

Communication from Public

Name: Joseph Geumlek

Date Submitted: 08/29/2022 10:27 AM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: I support alternative 1.5 for the LA Zoo Vision plans. In particular, I find the focus on native plants such as the oaks to be crucial, as far too much of the Los Angeles basin environment has already been paved over and local species are struggling. The broader Griffith park area needs to remain a refuge of wilderness, and with that comes the need to rethink transportation into attractions like the Zoo. It is for that reason that I also applaud alternative 1.5 for eliminating the parking structure. Massive amounts of parking can only lead to two outcomes: one, they go unused, which is a massive waste of time, effort, space, and materials for this precious land, or two, they are used, which necessarily means higher traffic volumes by individual vehicles in this sensitive area. I have no doubt that the latter situation, with higher traffic, would require further road building in the future, leading to more destruction of land around the Zoo.

Communication from Public

Name: Esteban McKenzie

Date Submitted: 08/29/2022 10:28 AM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: I do not support adding additional parking to the LA Zoo. Griffith Park has lately taken steps to discourage driving in the park, to make it more enjoyable for all visitors. Adding parking runs contrary to sustainability goals. Zoo should instead focus on improving transit connections to the park via shuttles to metro stops.

Communication from Public

Name: Kristoffer Miller

Date Submitted: 08/29/2022 11:43 AM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: Regarding the Vision Plan being developed for the L.A. Zoo, I want to voice my opposition to adding any additional parking to Zoo facilities. Even the Alternative 1.5 plan, arguably the best proposal in terms of minimizing negative impacts, calls for an additional 300 parking spots. This will encourage more visitors to use private cars, which flies in the face of Zoo and City climate goals. Instead, the Zoo must evaluate alternatives, including ATP routes and implementing an electric shuttle that can connect to major transit centers in the area. We don't need to eliminate all parking, but the priority should be prioritizing other modes by making these more convenient.

Communication from Public

Name: Jamie Chen

Date Submitted: 08/29/2022 12:03 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: Please do not increase parking at the Los Angeles Zoo. The woodlands of Griffith Park are valuable wildlife habitat in our city and with legacy California native plants and Vision Plan Alternative 1.5 will remove woodlands. Instead, make it easier for visitors to the zoo to arrive by public transit options with improved bus frequency, please! And improve bicycling facilities. Or, consider electric shuttles connecting to parking lots and transit hubs outside of the park. Thank you!

Communication from Public

Name: Joshua Cooper

Date Submitted: 08/29/2022 12:34 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to NOT support any additional public parking at the LA Zoo. During a climate emergency, increasing parking will only incentivize more people to drive their personal vehicles to the zoo. This induced demand will only increase the carbon emissions that are driving the climate crisis. I believe that alternative methods like an electric shuttle should be considered. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Laura Gonzalez

Date Submitted: 08/29/2022 01:09 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: Hello! I do not support additional parking at the LA Zoo as outlined in the new 1.5 plan. 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. It would be better to bolster public transportation to the Zoo rather than encouraging people to drive. Laura Gonzalez Los Angeles, 90041

Communication from Public

Name: Elizabeth Neat

Date Submitted: 08/29/2022 03:28 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: I am a member of the Greater Los Angeles Zoo Association (GLAZA) and of Friends of Griffith Park (FoGP). I hope I never have to choose between the two because of a conflict of values and priorities. I fully-support the Zoo's mission of conservation, outreach and education, and I look forward to supporting their plans for modernization and evolution in the future; 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. The Alternative 1.5 plan is unacceptable to me, because the proposed, massive development of the California Area, which encompasses a currently undeveloped, largely native habitat (16.1 acres) and the prospect of a massive excavation project to create "Condor Canyon" would have a devastating, everlasting impact on Griffith Park. I support Alternative 1.5, but without development of the California Area, including its new Visitor Center along the ridge line and excavated "Condor Canyon." I sincerely hope that the zoo and the city of LA are able to move forward without this devastating impact on Griffith Park, which is so valuable to so many Angelenos.

Communication from Public

Name: Andre Villasenor

Date Submitted: 08/29/2022 04:53 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: O ADDITIONAL PARKING AT THE LOS ANGELES ZOO!
Hello, Regarding your vision plan, I do not support any additional motor vehicle parking for L.A. Zoo patrons. We are in a climate emergency and need to reduce motor vehicle use. Instead, provide secure parking for bikes and e-scooter and build a comprehensive network of protected bike lanes within Griffith Park. Also, provide extra public transit.

Communication from Public

Name: Jennifer Lim

Date Submitted: 08/29/2022 07:31 PM

Council File No: 21-0828

Comments for Public Posting: No to the destruction of the natural habitat at one of the most beautiful parts of Griffith Park, which includes the Condor Trail and Skyline Trail, for creating another [second-rate] amusement park by the name of “Condor Canyon” for rock climbing. This area is already in usage as a popular equestrian trail. Adding an equestrian lodge could provide a weekend recreation venue which does not involve the wide-scale destruction of natural habitat. Although the L.A. Zoo has provided affordable recreation activity for Los Angeles families, its primary value consists of being affordable. The increase of visitors for the new amusement park will only increase traffic congestion and SMOG. If the L.A. Zoo is anything to go by, we see birds in captivity and clipped wings, for the sake of providing a spectacle to visitors. At certain spots of the Zoo which are designated for bird watching, we don’t see any birds. Nature cannot flourish in captivity. For comparison, the Berlin Zoo (which is rated second in the world) with 86.5 acres and award-winning architecture that houses 1380 species, while LA Zoo spans 133 acres and houses 280 species. Foot-by-foot, the Berlin Zoo has made better use of the land that it has taken away from nature. In the choice between naturally beautiful Griffith Park and the ugly LA Zoo, the natural habitat and majestic vistas of the park is a superior gift to the public and a better tourist venue. We don’t have a Griffith Park Nature Center, while other regional parks have a nature center. The park can provide a central venue for outdoor youth and physical education classes and an important venue for public education and ecological activities. I have attached a collage of 6 photos taken from different parts of the site area, during different times of the day, to illustrate why the man-made structures in the park have not matched the natural beauty and grandeur of the park. Thank you for your time and consideration.

