you attended. After a set of general questions, there are a few questions about each of the different types of meetings involved in the LARRMP process. For these, you should answer only the questions about the type(s) of meetings you attended.

# measure scale: 1=Not really; 2=A little; 3=Some; 4=A lot; 5=Completely

Common Questions for All Respondents

Let’s start from these questions for all respondents, although you might have attended different LARRMP meetings. Please answer the questions below based on your understanding of LARRMP.

1. The interests of minority groups were discussed in the LARRMP planning process.
2. The distribution of the five recommended opportunity sites supports the goal of equitable development in Los Angeles.
3. The planning process of LARRMP was transparent.
4. The material presented by the LA River Team reflected ideas that people wanted to have included in the plan.
5. The reasons why some opportunity areas were omitted from the plan were explained to participants.
6. The LA River Team members had sufficient interaction with the affected population in the LARRMP planning process.
7. Stakeholders from different sectors had equal influence on decisions regarding the allocation of the budget in the LARRMP planning process.
8. All the stakeholder groups with an interest in the LARRMP were well represented in the planning process.
9. The LARRMP planning meetings were well-attended.
10. There was diverse participant representation in the LARRMP planning process.
11. Communication in the LARRMP planning process was one-way, from planners to stakeholders.
12. Participants at the meeting(s) I attended actively offered their recommendations concerning the LARRMP plan.
13. Representatives from the public agencies involved in the planning process had preconceived ideas about the LARRMP plan before public input about the project was articulated.
14. There was sufficient discussion of the criteria used to select the opportunity areas
included in the LARRMP plan.
15. Planning for the LARRMP was shaped through a participatory process.

- Community Workshops -
These questions are only for those who attended any LARRMP "Community Workshops."

16. Which community workshops did you attend? (Check all that you attended.)

☐ I did not attend any community workshops.
☐ 10/15/2005 (Weddington Recreation Center).
☐ 10/22/2005 (Goodwill Work Source Center, Cypress Park).
☐ 1/21/2006 (Reseda High School).
☐ 1/24/2006 (International Community Center at Exposition Park).
☐ 1/28/2006 (Chevy Chase Recreation Center in Atwater Village).
☐ 6/24/2006 (Goodwill Workforce Center).
☐ 6/28/2006 (Evergreen Recreation Center in Boyle Heights).
☐ 9/30/2006 (Chevy Chase Recreation Center in Atwater Village).
☐ 2/24/2007 (Hollenbeck Middle School, Boyle Heights).
☐ 2/27/2007 (Canoga Park High School Auditorium).
☐ 2/28/2007 (Metropolitan Water District Board Room).

17. The eviction of homeless encampments was discussed at the workshop(s) I attended.
18. The issue of gentrification was addressed at the workshop(s) I attended.
19. At the workshop(s) I attended, an explanation was given for why the 20
   opportunity sites were chosen for discussion.
20. At the workshop(s) I attended, the evaluative criteria for selecting the consultant
   team were disclosed.
21. At the workshop(s) I attended, the duties of the consultant team were explained.
22. The priorities regarding the LA River revitalization that were presented at the
   workshop(s) I attended matched those of the stakeholders present.
23. The "table exercise" at the workshop(s) I attended was helpful for receiving
   information from stakeholders.
24. At the workshop(s) I attended, there was discussion about how to resolve the homelessness problem in the planning area.
25. At the workshop(s) I attended, there was discussion about how to resolve the gang violence along the River.
26. The facilitator(s) at the workshop(s) I attended allowed adequate dialogue between planners and participants in the Q&A session.

➢ **Advisory Committee**
These questions are only for those who attended any LARRMP "Advisory Committee" meetings.

27. Did you attend any "Advisory Committee" meetings?
28. At the Advisory Committee meeting(s) I attended, suggestions were made for reducing existing inequities among different planning zones/neighborhoods/communities.
29. At the Advisory Committee meeting(s) I attended, there was discussion of how the plan would impact minority groups.

➢ **Peer Review Committee**
These questions are only for those who attended any LARRMP "Peer Review Committee" meetings.

30. Did you attend any "Peer Review Committee" meetings?
31. The membership of this committee included representatives of a variety of different professions.
32. Peer review of the plan helped to increase the extent to which it addresses the public interest.
33. The prerequisite for being invited to serve as a member of this committee was having a relevant professional background.

➢ **Stakeholders Committee**
These questions are only for those who attended any LARRMP "Stakeholders Committee" meetings.

34. Did you attend any "Stakeholders Committee" meetings?
35. Conflicts of interest among participants were resolved at the Stakeholders Committee meeting(s) I attended.
36. The "Stakeholders Committee" meetings were open to anyone interested in participating.
37. A prerequisite for being invited to serve as a member of this committee was having a background working on environmental issues.

- Task Force Meetings

These questions are only for those who attended LARRMP “Task Force” meetings.

38. Did you attend any "Task Force" meetings?
39. In their discussions, the Task Force put a high priority on meeting the public’s needs.
40. At the Task Force meeting(s) I attended, participants were clear about who would be held accountable for the consequences of the planning decisions.

Section II : Outcome of Governance

The items in this section ask for your opinions regarding the LARRMP draft plan. We assume you are familiar with the plan since you participated in one or more of the meetings addressed in the previous section.

# measure scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 4=Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree.

41. The $3 million spent preparing the LARRMP draft plan was a worthwhile expense.
42. I am satisfied with the goals of the LARRMP. (They are to revitalize the river, green the neighborhoods, capture community opportunities, and create value.)
43. I support the "three-tiered river management structure" included in the LARRMP draft plan.
44. The "three main selection criteria" for "the 5 ultimately-chosen opportunity areas" addressed in the LARRMP draft plan are appropriate.
45. I am satisfied with the alternatives proposed in the LARRMP draft plan for each opportunity area.
46. The distribution of parkland and open space among the River-adjacent communities addressed in the LARRMP draft plan is appropriate.
47. I support the LARRMP draft plan because I believe the economic benefits estimated in the plan will be achieved.
48. The five chosen pilot "Opportunity Areas" addressed in the LARRMP draft plan are appropriate. (They are Canoga Park, River Glen, Taylor Yard, Chinatown-Cornfields area and Downtown Industrial area.)
49. I believe the LARRMP draft plan should be implemented, regardless of how much it costs.

50. The "LA River Team" has the legitimate authority to propose the 239 potential projects that are identified in the LARRMP draft plan.

51. I support the LARRMP draft plan because I believe the funding resources identified in the plan are sufficient to implement it.

52. I believe the City Council should approve the LARRMP draft plan.

53. I am satisfied with the extent to which public comments were included in the LARRMP draft plan.

Section III: Principles of Governance

The questions in this section focus on your beliefs regarding principles that should be reflected in the process of planning for public projects.

# measure scale: 1 – No, it isn’t important; 2 – Sometimes, it depends; 3 – Usually, yes; 4 – Definitely, always.

54. The first priority of a planning process should be to maximize the public interest.

55. A public plan should aim to reduce existing inequities among different planning zones/neighborhoods/communities.

56. "Transparency" in the planning process is very important for a public project.

57. The interest of minorities should be protected in the planning process of public policy.

58. It should be clear who is accountable for public decisions.

59. Decisions that involve the redistribution of resources should be made by those who are affected.

60. The negative consequences of project recommendations should be taken into consideration.

61. All public projects should satisfy important public needs.

62. Active participation should be promoted in the planning process.

63. Sustained interaction with the affected population should be an important feature in a public project.

64. It is important for planners to receive information from stakeholders in a public meeting.

65. Local residents should participate in the process of making planning decisions that affect them.

66. The vision of a public project should reflect what people want.
67. A basic requirement for a public plan is that it should reflect the different interests of various stakeholders.
68. There should be two-way communication between planners and stakeholders in the planning process.
69. Planning decisions should be fully explained to stakeholders.
70. The meetings of a public project should be open to anybody who is interested.
71. Diverse participants should be represented in planning processes.
72. Attendance at public meetings should reflect the diversity of the population affected by the planning decision.
73. Planning processes should be oriented towards achieving consensus among stakeholders.

Section IV: General Participation Questions
In this section, the items are used to evaluate the general participation experience of individuals.

74. How would you describe the LARRMP decision-making process? (Check all that apply.)
   □ Due process.
   □ Collaborative process.
   □ Biased process.
   □ Other (Please specify.)

75. Please describe what you believe is/are the most important accomplishments of the LARRMP planning process? (Please specify.)

76. How did you acquire information about the LARRMP meetings? (Check all that apply.)
   □ Official notification from an LARRMP committee.
   □ Notification at a public library.
   □ Mail from “LA River Team.”
   □ Email from “LA River Team.”
   □ Website of “LA River.”
   □ Newspaper.
   □ Other (Please specify.)

77. Which of the following do you think has been the primary source of momentum keeping the LARRMP project moving forward?
   □ Entrepreneurial interests.
   □ Nonprofit organizations.
78. What was the biggest problem in the LARRMP planning process?

☐ The plan is biased towards certain interests.
☐ No one is accountable for the decision.
☐ The plan doesn't reflect stakeholders' needs.
☐ There was inappropriate representation in the process.
☐ Only a few local residents attended the meetings.
☐ It was hard to integrate the conflicting interests into the plan.
☐ Other (Please specify.)

Section V: Demographic Questions

This section asks you to answer questions related to your demographic characteristics which will help with the analysis. We guarantee that your responses will be used for academic purposes only and will adhere to the rules concerning research ethics at the University of Southern California.

79. What is your gender?
   ☐ Female.
   ☐ Male.

80. What is your age? (Please specify.)

81. What is your race/ethnicity?

☐ Caucasian.
☐ African-American.
☐ Latino.
☐ Asian/Pacific Islander.
☐ Multi-racial.
☐ Prefer not to say.
☐ Other (Please specify.)

82. What is your highest level of education?

☐ Some High School or less.
☐ High School graduate or equivalent.
☐ Some College or Vocational School.
☐ College graduate.
☐ Graduate education.
83. Which sector are you most closely affiliated with?
   - Governmental Sector.
   - For-Profit Sector.
   - Non-Profit Sector.
   - None of the above.

84. Which of the following describes your current status? (Check all that apply.)
   - Public manager.
   - Elected official.
   - Private consultant.
   - Investor/developer.
   - Community planner.
   - Environmentalist.
   - Local resident.
   - Neighborhood council board member.
   - Non-profit organization member.
   - Student/Teacher/Researcher.
   - Other (Please specify.)

85. Are you currently employed? (Please choose and specify.)
   - No.
   - Yes. (If yes, please identify the agency/organization you work for. For instance: Bureau of Engineering, City of Los Angeles.)

86. Which of the following “Los Angeles river channel reaches” do you live in or near?
   - Canoga High School to Sepulveda Basin.
   - Sepulveda Basin.
   - Sepulveda Basin to Tujunga Wash.
   - Tujunga Wash to Barham Blvd.
   - Barham Blvd. to Burbank Western Channel.
   - Burbank Western Channel to Taylor Yard.
   - Taylor Yard.
   - Taylor Yard to 1st St.
   - 1st St. to Washington Blvd.
   - None of the above.

87. Which “Opportunity Area” do you live in or near?
   - Canoga Park.
   - River Glen (Verdugo Industrial Green Park).
   - Taylor Yard.
☐ Chinatown-Cornfields area.
☐ Downtown Industrial area.
☐ None of the above.

88. How long have you lived in the Los Angeles area? (For example: 3 Years and 6 Months)

89. When did you first get involved in the LARRMP planning process? (For example: May 2006)

90. What are your main concerns about the Los Angeles River? (Please rank the top three in order, identifying your biggest concern with a 1, your next biggest concern with a 2, and your third concern with a 3.)

☐ Safety.
☐ Homelessness.
☐ Gang violence.
☐ Graffiti.
☐ Access to the river.
☐ Wild habitat.
☐ Trash and other pollution.
☐ Water quality.
☐ Public awareness.
☐ Aesthetic design/public art.
☐ Amenities.
☐ Open space.
☐ Other (Please specify.)

91. Why are you interested in the LARRMP process? (Check all that apply.)

☐ I live near the river.
☐ I have a business within the plan area.
☐ I care about the river.
☐ My work is related to the LARRMP process and its implementation.
☐ Other (please specify)

92. Would you be willing to be interviewed about these issues for this study? (Please choose and specify.)

☐ No
☐ Yes (If yes, please provide your contact information.)

93. Do you know of anyone else who might be willing to participate in this survey?
   If so, could you please provide their email or mailing address and/or other contact information.

Please provide your overall comment for this questionnaire?
Thank you for completing our survey!
With your help, I can revise my draft for the pretest phase and release the final version for the pretest.
I appreciate your assistance very much. If you have any questions and/or recommendations, please contact me through "g1256501@nccu.edu.tw".

Take Care and Best Regards,

José Chiucheng Chen
2006-2007 Fulbright Visiting Scholar at USC
Ph.D. Candidate, National ChengChi University, Taiwan
Apt. Phone: 323-737-6810 (available time 8~10 AM., 9~11 PM.)