Communication from Public

Name:	Anath White
Date Submitted:	11/18/2021 05:54 AM
Council File No:	21-0828
Comments for Public Posting:	To Members of City Council: I strongly oppose the current L.A. Zoo Plan which would consume irreplaceable habitat and horse trails, which Griffith W. Griffith made a permanent part of his donation to the City. I join with all who implore you to replace that environmentally careless proposal with the much wiser alternative plan. Thank you. Sincerely, Anath White La Tuna Canyon

Communication from Public

Name: Lisa Hart
Date Submitted: 11/19/2021 03:02 PM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: The representatives of the Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance (NCSA) voted to support the LA Zoo project alternative 1 (the Reduced Project Alternative) and oppose both the original proposed project and alternative 2 (the Multi-modal Transportation Alternative) as described in the environmental impact report (EIR) (in Council File 21-0828). While the LA Zoo's general manager wrote that the vision for the zoo's "proposed infrastructure and animal facility improvements prioritize animal welfare, conservation, sustainability, operational excellence and being a community resource," we disagree, and we do think the improvements should prioritize animal welfare, conservation, and sustainability, in addition to biodiversity. Removing native habitat at the scale proposed in the project (21 acres) does not strike us as consistent with the stated vision, and, if given the choice between the proposed project and alternatives 1 and 2, we would much prefer alternative 1, which is identified in the EIR as the "environmentally superior alternative."

NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL SUSTAINABILITY ALLIANCE®

November 19, 2021

Dear City Council:

This month, the representatives of the Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance (NCSA) voted to support the LA Zoo project alternative 1 (the Reduced Project Alternative) and oppose both the original proposed project and alternative 2 (the Multi-modal Transportation Alternative) as described in the environmental impact report (EIR) (in Council File 21-0828).

While the LA Zoo's general manager wrote that the vision for the zoo's "proposed infrastructure and animal facility improvements prioritize animal welfare, conservation, sustainability, operational excellence and being a community resource," we disagree, and we do think the improvements should prioritize animal welfare, conservation, and sustainability, in addition to biodiversity. Removing native habitat at the scale proposed in the project (21 acres) does not strike us as consistent with the stated vision, and, if given the choice between the proposed project and alternatives 1 and 2, we would much prefer alternative 1, which is identified in the EIR as the "environmentally superior alternative."

Thank you,

Lisa Hart
Board Member

Communication from Public

Name: MICHAEL R PERRY
Date Submitted: 11/18/2021 10:33 AM
Council File No: 21-0828
Comments for Public Posting: The proposed Zoo Vision Plan is based on faulty, unsupported assumptions, notably, that the zoo and the park should compete with commercial entertainments like Disneyland. The glory of the park is its preservation of natural habitat. I object strongly to removing any healthy heritage tree from the park, especially protected species like coast live oaks. I strongly object to the proposed parking garage, and the increase in automotive traffic that a nighttime entertainment destination would bring. If you want to see animals, a zoo is a poor substitute for encountering them in their native habitat. In just the last six months I have photographed more than 100 species of birds in Griffith Park, not because someone brought them there for my amusement but because previous generations preserved the trees that shelter and feed them. In the past, short-term plans have chipped away at Griffith Park, bit by bit, and we will never get back Toyon Canyon, which was filled with garbage; nor will we ever recover the grounds under the I-5, which was once a picnic and play area. Stop this new assault on our beloved Griffith Park before it begins.