

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/01/2021 02:30 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support alternative 1 to preserve the native habitat of Griffith park

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lynn Sosa

**Date Submitted:** 11/03/2021 06:10 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Clerks Office, I read about the plans for the LA Zoo expansion project in the LA Times and was shocked. The zoo's footprint is large enough to accommodate visitors and animals. To expand it to include other tourist attractions like rock climbing, a Lodge, and vineyards is unconscionable. Vineyards do not belong in Griffith Park. Amusement attractions, other than caged animals, do not belong in Griffith Park. Taking out native trees that the wildlife depend on just to bring in a few more tourists is not clear thinking. It seems like a huge waste of money. This money could be spent in other ways to help wildlife. Upgrades at the existing zoo are probably needed. Is there a wildlife refuge at the location? I hear about many people in neighborhoods across the city who find injured or sick animals, like coyotes, raccoons, squirrels, possums and don't know where to take them. Perhaps the Zoo could include a facility that takes in injured animals, rehabilitates them and releases them. The idea of destroying Oaks, Black Walnuts and so many other trees goes against the cities plan for a greener LA. Our city should want to preserve the wild habitat that surrounds the zoo, not destroy it. Please reconsider this massive undertaking. It is unnecessary, destructive and not in sync with the future of development. Future developments anywhere should focus on the preservation of land and ecosystems. Climbing walls, vineyards, gondolas, funiculars, and massive parking structures should be eliminated from the plans. LA should be a leader in sustainable development, not wasting money on unnecessary expansions like the current proposal. Our zoo is fine the way it is. Perhaps upgrading some of the existing facilities is in order, but the expansion is too huge and a waste of money that could be used in ways that are less destructive of native habitats. Thank you, Lynn Sosa

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/03/2021 06:42 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** “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. ”

## Communication from Public

**Name:** o katz

**Date Submitted:** 11/03/2021 10:20 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, As outlined, two "Project Objectives" are self-nullifying if the project does not protect existing native woodland, sage scrublands, and other native habitats. If the project stakeholders were actually concerned with Animal Welfare and Conservation they would not expand the LA Zoo. Animal Welfare The acreage in and around the Zoo area is already home to native species of birds, reptiles, mammals and insects. The Animal Welfare objective nullifies itself if it displaces or kills existing fauna in the area. Prioritizing exotic species over existing, and in some cases rare, species is counterproductive to the concept of Animal Welfare. Conservation Conservation 'efforts' in this plan start with erasing native habitat, then 'support[s] conservation actions to protect... habitats.' The suggestion to delete actual habitat, then try to re-establish them is not responsible and has no chance of succeeding. The vague language (eg 'efforts,' 'support') allow for less than complete conservation as an acceptable outcome. Los Angeles suffers from a shortage of native habitat not tourist attractions. Proceeding with this expansion continues the prioritization of profit at the cost of our gorgeous landscape. We are calculating costs in the wrong way if we discount the cost of destroying our natural home in favor of dollar amounts.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/03/2021 11:14 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please do not expand the LA Zoo unless it is for the animals benefit only. Both the zoo animals and wild life have to deal with enough human interaction already especially with all the afterhour events at night. They seem to never get a break from us anymore.  
:( Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sofia Lacin

**Date Submitted:** 11/03/2021 11:19 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** Councilmember Lee and APHEN committee members: As a concerned citizen of Los Angeles, I am writing to urge you to reject the destructive proposal from the LA Zoo. Their plan will eliminate absolutely crucial wildlife habitat. It is our duty, living in this time of the 6th Mass Extinction, to do the exact opposite and work to preserve and restore the remaining habitat in this city. 25 acres is a lot of land - any amount of entertainment or diversion is certainly not worth it. It's not just a loss for the creatures that depend on this wild space, all of us loose when we ruin nature. Please support Alternative 1 and do not allow the original plan or Alternative 2, both of which significantly impact the fragile ecosystem of Griffith Park and the broader Rim of the Valley ecosystem. Thank you, Sofia Lacin

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Teresa Lucia Rios Avalos

**Date Submitted:** 11/03/2021 12:59 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a resident of Los Angeles. I don't support the L.A. Zoo's "20-year Vision Plan." I don't support a project that would result in the destruction of native plant habitat. I believe that the native plant habitat that would be negatively impacted by an expansion plan should be preserved. The L.A. Zoo should avoid altering the natural landscape that supports native plants and wildlife within Griffith Park. I believe that the L.A. Zoo should not operate as an amusement park.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jaime Alfonso Parra

**Date Submitted:** 11/03/2021 01:53 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. Thank you



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kelsey Perry

**Date Submitted:** 11/03/2021 02:02 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** While I wish the LA Zoo would not expand at all, alternative 1 is the best option. Please support alternative 1 since it is better for our native species of plants and animals.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/03/2021 07:32 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a citizen of Los Angeles, I urge Los Angeles City Council to approve an "Environmentally Superior Alternative," presented in the Zoo's Environmental Impact Report as Alternative 1. This would substantially avoid development within the undeveloped areas of the Zoo that are home to protected trees, native habitats, and other special status plant species. Overall, Alternative 1 would reduce impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, urban forestry, noise, and transportation when compared to the Vision Plan.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Laura Keaton

**Date Submitted:** 11/03/2021 03:26 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support Alternative 1. The Los Angeles Zoo expansion plan is misguided in ignoring the value of the native habitat, flora and fauna that has been preserved in Griffith Park in the midst of our expansively developed city. To sacrifice that natural treasure under the guise of enabling the zoo to better promote values such as conservation is painfully ironic. The description of the Yosemite lodge and vineyards they wish to build is particularly idiotic and frustrating. Once the native habitat and plants have been removed and the area developed by the Zoo, we will never get them back. The native flora and fauna here are just as important as the charismatic mammals the zoo holds up and much more important than the Zoo's quest for explosive financial growth. ?Please: • 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:** Liliana Aguilar

**Date Submitted:** 11/03/2021 04:34 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the Zoo's expansion and ask you to please support Alternative 1 as the other project alternatives destroy protected trees and other native plants that are a critical habitat for native wildlife such as mountain lion P-22.