Communication from Public

Name:
Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 09:09 AM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: I oppose the Los Angeles Zoo's planned expansion which would alter 22 acres of critical natural habitat for native wildlife such as mountain lion P-22. I believe the zoo needs to focus on updating its current enclosures to be more humane for its current residents within the ample undeveloped space it has, rather than focus on drawing even more traffic and environmental impacts.

Communication from Public

Name:	Heather
Date Submitted:	11/01/2021 08:06 PM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	I am in opposition of the proposed LA Zoo vision plan which has a significant impact on habitat. I am in support of alternate 1. Griffith Park and its native habitats and ecosystems is a crucial part of Los Angeles and should not be impacted for entertainment even if it is tied to education. I believe we have a responsibility to preserve and support the remaining ecosystems in our care.

Communication from Public

Name:	Brian Pfeffer
Date Submitted:	11/02/2021 06:14 AM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	Greetings, and Thank You for taking the time to read this post: I love Griffith Park, and I love the LA Zoo. My family have supported the both the Friends of Griffith Park and the Greater Los Angeles Zoo Association for years. The proposed expansion plan for the Zoo concerns me, as it disrupts the established balance that's been in place between shared interests. It's paramount that the Zoo and Griffith co-exist without competing with each other. The public will lose out if this expansion plan goes through. Here's the official position of the Friends of Griffith Park, which I totally agree with: Please support Alternative 1 ? • Don’t destroy 23 acres of native habitat, including 227 LA 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 Should you have any questions or concerns, please to don't hesitate to reach out. Thank you for all that you do. best, Brian Pfeffer & Family Los Feliz Residents - 18 years running! bripfeff@gmail.com

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 07:25 AM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: I am asking that the city council move forward with alternative 1 regarding the la zoo expansion. Expanding the zoo is a backward way to protect the natural habitat that exists for wildlife in the city. The current proposal is upsetting and ironic - let us destroy our natural environment to create yet another human amusement park and put animals behind cages…how progressive our city is. The la zoo is a blemish on the city and should not be expanded.

Communication from Public

Name:	Caitlin Mendoza-Price
Date Submitted:	11/02/2021 05:08 AM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	I oppose destruction of Griffith Park for Zoo expansion and request the Council support Alternative 1 to the EIR.

Communication from Public

Name: Nancy R Stone
Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 10:14 AM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to voice my opposition to the full expansion proposal presented and evaluated in the LA Zoo Expansion DEIR and instead recommend and urge the City to adopt ALTERNATIVE 1 - the Reduced Project Alternative. The full proposal contains unacceptable impacts on the park's environment, including the leveling of a significant amount of hillside for the creation of two new Visitor Centers with restaurants for added special events and evening venues, the addition of a multi-level parking structure in Griffith Park, the construction of a gondola and a funicular within Zoo property and the destruction of native habitat including 227 City Protected Trees -- including native oaks and walnuts. Griffith Park and the Zoo are two of LA's treasures. The Zoo is an important part of the Park and any expansion must be made with the understanding that Griffith Park provides LA with the vast majority of the City's much-needed open space. Any actions that would result in the degradation of that open space should be viewed as unacceptable. Improvements to the Zoo that result in improved living conditions for the animals that live in the Zoo should take precedence over any efforts to create a more attractive tourist destination. LA will likely never compete with the San Diego Zoo and Wild Animal Park that are world-renowned and successful largely because of their animals and the habitats created for them-- not because they have built amusements to attract tourists. The natural setting in which the Zoo is located is a positive attribute for our Zoo. Instead of destroying that setting, it might be a wiser strategy to capitalize on it and to introduce Zoo visitors to the ecology of the park and of the Los Angeles basin. Better understanding of the ecology of our City and its hillsides will go a long way to creating a more environmentally conscious population here at home and amongst our visitors. Our protected trees and the critters that live amongst them should be celebrated, not bulldozed. Please advance Alternative 1 -- the Reduced Project Alternative.

Communication from Public

Name:	Terri Lloyd
Date Submitted:	11/02/2021 09:50 AM
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:
Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 09:58 AM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: I live in Glendale close to Griffith Park. I hike in Griffith Park often and enjoy the open space and trees, and I am a member of Friends of Griffith Park. I am writing to urge that Los Angeles City Council support Alternative 1 for the Los Angeles Zoo, for the following main reasons: • Don't destroy 23 acres of native habitat, including 227 LA 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 Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name:	Rita Iverson
Date Submitted:	11/02/2021 11:00 AM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	For the sake of wildlife and the shrubbery that supports the wildlife, please consider Alternative 1 for the Los Angeles Zoo proposal. Don't let the LA Zoo turn into an Amusement Park. That would be a death sentence for the wildlife involved in the surrounding area. NOT TO MENTION P-22!

Communication from Public

Name: Mary Button
Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 11:07 AM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: I have concerns about the Zoo's expansion plan, since certain elements of these plans that will increase the Zoo's footprint, expanding and encroaching into the natural Griffith Park acreage. The zoo's plan refers to its native woodlands as 'underutilized and underdeveloped areas'. This is a ludicrous assertion from the perspective of conservation and biodiversity. I strongly support Alternative 1, which would save and preserve the 23 acres of native woodlands including 120 coast live oaks, 60 toyons, and 22 California black walnut trees. Alternative 1 is declared the "Environmentally Superior Alternative" in the EIR itself, and allows natural habitat areas to remain intact. Under Alternative 1, the Zoo can achieve animal care goals set forth, and can still become a world-class destination zoo. Unfortunately, once land acreage and endangered tress are gone, they are lost forever. Please vote for the compromise that is best for the native habitat and still allows the Zoo to expand and fulfill its mission of being a world class zoo. This is without a doubt Alternative 1. Sincerely, Mary J Button

Communication from Public

Name:	Jennifer H.
Date Submitted:	11/02/2021 01:53 PM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	Hi, I'm appalled by the LZ Zoo's 20 year vision plan that would alter 22 acres of natural habitat in Griffith Park and destroy 202 native, protected trees. I am writing to support Alternative 1 to avoid development within the underdeveloped areas of the Zoo that are home to protected trees, native habitats, and other special status plant species. Habitat fragmentation in this city has already directly led to a decrease in biodiversity in our beautiful city. We can't afford to destroy and fragment the city further. Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your response and further discussing this important topic and moment in time to prioritize ecosystem health if we are to deliver a livable future for our children. Sincerely, Jennifer H. (Resident of LA)

Communication from Public

Name:	Darrel Haynes
Date Submitted:	11/02/2021 01:26 PM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	Please support Alternative 1 ? • Don’t destroy 23 acres of native habitat, including 227 LA 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:
Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 01:09 PM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: The people implore you to approve an “Environmentally superior Alternative” presented in the Zoo’s environmental impact report. It is completely unacceptable to allow them to do otherwise. We simply can not allow more of our native habitat to be destroyed. It will have grave consequences for our climate resilience, air quality, habitat for our increasingly pushed out and threatened native species, urban aesthetics and overall quality of life. Alternative 1 is the only option. Please, you must do the right thing and enforce Alternative 1. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Sara

Communication from Public

Name:	McKenna Rowe
Date Submitted:	11/02/2021 12:23 PM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	With regard to the proposed Zoo expansion, I respectfully ask you to please support Alternative 1! • Don't destroy 23 acres of native habitat, including 227 LA 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 As a 21 year resident of Los Angeles and member of Friends of Griffith Park, I believe in keeping Griffith Park as natural as possible. When that acre of land (the endangered trees or that open field) is gone, it's gone forever.

Communication from Public

Name: Rebecca Waer
Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 11:38 AM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: I strongly support the Friends of Griffith Park Alternative 1 plan.

Communication from Public

Name:	Debra Spinelli
Date Submitted:	11/02/2021 11:24 AM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	Please support Alternative 1 Keep Griffith Park's greenspace for the citizens of Los Angeles. • Don’t destroy 23 acres of native habitat, including 227 LA 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: Barbara Broide
Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 11:28 AM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to voice my opposition to the full expansion proposal presented and evaluated in the LA Zoo Expansion DEIR and instead recommend and urge the City to adopt ALTERNATIVE 1 - the Reduced Project Alternative. The full proposal contains unacceptable impacts on the park's environment, including the leveling of a significant amount of hillside for the creation of two new Visitor Centers with restaurants for added special events and evening venues, the addition of a multi-level parking structure in Griffith Park, the construction of a gondola and a funicular within Zoo property and the destruction of native habitat including 227 City Protected Trees -- including native oaks and walnuts. Griffith Park and the Zoo are two of LA's treasures. The Zoo is an important part of the Park and any expansion must be made with the understanding that Griffith Park provides LA with the vast majority of the City's much-needed open space. Any actions that would result in the degradation of that open space should be viewed as unacceptable. Improvements to the Zoo that result in improved living conditions for the animals that live in the Zoo should take precedence over any efforts to create a more attractive tourist destination. LA will likely never compete with the San Diego Zoo and Wild Animal Park that are world-renowned and successful largely because of their animals and the habitats created for them-- not because they have built amusements to attract tourists. The natural setting in which the Zoo is located is a positive attribute for our Zoo. Instead of destroying that setting, it might be a wiser strategy to capitalize on it and to introduce Zoo visitors to the ecology of the park and of the Los Angeles basin. Better understanding of the ecology of our City and its hillsides will go a long way to creating a more environmentally conscious population here at home and amongst our visitors. Our protected trees and the critters that live amongst them should be celebrated, not bulldozed. Please advance Alternative 1 -- the Reduced Project Alternative.

Communication from Public

Name: Jan Westbrook
Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 03:47 PM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: Surely it's possible to help the Zoo without destroying all the acres of native vegetation that provide shade, diversity of habitat for non-zoo animals and birds. You're assuming "glitz" will attract foreign tourists - maybe non-glitz will attract more people happy to see the Zoo and the natural habitat. I live in Kern County, but strongly support Alternative 1 which would do the least amount of damage to the native habitat, yet provide improvements in the zoo enclosures and facilities. Use the San Diego Zoo as a demonstration of enclosure habitat improvements - they're bigger, more natural, less "cage". You have space to work in restaurants and picnic areas between the enclosures without going outside the zoo's present footprint. Building a cable car within the park will work if carefully done. The joy of Griffith Park in general is all the native habitat, even P22, within the city! Don't get carried away with shiny improvements which are not improving the lives of the animals in the Zoo. Save $$ and use it on the animals. That will attract the tourists you want.

Communication from Public

Name: Kent Strumpell
Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 02:49 PM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: I do not support the LA Zoo expansion as proposed and urge that the Zoo develop a plan that is more appropriate to our needs today. Any project of this scale must conform to our city's sustainability and climate goals, including resource conservation, traffic reduction and greenhouse gas reduction. The project proposed by the Zoo fails in these regards and is inappropriate for other reasons. - The stated objectives of the expansion, namely improving animal welfare, enhancing access and interpretive opportunities and fostering the Zoo's sustainability are all worthy and should be the priorities for evaluating expansion plans, not revenue generation and competing with theme parks. - Aspiring to become more like a theme park to swell attendance runs counter to our city's sustainability and climate goals. Developing attractions like a climbing wall, decorative vineyard and other superficial attractions is inconsistent with the objectives summarized above. - Adding a massive parking structure would only serve to undermine strategies for developing sustainable, alternative access modes to the Zoo that do not encourage more vehicle miles traveled. - The price tag of $650million would consume too large a share of the city's budget and/or borrowing power. At a time when our city is confronted by the covergence of multilple challenges including the housing crisis, a pandemic, climate change and transportation burdens, this project would not be a wise or timely use of limited resources. - The proposed intrusion into of 23 acres of some of the last natural woodland in the heart of our city would be a significant loss of rare habitat that numerous species of flora and fauna are dependent on. A prudent, timely expansion of LA Zoo has the opportunity to enhance its role as an educator and conservator of the natural species of our planet, particularly those that are native to our region, and to foster greater understanding of the need for conservation, sustainability and even adaption to our changing climate. The Zoo expansion as proposed strays far from what our city needs at this urgent moment in time. I urge the Zoo to scale back its plans and refocus them to better address our city's urgent need for climate change-sensitive solutions, education and investments. Kent Strumpell 6483 Nancy St. Los Angeles, CA 90045

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 03:19 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: Los Feliz Improvement Association
Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 03:27 PM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: Please see attached letter. Thank you.

LFIA advocacy and action for Los Feliz

Councilmember's John Lee and Mike Bonin
Arts, Parks, Health, Education and Neighborhoods Committee

RE: Los Angeles Zoo CF 21-0828, Support for Alternative 1

November 2, 2021

Dear Mr. Mundy
LFIA, the advocacy group for all residents of Los Feliz which represents thousands of residents around Griffith Park, has studied the EIR for the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan. We find it contrary to several principles already adopted by the City in the preservation and management of America's largest urban wilderness park.

On January 8, 2014, the Los Angeles Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners adopted *A Vision for Griffith Park*, a governance document created through an arduous ten-year process, involving a citizen's working group representing every major stakeholder in the park. The proposed Zoo Vision Plan is in direct conflict with this governing document in the following areas:

Displacement of Historic and Current User Groups
Section 3:15 Transportation
The rerouting of Crystal Springs Drive as illustrated displaces several user groups, including the North Hollywood High School Zoo Magnet Center, equestrians, runners, the Griffith Observatory Satellite, and golfers on the Woodrow Wilson/Harding golf courses. Indeed, the original Griffith gift granting the park to the city has conditions requiring that it be a place for passive outdoor activity for the public.

Parking Structures and Increased Private Passenger Traffic
Section 3:15 Transportation
All major venues in Griffith Park are endeavoring to migrate to fewer private automobiles with a greater reliance on public transportation. The concept of a parking structure anywhere in Griffith Park is a direct violation of *A Vision for Griffith Park* and contradicts contemporary best practices for wilderness parks all over the world. The trend is toward fewer automobiles, not building capacity for more. The current traffic congestion at I-5 and SR-134 is untenable yet the plan proposes nothing to alleviate the traffic jam.

Best Conservation Practices in Wilderness Parks
Section 3.6 Urban Forestry Resources
The removal of hundreds of heritage trees, particularly in the California and African planning areas, is a shocking violation of accepted conservation tenets, and is illegal per the city's Protected Tree Ordinance. The removal of coast live oaks, the iconic tree of Griffith Park, is nearly impossible to mitigate as it would take 75 years for a replacement sapling to become a mature tree. The removal of the smaller toyons and Mexican elderberry trees would constitute a substantial loss of a food source for our native birds who depend on their berries.

Zoning Violations
Section 2.11 Land Use and Planning
The emphasis and reallocation of space in the proposed Zoo Vision Plan towards entertainment is not allowed on land zoned for Open Space. The recommendation to expand visitor-serving facilities, particularly event rental space, allowing the LA Zoo to become a 200+ night per year entertainment venue should not be pursued. The wilderness designation of Griffith Park makes it an inappropriate setting for such activity with the resulting noise and light pollution, particularly for the nocturnal wildlife that lives adjacent to the zoo. The noise and light pollution generated by the event areas would also be harmful to the Zoo's own animals, species that the Zoo is charged with protecting. Tangentially, we have reservations about digital signage anywhere in Griffith Park, for the same reasons.

Further to our letter dated February 8, 2021, and the winnowing options in the final EIR, LFIA supports highly recommends that the Zoo select Alternative 1 Reduced Project Alternative, the environmentally responsible alternative.

In general, other alternatives are inappropriate for America's largest urban wilderness and the city's largest Historic-Cultural Monument, and the LFIA will vigorously oppose any attempt to transform the Zoo into an entertainment venue within Griffith Park.

Sincerely,
Amy Gustincic

President, LFIA

cc: Mayor Garcetti, Councilmember Raman, Andrea Conant, Mike Shull, Denise Verrett, Stefanie Smith, RAP Commissioner

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/02/2021 05:13 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose the Zoo's expansion and ask you to support Alternative 1 as the other project alternatives destroy protected trees and other native plants that are critical habitat for native wildlife such as mountain lion P-22. The Reduced Project Alternative (Alternative 1) would substantially avoid developed [sic] within the existing undeveloped areas of the Zoo property where protected trees, native habitats, and other special status plant species are present. Alternative 1 would also generate a smaller increase in visitation, thereby reducing projected vehicle miles traveled and reducing the size of the parking structure or eliminating the need for it entirely. Alternative 1 would reduce impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, urban forestry, noise, and transportation when compared to the Project.