

Communication from Public

Name: Friends of Griffith Park

Date Submitted: 08/21/2022 07:44 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: This comment letter is in response to the Zoo Commission action noted in this same Council File, "Communications from the Board of Zoo Commissioners," dated 8/17/2022.



Friends of Griffith Park

P.O. Box 27573

Los Angeles, CA 90027-0573

friendsofgriffithpark.org

August 20, 2022

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

Re: Comment #2, Focused, Recirculated Zoo Vision, CEQA Process

Mr. Mundy,

Friends of Griffith Park and others became aware on Friday, August 19, 2022, of a letter posted in the City Council File 21-0828, written by the Zoo Commission regarding its action of Tuesday, August 16, 2022. The letter was submitted Aug 17, 2022, as a [Communication from Board of Zoo Commissioners](https://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2021/21-0828_misc_08-17-22.pdf).
(https://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2021/21-0828_misc_08-17-22.pdf)

The Zoo Commission's unanimous vote to support a specific alternative (Alternative 1.5) **13 days** before the end of the comment period (August 29, 2022) shows a clear disregard for public comment and for the CEQA process. The purpose of the comment period is to solicit public feedback about the potential environmental impacts of the newly-favored alternative. Why even go through the motions of having a comment period if their minds were already made up?

This official Commission action clearly signals they are not willing to listen to the public. The Zoo is signing off on Alternative 1.5 even before the Lead Agency has prepared responses to submitted public comments and corrected any errors in the FREIR. So, it not only doesn't want to hear from the public, it doesn't want to review the responses and corrections from the Lead Agency.

These are just a couple random case history citations:

"Environmental review derives its vitality from public participation." (Ocean View Estates Homeowners Ass'n, Inc. v. Montecito Water Dist. (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 396, 400.)

"The fundamental goals of environmental review under CEQA are information, participation, mitigation, and accountability." (Lincoln Place Tenants Assn. v. City of L.A. (2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 425, 443-444.)

Yet, despite this premature endorsement of Alternative 1.5, the Zoo Commission peddles their willingness to engage and listen to the public. The last paragraph states: *"The Zoo developed Alternative 1.5 based on public feedback, through engaging a variety of audiences, listening to their suggestions, reflecting on these comments, and reevaluating our Vision Plan."*

Sincerely,



Gerry Hans
President

About Friends of Griffith Park:

Friends of Griffith Park (FoGP) is a California non-profit 501(c)(3) dedicated to preserving and protecting Griffith Park's natural habitat, biodiversity, and historic features, for current and future generations. FoGP is committed to ensuring that Griffith Park, a public park and Los Angeles' largest Historic-Cultural Monument, remain open, natural, and free to all citizens of Los Angeles.

Communication from Public

Name: Mary Button

Date Submitted: 08/22/2022 09:31 AM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Mary Button. I have lived in Los Angeles for the past 36 years. I appreciate and enjoy the urban wilderness of Griffith Park and I am grateful for this generous gift of 3,015 acres of land in 1896 by Colonel Griffith J Griffith. He stipulated the land be used specifically as a park for the “plain people” of the city. I am deeply concerned about the proposed California Area which would destroy 16 acres of native habitat and remove more than 20 protected trees. Our urban wilderness is our city’s most valuable asset and it deserves to be protected. As we all know when native habitat is gone, it is lost forever. The enormity of habitat destruction of the Condor Canyon is staggering. Excavating more than 74,000 cubic yards of earth/rock will leave permanent scars on this topographical feature of Griffith Park. Please, let us NOT go down this path of destruction. I will support alternative 1.5, but only if the California Area is left alone and not developed. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Mary Button