

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 08/14/2022 07:38 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose Alternative 1.5 but would fully support a new Alternative which follows Friends of Griffith Park's revisions, especially with regard to the California Planning Area.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Maura Lucas

**Date Submitted:** 08/14/2022 07:06 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: L.A. Zoo Vision Plan Focused Recirculated EIR) I oppose Alternative Project 1.5 Please leave an unadulterated home in GriffithPark for wildlife.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Louise Woo

**Date Submitted:** 08/14/2022 07:18 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear L.A. City Council, Regarding the L.A. Zoo Vision Plan: I'll just make this short and sweet: DO NOT EXPAND THE L.A. ZOO! The Zoo is plenty big. I walked it as a parent with my kids for years. It's hilly and exhausting. And we have too many animals. The only animals that should be living in zoos in 2022 are those that are endangered and/or cannot live in the wild anymore. Keeping animals in a zoo for "entertainment" is not educational. It is cruel. We would never treat our pets this way. It's sad to see animals in captivity. Period. ALSO, every square foot you add to the zoo is land you SUBTRACT from the wilds of Griffith Park. Our native Angelino wild animals need a bigger home, not a smaller one. If anything, L.A. should make the zoo SMALLER. Our resident mountain lion, P-22, will thank you. Please give us a plan to REDUCE the zoo! Thanks, Louise Woo  
Los Angeles, CA. 90012

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lionel Mares

**Date Submitted:** 08/15/2022 07:04 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** After reviewing the L.A. Zoo Vision Plan Alternative 1.5 Plan... I am for Conservation, Native Plant Species, and the Welfare of the Animals. I am strongly opposed to further expansion of the L.A. Zoo and I do not want Griffith Park to be further developed. I am opposed to further land development on Public Lands. I do believe that the L.A. Zoo should improve its facilities and animal welfare without having to expand into Griffith Park. I am a hiker, and I hike at Griffith Park all the time. I am strongly opposed to any expansion by the L.A. Zoo. I am skeptical about the Vision Plan Alternative 1.5. I want to make sure that the L.A. Zoo has NO plans for further land development that will harm native habitat and wildlife. We all want to improve the well-being of the animals at the L.A. Zoo and we can achieve that without having to expand the L.A. Zoo and take away land from Griffith Park. I want to preserve Griffith Park and protect it for future generations to enjoy. Thank you, Lionel Mares Los Angeles, Council District 6

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lionel Mares

**Date Submitted:** 08/15/2022 08:08 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** To Whom It May Concern: After reviewing the L.A. Zoo Vision Plan Alternative 1.5 Plan... I am for Conservation, Native Plant Species, and the Welfare of the Animals. I am strongly opposed to further expansion of the L.A. Zoo and I do not want Griffith Park to be further developed. I am opposed to further land development on Public Lands. I do believe that the L.A. Zoo should improve its facilities and animal welfare without having to expand into Griffith Park. I am a hiker, and I hike at Griffith Park all the time. I am strongly opposed to any expansion by the L.A. Zoo. I am skeptical about the Vision Plan Alternative 1.5. I want to make sure that the L.A. Zoo has NO plans for further land development that will harm native habitat and wildlife. We all want to improve the well-being of the animals at the L.A. Zoo and we can achieve that without having to expand the L.A. Zoo and take away land from Griffith Park. I want to preserve Griffith Park and protect it for future generations to enjoy. Thank you, Lionel Mares Los Angeles, Council District 6

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nina Eliasoph

**Date Submitted:** 08/15/2022 08:16 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** My comments about the theme-park-ification of a large section of Griffith Park: 1. Kids need direct contact with nature, not manicured and curated instructions ABOUT nature!! 2. Attracting fee-paying tourists won't increase diversity in Griffith Park. 3. Griffith J Griffith donate the Park mandating that it be open to all, regardless of ability to pay. Nature can't ALWAYS be turned into a money-maker. 4. Increasing traffic and noise won't help species in or out of the zoo (that's supposedly why parking near the Observatory was increased beyond affordability for most angelenos). 5. Climate effects have not been adequately addressed. 6. A healthy habitat includes nighttime darkness, not brightly lit money-making events. The tennis courts and golf courses are brazenly lit in a way that's blinding for hikers and local animals and zoo animals alike. 7. Public comments should be visible to the public, not just to the officials. The "public meeting" was formatted incorrectly, so the public could not "unmute." We learn from each other, and officials' accountability happens partly when the public gets to hear other members of the public, rather than just individually speaking to officials who may well ignore us.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** LG

**Date Submitted:** 08/16/2022 12:35 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council – As a native Angeleno, I implore you to approve the L.A. Zoo’s Vision Plan Alternative 1.5. Growing up in underserved Echo Park, the L.A. Zoo was the place where I found a greater connection to nature and the amazing animals that inhabit our world. The Zoo is the first place I heard about animal extinction beyond dinosaurs – I didn’t hear about it in the LAUSD classroom – I heard about it while on a field trip to the L.A. Zoo. An immersive California section as the gateway to our Zoo would highlight the importance of biodiversity in our own beautiful state. It also allows the Zoo to tell the successful conservation story of the California Condor Program, which represents a species that would not exist without the work of the Los Angeles Zoo. The enhancements the Zoo was allowed to make in the 1990s and early 2000s benefitted both animal welfare and visitor experiences. However, the majority of the Zoo grounds are still made up of out-of-date animal roundhouses and minimal animal exhibit space. Zoo improvements provide a better quality of life for the animal collection. I appreciate everyone’s concern for the flora and fauna of Griffith Park. I refer to Griffith Park as my church; the only place in L.A. I seek solace. I do not see the Zoo’s improvements as destroying or harming our wonderful park in any way. As a reminder, the entire hillside being discussed in the California Focused Conservation Alternative is a man-made hillside. The Zoo sits on the site of what was the Roosevelt Golf Course – that’s right – it was a flat graded piece of the park. The hillside was constructed during the building of the Zoo in the 1960s. Griffith Park landscaping has changed plenty of times in the past century. What the Zoo is proposing is an actual restoration of native plants, which improves the entire area of the park. And yes, the Zoo is part of Griffith Park, but its boundaries are clearly defined – this project is completely within the Zoo’s boundaries and does not affect normal park usage as the public cannot access these areas. This City deserves and desperately needs improvements to our Zoo. LG GREW UP IN CD 13 – LIVED OVER A DECADE IN CD 4 – HOMEOWNER RESIDENT CD 14

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Leigh Jacoby

**Date Submitted:** 08/17/2022 10:51 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0828

**Comments for Public Posting:** I fully support the Zoo's mission of conservation, outreach and education; however, this cannot come at the expense of razing undeveloped lands and disrupting the wildlife (native species) that currently call it home. The Zoo can meet their objectives of animal care excellence and fulfill their important mission of educating as many people as possible about conservation without destroying this hillside. An updated version of Alternate 1.5 that models its California Area development along the lines of what was proposed in Alternative 1 is a concept I would fully and enthusiastically support.





advocacy and action  
for Los Feliz

**2022-2023**

**President**

Amy Gustincic

**First Vice-President**

Debra Matlock

**Second Vice-President**

Lynne T. Jewell

**Coordinating Secretary**

Donna Kolb

**Recording Secretary**

Marian Dodge\*

**Treasurer**

Donald Seligman\*

**Directors**

David Bell

Philip Gasteier

Ray Hovsepian

Melody King

Alex Kondracke

Chris Laib\*

Deanne Paul

David Roberti

Joel Rochlin

Patricia Ruben

Karen Stetler

Sam Wasserman

\*Past President

Norman Mundy, Environmental Supervisor II

Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, Environmental Management Group

1149 S. Broadway, Suite 600, Mail Stop 939

Los Angeles, CA 90015

Norman.Mundy@lacity.org

August 15, 2022

**RE: Focused Recirculated Zoo Vision Plan, CF 21-0828**

Dear Mr. Mundy:

Los Feliz Improvement Association (LFIA), representing thousands of residents in Los Feliz and around Griffith Park, has studied the FREIR for the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan which was released on July 14, 2022. While Alternative 1.5 is an improvement on the initial Vision for the Zoo, it still falls short of the mark. The mission of a zoo is to provide a safe and comfortable environment for the viewing of its captive animals. This plan is a veiled attempt to transform the LA Zoo into an entertainment venue. LFIA cannot support such a change in the Zoo's mission.

LFIA appreciates that numerous egregious elements of the Zoo Vision have been removed in Alternative 1.5. Preserving the beautiful oak woodland in the Africa Area is greatly appreciated and also keeps the Zoo from violating the City's Protected Tree Ordinance. But shame on you for having even remotely considered such a destructive plan in the first place.

Eliminating the aerial tram will save the Zoo millions of dollars in construction costs.

Eliminating the proposed multi-story parking structure gives us hope that the Zoo may be joining other park planners in using contemporary best-management practices of reducing the number of automobiles in parks. The creation of a Peak Visitation Management Program is a hopeful sign. It worked successfully controlling reduced visitorship during the pandemic.

Eliminating the vineyard proposed for the steep slope of the California Area is a step in the right direction. Every city department is urging Angelenos to plant native plants because they are adapted to California's climate and require less water.

However, we still have serious concerns about several features of Alternate 1.5.

LFIA was very disappointed to see that Condor Canyon was still included in Alternate 1.5. Changing its name to Condor Corridor did not in any way reduce its impact on the environment. Digging a 60-foot -deep trench, whether by blasting or by excavation, to go through a hill is impactful and entirely unnecessary. Your own illustrations state that ADA guests can either take the corridor or the tram. Since they already have access, there is no need to build another.



advocacy and action  
for Los Feliz

## **Page 2, Focused Recirculated Zoo Vision Plan, CF 21-0828**

It is unfathomable that Alternative 1.5 which includes Condor Corridor could be considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Where are the scientific studies to support such a claim? Alternative 1 has no Condor Canyon/Corridor. It is obvious to all that excavating 74,000 cubic yards of dirt and rock and hauling it out in 6,000 trips of dump trucks (12,000 trips if you count when they come back for another load) will have a huge impact. The particulate matter released into the air will be enormous. What impact will that have on Zoo animals, staff and visitors? The FREIR's declaration of Alternative 1.5 as the Environmentally Superior Alternative when it is patently obvious it is not makes us suspicious of the accuracy of all of your analyses.

The proposed California Area is to be constructed on the top of a ridgeline. It is one of the most visible ridgelines in Griffith Park as it is visible from both I-5 and SR 134 as well as from Atwater Village and Glendale. All of the Santa Monica Mountains, including that ridge, are included in the recently passed federal Rim of the Valley initiative. The City of Los Angeles, recognizing the importance of preserving ridgelines, is in the process of approving a new Wildlife Ordinance which includes protecting ridgelines. The development of the California Area would be in violation of that ordinance.

While the California Area does not include large numbers of protected oak trees, it does contain valuable chaparral. This is the same chaparral that makes up the vast majority of Griffith Park habitat. Its value as habitat should not be underestimated. Indeed it is this chaparral that supports most of Griffith Park's birds and animals.

The zoo is proposing 750,000 new visitors/year. What are the real measures to mitigate the impacts of those automobile trips on the park and adjacent neighborhoods? When one looks under the hood, the Peak Visitation Management Program doesn't offer any certainty that the park and the adjacent neighborhoods won't be flooded with additional cars. And, there is a reliance on the Parkline Shuttle, but that shuttle is currently not functioning (and hasn't been for several years), does not have funding, and is not scheduled to recommence due to a driver staffing shortage. Our experience is that if traffic mitigation isn't guaranteed up front in the plan, it is quite unlikely to be added voluntarily in the future.

Great care must be taken in the re-routing of Crystal Springs Drive around the Zoo south parking lot to assure that it does not impact the Zoo Magnet School. It must also preserve the tree-lined trail that makes a loop around the golf course. This is an especially valuable hiking trail as it is one of the few trails in Griffith Park that is fairly level and suitable for baby strollers and for people with mobility issues. The tree-lined route provides welcome shade on hot days and must be preserved.

The Zoo was highly criticized for its lack of community outreach in 2019. Only a few organizations were contacted by the Zoo; many interested organizations only found out about the Zoo's Vision Plan from friends in other organizations. The same can be said for the release of the FREIR on July 14, 2022. Although LFIA submitted a comment letter in 2021, we were not notified of the release of the new FREIR for Alternative 1.5. Several other groups were similarly not notified. This is a serious failure on the part of the Zoo.



advocacy and action  
for Los Feliz

**Page 3, Focused Recirculated Zoo Vision Plan, CF 21-0828**

Since the Scoping Period for the Zoo's Vision Plan in January, 2019, LFIA has been trying to find out what is proposed to happen to the Griffith Observatory Satellite located in the middle of the Zoo's south parking lot. It did not appear on drawings of the proposed Vision Plan. It was never mentioned in the text. To date, it has not appeared anywhere. The Zoo does not seem to recognize its existence. What will happen to the Griffith Observatory Satellite facility?

LFIA's greatest concern is that the Zoo seems to be changing its focus from animal care and conservation to an entertainment venue and event rental space. The Zoo is located entirely in Griffith Park which is zoned Open Space. The emphasis and reallocation of space in the proposed Zoo Vision Plan towards entertainment is not allowed on land zoned for Open Space. Therefore, LFIA was dismayed to learn that instead of *reducing* the number of entertainment venues as requested in numerous public comments, Alternative 1.5 proposes adding a new venue called innocently Entry Garden and Park. This new venue, located near the now eliminated parking structure, is the size of a football field. Gates to the facility would be designed so that event guests could have access to the Zoo itself, or not, depending on the plans for the event. This addition of event space is moving in the wrong direction.

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.

Alternative 1.5 has many commendable features. LFIA could support Alternative 1.5 if it eliminated the construction of Condor Corridor and California Visitor Center. In general, other alternatives are inappropriate for America's largest urban wilderness, and LFIA will vigorously oppose any attempt to transform the Zoo into an entertainment venue within Griffith Park.

Sincerely,  
The Board of Directors of LFIA

Amy Gustincic  
President, LFIA