Communication from Public

Name:	Richard Bourne
Date Submitted:	08/26/2022 07:28 AM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	I do not support any additional parking at the LA zoo, or anywhere in Griffith Park. There is already far too much of the city's parkland paved over with asphalt ruining the natural beauty. If parking demand exceeds supply at the zoo, the city should start charging for parking. That would be far preferable than increasing entry tickets. Washington DC's zoo is free to enter but ~$35 to park a car at. If parking isn't free, people will consider taking the bus/walk/bike to the zoo reducing the demand for parking on site.

Communication from Public

Name:	Jon A
Date Submitted:	08/27/2022 09:44 AM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	Don’t add parking spots. Ripping up Griffith Park for more parking is a lose-lose scenario. In a time when we must start investing in better public transportation and bicycle infrastructure, paving over natural park space is two steps in the wrong direction.

Communication from Public

Name:	Iden Baghdadchi
Date Submitted:	08/27/2022 04:51 PM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	I do NOT support any additional parking at the LA Zoo. Instead, alternative methods like an electric shuttle should be considered. Increasing parking in a climate emergency will only encourage visitors to drive to the Zoo and is contrary to the Zoo's and City of LA's sustainability goals.

Communication from Public

Name:	Ann Dorsey
Date Submitted:	08/27/2022 09:11 PM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	Although, the LA Zoo Vision Plan Alternative 1.5 is the best option on the table for visitors, animals, and Griffith Park, please reconsider additional parking to the zoo. Increased parking capacity will encourage driving instead of other modes of transportation and is counter to the City of LA and the Zoo's climate change goals. Additionally, more vehicles in Griffith Park will mean greater danger to park visitors.

Communication from Public

Name: Bella Liu
Date Submitted: 08/27/2022 10:38 PM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: Reject Alternative 1.5 and support Alternative 1 instead unless Alternative 1.5 it is changed to preserve the native habitat in the California Planning Area and prevent excavation of Condor Canyon. LA Zoo is proposing Alternative 1.5 as better for the environment, even though it would destroy 15 of the 21 acres of native habitat Alternative 1 sets aside. The zoo claims that Alternative 1.5 will increase native plant use within zoo property, which supposedly makes up for developing on acres of native habitat. While native plants in the zoo would be beneficial, ecosystems are far more complex than the plants they're composed of -- in-zoo restoration comes nowhere close to preserving the complex system of soil, plants, and fauna in a native ecosystem. Conservation isn't just a moral issue -- it's directly related to practical interests. Our ecosystems purify our water and air, and they support organisms that benefit us. Birds and insects pollinate our crops and gardens, and natural predators keep nuisance species in check. Ecotourism generates massive revenue for the local economy. While destroying native habitat may seem economically beneficial in the short term, it is economically harmful in the long run. There are many endangered and threatened species in the proposed development area, as well as cultural relics of Native American tribes. I feel for the zoo, and I wish they could start a satellite location or some other alternative to give them land for growth -- I know they want to serve the public better, but Alternative 1.5 has such a high biodiversity cost.

Communication from Public

Name:	Jessica Hough
Date Submitted:	08/28/2022 09:00 PM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	August 28, 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 Via email: Norman.Mundy@lacity.org Re: LA Zoo Vision Plan Focused Recirculated EIR Comments Dear Mr. Mundy, I support the Zoo's mission of conservation, outreach and education, and look forward to supporting their plans for modernization; however, this cannot come at the expense of razing undeveloped lands, stripping mature trees from the property and disrupting the wildlife (native species) that currently call it home. This new Alternative 1.5 plan still includes the proposed, massive development of the California Area, which encompasses a currently undeveloped, largely native habitat (16.1 acres). Beyond developing this hillside, the prospect of a massive excavation project to create "Condor Canyon" would have a devastating, everlasting impact on Griffith Park. The Zoo should be working to preserve and protect native habitat and open space for the flora and fauna of Southern California. Please do not allow the zoo to expand its footprint into this part of Griffith Park. Thank you. Jessica Hough 3622 Landa Street Los Angeles CA 90039

Communication from Public

Name:	Bjorn Kindem
Date Submitted:	08/28/2022 11:47 PM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	Dear City Council, I am opposed to LA zoo expansion into more habitat of the Griffith Park. Please consider alternatives. Thank you, Bjorn Kinde