Communication from Public

Name:	Jennifer Tamera
Date Submitted:	10/27/2021 01:37 PM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	I oppose this new expansion. Upgrade existing zoo sites and protect the 120 coast live oaks, 60 toyons, 22 California black walnut trees which are federally and state-listed endangered shrubs in the proposed development zones.

Communication from Public

Name:	Jon Magram
Date Submitted:	10/27/2021 01:48 PM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	It's incredibly depressing to imagine the LA Zoo expansion project being so focused on revenue and tourism that they're ignoring their obligations to sustaining the nature that already exists. What a terrible irony that contrary to the LA Zoo's supposed aims of educating the public on preservation and natural resources, they're trying to bulldoze and destroy the lands that our native wildlife needs. Please do not do this, for the sake of our already-dwindling prospects of a sustainable future in Los Angeles.

Communication from Public

Name:	Diana S. Matsushima
Date Submitted:	10/27/2021 02:02 PM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	I urge the LA City Council to support Alternative 1 that was submitted to the LA City Council on October 12, 2021. Alternative 1 would accomplish what is needed to upgrade the zoo, without destroying 23 acres of native habitat. The full project is counter to LA City priorities including the Biodiversity Report and the LA Sustainability Plan.

Communication from Public

Name:	Holly Ramos
Date Submitted:	10/27/2021 09:58 AM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	Please do not approve the proposed LA ZOO expansion. It hurts wildlife, and the environment. This proposal is an example of corporate thinking which puts profit over the need of the community and the environment.

Communication from Public

Name:	Melissa King
Date Submitted:	10/27/2021 10:22 AM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	I am adamantly against the LA Zoo's proposal to expand at the cost of destroying a California native habitat. We have no shortage of amusement parks, restaurants, etc. in Los Angeles but yet natural areas, especially native ones, are at such a minimum. This proposal brings me immense sadness, not only because I enjoy being in our native habitat myself, but also thinking about what continuing to demolish it will mean for the wildlife. Protecting the wildlife for their own sake should be reason enough, but it would also be extremely foolish to think that destroying it will not affect our future as well.

Communication from Public

Name: Rebecca Kalauskas
Date Submitted: 10/27/2021 10:26 AM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: The zoo expansion inside Griffith Park runs counter to our climate and transit goals. Do not kill trees; do not add more parking. We need more trees and fewer cars. The zoo master plan provides an opportunity to provide a safe, fully protected bike path through Griffith Park that would connect to the surrounding communities. Instead of just expanding the parking lot, LA needs to commit to climate goals and create a safe place for everyone to use - not just those driving into the park. As it is currently designed, the Crystal Springs is a cut through with people traveling at high speeds despite the posted speed limits. With increased parking and vehicles accessing the zoo, Crystal Springs will only become more dangerous. We desperately need a safe, separated path for active users of the park.

Communication from Public

Name:	Samantha Karim
Date Submitted:	10/26/2021 09:18 PM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	I am NOT in favor of the the “Disneylandification” proposal, which seems to offer very little for the animals, "new tourist attractions, including a 60-foot-deep canyon offering rock climbs and a hilltop Yosemite lodge-style California Center with sweeping views of a 25,000-square-foot vineyard" displaces native trees, whilst at the same time destroys more of the natural surroundings. At a time when Zoos are going out of favor, expanding the zoo for tourism seems like a big waste of resources.

Communication from Public

Name:	Liz
Date Submitted:	10/27/2021 08:50 AM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	I 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