

Communication from Public

Name: Barry Campion

Date Submitted: 11/07/2021 01:17 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: I would like to oppose the the Zoo's expansion and support Alternative 1 which is much less damaging to surrounding the habitat and less impactful in general to the immediate surroundings. As a Audubon docent at the Ballona Ecological Reserve I am deeply concerned with how our habitat is managed in the Los Angeles. We have incredible resources here in terms of wildlife habitat and yet we so often seem not to treat it with the respect it deserves. Through out the world we are losing precious habitat which supports cleaner air and water as well as providing homes for wildlife which exist under enormous pressure to survive. Given that this is the present state of world, this project seems incredibly misguided. Once the 20 or so acres are gone, the trees cut done, shrubs etc scraped - you can't go back. That small piece of OUR world is gone along with all the creatures that depend on it. I hope a wiser more thoughtful vision can prevail so that we can continue to support our local habitat and wildlife. Thank you for your time, Barry Campion

Communication from Public

Name: Elizabeth Neat

Date Submitted: 11/07/2021 05:49 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: Dan Larson

Date Submitted: 11/07/2021 12:32 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. Griffith Park is an one of the largest urban parks in America, and it should be preserved better, with Alternative 1. Los Angeles does not need a vineyard, that's what all of the land north of the Bay Area makes responsible use of. In terms of climate resiliency, Los Angeles is better off with the carbon capture capabilities of those trees. Overdeveloping will hurt the effort to cool Los Angeles by 3 degrees by 2040. In terms of cost benefit analysis, the nonuse and option value are high, as Griffith Park is a not only a destination, but a treasured Oasis for LA county residents. Can you imagine if somebody wanted to drain the Echo Park Lake to build a vineyard? The other two visitor centers are not needed, as well as a manmade canyon. There are many great actual rock climbing opportunities in Angeles National Forest. The Zoo should not try to turn itself into something it's not, it should focus on its core modus operandi: preservation and care of their animals. The Zoo must innovate in their existing development footprint and use minimal additional development if they are to come to an agreement with what many other stakeholders are saying. They put out a proposal, and have now heard opinions of it. It needs to be modified before being approved, if it even will be. The Zoo may need some updates, but it Alternative 1 is the proper course of action.