

Communication from Public

Name: Jay Eckensberger

Date Submitted: 10/20/2021 12:32 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: Please support Alternative 1 • Don't destroy 23 acres of native habitat, including 227 City-protected trees • The full project is counter to City priorities, including the Biodiversity Report and the LA Sustainability Plan • The LA Zoo will still benefit from zoo animal care improvements and many visitor amenities if Alternative 1 is implemented

Communication from Public

Name: Geoffrey Stradling

Date Submitted: 10/20/2021 12:53 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: I am 100% against the destruction of 23 acres of native habitat, including 227 City-protected trees in the proposed expansion of the LA Zoo. We need more trees, and more greenery not less. Global warming is real. More trees, less destruction of natural habitat please.

Communication from Public

Name: Kai

Date Submitted: 10/20/2021 02:18 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: I support Alternative 1. As a resident of Los Angeles, I've visited both the zoo and Griffith Park. To destroy 23 acres of wood land, is counter productive to the purpose of a zoo. The zoo is meant to educate the public in order to protect animals and plants. It seems pretty outlandish that an ecosystem of 23 acres is to be destroyed so that the zoo can "attract" more visitors and make more money. We should work to continue to preserve Griffith Park and not destroy for future generations.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/20/2021 07:10 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: Regarding the Zoo Vision plan: as a resident of Los Feliz, the health and wellness of Griffith Park is integral to the health and wellness of my community. And therefore the idea of willingly destroying natural flora and fauna in the chaparral, including live oaks, black maples, toyon, legless lizards, bats, and animals up and down the foodchain, is frankly unfathomable. We cannot destroy what little natural habitat and beauty is left in our city in exchange for a gamble on tourism dollars. And the irony that this plan is coming from a zoo of all places - somewhere that houses animals for preservation because their natural habitats have been destroyed. Additionally, with Southern California under persistent drought wildfire threat, care must be taken to preserve the natural resources we have. Native plants (especially live oaks) are proven fire-resistant, and native plants are better at surviving drought. Please do not let a short-sighted project contribute to the destruction of what little natural land we have left in Los Angeles. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Devon Garber

Date Submitted: 10/20/2021 11:16 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, I am heavily opposed to the proposed expansion of the LA Zoo. Although I have memories of visiting as a child, the fond memories don't change the concerns that I have with the proposal. Firstly, Why? Why does the LA Zoo need to be competing with Universal and Disneyland? One of the first things that come to mind is money and that seems to be it. Secondly, adding the massive amount of vehicle traffic to the already fragile network of roads in Griffith Park would paralyze traffic and make the public spaces of the park less accessible. Added traffic would also add to more immediate pollution via exhaust gasses for park-goers. Third, removing native, known, protected species to create an artificial environment is completely backward thinking. In our current state as a community, we need to be doing all that we can to preserve the native environment around us and to help it flourish. The last thing we should be doing is leveling it to put up tacky, themed cafes and fake rock. The natural landscape of Griffith Park is more valuable, and more accessible, for education and learning about the environment than this new expansion could be. Permanently damaging the landscape around the zoo is irreversible and should not be done. Especially not so the Zoo can make more money.

Communication from Public

Name: Jean Johnston

Date Submitted: 10/20/2021 02:38 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: I support Alternative 1 of the LA Zoo's expansion. LA's natural habitat is in desperate need for the area they currently have to be preserved, humans do not need another theme park. The LA Zoo's intent on creating more money making opportunities for themselves instead of the care and preservation of animal and endangered wildlife is very concerning. It seems their focus is on the bottom line, not the animals.

Communication from Public

Name: Keri Dearborn

Date Submitted: 10/20/2021 03:19 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: The Environmental Impact Analysis for the Los Angeles Zoo's Proposed 20-year building plan clearly lays out why the full project should not be approved. The construction would violate the Zoo's own recently enacted Strategic Conservation Plan by resulting in "the removal and direct disturbance of more than 19 acres of native vegetation communities and hundreds of trees..." (EIR 2021). The city and its zoo should be modeling how to celebrate California's biodiversity, not destroy it. Alternative 1 of the plan is the only option that supports the Zoo's future without damaging the biodiversity of Griffith Park.