3.15 TRANSPORTATION

As a regional attraction, the Los Angeles Zoo draws 1.8 million visitors a year and employs 570 staff, the majority of who use a private vehicle to travel to the Zoo daily. The widespread distribution of Zoo patrons and employees across the Los Angeles region, limited accessible transit within Griffith Park, and distance to surrounding communities limits the viability of using transit, biking, or walking by Zoo patrons and staff, presenting a challenge to reduce the length and total number of vehicle trips generated by the Zoo now and under the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan. Existing and projected vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would be greater than the City and regional averages and would exceed City transportation thresholds. However, a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program would help the Zoo achieve at least a 10 percent reduction of existing employee VMT and a measurable reduction of projected visitor VMT to help achieve measurable GHG reductions consistent with the goals of the California Climate Change Scoping Plan and local GHG plans. Even with robust mitigation, VMT transportation impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

This section analyzes the potential environmental effects of the proposed Los Angeles Zoo (Zoo) Vision Plan (Project) related to transportation as defined under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the consistency with the existing policy framework applicable in the City of Los Angeles (City). This analysis describes the existing transportation facilities in the Project area and the current travel trends of Zoo visitors and employees, including trip lengths, mode choice, and peak visitation days. Consistent with state law and local regulations, this analysis employs a new approach to assessing transportation impacts using vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the numeric threshold, as well as evaluating the Project’s effectiveness and accessibility for all modes of transportation to meet mobility needs of Zoo patrons and employees. This section also evaluates the consistency of the Project with applicable regional and local circulation goals, plans, programs, and policies, including state goals to reduce VMT by 15 percent by 2050. This analysis is informed by a Transportation Assessment prepared for the Project consistent with the City Department of Transportation (LADOT) Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG).

Transportation impact analysis under CEQA considers the Project’s VMT compared to City thresholds and consistency with applicable policies and plans for multimodal accessibility throughout the City. Photo: Griffith Park Line Shuttle, ABC 2019
As discussed in detail below, changes in state law now require VMT analysis measuring vehicle trip distance rather than Level of Service (LOS) analysis measuring intersection congestion and roadway capacity. This reflects state policy goals to reduce vehicle energy use, particularly that associated with non-renewable fossil fuels, and associated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and their adverse effects on global climate change. VMT is a measure of the amount and distance that residents, employees, or visitors drive, determined by multiplying trip generation by the average length of the trips measured in miles. VMT per capita is calculated as the total annual miles of vehicle travel divided by the total population in the planning area. Many factors affect travel behavior, including density and diversity of land uses, design of the transportation network, access to regional destinations, distance to high quality transit and active transportation facilities, development scale, demographics, and transportation demand management (TDM). Typically, low density development at greater distances from other land uses, located in areas with poor access to non-private vehicular modes of travel, generate more automobile travel compared to development located in urban areas, where there is higher population density and a mix of land uses (e.g., commercial uses near housing), and travel options other than private vehicles are available.

### 3.15.1 Environmental Setting

#### Regulatory Setting

**Federal Regulations**

**Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**

Titles I, II, III, and V of the ADA have been codified in Title 42 of the U.S. Code (USC), beginning at Section 12101. Title III prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in places of public accommodation (i.e., businesses and non-profit agencies that serve the public) and commercial facilities (i.e., other businesses). This regulation includes Appendix A to Part 36, Standards for Accessible Design, which establishes minimum standards for ensuring accessibility when designing and constructing a new facility or altering an existing facility.

Examples of key guidelines include detectable warning for pedestrians entering traffic where there is no curb, a clear zone of 48 inches for the pedestrian travelway, and a vibration-free zone for pedestrians.

**State Regulations**

**Statewide Transportation Improvement Program**

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) administers transportation improvement programming. Transportation programming is the public decision-making process, that sets priorities and funds projects envisioned in long-range transportation plans. It commits expected revenues over a multi-year period to transportation projects. The State
Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year Capital Improvement Program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from the State Highway Account and other funding sources. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) manages the operation of State Highways, including the freeways passing through the Los Angeles Region.

**Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006**

Transportation is the largest single sector of the economy that generates GHGs, and changes in transportation are a focus of several statewide regulations to reduce VMT and increase access to non-vehicular modes of travel. The Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32) commits the State of California to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 acknowledges that such emissions cause significant adverse impacts to human health and the environment, and therefore must be identified and mitigated where appropriate. Achieving these goals requires a reduction of approximately 30 percent from projected state emission levels and 15 percent from 2006 state levels, with even more substantial reductions required in the future. Pursuant to AB 32, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) must adopt regulations to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emission reductions.

**Senate Bill (SB) 32, Executive Order B-30-15**

In 2016, the California State Legislature adopted Senate Bill (SB) 32 to reduce statewide GHG emissions by 2020 to 1990 levels and by 2030 to 40 percent less than 1990 levels. SB 32 updates AB 32 and establishes an intermediate goal of achieving 80 percent reductions in GHG emissions by 2050. Such reductions will require major changes in the transportation sector. This intermediate target was codified into law by SB 32, which was signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown on September 8, 2016.

**SB 375, California’s Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act**

The adoption of SB 375 on September 30, 2008 recognizes the connection between land use planning and reliance on vehicles as the primary mode of transportation, with the result being that emissions from vehicles account for 30 percent of GHG emissions in California. SB 375 aligns the goals of regional transportation planning efforts, regional GHG reduction targets, and land use and housing allocations, and requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), such as the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), to adopt a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) within their regional transportation plan to demonstrate achievement of GHG reduction targets. As discussed below, in compliance with SB 375, SCAG has adopted the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), which guides land use and transportation planning for the region and City to reduce transportation related GHG emissions. On September 3, 2020, SCAG’s Regional Council unanimously voted to approve and fully adopt the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal).
SB 743
To further the state’s commitment to the goals of SB 375, AB 32, and AB 1358, Governor Brown signed SB 743 on September 27, 2013. SB 743 adds Chapter 2.7, Modernization of Transportation Analysis for Transit-Oriented Infill Projects, to Division 13 (Section 21099) of the Public Resources Code. Key provisions of SB 743 include eliminating the measurement of vehicle delay, or LOS, as a metric that can be used for measuring traffic impacts. Under SB 743, the focus of transportation analysis shifts from LOS to VMT and the reduction of GHG emissions through the creation of multimodal transportation networks and promotion of a mix of land uses to reduce VMT. SB 743 required the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend the CEQA Guidelines to provide an alternative to LOS for evaluating transportation impacts. Particularly for areas served by transit [i.e., transit priority areas (TPA)], those alternative criteria must “promote the reduction of GHG emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses” (New Public Resources Code Section 21099[b][1]). Measurements of transportation impacts may include “vehicle miles traveled, vehicle miles traveled per capita, automobile trip generation rates, or automobile trips generated.” OPR also has discretion to develop alternative criteria for areas that are not served by transit, if appropriate.

Pursuant to the mandate in SB 743, OPR adopted the revised CEQA Guidelines in December 2018, recommending the use of VMT for analyzing transportation impacts under CEQA. In turn, Section 15064.3 was added to CEQA Guidelines, which states “generally, vehicle miles traveled is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts.” The revised guidelines require that lead agencies remove automobile delay, as described solely by LOS or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion, as a criterion for determining a significant impact on the environment pursuant to CEQA, except in locations specifically identified in the revised guidelines, if any. In accordance with this requirement, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(a), adopted in December 2018, states “a project’s effect on automobile delay does not constitute a significant environmental impact.”

As noted below, on July 30, 2019, the City adopted VMT as part of its CEQA Transportation Thresholds as a criterion to determine transportation impacts, pursuant to SB 743 and the recent changes to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3.

California’s 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan
CARB is responsible for the coordination and administration of both federal and state air pollution control programs within California. CARB’s 2017 Scoping Plan reflects the new statewide GHG emissions reduction goals called for in SB 32 of 40 percent below 1990 emissions levels by 2030.

In the transportation sector, GHG emissions reducing measures include low carbon fuels, cleaner vehicles, and strategies to promote sustainable communities and improved transportation choices that result in curbing the growth in VMT (CARB 2017). Relative to
transportation, the Scoping Plan includes measures to reduce VMT and vehicle GHGs, including, but not limited to:

- Pursue 15 percent reduction in light duty VMT from Business as Usual by 2050.
- Promote all feasible policies to reduce VMT, including land use and community design that reduce VMT such as transit-oriented development.
- Implement complete street design policies that prioritize transit, biking, and walking.
- Increase low carbon mobility choices, including improved access to viable and affordable public transportation and active transportation opportunities.
- Developing pricing mechanisms such as road user/VMT-based pricing, congestion pricing, and parking pricing strategies,
- Reduce GHG emissions through commute trip reduction strategies, and programs to maximize the use of alternatives to single-occupant vehicles, including bicycling, walking, transit use, and shared mobility options.
- Accelerating equitable and affordable transit-oriented and infill development through new and enhanced financing and policy incentives and mechanisms.
- Increase the number, safety, connectivity, and attractiveness of biking and walking facilities to increase use.

**AB 1358, the California Complete Streets Act of 2008**

Governor Schwarzenegger signed AB 1358 into law on September 30, 2008. AB 1358 requires cities and counties to modify the circulation element to plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit riders, children, older people, and disabled people, as well as motorists.

**Congestion Management Program (CMP)**

The CMP was established statewide in 1990 to implement Proposition 111, tying appropriation of new gas tax revenues to congestion reduction efforts. The CMP is managed at the countywide level and primarily uses an LOS performance metric, which is inconsistent with more recent state efforts to transition to VMT-based performance metrics. California Government Code Section 65088.3 allows counties to opt out of CMP requirements without penalty, if a majority of local jurisdictions representing a majority of a county’s population formally adopt resolutions requesting to opt out of the program.

On June 20, 2018, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) initiated a process to gauge the interest of local jurisdictions in opting out of State CMP requirements. On July 30, 2019, the Los Angeles City Council passed a resolution to opt out of the CMP program, and on August 28, 2019, Metro announced that the thresholds had been reached and the County of Los Angeles had opted to be exempt from the CMP. As such, the provisions of the CMP no longer apply to any of the 89 local jurisdictions in Los Angeles County. Accordingly, CMP analysis is no longer included in City of Los Angeles environmental documents.
Parking Cash Out

Parking Cash Out, addressed by AB 2109, requires employers of 50 or more employees who lease their parking and subsidize any part of their employee parking to offer their employees the opportunity to give up their parking space and rideshare to work instead. In return for giving up their parking space, the employer pays the employee the cost of the parking space.

Regional Regulations

SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

SCAG is the designated MPO for six Southern California counties (Los Angeles, Ventura, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, and Imperial), and is federally mandated to develop plans for regional transportation, land use and growth management, and air quality. The City is one of many local and regional jurisdictions comprising SCAG.

SCAG updates its long-range (i.e., minimum 20 years) Regional Transportation Improvement Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) every four years, per federal law (23 U.S.C.A. §134 et seq) and state law (SB 375). The SCS is a required element of the RTP that provides a plan for meeting GHG emissions reduction targets set forth by the CARB. SCAG's 2016–2040 RTP/SCS provides growth forecasts that are used in the development of air quality-related land use and transportation control strategies by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). CARB has determined SCAG’s reduction target for per capita vehicular emissions to be 8 percent by 2020 and 13 percent by 2035 relative to the 2005 baseline.

In June 2016, CARB determined that SCAG’s 2016–2040 RTP/SCS is consistent with their GHG reduction targets. Successfully meeting these targets will require substantial effort to reduce VMT. The 2016 RTP/SCS calls for investing $6.9 billion toward TDM strategies throughout the region. These strategies focus on reducing the number of drive-alone trips and overall VMT through ridesharing, which includes carpooling, vanpooling and supportive policies for ridesharing services such as Uber and Lyft; redistributing or eliminating vehicle trips from peak demand periods through incentives for telecommuting and alternative work schedules; and reducing the number of drive-alone trips through increased use of transit, rail, bicycling, walking and other alternative modes of travel.

Of the eight goals presented in the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS, four are applicable to transportation, including the following:

- Goal 2: Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.
- Goal 3: Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region.
- Goal 5: Maximize the productivity of our transportation system.
- Goal 6: Protect the environment and health of our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation (e.g., bicycling and walking).
On September 3, 2020, SCAG’s Regional Council unanimously voted to approve and fully adopt the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal). The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS includes more than three years of consultation with stakeholders and the public to capture the goals and objectives of the people within the region and capture the most current available data for determining future demographic projections. The intent of the plan is to build upon and expand land use and transportation strategies established over several planning cycles to increase mobility options and achieve a more sustainable growth pattern.

**Metro Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) & Congestion Management Program (CMP)**

Metro’s LRTP, adopted in 2009, provides a 30-year vision for Los Angeles County’s transportation system to the year 2040. The LRTP identifies public transportation and highway projects, funding forecasts over a 30-year timeframe, multi-modal funding availability, sub-regional needs, and project performance measures. The current LRTP addresses regional public transit and highways and does not propose any transit improvements in Griffith Park or in proximity to the Zoo. The County and City of Los Angeles are now exempt from CMP. There are no outstanding planned LRTP improvements within the vicinity of the Zoo.

**Local Regulations**

**City of Los Angeles General Plan**

The City General Plan sets forth goals, objectives, and programs for land use and development to meet the existing and future needs and desires of the community while integrating a range of state-mandated elements. The City includes 35 geographic community plan areas with specific growth and development policies. The community plans are focused on specific geographic areas of the City, locally defining the General Plan’s more general citywide policies and programs. The Project site is in the Hollywood Community Plan area.

In addition, LADOT is responsible for traffic operations in the City. As part of their responsibilities, LADOT establishes thresholds for determining when projects require traffic studies, established significance thresholds for evaluating traffic impacts, and reviews and authorizes work plans for construction that encroaches into public streets.

**Air Quality Element**

The Air Quality Element of the City’s General Plan includes the following goals, objectives, and policies aimed to reduce vehicle trips and VMT to minimize the associated GHG emissions.

**Goal 2.** Less reliance on single-occupant vehicles with fewer commute and non-work trips.

**Objective 2.1.** *It is the objective of the City of Los Angeles to reduce work trips as a step towards attaining trip reduction objectives necessary to achieve regional air quality goals.*
Policy 2.1.1. Utilize compressed work weeks and flextime, telecommuting, carpooling, vanpooling, public transit, and improve walking/bicycling related facilities in order to reduce Vehicle Trips and/or VMT as an employer and encourage the private sector to do the same to reduce work trips and traffic congestion.

Objective 2.2. It is the objective of the City of Los Angeles to increase vehicle occupancy for non-work trips by creating disincentives for single passenger vehicles, and incentives for high occupancy vehicles.

Policy 2.2.1. Discourage single-occupant vehicle use through a variety of measures such as market incentive strategies, mode-shift incentives, trip reduction plans, and ridesharing subsidies.

Policy 2.2.2. Encourage multi-occupant vehicle travel and discourage single-occupant vehicle travel by instituting parking management practices.

Policy 2.2.3. Minimize the use of single-occupant vehicles associated with special events or in areas and times of high levels of pedestrian activities.

Goal 4. Minimal impact of existing land use patterns and future land use developments on air quality standards as a primary consideration in land use planning.

Objective 4.2. It is the objective of the City of Los Angeles to reduce vehicle trips and VMT associated with land use patterns.

Policy 4.2.3. Ensure that new development is compatible with pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and alternative fuel vehicles.

Policy 4.2.5. Emphasize trip reduction, alternative transit, and congestion management measures for discretionary projects.

Mobility Element - Mobility Plan 2035

Mobility Plan 2035, which was adopted by the City Council on January 20, 2016, is a comprehensive update of the City’s Transportation Element and incorporates “complete streets” principles.

Mobility Plan 2035 includes goals that define the City’s five main priorities: 1) Safety First; 2) World Class Infrastructure; 3) Access for All Angelenos; 4) Collaboration, Communication and Informed Choices; and 5) Clean Environmental & Healthy Communities. Mobility Plan 2035 serves to meet the goal in SCAG’s 2016-2040 RTP/SCS to decrease the VMT per capita by 5 percent every five years, to 20 percent by 2035 and to meet a 9 percent per capita GHG reduction by 2020, and a 16 percent per capita reduction by 2035.

Mobility Plan 2035 includes roadway definitions and designations pursuant to updated policies and current transportation needs in the City, including the following:
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- Freeways - High-volume, high-speed roadways with limited access provided by interchanges that carry regional traffic through and do not provide local access to adjacent land uses.
- Arterial Streets - Major streets that serve through traffic and provide access to major commercial activity centers. Arterials are divided into two categories:
  - Boulevards represent the widest streets that typically provide regional access to major destinations and include two categories:
    - Boulevard I provide up to four travel lanes in each direction with a target operating speed of 40 miles per hour (mph).
    - Boulevard II provide up to three travel lanes in each direction with a target operating speed of 35 mph.
  - Avenues pass through both residential and commercial areas and include three categories:
    - Avenue I provide up to two travel lanes in each direction with a target operating speed of 35 mph.
    - Avenue II provide up to two travel lanes in each direction with a target operating speed of 30 mph.
    - Avenue III provide up to two travel lanes in each direction with a target operating speed of 25 mph.
- Collector Streets - Generally located in residential neighborhoods and provide access to and from arterial streets for local traffic and are not intended for cut-through traffic. Collector Streets provide one travel lane in each direction with a target operating speed of 25 mph.
- Local Streets - Intended to accommodate lower volumes of vehicle traffic and provide parking on both sides of the street. Local Streets provide one travel lane in each direction with a target operating speed of 15 to 20 mph. Local Streets can be:
  - Continuous local streets that connect to other streets at both ends.
  - Non-Continuous local streets that lead to a dead-end.

In addition, Mobility Plan 2035 identifies corridors proposed to receive improved bicycle, pedestrian, transit, and vehicle infrastructure improvements. Each of the networks are defined as the following:

- The Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN) identifies a selection of streets that provide comfortable and safe routes for localized travel of slower-moving modes, such as walking, bicycling, or other slow speed motorized means of travel.
- The Transit Enhanced Network (TEN) identifies a network of arterial streets prioritized to improve existing and future bus service for transit riders.
• The Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN) identifies a network of streets that will receive treatments that prioritize bicyclists. The bicycle network is described in Policy 2.6 of Mobility Plan 2035 and includes gap closures for the protected bicycle lane system, bicycle paths, and Tier 1 protected Bicycle Lanes, which are bicycle facilities on arterial roadways with physical separation.

• The Bicycle Lane Network (BLN) identifies a network of streets that will receive treatments that prioritize bicyclists, specifically Tier 2 and Tier 3 Bicycle Lanes. Tier 2 and Tier 3 Bicycle Lanes are facilities on roadways with striped separation. Tier 2 Bicycle Lanes are those more likely to be built by 2035.

• The Vehicle Enhanced Network (VEN) identifies streets that prioritize vehicular movement and offer safe, consistent travel speeds and reliable travel times.

• The Pedestrian Enhanced Districts (PEDs) identify where pedestrian improvements on arterial streets could be prioritized to provide better walking connections to and from the major destinations within communities.

The following policies from the Mobility Plan 2035 are applicable to the proposed Project:

**Policy 1.2.** Implement a balanced transportation system on all streets, tunnels, and bridges using complete streets principles to ensure the safety and mobility of all users.

**Policy 1.3.** Prioritize the safety of school children on all streets regardless of highway classifications.

**Policy 2.1.** Design, plan, and operate streets to serve multiple purposes and provide flexibility in design to adapt to future demands.

**Policy 2.3.** Recognize walking as a component of every trip and ensure high-quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right-of-way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.

**Policy 2.4.** Provide a slow speed network of locally serving streets.

**Policy 2.5.** Improve the performance and reliability of existing and future bus service.

**Policy 2.6.** Provide safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities* for people of all types and abilities.

**Policy 3.1.** Recognize all modes of travel, including pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicular modes - including goods movement – as integral components of the City’s transportation system.

**Policy 3.2.** Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities when modifying or installing infrastructure in the public right-of-way.
Policy 3.5. Support “first-mile, last-mile solutions” such as multi-modal transportation services, organizations, and activities in the areas around transit stations and major bus stops (transit stops) to maximize multi-modal connectivity and access for transit riders.

Policy 3.8. Provide bicyclists with convenient, secure, and well-maintained bicycle parking facilities.

Policy 5.2. Support ways to reduce VMT per capita.

**Bicycle Plan**

The 2010 Bicycle Plan, which is part of Mobility Plan 2035, guides the development of a Citywide bicycle transportation system and establishes standards for development of these facilities, as well as criteria for prioritization of development of designated routes. With a stated policy to reduce automobile trips and GHG emissions by making five percent of all daily trips and three percent of commute trips bicycle trips by 2020, the 2010 Bicycle Plan establishes a Backbone Bikeway Network and Neighborhood Bikeway Network linking Regional Centers to promote bicycle usage.

**Hollywood Community Plan**

The Project site is located within the boundaries of the Hollywood Community Plan. The Hollywood Community Plan provides a planning policy framework for the Hollywood and Los Feliz communities, as well as the larger 25-square-mile area, which lies south of the U.S. Highway 101 (Ventura Freeway) and west of the Interstate 5 (I-5) and which includes the Zoo. The Community Plan was initially adopted in 1988 and addresses land use within its boundaries through the year 2010. While an updated Community Plan is currently under development, the 1988 plan addresses City policy regarding transportation.

The 1988 Hollywood Community Plan includes the following transportation and circulation objectives and policies that are applicable to the Project:

**Objective 6:** To make provision for a circulation system coordinated with land uses and densities and adequate to accommodate traffic; and to encourage the expansion and improvement of public transportation service.

The Community Plan also includes a circulation policy section and a circulation public improvement program. The Hollywood Community Plan requires arterials and local streets to be developed with standards and criteria contained in the Mobility Plan 2035, and supports continued planning of and improvements to the public transportation system of the community, including people-mover systems in high intensity areas as well as the proposed Metro Rail System.
Vision Zero

Vision Zero: Eliminating Traffic Deaths in Los Angeles by 2025, is a traffic safety policy that promotes strategies to eliminate collisions that result in severe injury or death by 2025. In this regard, it promotes a culture of shared responsibility, where both designers and policymakers, not just the users (i.e., motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrian), are held accountable for deaths on streets.

Vision Zero programs typically address safety through coordinated engineering, enforcement, and education efforts. Traditional road design models tend to facilitate faster movement of cars, but the Vision Zero philosophy calls for reordering the priorities to make roads as safe as possible, particularly for more vulnerable street users like cyclists and pedestrians. Strategies to slow car traffic to speeds less likely to cause death and serious injury to pedestrians and bicyclists include wider sidewalks, reduced or narrowed car lanes, added bike lanes, bulb-outs of curb corners and improved signals. Traffic enforcement efforts focus on infractions most likely to cause death and serious injury, such as speeding, running red lights, and not yielding to pedestrians. Some places rely on automated speed and red-light enforcement cameras. Education campaigns aim to raise public awareness of the problem, reframe assumptions about traffic safety, and gain support for changes.

LADOT has collected data on traffic crashes in the City and identified a network of street segments with the highest share of serious and fatal crashes, which it calls the High Injury Network (HIN). The HIN, composed of only 6 percent of streets in the City, account for two-thirds of all serious and fatal crashes. Targeting improvements on these streets is a Vision Zero goal that could significantly reduce fatalities.

Sustainable City Plan – L.A.’s Green New Deal

The Green New Deal Plan (2019) is the first four-year update to the 2015 Sustainable City pLAn. Of the plan’s 13 chapters, two are applicable to transportation: Mobility & Public Transit and Zero Emission Vehicles. The plan augments and expands the City’s vision for a sustainable future and presents accelerated targets and new aggressive goals to address the climate emergency. The 2019 update includes four key principles, including: (1) a commitment to the Paris Climate Agreement and to act urgently with a scientifically-driven strategy for achieving a zero carbon grid, zero carbon transportation, zero carbon buildings, zero waste, and zero wasted water; (2) a responsibility to deliver environmental justice and equity through an inclusive economy, producing results at the community level, guided by communities themselves; (3) a duty to ensure that every Angeleno has the ability to join the green economy, creating pipelines to good paying, green jobs and a just transition in a changing work environment; and (4) a resolve to demonstrate the art of the possible and lead the way, walking the walk and using the City’s resources - our people and our budget - to drive change.
Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles

Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles: A Health and Wellness Element of the General Plan (Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles) provides guidelines to enhance the City’s position as a regional leader in health and equity, encourage healthy design and equitable access, and increase awareness of equity and environmental issues. The Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles addresses GHG emission reductions and social connectedness, which are affected by the land use pattern and transportation opportunities.

Griffith Park Circulation and Parking Enhancement Plan (CPEP)

In 2016, the City Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) published the Griffith Park Circulation and Parking Enhancement Plan (CPEP). The CPEP includes roadway and parking lot improvements within the vicinity of Griffith Observatory to improve multi-modal circulation; implementation of paid parking at Griffith Observatory and along adjacent roadways; expansion of Metro and/or DASH transit services to the Griffith Park Observatory; and introduction of shuttle system to improve public access, paid for through parking revenue from implementation of the paid parking at the Observatory. Paid parking costs $10/hour between noon and 10:00 PM when the park closes. Despite these fees, RAP reports that parking around the Observatory remains in high demand. DASH implemented new shuttle service to the Observatory in 2017, which was combined with the DASH Los Feliz shuttle in 2019.

Mobility Hubs Reader’s Guide

Mobility Hubs: A Reader’s Guide (Mobility Hub Guide) provides guidance for enhancing transportation connections and multi-modal improvements in proximity to new or existing transit stations. The Mobility Hub Guide focuses on enhancing bicycle connections, providing vehicle sharing services, improving bus infrastructure, providing real-time transit and wayfinding information, and enhancing walkability and pedestrian connections.

Walkability Checklist

The Walkability Checklist – Guidance for Entitlement Review (Walkability Checklist) serves as a guide for enhancing pedestrian movement, access, comfort, and safety to contribute to the overall walkability of the City. Transportation-applicable topics include sidewalks, crosswalks/street crossings, on-street parking, building orientation, and off-street parking and driveways.

LADOT Manual of Policies and Procedures

The Manual of Policies and Procedures is LADOT’s document containing design standards and guidelines for driveways, striping, channelization, special signing, and traffic signal timing and operation.
Comprehensive Strategies Report: Improving Access, Safety, and Mobility Around Griffith Park & the Hollywood Sign (CSR)

In 2018, Los Angeles Council District 4 released the CSR to assess strategies to improve access and reduce congestion in Griffith Park, including high visitation to view the Hollywood Sign. Goals of the report included reducing neighborhood congestion, enhancing pedestrian safety, improving access to Griffith Park and trailheads, expanding transit opportunities, improving traffic flow and reducing congestion, improving emergency vehicle access, increasing parking efficiency, and actively managing and providing visitor opportunities. Strategies which potentially relate to or impact the Zoo include development of a Griffith Park Transit Hub and Aerial Transit System (ATS). The ATS is currently undergoing a feasibility analysis. While a feasibility study is currently underway, and no site has been selected, sites under consideration for a Transit Hub and ATS include the north and south Zoo parking lots, Travel Town, and Universal Studios. The ATS as currently proposed would have a single destination to provide enhanced ease of access for viewing of the Hollywood Sign, which could become a major tourist attraction.

1978 Griffith Park Master Plan (Non-adopted Local Plan)

Although not officially adopted, the 1978 Griffith Park Master Plan established an important informal policy framework that has helped to guide planning and facilities development actions within Griffith Park over the last few decades. The Plan presents two overarching goals. The first goal is that of creating greater visual coherence and visual quality and establishing park gateways to provide a sense of arrival and orientation to visitors. The second goal is the establishment of a balanced mobility system utilizing mass transit, automobile, pedestrian, and bicycle access to and within the Park, including better connections between the existing Park parking areas. Goal 4 specifies intention to improve the established civic function of Griffith Park. Goal 5 specifies intention to improve the parkwide transportation systems.

2013 Griffith Park Vision Plan

In 2013, RAP released the draft “Vision Plan for Griffith Park: An Urban Wilderness Identity.” The Plan was originally conceived as a “Master Plan,” then changed to a “Vision Plan” and finally adopted as “A Vision for Griffith Park” by the Los Angeles Recreation and Park Commission on January 8, 2014. The plan states that while it is not a Master Plan for Griffith Park, the Griffith Park Master Plan Working Group, the City, and RAP intended the Plan to guide decisions made for Griffith Park until a full Master Plan is developed and adopted.

The Griffith Park Vision Plan states that Griffith Park should retain an urban wilderness identity. The Griffith Park Vision Plan also acknowledges the unique developed portions of the park, including the Zoo and the Autry Museum of the West. The 2013 Griffith Park Vision Plan applies only to those areas of Griffith Park owned and managed by RAP and does not apply to the Zoo property.
The Griffith Park Vision Plan includes the following goals and objectives that are specific to transportation within the park:

- Work with the City and County to increase public transportation to and within the Park.
- Improve Park mobility, including making the Park universally accessible while protecting the natural environment, and developing a comprehensive transportation system that provides circulation within the Park.
- Establish additional, high-frequency, Metro Bus and DASH Bus routes to bring visitors to the Park.
- Extend existing DASH Bus lines serving the greater Los Feliz area to bring visitors to the Vermont Canyon and Western Canyon areas of the Park.
- Establish new DASH connections to link the Park to the Metro Red Line subway stops at Vermont/Sunset and Hollywood Western.
- Enable visitors to access the Park by a subway stop located near the Zoo and the Autry, in the long term. Such a stop would permit users to access the Park and simultaneously reduce traffic on surrounding streets as well as GHG emissions.
- Develop a park shuttle system.
- Alleviate parking shortages through a park-and-ride shuttle system utilizing contingency parking areas.
- Locate parking structures immediately outside the boundaries of the Park with a fully developed park and ride shuttle system available to transport Park users into and around the Park.
- Prioritize accessibility to the Park by means other than by private automobile, consistent with the City’s planning for higher density and decreased use of the individual automobile.
- Eliminate speeding within the Park, which presents a safety hazard for Park visitors especially within the Zoo Drive/Crystal Springs Drive/Griffith Park Drive corridor.

City of Los Angeles Policies for Bicycle Parking Requirements

- **LAMC Section 12.21 A.16.(a)(4).** In all buildings or parking lots used by the City of Los Angeles for government purposes, including government office buildings, both short-term and long-term bicycle parking shall be provided at a rate of 10 percent of the required parking available on the site. However, short- and long-term bicycle parking shall be no less than five spaces each for the entire site.
- **LAMC Section 12.21 A.16.(a)(5).** In Neighborhood Recreation Sites, Community Recreation Sites, Regional Parks, and School Playgrounds, as defined in Section 1 of the Service Systems Element - Public Recreation Plan of the City’s General Plan, short-term bicycle parking shall be provided at a rate of 10 percent of the required automobile parking with a minimum of five short-term bicycle parking spaces. In Neighborhood Recreation Sites, Community Recreation Sites, Regional Parks, and
School Playgrounds where no automobile parking is provided, at least five short-term bicycle parking spaces will be provided, except that in park space of less than two acres in which there are no recreational facilities requiring building permits, no short-term bicycle parking shall be required. Long-term bicycle parking shall be provided as required in the California Green Building Standards Code Section 5.106.4 as that section may be amended from time to time.

Existing Conditions

Statewide VMT and Mode Split

Statewide VMT is highly variable and is affected by population centers, density of development, and the mix of land uses within an area. Caltrans reports a total of 344.3 billion statewide annual VMT and 943.3 million daily VMT in 2017 (the most recent data available) (Caltrans 2019; see Table 3.15-1). According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the 2017 population for the state California was 39.36 million (U.S. Census Bureau 2017). Therefore, the 2017 statewide annual VMT per capita was approximately 8,747 miles (approximately 23.97 daily VMT per capita).

Table 3.15-1. Statewide Annual and Daily VMT in 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Roads</th>
<th>Annual VMT (in billions)</th>
<th>Daily VMT (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Highways</td>
<td>187.1</td>
<td>512.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Roads(^1)</td>
<td>155.8</td>
<td>426.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies(^2)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of All Public Roads(^3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>344.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>943.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Totals may not equal sum of components due to independent rounding.

\(^1\) Includes city streets and county roads only

\(^2\) Includes federal, other state and other local jurisdictions

\(^3\) All public roads include those owned by cities, counties, and various state and federal agencies

Source: Caltrans 2019.

A majority (approximately 73.6 percent) of the employed population in California drove to work alone in 2017. A smaller portion of the population carpooled (10.4 percent) and took public transit (5.2 percent) to work. Approximately 2.7 percent of the state population walked to work, 1.1 percent biked, and 1.5 percent took a taxi, rode a motorcycle, or chose other means of transportation. Approximately 5.6 percent of the state population worked at home. The average vehicle occupancy (AVO) of workers who drove (alone or carpool) was 1.07 persons per vehicle (see Chart 3.15-1; U. S. Census Bureau 2017).

---

\(^1\) The 2020 COVID-19 pandemic has substantially affected travel behavior, with millions of Californians unemployed or working from home; it is unclear what the longer-term implications of this Pandemic on travel behavior will be.
Regional VMT and Mode Split

According to the SCAG Transportation Safety Regional Existing Conditions report, the SCAG region includes a population of 19 million and a total of 8,700 annual average of VMT per capita in 2017 (SCAG 2017). The SCAG’s regional VMT equates to a daily VMT per capita of approximately 23.8 within the greater Los Angeles region.

The 2017 population for Los Angeles County was 10,163,507. The countywide annual VMT per capita in 2017 was 8,000 annual VMT per capita (approximately 21.9 daily VMT per capita) (SCAG 2017; County of Los Angeles 2019).

In Los Angeles County, 74 percent of the employed population drove to work alone in 2017. Less people carpooled to work (9.5 percent) and more people took public transportation (6 percent) than the state averages described above. Similar to the State of California, 2.7 percent of the County’s population walked to work, 0.7 percent biked, and 1.9 percent of the population got to work by taxi, motorcycle, or other means. The remaining 5.6 percent of the County’s population worked at home. The AVO of workers who drove (alone or carpool) was 1.07 persons per vehicle, identical to the state AVO (refer to Chart 3.15-1; U. S. Census Bureau 2017).

Citywide VMT and Mode Split

Within the City, the annual VMT per capita is 3,395 (9.3 daily VMT per capita). The annual VMT per employee is 4,709 (12.9 daily VMT per employee). Citywide average VMT is substantially lower than statewide or countywide averages. The average VMT per capita and per employee in the jurisdictions of the City's seven Area Planning Commissions (APCs) are...
enumerated in Table 3.15-2 below. The Zoo lies within the Central APC, which has a relatively low daily VMT per capita compared to the other APCs in the City; only the South Los Angeles APC is similar (LADOT 2019).

Table 3.15-2. Average VMT per Capita by Area Planning Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Planning Commission</th>
<th>Daily VMT per Capita</th>
<th>Daily VMT per Employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Los Angeles</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Valley</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Los Angeles</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Valley</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: These values are scaled from the daily VMT data presented in the TAG, which represent a 15 percent reduction of the APC average daily VMT.
Source: LADOT 2019.

Within the City, a smaller portion of the population drove alone to work (69.7 percent) than the state and county averages in 2017. More of the population walked (3.3 percent) and took public transportation (8.9 percent). Similar to the state and county averages, 9.1 percent of the population carpooled, and 0.9 percent of the population biked to work. Approximately 1.7 percent of the population traveled to work via taxi, motorcycle, or other means. The remaining 6.3 percent worked at home. Similar to the state and county averages, the AVO for workers who drove (alone or carpooled) to work in the City was 1.07 persons per vehicle (refer to Chart 3.15-1; U. S. Census Bureau 2017).

Zoo VMT and Mode Split

To assess existing and projected transportation conditions associated with the Project, a Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan Transportation Assessment (Transportation Assessment) was prepared by Fehr & Peers (Fehr & Peers 2020; see Appendix N). The Transportation Assessment contains detailed analyses of local traffic circulation issues, with attention to VMT associated with the proposed Project consistent with the intent of SB 743 and the associated updates to the CEQA Guidelines. The Transportation Assessment determined daily VMT for Zoo visitors and employees by multiplying daily vehicle trips by average trip length. Over 650 surveys were collected from Zoo patrons and over 530 from Zoo employees to collect new information about travel trend, including average trip length estimates for visitors and employees for both weekday and weekend trips. Visitor trip length is derived from surveys that were administered at the Zoo entrance on Wednesday, May 15, 2019 and Sunday, May 19, 2019. Participants were asked their home origin zip code (i.e., hotel zip code for non-residents). Trip length is based on the distance from the Zoo to the center of the origin zip code area. Based on this analysis, visitor and employee home origins are broadly distributed across the region (Figure 3.15-1 and Figure 3.15-2).
Distribution of Zoo Visitor Origins – Sunday

FIGURE 3.15-1
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Median trip lengths for visitors who drove in private vehicles are approximately 25 miles on both weekdays and weekends. For reference, the following four cities are approximately 25 miles from the Zoo in one of the cardinal directions: Santa Clarita (north), Covina (east), Carson (south), and Santa Monica (west). Mean visitor trip lengths are higher than the median overall, indicating that average trip lengths are skewed by those traveling longer distances and illustrative of the Zoo’s ability to attract patrons from across the region. Mean weekend visitor trip lengths are almost 25 percent higher than mean weekday trip lengths, suggesting that people are willing to travel longer distances for weekend entertainment than they are during the week, when children are in school and many family members may be working. Weekday visitors may also comprise more local residents with Zoo membership who use the Zoo for regular recreation. During the week, 21 percent of visitors come from communities within 5 miles of the Zoo, including from neighborhoods in Los Feliz, Hollywood and North Hollywood, whereas on weekends, just 11 percent of visitors comes from within 5 miles.

Employee trip length was collected through an employee travel survey administered during the same time period as the visitor survey. Employees were asked their home zip code and travel mode. Employee travel is less variable by day of the week; therefore, a uniform trip length was developed for employees. Zoo employee work trips are also shorter, on average, than visitor trips, and less skewed by long distance trips. The Zoo employee median trip length for those who reported driving alone is 19 miles and the mean is 24 miles. For reference, the following four cities are approximately 19 miles from the Zoo in one of the cardinal directions: Newhall (north), Duarte (east), Gardena (south), and Santa Monica (west). For employees who car- or vanpool to work, the median trip length is 10 miles and the mean is 16 miles. Approximately 27 percent of employees live within 5 miles of the Zoo, particularly in communities in Burbank, Los Feliz, and Highland Park. Many of these employees are generally within the existing or projected bicycling distance (bike shed) of the Zoo.

The survey data was also used to determine a unique AVO rate for visitor and employee trips. Visitor AVO is substantially higher than employee AVO, with an average of 2.85 persons per vehicle on weekdays and up to 3.7 persons per vehicle on weekends, reflective of visitation by families or groups of Zoo patrons. The AVO for employees is 1.23 persons per vehicle, indicating that most drive alone, though this AVO is higher than the City average of 1.09. For the approximately 5 percent of Zoo survey participants arriving by transportation network companies (TNCs) such as Uber or Lyft, or taxis, AVO was lower than for visitors who arrived by private vehicle but higher than for employees. TNC/taxi AVO was calculated excluding the
driver, so it may only be lower than for private vehicles because they can accommodate one fewer Zoo patrons.

This data indicates that the vast majority of Zoo patrons arrive by private automobile (greater than 94 percent), with minimal use of taxis and rideshare services and negligible use of public transit. Similarly, 85 percent of employees drive alone, a substantially higher percentage than citywide averages, 7 percent carpool, 5 percent are dropped off, and 1 percent each walk or bike, take TNCs or taxis, or ride transit to work. Compared to U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey data on work trip mode for the City, Zoo employees drive alone more than average, walk and bike less, and ride transit less (see Table 3.15-3).

Table 3.15-3. Visitor and Employee Mode Split and Regional/Statewide Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Zoo Visitors</th>
<th>Drove Alone (%)</th>
<th>Walk/Bike (%)</th>
<th>Dropped Off/Taxi (%)</th>
<th>Transit (%)</th>
<th>School Bus (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoo Visitors</td>
<td>Private Vehicle (%)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk/Bike (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropped Off/Taxi (%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Bus (%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo Employees</td>
<td>Drove Alone (%)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Drove Alone (%)</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Drove Alone (%)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Drove Alone (%)</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fehr & Peers 2020; U.S. Census Bureau 2017. See Appendix N.

The Transportation Assessment determined a site-specific trip generation rate for the Zoo utilizing the data from the visitor intercept survey and the employee travel survey, in combination with attendance data provided by the Zoo. Daily trip generation rates were based on visitor attendance data provided by the Zoo for the days on which the highest weekday and weekend driveway counts occurred. As visitation reflects person trips, rather than vehicle trips, the visitor attendance day was adjusted to account for visitor AVO (i.e., 2.85 to 3.70 persons per vehicle). Daily trip generation rates are equal to daily Zoo attendance divided by AVO and multiplied by two to account for both inbound and outbound trips. Zoo employee trip generation estimates were developed based on detailed employee staffing data provided by the Zoo identifying the number of employees working each day and when each employee’s shift started and ended. Employee ins and outs were adjusted to account for AVO (i.e., 1.23 persons per vehicle).
Daily VMT for visitors and employees was determined by multiplying average trip length with daily vehicle trips to and from the Zoo. The Transportation Assessment included a detailed data collection effort based on a review of three years of Zoo daily attendance data (i.e., 2016 to 2018) to establish an understanding of baseline travel behavior to the Zoo, including busy attendance days of the week, holidays, and periods of the year. These records indicate that weekends are generally the busiest time of the week, with similar attendance on both Saturdays and Sundays. Average weekend attendance is almost double that of the busiest weekday (Friday). During the week, the bookend days (Mondays and Fridays) are approximately 30 percent busier than the midweek days (Tuesday through Thursday). Therefore, daily VMT for visitors and employees was determined for days of the week with similar attendance (see Table 3.15-4). Zoo employee VMT is approximately ranges from roughly 10% to almost 28% of average daily Zoo VMT.

Table 3.15-4. Existing Daily VMT per Total Visitors and Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily VMT</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Per Visitor</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Per Employee</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Per Visitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday &amp; Friday</td>
<td>42,061</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>12,651</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>54,712</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Wednesday, &amp; Thursday</td>
<td>32,583</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>12,555</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>45,137</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday &amp; Sunday</td>
<td>80,963</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>9,978</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>90,941</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fehr & Peers 2020. See Appendix N.

Depending on the day of the week, Zoo VMT fluctuates between 54,712 VMT and 90,941 VMT. These totals reflect dramatic changes in daily visitor attendance on weekend days and, to a lesser degree, changes in employment levels on site on the weekend. Considering daily VMT per capita, the Zoo averages between 12 and 13.3 daily VMT per capita. This daily VMT per capita range is substantially lower than the state (23.97 daily VMT per capita) and the County (21.9 daily VMT per capita), but exceeds the City (9.3 daily VMT per capita) and the Central APC (7.1 daily VMT per capita), which reflects travel trends in the immediate vicinity of the Zoo and Griffith Park.

Roadway Network

Regional Highway and Street System

Regional vehicle access, including emergency access, to the Zoo is provided via Interstate (I) 5, located approximately 0.2 miles east of the Zoo entrance, as well as State Route (SR) 134, which is located approximately 0.35 miles north of the northern Zoo (refer to Figure 2-1). I-5 runs along the eastern edge of Griffith Park and provides access southeast to Anaheim and northeast to Santa Clara. SR-134 is located immediately north of Griffith Park and the Project.
site and provides access to U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101) in Sherman Village and Pasadena to the east. Visitors arrive at the Zoo from the south and east via offramps from I-5 and SR-134, from the north via I-5, and from the west via SR-134. Additional descriptions of these highways and roadways are provided below.

- **I-5 (Golden State Freeway)** is a major north-south route that spans the U.S. borders with Mexico and Canada, traversing through Seattle, Washington and Portland, Oregon and linking major California cities, including San Diego, Santa Ana, Los Angeles, Stockton, Sacramento, and Redding. In the Project vicinity, I-5 provides five lanes in each direction. Freeway access is provided via ramps at located at Western Avenue in the City of Glendale, and at Zoo Drive and Crystal Springs Drive in the City of Los Angeles, both of which provide direct access to Griffith Park. Vehicle access to the Zoo is provided from the I-5 by a northbound off-ramp and southbound on-ramp at Zoo Drive. Additional vehicle access from I-5 is provided via Crystal Springs Drive, which traverses Wilson & Harding Municipal Public Golf Course and provides a northbound off-ramp and a southbound on-ramp at I-5 south of the golf courses.

- **SR-134 (Ventura Freeway)** runs in an east-west direction north of the Project site and extends from the City of Pasadena in the east to the Toluca Lake area of Los Angeles in the west. In the Project vicinity, SR-134 provides five lanes in each direction. Freeway access is provided via ramps located at Riverside Drive and Buena Vista Street in the City of Burbank, and Riverside Drive and Zoo Drive in the City of Los Angeles. Vehicle access from the SR-134 is provided via an eastbound off-ramp and a westbound on-ramp at Riverside Drive, which supports a stop-controlled intersection at Zoo Drive.

Public roadways in the Project vicinity include the following:

- **Los Feliz Boulevard** (City of Los Angeles) is designated as a Modified Avenue I west of Riverside Drive and as an Avenue I east of Riverside Drive. Los Feliz Boulevard runs east-west south of Griffith Park and provides park access. In the Project vicinity, it provides two travel lanes in each direction. Parking is permitted on both sides of the street, except during the peak period when the parking lanes are utilized as travel
lanes. Left-turn channelization is provided at most intersections. Within the Project vicinity, Los Feliz Boulevard is identified in the Mobility Plan 2035 as a Comprehensive Transit Enhanced Street between Hillhurst Avenue and San Fernando Road, and is planned to provide a Tier 3 Bicycle Lane as part of the City of Los Angeles’s Bicycle Network.

- **Riverside Drive south of Griffith Park** (City of Los Angeles) is designated as an Avenue I. It runs north-south south of Griffith Park and provides park access. In the Project vicinity, it provides two travel lanes in each direction. Parking is permitted on both sides of the street. Left-turn channelization is provided at most intersections. Within the Project vicinity, Riverside Drive is identified in the Mobility Plan 2035 as providing a Tier 2 Bicycle Lane as part of the City of Los Angeles’s Bicycle Network.

- **Riverside Drive north of Griffith Park** (City of Los Angeles and City of Burbank) is designated a local street that extends into both the City of Los Angeles and the City of Burbank municipal boundaries. It runs north-south north of Griffith Park and provides park access. In the Project vicinity, it provides two travel lanes in each direction. On-street parking is not permitted. A Class II (i.e., striped) bicycle lane is provided on both sides of the street.

- **Zoo Drive** (City of Los Angeles) is designated a local street and runs directly north of the Project site. Zoo Drive provides one travel lane in each direction. Parking is not permitted on either side of the street. Zoo Drive is identified in the Mobility Plan 2035 as providing a Tier 2 Bicycle Lane as part of the City of Los Angeles’s Bicycle Network and is closely paralleled by the Main Trail to the north.

- **Alameda Avenue** (City of Burbank) is a major arterial that provides two travel lanes in each direction. Left-turn channelization is provided at most intersections. On-street parking is generally allowed on both sides of the street in the Project vicinity. Alameda Avenue provides regional access to SR-134 and I-5.

- **Buena Vista Street** (City of Burbank) is a secondary arterial running in the north-south direction. It provides two travel lanes in each direction. On-street parking is generally allowed on both sides of the street north of Alameda Avenue. Left-turn channelization is provided at most intersections.

- **Main Street** (City of Burbank) is a neighborhood collector street that provides one travel lane in each direction. Left-turn channelization is provided at most intersections. A Class II bicycle lane is provided on both sides of the street.

- **Riverside Drive** (City of Burbank) is a secondary arterial west of Buena Vista Street and a neighborhood collector street east of Buena Vista Street that provides two travel lanes in each direction. On-street parking is generally allowed on both sides of the street in the Project vicinity. Left-turn channelization is provided at most intersections. Riverside Drive provides regional access to SR-134. A Class II bicycle lane is provided on both sides of the street.
• **Victory Boulevard** (City of Burbank) is a major arterial running in the north-south direction. It provides two travel lanes in each direction. On-street parking is generally allowed on both sides of the street. Left-turn channelization is provided at most intersections.

• **San Fernando Road** (City of Glendale) is a major arterial running north-south on the east side of the Los Angeles River. It provides two travel lanes in each direction and a shared center turn lane. On-street parking is permitted along both sides of the street.

• **Western Avenue** (City of Glendale) is an arterial street which runs east-west and provides regional access to I-5. East of Lake Avenue, two travel lanes in each direction are provided, as is left-turn channelization at most intersections. Parking is generally allowed on both sides of the street.

**Local Access within Griffith Park**

Local access to the Zoo entrance is provided by Zoo Drive from the north and west and via Crystal Springs Drive/Western Heritage Way from the south. Access into the Zoo for Zoo employees and emergency vehicles is also available at the employee and service entrance located south of the Zoo Entry from Crystal Springs Drive and at the Gottlieb Animal Health and Conservation building from Griffith Park Drive. Zoo Drive is a public roadway managed by LADOT. Crystal Springs Drive is a private roadway managed by City Recreation and Parks Department (RAP). Additionally, Griffith Park Drive provides vehicular access to the west end of the Zoo for employees and deliveries only.

• **Zoo Drive** (City of Los Angeles) runs primarily east-west along the northern perimeter of Griffith Park and provides direct access to the Zoo from the north and west. Parking is not permitted on Zoo Drive.

• **Crystal Springs Drive** (City of Los Angeles) runs north-south within Griffith Park and provides direct access to the Zoo. Crystal Springs Drive provides one travel lane and a Class II bicycle lane in each direction. Parking is not permitted on Crystal Springs Drive. Crystal Springs Drive is identified in the Mobility Plan 2035 as providing a Tier 2 Bicycle Lane as part of the City of Los Angeles’s Bicycle Network.

• **Western Heritage Way** (City of Los Angeles) runs north-south within Griffith Park and provides direct access to the Zoo. Western Heritage Way provides one travel lane and a Class II bicycle lane in each direction. Parking is prohibited on both sides of the street.
3.15 Transportation

Western Heritage Way is identified in the Mobility Plan 2035 as providing a Tier 2 Bicycle Lane as part of the City’s Bicycle Network.

- **Griffith Park Drive** (City of Los Angeles) runs north-south within Griffith Park and provides direct access to the back-of-the-house facilities at the Zoo, including employee parking locations. Griffith Park Drive provides one travel lane in each direction. Parking is not permitted on Griffith Park Drive.

There are six existing driveways that provide access to the Zoo, including the following (Figure 2-3):

- **Driveway 1** - On the south side of the Zoo parking lot where Crystal Springs Drive becomes Western Heritage Way, and currently serves Zoo employees and Metro Line 96.
- **Driveway 2** - On the south side of the Zoo parking lot. The driveway is stop controlled, but traffic on Western Heritage Way is not required to stop.
- **Driveway 3** - On the southeast corner of the Zoo parking lot. The driveway is stop-controlled, but traffic on Western Heritage Way is not required to stop.
- **Driveway 4** - At the intersection of Zoo Drive and Western Heritage Way. This driveway is an all-way stop-controlled intersection and the primary access driveway for visitors entering and exiting the Zoo’s main parking lot.
- **Driveway 5** - On the north side of the Zoo parking lot. The driveway is stop-controlled, but traffic on Zoo Drive is not required to stop.
- **Driveway 6** - On Zoo Drive west of the northern portion of the existing Zoo parking lot. This driveway exclusively serves Zoo employees.

**Internal Zoo Circulation**

The Zoo’s internal circulation system supports walks and pathways accommodating both visitors and service personnel, and generally range between approximately 25- and 50-feet in width. The circulation system was established by the original 1966 site layout with focused modifications made between 2002 to 2016. Several pathways combine visitor and service traffic to commingle pedestrians and service vehicles (e.g., carts, trams). With a single entrance, the circulation system traverses the Zoo property in a meandering pattern, where pathways commonly are “one way in, one way out.” Existing pedestrian paths are fragmented and include many smaller loops, barriers, and dead ends (refer to Figure 2-3).
FIGURE 3.15-3

Existing Transit Services in the Project Vicinity
The Zoo’s 40-foot-wide entrance supports a single entry and exit point for Zoo guests. A primary pathway runs from the Zoo entrance west towards the Zoo’s exhibit areas, with several shorter loops splitting off from this pathway to individual exhibits. This pathway also connects to a main circulation system approximately 675 feet west of the Zoo entrance. In compliance with ADA, some pedestrian paths meet the requirements for wheelchair accessibility, primarily along the outer pathways and the central pathway connecting the entrance with the exhibits. ADA guests and families with strollers are often limited in available routes due to steep grades throughout Project area. Several fragmented, meandering routes through the Zoo’s interior exhibits are not accessible for ADA visitors and may be challenging for families with strollers.

Several existing pedestrian roads within the Zoo are shared with the tram and service vehicles. Service circulation is provided via two portals, located to the southeast and southwest of the site (refer to Figure 2-3). Similar to Zoo pedestrian paths, service roads leading to exhibit areas and animal care facilities are short, fragmented routes.

**Public Transit Services**

**Regional Transit and Shuttle Services**

Several transit providers serve the Greater Los Angeles area, including Amtrak, Metro, and LADOT. Amtrak provides regional passenger train and bus services. Metro also provides both rail and bus service regionally. LADOT provides the DASH bus service within the City, including to Griffith Observatory, located 2.3 miles southwest across Griffith Park from the Zoo.

**Amtrak Intercity Rail** - Amtrak is the national rail operator, providing long-distance, intercity rail service throughout the U.S, including Union Station in the City, the Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, and the Glendale Station.

**Metrolink** - Metrolink operates Southern California’s regional commuter rail system, which serves commuters in six counties, including Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, and Ventura Counties; as well as northern San Diego County. In the Project vicinity, Metrolink serves Union Station in the City, the Downtown Burbank, and Glendale Station.
**Metro Rail** - Metro operates the Metro Rail system, the high-capacity rail rapid transit service for Los Angeles County. Metro Rail is operated in dedicated rights-of-way (in contrast to Metrolink and Amtrak, which operate on tracks shared with freight operators), serves dedicated transit stations, and is powered by electricity. Service is provided using two technologies, subway, and light rail:

- **Subway** Metro Rail’s heavy rail subway system includes the B Line (Red) and D Line (Purple). The lines operate exclusively below grade and are powered by an electrified third rail. The lines use 75-foot cars, and typically operate 4- to 6-car concurrently.
- **Metro Rail Light Rail Transit (LRT)** service uses shorter trains than heavy rail—typically operated with two- or three-car consists. LRT vehicles are powered by overhead catenary wires. Unlike heavy rail, Metro Rail LRT service runs on rights-of-way ranging from complete grade separation (above or below grade) to at-grade.

**Metro Bus Service.** Metro operates 165 bus routes with 13,978 stops within its 1,479 square-mile service area. Services range from expedited bus rapid transit that operates in an exclusive right of way on either arterials or freeways to local bus services serving neighborhoods and destinations throughout the City.

**Public Transit and Shuttle Services in the Project Vicinity**

The Zoo is served by one Metro local bus route (Route 96), which has a stop at the Zoo. Additionally, RAP launched free shuttle service throughout Griffith Park on the Parkline Shuttle in December 2019 with a stop at the Zoo. Given the limited public transit service that serves the Zoo, headways, or frequency of service, can be long. The State of California defines high-quality transit as service providing headways no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute periods; regional transit service to the Zoo does not currently meet this definition, with headways between 45 minutes and an hour on Line 96, the only transit service connecting employees and visitors with the regional transit system. The transit lines the Project vicinity are described below:

- **Metro Line 96** – Line 96 provides local service between Downtown Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank. In Downtown Los Angeles, Line 96 connects to Union Station and 7th Street Metro Center; in Burbank, it connects to the Metrolink Burbank Downtown Station. It is the only Metro transit service available within Griffith Park, running on the east side of the Park along Crystal Springs Drive and Zoo Drive. It stops at four locations within the Park, at the Pony Rides, adjacent to Shane’s Inspiration/Merry-Go-Round, between the Zoo and Autry Museum, and at the intersection of Zoo Drive & Riverside Drive at the northern entrance to the park. Line 96 runs immediately east of the Project Site along Crystal Springs Drive, and north of the Project site along Zoo Drive and then Victory Boulevard.

Headways, which are the average interval time between two transit vehicles moving in the same direction on the same route, average approximately 45 minutes during the
weekday evening peak period and 60 minutes during the weekend midday peak period. Ridership on Line 96 is very low. Average weekday ridership in 2019 was just over 1,300 riders; average weekend ridership was less than 650. Boardings and alightings at the Zoo stop average about 50 riders per day in both directions on both weekdays and weekends. Metro’s NextGen bus reorganization plan, as presented to the Metro Board on January 16, 2020, proposes to consolidate Lines 96, 180, 181, and 780 into a single route serving Mid-City, Los Feliz, Eagle Rock, Pasadena, and San Marino. If implemented, the new route, Line 501, will begin service in 2021 or 2022 and will run every 7.5 minutes during the weekday peak period and every 15 minutes on the weekend (Metro 2020).

- **RAP Parkline Shuttle** – On December 7, 2019, the RAP began running the Parkline Shuttle service within Griffith Park. Branded shuttle buses, each seating 24 passengers with extra room for strollers and wheelchairs and a bike rack on the front for bicyclists, provide free circulator service to 13 major destinations within Griffith Park along a 14.2-mile round-trip route, connecting all existing Metro and DASH bus stops in and around the park. The current route provides connections to local bus services only: to Metro Line 96 at stops located at Los Feliz Boulevard & Riverside Drive, Griffith Park Pony Rides, Shane’s Inspiration/Merry-Go-Round, Zoo/Autry, and Zoo Drive & Riverside Drive, to Metro Lines 180, 181, and 780 at Los Feliz Boulevard & Riverside Drive, and to the LADOT DASH Observatory shuttle at the Griffith Observatory. A Parkline Shuttle service expansion to the Metro B Line Universal City Station is currently being explored.

  Headways are 15 to 20 minutes. Current hours of operation are Saturdays and Sundays from noon (two hours after the Zoo opens to the public each day) to 10:00 PM. Service hours may be extended in the future. Based on informal surveys by RAP, the Parkline Shuttle carries approximately 480 to 900 riders per day that the shuttle operates, with peak ridership occurring on Sundays.

**Shuttle Services within the Zoo**

The Zoo operates an internal ground tram service for visitors for a fee. The tram, called the Safari Shuttle, has five stops along the Zoo perimeter. There is no tram service to the interior portions of the Zoo. While the shuttle is wheelchair accessible, the nearest shuttle station to the Zoo’s entrance is located approximately 1,350 feet from the main entry. The remaining shuttle stops are located south of the Angela Collier World of Birds Theater, at the Neil Papiano Play Park, the lemur exhibit at the northwest end of the Zoo, and the Australia House.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities**

The immediate Project vicinity is well served by both bicycle and hiking facilities, which are heavily used by Griffith Park visitors. However, the Zoo is relatively isolated from surrounding communities in the cities of Glendale and Burbank by the Los Angeles River, I-
5, and SR-134. In addition, the widespread distribution of Zoo patrons and employees across the greater Los Angeles region and distance to surrounding communities limits the viability of biking or walking by Zoo patrons and staff.

Studies have identified the distance people are willing to walk as approximately 0.5 miles, and the distance people are willing to bicycle as approximately 3 miles (Schlossberg and Weinstein Agrawal 2007). The Zoo’s relatively isolated location is well outside the walkshed of any residential communities in the vicinity, although it is within the bikeshed of adjacent communities such as North Atwater and portions of Glendale and Burbank. Several pedestrian and bicycle connections to Griffith Park and the Zoo from surrounding communities are planned for operation by 2025, as described further below.

**Pedestrian Facilities serving Griffith Park**

The urbanized portions of the Project vicinity located in the cities of Burbank and Glendale provide a mature network of pedestrian facilities including sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian safety features on most roadways. These areas are considerably more than 0.5 miles from the Zoo, a reasonable “walkshed” depicted on Figure 3.15-4. Pedestrian facilities in the northeast area of Griffith Park Griffith Park consist of a robust network of trails for pedestrian and equestrian use, often near main roads, but provide only limited pedestrian sidewalks alongside Park roadways.

There are currently no sidewalks along Zoo Drive or Western Heritage Way, except at existing bus stop and crosswalk locations. Crosswalks are provided along Western Heritage Way at two locations. The first crosswalk is located adjacent to the existing bus stop on the east side of the street in front of the Autry Museum. The crosswalk at the Autry Museum connects to the main Zoo entry promenade, an 18-foot-wide walkway that extends for 800 feet from the Zoo entry to the Autry Museum. The second crosswalk across Western Heritage Way is located adjacent to the south driveway, connecting the Zoo’s main parking lot with the overflow parking lot and North Hollywood High School Zoo Magnet Center. The main Zoo parking lot has four additional pedestrian walkways to safely connect Zoo patrons parking in this lot to the Zoo entry. South
of the Project site along the east side of Crystal Springs Drive, there is a decomposed granite path available for shared use with bicycles.

Additionally, Griffith Park offers visitors hiking trails, including Skyline Trail, Condor Trail, and Mineral Wells Trail. The Main Trail hugs the northern and eastern perimeter of the park in areas adjacent to the Zoo from Travel Town and the Martinez Arena in the north to the Griffith Park & Southern Railroad and Pony Rides in the south. Near the Zoo, the Main Trail runs parallel to Zoo Drive and then passes through a below-grade undercrossing beneath North Zoo Drive as that street transitions toward I-5, and then continues behind the Autry Museum; access to the Main Trail is provided through the Autry Museum parking lot. The Main Trail provides a safe off-road option for pedestrians, runners, and equestrians. Approximately 1 to 1.5 miles west of the Zoo, the Main Trail connects with Riverside Drive, which crosses the Los Angeles River and SR-134 to provide pedestrian and bicycle linkages with Burbank (refer to Section 3.14, Recreation); Main Trail also provides access to equestrian trails and facilities within Griffith Park.

**Bicycle Facilities in Griffith Park**

The Caltrans Highway Design Manual establishes guidelines and design standards for bikeway facilities. There are three type of bikeway facilities, as described below (Caltrans 2015).

- **Class I Bikeways (Bike Paths)** provide a completely separated right-of-way path exclusively for the use of bicycles and with minimized crossflow by motorists and pedestrians. In general, bike paths serve corridors not served by streets and highways or where sufficient right-of-way exists to allow such facilities to be constructed away from the influence of parallel streets and vehicle conflicts.

- **Class II Bikeways (Bike Lanes)** are lanes for bicyclists generally adjacent to the outer vehicle travel lanes. These lanes have special lane markings, pavement legends, and signage. Bicycle lanes are generally 5 feet wide. Adjacent vehicle parking and vehicle/pedestrian crossflow are permitted. Bike lanes are established along streets in corridors where there is significant bicycle demand, and where there are distinct needs that can be served by them.

- **Class III Bikeways (Bike Routes)** are designated by signs or pavement markings for shared use with pedestrians or motor vehicles but have no separated bike right-of-way or lane striping. Bike routes serve either to a) provide continuity to other bicycle facilities, or b) designate preferred routes through high demand corridors.

- **Class IV Bikeways (Cycletracks or Protected Bike Lanes)** provide a right-of-way designated exclusively for bicycle travel within a roadway and which are protected from other vehicle traffic with devices, including, but not limited to, grade separation, flexible posts, inflexible physical barriers, or parked cars.
The Los Angeles River Bike Path is a Class I bikeway that extends along the west side of the Los Angeles River and along the east side of I-5 in the vicinity of Griffith Park. The Los Angeles River Bike Path begins at the historic Riverside Drive/Zoo Drive Bridge where it bends south at Ferraro Soccer fields and continues for 10 miles alongside the soft-bottom portion of the River channel known as the Glendale Narrows. This portion of the Los Angeles River Greenway terminates at Elysian Park. Another section of the Los Angeles River Greenway starts at South Atlantic Boulevard in Maywood and continues parallel to the River until its confluence with the Pacific Ocean at Ocean Boulevard in Long Beach (City of Los Angeles 2020).

Several recently completed and near-term future pedestrian and bicycle (and sometimes also for equestrians) bridges provide connections to the Los Angeles River Bike Path and across the Los Angeles River. The bridge over the Los Angeles River on Riverside Drive provides a bicycle connection to Zoo Drive and Griffith Park from the residential Riverside Rancho neighborhood in Burbank and the adjacent neighborhoods in Glendale. Recently completed bridges include from north to south, the North Atwater LaKretz Bridge (opened Spring 2020), the Red Car Bridge (opened Spring 2020) located adjacent to the Glendale Hyperion Bridge, and the Sunnynook Bridge located approximately 2.4 miles south of the Zoo’s entrance. The Taylor Yard Bridge, which is currently being constructed at Rio de Los Angeles State Park in Cypress Park and is expected to open in Spring 2021. Additionally, the City of Glendale plans to construct a fourth bicycle and pedestrian bridge across the river within the next decade, called the Garden Bridge. The Garden Bridge will connect the Los Angeles River Bick Path, on the west bank of the river, and the Glendale Riverwalk, on the east bank of the river, adjacent to the terminus with Flower Street. The Garden Bridge would be located within approximately 0.5 miles of the Zoo’s Entry. These bridges will connect communities on the north and east side of the Los Angeles River to the Los Angeles River Bike Path, which is currently being improved through implementation of the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan.

There is an existing connection between the Los Angeles River Bike Path and the Griffith Park roadway network via a ramp from the path to Riverside Drive, where a Class III sharrowed facility is provided. The City plans to improve the existing Class III bicycle facility to a Class II bicycle lane.
Existing and Planned Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities in the Project Vicinity

FIGURE 3.15-4
Additionally, the City is currently planning to build two connecting bicycle facilities from the Los Angeles River Bike Path to Griffith Park adjacent to the Zoo. One connection point is approximately 0.4 miles east of the Zoo entrance, south of the intersection of Zoo Drive & Western Heritage Way. This bridge connection would include a redesign of Zoo Drive along the perimeter of Ferraro Soccer Complex to include pedestrian crossings and landscaping. This connection is still conceptual and a precise location for it has not been identified. The City envisions this connection as a neighborhood greenway, alternatively called a bicycle boulevard. A neighborhood greenway is a facility on which vehicles are allowed but discouraged, volumes and speeds are low, and a comfortable environment is provided for bicycling, walking, skateboarding, etc. Neighborhood greenways often feature substantial plantings to enhance the feeling of comfort, often providing a linear park character to the facility. The other planned bicycle connection is near the intersection with Zoo Drive & Riverside Drive, approximately 0.8 miles north of the Zoo entrance. The planned neighborhood greenway and improvement of the existing bicycle facility on Riverside Drive will facilitate easy access between the Zoo, the bicycle path, and connections across the river into Glendale and Atwater Village. Considering a 3-mile “bikeshed” depicted in Figure 3.15-4, these existing and planned facilities would serve bicyclists traveling to the Zoo from the nearby neighborhoods and communities in Glendale and Burbank.

Within Griffith Park, an off-road Class I bicycle path is located parallel and adjacent on the east side of Crystal Springs Drive. It is designated as a Bicycle Path in the City’s 2010 Bicycle Plan and designated as part of the Green Bikeway Network. Class II bicycle facilities are provided on Riverside Drive and on Main Street in the City of Burbank. Additionally, on-street Class II bicycle lanes are located along Los Feliz Boulevard and Crystal Springs Drive. These are designated as part of the backbone bikeway network for the City. Within the Project vicinity, Class II bicycle lanes are provided along both sides of Zoo Drive north of the Project site, Western Heritage Way, and Crystal Springs Drive.

Mobility Plan 2035 identifies roadway corridors proposed to receive improved bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicle infrastructure improvements. Tier 1 Protected Bicycle Lanes are bicycle facilities that are separated from vehicular traffic. Tier 2 and Tier 3 Bicycle Lanes are facilities on roadways with striped separation, and a bicycle path is a bicycle facility outside of the roadway.

- Existing Tier 2 facilities include Riverside Drive south of Griffith Park, Crystal Springs Drive, Western Heritage Way, and Zoo Drive.
- Planned Tier 3 facilities in the Project area include Los Feliz Boulevard located just under 3 miles south of the Project site.
- Mobility Plan 2035 identifies completion of a Class I bicycle path along the Los Angeles River, less than 0.5 miles east of the Project site.
Public Parking in the Project Vicinity

Parking in Griffith Park and Surrounding Areas

Per the Griffith Park Vision Plan, there are approximately 10,000 spaces for car parking within Griffith Park. Approximately 70 percent are in dedicated surface lots, 20 percent are curbside parking areas, and 10 percent are temporary spaces at special event venues such as the Greek Theatre. There are currently no parking garages within Griffith Park. Parking at Griffith Observatory and along Western Canyon road is fee-based, ranging from $8 to $10 per hour. Free parking is available at the Greek Theatre when no shows are in session. Additionally, several parking areas are located immediately south of the Wilson-Harding Golf Course, for the Griffith Park Merry-Go-Round, tennis courts, baseball field, and Crystal Springs Picnic Area.

Parking at the Project Site

Zoo parking spaces account for approximately 30 percent of all surface parking spaces located within Griffith Park. The Zoo provides a total of 2,144 surface parking spaces, including 2,081 regular spaces, 55 standard handicap spaces, and 8 handicap van spaces, in four distinct parking areas: the north main parking lot, the south main parking lot, the far north parking lot, and the far south parking lot. The main parking lot directly east of the Zoo campus provides parking for both guests and Zoo employees. An additional parking lot is located south of Crystal Springs Drive, adjacent to the North Hollywood High School Zoo Magnet Center (Figure 2-3). These lots are the only parking available for visitors; on peak days when the lots are full, visitors are either asked to wait or turned away. Several small parking areas are provided for Zoo staff along the internal perimeter roads, with a combined total of 100 parking spaces. Up to 66 spaces of additional parking are also available for Zoo employees in a secured lot with entry from Zoo Drive to the north of the Zoo entrance.

The visitor parking lots are also subject to a shared use agreement with the Autry Museum of the American West, which began on January 23, 1987 and is valid for 50 years unless extended by mutual agreement. Per the shared use agreement, the parking lots shall be kept open for general parking for visitors and employees of the Autry Museum of the American West from 5:00 a.m. to 10:30 p.m. daily in accordance with LAMC Section 63.44 B.14. These hours may be extended to 11:30 p.m. for special events conducted by the Museum. No charge shall be made to visitors or employees of the Museum for parking in the lot at any time.

Two portable bicycle racks, capable of securing 14 bicycles are located north of the Zoo’s ticket booth along the southeastern corner of the Witherbee Auditorium. Approximately 40 additional bicycle parking spaces are provided in permanent bicycle racks south of the Zoo Entry. While existing bicycle parking is utilized on a weekly basis, the lack of current bicycle connections to the Zoo discourages daily ridership. As such, these 54 bicycle parking spaces are not currently utilized at capacity.


**3.15 Transportation**

**High-Injury Network and Collisions**

The City’s High Injury Network (HIN) comprises streets with a high concentration of traffic collisions that result in severe injuries and deaths, with an emphasis on those involving people walking and bicycling. No roadways in the Project vicinity have been identified by the City as part of the HIN.

A review of the Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) indicates that there have been 11 vehicle collisions in the previous five years along the northern stretch of Zoo Drive west of the intersection with Western Heritage Way. There were two collisions involving bicycles, one of which resulted in a severe injury. Both bicycle-involved collisions occurred at the intersection of Zoo Drive & Riverside Drive. None of the other nine collisions along northern Zoo Drive resulted in serious injuries. There were no pedestrian-involved collisions. There were no collisions adjacent to the Zoo on Western Heritage Way or Crystal Springs Drive.

**3.15.2 Impact Assessment Methodology**

**Significance Thresholds**

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would have a significant impact related to transportation if it would:

- a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities;
- b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b);
- c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment);
- d. Result in inadequate emergency access.

Regarding VMT, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 (b) provides *Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts*, as follows

1. Land Use Projects. Vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high-quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.

2. Transportation Projects. Transportation projects that reduce, or have no impact on, vehicle miles traveled should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. For roadway capacity projects, agencies have discretion to determine the appropriate measure of transportation impact consistent with CEQA and other applicable requirements. To the extent that such impacts have already been adequately addressed at a programmatic level, such as in a regional transportation plan EIR, a lead agency may tier from that analysis as provided in Section 15152.
3. Qualitative Analysis. If existing models or methods are not available to estimate the vehicle miles traveled for the particular project being considered, a lead agency may analyze the project’s vehicle miles traveled qualitatively. Such a qualitative analysis would evaluate factors such as the availability of transit, proximity to other destinations, etc. For many projects, a qualitative analysis of construction traffic may be appropriate.

4. Methodology. A lead agency has discretion to choose the most appropriate methodology to evaluate a project’s vehicle miles traveled, including whether to express the change in absolute terms, per capita, per household or in any other measure. A lead agency may use models to estimate a project’s vehicle miles traveled and may revise those estimates to reflect professional judgment based on substantial evidence. Any assumptions used to estimate vehicle miles traveled and any revisions to model outputs should be documented and explained in the environmental document prepared for the project. The standard of adequacy in Section 15151 shall apply to the analysis described in this section.

5. The City’s CEQA Transportation Thresholds, along with the TAG, supersede the guidance and factors included in the City’s 2006 L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide. The impact criteria in the TAG are discussed below. Non-CEQA issues required by the TAG for analysis, including disclosure of LOS changes at affected intersections, are summarized below in Section 3.15-6, Non-CEQA Transportation Planning Issues and analyzed fully by the Transportation Assessment (Appendix N).

Regarding emergency access, neither the TAG nor the City’s CEQA Transportation Thresholds include specific factors or thresholds for determining potentially significant impacts. The methodology discussed below describes the City’s standard considerations when assessing emergency access impacts.

**OPR’s Recommendations for Transportation Impact Criteria**

Authorized in September 2013, SB 743 directed OPR to revise the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations) to establish new criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts. In developing the criteria, OPR has proposed, and the California Natural Resources Agency has certified and adopted, changes to the CEQA Guidelines that identify VMT as the most appropriate metric to evaluate a project’s transportation impacts. CEQA Section 15064.3 defines VMT as “the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project” and notes that for determination of significance for transportation impacts, “Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel”.

In January 2016, OPR published for public review and comment a *Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (Proposed Transportation Impact Guidelines)* recommending that transportation impacts for projects...
be measured using a VMT metric (refer to Regulatory Setting). The final Proposed Transportation Impact Guidelines were published in December 2018 (OPR 2018). VMT measures the amount and distance that a project might cause people to drive, accounting for the number of passengers within a vehicle. These proposed transportation impact guidelines provide substantial evidence that VMT is an appropriate standard to use in analyzing transportation impacts to protect environmental quality and a better indicator of greenhouse gas, air quality, and energy impacts than automobile delay. With the changes to the CEQA Guidelines, automobile delay, as measured by LOS and other similar metrics, no longer constitutes a significant environmental effect under CEQA (Pub. Resources Code §21099). These updated criteria for transportation impact assessment better align transportation analysis with state GHG reduction goals set by SB375 to encourage infill development and improve public health through increased active transportation.

VMT completely replaces as the CEQA metric of analysis of roadway capacity-based or automobile delay-based LOS, which measures a project’s impact on the driving experience of other vehicle drivers (e.g., congestion, delay) and favors development in exurban areas where existing roadway traffic is light, often leading to longer vehicle trips, or resulting in road-widening projects, which result in adverse environmental and public health impacts through induced vehicle demand and degradation of the biking or walking experience. Conversely, evaluation of a project’s impact on VMT evaluates the effect on the environment of project-generated vehicle trips, such as more and/or longer vehicle trips which emit more GHGs, or projects which generate fewer vehicle trips or shorten existing trips such as development of an infill site or facilities that improve bicycle access or walkability.

Pursuant to SB 743, OPR released draft CEQA Guidelines in November 2017, and adopted final guidelines in December 2018. The provisions of SB743 are now in effect, with agencies across the state having an opt-in period until July 1, 2020. The City of Los Angeles was among the first cities in California, almost a year ahead of the OPR deadline, to adopt their own, local VMT-based CEQA guidelines and thresholds for VMT. City of Los Angeles guidelines are prescribed in the TAG, as described below.

While OPR recognizes that lead agencies have the discretion to set or apply their own thresholds of significance, the Proposed Transportation Impact Guidelines include recommendations regarding significance thresholds residential, office, and retail projects. For residential and office projects, the Proposed Transportation Impact Guidelines recommend that a significant impact occurs when a project’s VMT exceeds a level of 15 percent below the existing regional or city VMT per capita and per employee, respectively. This target reduction is consistent with the overall VMT reduction goals of the 2017 CARB Scoping Plan. For retail and redevelopment projects, the Guidelines recommend that a significant impact would occur with any net increase in total VMT. The guidelines also recommend significance thresholds for land use plans. A general plan, area plan, or community plan may have a significant impact on transportation if proposed new residential,
office, or retail land uses would in aggregate exceed the respective thresholds recommended above.

**LADOT TAG Impact Criteria**

On July 30, 2019, the City adopted the revised City of Los Angeles CEQA Transportation Thresholds to include new impact criteria from the LADOT’s TAG. LADOT established the TAG in July 2019 to effectuate a review process that advances the City’s vision of developing a safe, accessible, well-maintained, and well-connected multimodal transportation network. The TAG was developed to identify land use development and transportation projects that may impact the transportation system, to ensure proposed land use development projects achieve site access design requirements and on-site circulation best practices, to define whether off-site improvements are needed, and to provide step-by-step guidance for assessing impacts and preparing transportation studies.

Project applicants and consultants must follow the procedures and standards set forth in the TAG when preparing and submitting a transportation assessment to ensure a timely review by LADOT. However, the TAG requirements may differ in certain areas of the City where specific plans or similar area specific ordinances establish distinct guidelines.

The TAG includes guidelines, methods, and impact criteria for CEQA considerations that focus on VMT, geometric hazards, and policy conflicts. The TAG also establishes a framework for various issues it identifies as non-CEQA analyses including a pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access assessment, a project access, safety, and circulation assessment, project construction, and residential street cut-through analysis. Each area of analysis is described in the TAG with a discussion of screening criteria, the methodology for analysis, impact criteria, and potential mitigation options.

The thresholds include using VMT as a criterion to determine transportation impacts, pursuant to SB 743 and the recent changes to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3.9. LADOT revised the City’s guidelines for evaluating project-level transportation issues to ensure that proposed development projects would be consistent with City and mobility objectives (e.g., Mobility Plan 2035).

TAG impact criteria are based upon OPR technical guidance, but also reflect local considerations, including a Mobility Element 2035 objective to decrease VMT per capita by 5 percent every 5 years through 2035. Per the TAG, any project estimated to generate a net increase of 250 or more daily vehicle trips and likely to induce additional VMT is required to complete a transportation assessment and an evaluation of the project’s impact on VMT to determine whether it causes substantial VMT. In addition to VMT and other assessments required under CEQA, the TAG also establishes a framework for analyses of project pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicular access, safety, and site circulation in addition to the elements required for analysis by CEQA. Each area of analysis is described in the TAG with a...
discussion of screening criteria, the methodology for analysis, impact criteria, and potential mitigation options. TAG project screening criteria require evaluation of the following:

1. Would the project generate a net increase of 250 or more daily vehicle trips?
2. Is the project proposing to, or required to make any voluntary or required, modifications to the public right-of-way?
3. Is the project on a lot that is 0.5 acres or more in total gross area, or is the project’s frontage along a street classified as an Avenue or Boulevard (as designated in the City’s General Plan), 250 linear feet or more, or is the project’s building frontage encompassing an entire block along a street classified as an Avenue or Boulevard by the City’s General Plan?
4. Would the project generate a net increase in daily VMT?
5. If the project includes retail uses, does the portion of the project that contain retail uses exceed net 50,000 square feet?
6. Would the project or plan located within a one-half mile of a fixed-rail or fixed-guideway transit station replace an existing number of residential units with a smaller number of residential units?
7. For a transportation project, would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2)?
8. Would the project include the addition of through traffic lanes on existing or new highways, including general purpose lanes, high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, peak period lanes, auxiliary lanes, and lanes through grade-separated interchanges (except managed lanes, transit lanes, and auxiliary lanes of less than one mile in length designed to improve roadway safety)?
9. Is the project proposing new driveways, or introducing new vehicle access to the property from the public right-of-way?
10. Is the project proposing to, or required to make any voluntary or required, modifications to the public right-of-way (i.e., street dedications, reconfigurations of curb line, etc.)?

In addition, CEQA requires analysis of potentials conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, where substantial conflicts may create significant impacts. As such, the TAG requires a detailed policy analysis to identify potential conflicts with adopted City plans, programs, ordinances, or policies (PPOP). If a conflict is identified, improvements which prioritize access for and improve the comfort of people walking, biking, and riding transit shall also be identified. Analysis of federal, state, regional, and local policies/plans is required by CEQA, and the TAG prescribes a specific set of 16 plans and policies that must review within the PPOP analysis. Analysis of state and regional programs and policies is particularly important as these are the source for a switch to VMT analysis with related goals to reduce VMT, energy consumption, and GHG generation. These include local, regional, or state
programs or policies related to vehicular circulation, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access or operation.

The City’s VMT impact criteria for development projects was adopted from guidance from the OPR. Per the criteria, a development project would have a potential impact if the project meets the following:

- For event centers and regional-serving entertainment venues, such as the proposed Project, the project would result in a net increase in VMT (LADOT 2019; page 20).

**Methodology**

This analysis is conducted based on the proposed Project assumptions, as described in Section 3.0, *Introduction and Approach to Analysis*. This analysis considers proposed Project construction and operational components (e.g., events, tours, educational programs) that support the transformation of the Zoo (Appendix A). Impact analysis is directly informed by the Transportation Assessment prepared for the proposed Project (Appendix N).

The scope of work for the Transportation Assessment was determined in consultation with the BOE, the Zoo, and LADOT to inform the transportation impact analysis, consistent with CEQA. It was prepared in accordance with LADOT’s TAG adopted in July 2019, and included outreach to and coordination with relevant regional and local transit providers, and the Los Angeles River Master Plan team, which included staff from the Los Angeles Department of City Planning (DCP), and RAP. Additional scoping sessions were held with staff at the City of Burbank and City of Glendale. The base assumptions are described through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), including study analysis methodology and ambient traffic growth forecasts that was submitted for review to City staff to confirm that the analysis parameters and inputs are consistent with City requirements, guidance, and industry standards.

**Programs, Plans, Ordinance, and Plan Consistency**

The state, SCAG, and City have adopted programs, plans, ordinances, and policies that establish the transportation planning framework for all travel modes. The overall goals of these policies are to achieve a safe, accessible, and sustainable transportation system for all users. The City’s Mobility Plan 2035 offers a comprehensive vision and set of policies and programs the City aims to achieve to provide streets that are safe and convenient for all users. Vision Zero Los Angeles aims to reduce transportation fatalities to zero by using extensive crash data analysis to identify priority corridors and intersections and applying safety countermeasures. The TAG indicates that these and other relevant City plans and policies, including new and revised plans that may be adopted over time, be consulted to identify potential conflicts with projects and plans in the CEQA review process.

The threshold test is to assess whether a project would conflict with an adopted program, policy, plan, or ordinance addressing the circulation system (including transit, roadways,
bicycle, and pedestrian facilities as required under CEQA) that is adopted to protect the environment. In general, transportation policies or standards adopted to protect the environment are those that support multimodal transportation options and a reduction in VMT. A project that does not implement a program, plan, policy, or ordinance would not necessarily result in a conflict or an impact. Many of these programs must be implemented by the City itself over time and over a broad area, and it is the intention of this threshold test to ensure that proposed development projects and plans do not preclude the City from implementing adopted programs, plans, and policies.

This analysis of land use consistency considers whether the proposed Project would be consistent with applicable plans, policies, and regulations. Sources utilized in the development of this section include SCAG’s RTP/SCS, the City’s General Plan, Mobility Plan 2035, the Hollywood Community Plan, the Griffith Park Vision Plan, and LADOT’s TAG. Plan and policy consistency are based on whether the Project would result in environmental impacts to transportation as outlined in the applicable plan.

Since VMT completely replaces as the CEQA metric of analysis of roadway capacity-based or automobile delay-based LOS, the Project’s consistency with LOS thresholds from neighboring jurisdictions (i.e., City of Burbank and City of Glendale) are considered non-CEQA issues and are summarized below in Section 3.15.6 and in Appendix N.

**VMT**

The potential impacts Project VMT increases are assessed in the context of CEQA Section 15064.3 and CEQA Appendix G, as well as the City’s TAG. The analysis also accounts for the goals or state, regional, and local plans regarding reduction targets for VMT and GHG emissions, including the 2017 CARB Scoping Plan target VMT reduction of 15 percent.

The Transportation Assessment determined future trip generation estimates for the Project by applying trip generation rates to the Zoo’s visitor and employee growth projections by phase (see Appendix N). Trip generation was estimated for visitors and employees on weekdays and weekends. Trip lengths for both visitors and employees, as derived from the surveys discussed above, were combined with average daily attendance by day of the week based on the historic attendance data provided by the Zoo, to develop VMT estimates for the Zoo, both for existing (2019) conditions and future phases of Vision Plan implementation. See Table 3.15-3 and Table 3.15-4.

**Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use Hazards & Emergency Access**

Project access plans are reviewed in light of commonly accepted traffic engineering design standards to ascertain whether any deficiencies are apparent in the site access plans which would be considered significant. The determination of significance shall be on a case-by-case basis, considering the following factors:

- The relative amount of pedestrian activity at Project access points.
- Design features/physical configurations that affect the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists to drivers entering and exiting the Project site, and the visibility of cars to pedestrians and bicyclists.

Emergency access is analyzed with consideration of the routes of ingress/egress to the Zoo, evaluating the potential limits to access for emergency personnel and site evacuation. Refer also to Section 3.9, *Hazards & Hazardous Materials* and Section 3.13, *Public Services*.

### 3.15.3 Environmental Impact Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-1: Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Project Consistency with Applicable Transportation Plans, Policies, and Regulations**

The CEQA guidelines state that a project would have a potentially significant impact if the project would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Per the City’s TAG (July 2019), a project that generally conforms with, and does not obstruct the City’s development policies and standards, will generally be consistent. The TAG requires review of specific City documents and ordinances for City plans, policies, programs, ordinances, and standards relevant to determining project consistency. The TAG also lists questions that shall be answered to help guide whether the project conflicts with City circulation system policies.

The City has adopted programs, plans, ordinances, and policies that establish the transportation planning framework for all travel modes. The overall goals of these policies are to achieve a safe, accessible, and sustainable transportation system for all users. Further, the State of California and regional agencies have adopted plans and programs addressing circulation systems that serve the City. To address Project consistency with circulation plans and programs per CEQA and the TAG, this analysis considers both City documents and applicable regional transportation and circulation documents that relate to the Zoo. As a Regional-Serving Entertainment Venue and Event Center, the Zoo’s transportation impacts include regional transit services and bicycle and pedestrian facilities and services. In compliance with the TAG, this analysis adapts Table 2.1-2 in the TAG to review relevant City policies and programs corresponding to the questions to assess whether the proposed Project precludes the City’s implementation of any adopted policy and/or program. In compliance with CEQA, this analysis also assesses consistency with applicable plans in the Project vicinity.

LADOT maintains the LADOT Manual of Policies and Procedure (MPP). As the proposed Project is a long-term Vision Plan for phased redevelopment of the Zoo, site plans and driveway/access design have not been developed yet. During Project implementation, each
The following provides the analysis of: 1) the City TAG screening criteria; 2) applicability of City plans, policies, programs, and ordinances, consistent with the TAG; and 3) analysis of the Project’s consistency with applicable plans, policies, programs, and ordinances, consistent with CEQA. Findings of consistency are either “consistent”, “consistent with mitigation” or “inconsistent” if consistency issues exist. The analysis includes discussion of proposed Project mitigation measures where consistency may be improved or resolved. Table 3.15-5 was prepared to inform this EIR analysis of the proposed Project. Final policy consistency would be determined as part of Project review and approval process with the City.

Based upon this analysis, the Project, with implementation of required mitigation measures identified in this EIR and required consistency with existing regulations, would be consistent with the SCAG RTP/SCS, Los Angeles General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan, Griffith Park Vision Plan, and Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles. The Project would not cause significant environmental impacts due to conflicts with any transportation plan, policy, or regulation, and the Project would not preclude the City’s implementation of any adopted policy and/or program. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

**Construction**

Construction activities associated with development of the proposed Project would result in additional construction VMT in the Project vicinity and on the I-5 and SR-134 freeways. Construction-related traffic would include haul trucks, cement trucks, equipment delivery trucks, and construction worker vehicles. During excavation, heavy haul trucks would be required for import and export of materials. The majority of excavation and soil export would occur during the construction of the California (Phase 1) and Africa (Phase 3) Visitor Centers. The timing and frequency of heavy haul trucks would be dictated by the rate of excavation activities within the California and Africa hillside areas. It is assumed all construction and demolition (C&D) waste would be exported to a facility within the County. This phase would also involve vehicles trips and associated VMT to provide construction materials, support excavation, and transport construction workers. Construction worker vehicles, materials deliveries, and other construction-related trips are expected to add dozens of often heavy truck trips to area streets throughout the construction period. Construction-related increases in VMT would occur intermittently and would be lower in volume than the operational vehicle trips and VMT associated with the proposed Project. Therefore, it would not contribute significantly to long-term GHG effects from VMT.
| Table 3.15-5. Regional Circulation Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Analysis |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Policy**                       | **Relationship to Project**                                                                 |
| **SCAG RTP/SCS**                 |                                                                                       |
| Goal 2. Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region. | Consistent with Mitigation. The Vision Plan proposes substantial redesign of the Zoo Entry and internal circulation system to provide more ADA-accessible and pedestrian friendly navigation for visitors. The proposed Phase 1 realignment of Crystal Spring Drive would also allow the Zoo’s southbound bus stop to be moved to Western Heritage Way between the Zoo and Autry Museum of the American West, improving the efficiency of public transportation access to the North Hollywood High School Zoo Magnet Center, Autry Museum, and the Zoo. Improvements to the Zoo Drive/Western Heritage Way intersection would reduce vehicle queuing and increase safety for all modes, thereby facilitating multi-modal access to the Zoo and Griffith Park. Internal improvements to Zoo service area and access would also increase efficiency of Zoo operations related to deliveries of good and services. However, increased visitation would drive transportation impacts related to increased VMT. The Project does not include multi-modal improvements or expansion of active transportation facilities to ensure accessibility to the Zoo. Under the Project, visitors and employees would continue to mainly use passenger vehicles to travel to and from the Zoo, which presents a barrier to mobility and accessibility in the region. Lack of regional transit access and pedestrian/bicycle facilities at the Zoo reduces the productivity of the transportation system to serve Zoo visitors and employees using non-vehicular modes. **MM T-2** would require implementation of a comprehensive TDM Program which would include measures to incentivize rideshare/carpooling, parking management, and use of non-vehicular modes for both employees and visitors, including expansion of transit service connection to the Zoo. With implementation of **MM T-2**, the Project would be consistent with these regional policies. |
| Goal 3. Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region. |                                                                                       |
| Goal 5. Maximize the productivity of our transportation system. |                                                                                       |
| Goal 6. Protect the environment and health of our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation (e.g., bicycling and walking). | Consistent with Mitigation. The Zoo currently provides approximately 54 bicycle parking spaces and would continue to provide bicycle parking at the Zoo Entry to encourage active transportation to the Zoo. However, increased visitation and employment would drive transportation impacts related to increased VMT for the Zoo, which is a regionally serving attraction. Further, the Project does not include multi-modal improvements or expansion of active transportation facilities to reduce vehicle trips and trip lengths for visitors and employees. **MM T-2** would require implementation of a comprehensive TDM Program which would include measures to implement or expand non-vehicular transportation modes to the Zoo to reduce trips, VMT, and congestion, and improve air quality/reduce GHG emissions. With implementation of **MM T-2**, the Project would be consistent with this regional policy. See additional detailed analysis below for the Project’s consistency with the Mobility Element 2035. |
| **City of Los Angeles General Plan** |                                                                                       |
| **Air Quality Element**           |                                                                                       |
| Policy 2.1.1. Utilize compressed work weeks and flextime, telecommuting, carpooling, | Consistent with Mitigation. The Zoo currently provides and would continue to utilize compressed work weeks and flexible work schedules (refer to Section 2, **Project Description**). This is due to the |

Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan
City of Los Angeles
### Table 3.15-5. Regional Circulation Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Analysis (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Relationship to Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vanpooling, public transit, and improve walking/bicycling related facilities to reduce Vehicle Trips and/or VMT as an employer and encourage the private sector to do the same to reduce work trips and traffic congestion.</td>
<td>unique hours of operation, schedules, and employee shifts that align with non-peak hours, thereby reducing traffic congestion. As part of the TDM Program under <strong>MM T-2</strong>, the Zoo would consider allowing telecommuting for City employees (particularly for Greater Los Angeles Zoo Association [GLAZA], administrative, and marketing employees who are not required on-site) or alternative work schedules, such as the 9/80 or 4/10 schedule, at discretion of the Zoo General Manager. In addition, the Zoo currently provides and would continue to provide bicycle parking at the Zoo Entry. The proposed Phase 1 road realignment would also allow the Zoo’s southbound bus stop to be moved to Western Heritage Way between the Zoo and Autry Museum of the American West, improving the efficiency of public transportation access to the Zoo and the North Hollywood High School Zoo Magnet Center, and Autry Museum. However, increased visitation and employment would drive transportation impacts related to increased VMT. The Project does not include multi-modal improvements or expansion of active transportation facilities to ensure accessibility to the Zoo. Under the Project, visitors and employees would continue to mainly use passenger vehicles to travel to and from the Zoo, which presents a barrier to mobility and accessibility in the region. As described in <strong>Existing Conditions</strong>, lack of regional transit access and pedestrian/bicycle facilities at the Zoo reduces the productivity of the transportation system to serve Zoo visitors and employees using non-vehicular modes. <strong>MM T-2</strong> would require implementation of a comprehensive TDM Program which would include measures to implement or expand non-vehicular transportation modes to the Zoo to reduce trips, VMT, and congestion, and improve air quality/reduce GHG emissions. With implementation of <strong>MM T-2</strong>, the Project would be consistent with this regional policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2.2.1. Discourage single-occupant vehicle use through a variety of measures such as market incentive strategies, mode-shift incentives, trip reduction plans, and ridesharing subsidies.</td>
<td>Consistent with Mitigation. Survey data collected for this analysis indicates that most employees (85 percent) drive to the Zoo, most commonly as single-occupant vehicles. Further, most visitors (95 percent) drive passenger vehicles and do not have ready access to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities that allow reasonable transportation to the Zoo. Parking at the Zoo is generally free with limited parking fees during peak attendance for convenient “VIP” spaces. The Zoo currently provides approximately 54 bicycle parking spaces and would continue to provide bicycle parking at the Zoo Entry. The proposed Phase 1 road realignment would improve the efficiency of public transportation access to the Zoo and surrounding uses by relocating the Zoo’s southbound bus stop to Western Heritage Way between the Zoo and Autry Museum of the American West. However, increased visitation and employment growth would drive transportation impacts related to increased VMT. The Project does not include multi-modal improvements or expansion of active transportation facilities to ensure accessibility to the Zoo. Under the Project, visitors and employees would continue to mainly use passenger vehicles to travel to and from the Zoo, which presents a barrier to mobility and accessibility in the region and generate air emissions and GHGs. Lack of regional transit access and pedestrian/bicycle facilities at the Zoo reduces the productivity of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2.2.2. Encourage multi-occupant vehicle travel and discourage single-occupant vehicle travel by instituting parking management practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2.2.3. Minimize the use of single-occupant vehicles associated with special events or in areas and times of high levels of pedestrian activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4.2.3. Ensure that new development is compatible with pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and alternative fuel vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.15-5. Regional Circulation Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Analysis (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Relationship to Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4.2.5. Emphasize trip reduction, alternative transit, and congestion management measures for discretionary projects.</td>
<td>Transportation system to serve Zoo visitors and employees using non-vehicular modes. <strong>MM T-2</strong> would require implementation of a comprehensive TDM Program which would include measures to incentivize rideshare/carpooling, parking management, and use of non-vehicular modes for both employees and visitors, including expansion of transit service connection to the Zoo. With implementation of <strong>MM T-2</strong>, the Project would be consistent with these regional policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility Element (Mobility Plan 2035)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consistent with Mitigation.</strong> Per the Mobility Plan, complete streets provide a space for people to recreate, exercise, conduct business, engage in community activities, interact with their neighbors, and beautify their surroundings. Complete streets offer safety, comfort, and convenience for all users regardless of age, ability or means of transportation. The transportation system near the Zoo currently reflects many complete street principles. The streets on the Project frontages (Zoo Drive and Western Heritage Way) are identified in the Mobility Plan 2035 as providing a Tier 2 Bicycle Lane as part of the City of Los Angeles’s Bicycle Network. These facilities currently exist and would be maintained with development of the Project. The realignment of Western Heritage Way and reconfiguration of the Zoo south parking lot would be designed to all applicable City standards, including sidewalks and pedestrian crossings and a contiguous guest parking lot, which would comply with complete streets principles to ensure the safety and mobility of all users. Metro Bus Line 96 and the Parkline Shuttle provide services the Zoo and would continue under the Project. However, the Project does not include multi-modal improvements or expansion of active transportation facilities to ensure accessibility to the Zoo. Under the Project, visitors and employees would continue to mainly use passenger vehicles to travel to and from the Zoo, which presents a barrier to mobility and accessibility in the region and generate air emissions and GHGs. Lack of regional transit access and pedestrian/bicycle facilities at the Zoo reduces the productivity of the transportation system to serve non-vehicular modes. <strong>MM T-2</strong> would require implementation of a comprehensive TDM Program which would include measures to incentivize rideshare/carpooling, parking management, and use of non-vehicular modes for both employees and visitors, including expansion of transit service connection to the Zoo. With implementation of <strong>MM T-2</strong>, the Project would be consistent with this regional policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.2. Complete Streets: Implement a balanced transportation system on all streets, tunnels, and bridges using complete streets principles to ensure the safety and mobility of all users.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> Phase 1 of the Project would realign Western Heritage Way/Crystal Springs Drive to the southern perimeter of the Zoo parking lots to create a contiguous guest parking lot, reducing pedestrian street crossings (refer to Figure 2-4). This would more strongly link the North Hollywood High School Zoo Magnet Center to the main Zoo campus, eliminating the need for students and Zoo visitors to cross Crystal Springs Drive to reach the Zoo and parking areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.3. Safe Routes to Schools. Prioritize the safety of school children on all streets regardless of highway classifications.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The Zoo is located in Griffith Park where public recreational trails, such as Main Trail, Condor Trail, and Skyline...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.9. Recreational Trail Safety: Balance user needs on...</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.15-5. Regional Circulation Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Analysis (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Relationship to Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the City’s public recreational trails</td>
<td>Trail, are popular and used daily by hikers, cyclists, and equestrians. The Project would not modify existing trails. The Project would improve the Zoo Drive/Western Heritage Way intersection with a signal and potentially a below-grade crossing to enhance accessibility and safety for all modes. The Project would also realign Crystal Springs Drive but maintain the adjacent public trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2.1. Adaptive Reuse of Streets: Design, plan, and operate streets to serve multiple purposes and provide flexibility in design to adapt to future demands.</td>
<td>Consistent. The Project would realign a segment of Western Heritage Drive/Crystal Springs Drive and upgrade the Zoo Drive/Western Heritage Way intersection with a new signal in Phase 1 and potentially a below-grade crossing in Phase 7. The designs of these improvements would be subject to applicable City requirements and in coordination with LADOT, RAP, and Caltrans to ensure alterations are completed in a manner that would not preclude future City demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2.3. Pedestrian Infrastructure: Recognize walking as a component of every trip and ensure high-quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right of way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.</td>
<td>Consistent with Mitigation. The Project would improve the Zoo Drive/Western Heritage Way intersection with a signal in Phase 1 and potentially a roundabout or below-grade crossing to enhance accessibility and safety for pedestrians in Phase 7. The Project would also realign Crystal Springs Drive and reconfigure the south parking lots in accordance with all applicable City standards, including sidewalks and pedestrian crossings and a contiguous guest parking lot, which would improve the safety and comfort for pedestrians. However, changes to operations and configurations of these roadways would potentially increase vehicle speeds. Pedestrian safety would need to be considered in the design and amenities provided in the final design/engineering of a proposed roundabout or below-grade crossing in Phase 7 of the Project. In addition, MM REC-1 would require proposed Zoo Drive/Western Heritage Way intersection improvements be considerate of pedestrian, bicyclist, and equestrian safety with regard to the Main Trail and that use of this important trail is not hindered by implementation of the improvement. With consideration of pedestrian safety in the design of proposed improvements and implementation of MM REC-1, the Project would be consistent with this regional policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2.5. Transit Network: Improve the performance and reliability of existing and future bus service.</td>
<td>Consistent with Mitigation. Metro Bus Line 96 and the RAP Parkline Shuttle provide services to the Zoo and would continue under the Project. The Parkline Shuttle also provides shuttle service to the Zoo for riders traveling through Griffith Park. Ridership to the Zoo is generally low as convenient connections to regional transit services, such as Metro Light Rail, are not available. The Project does not include multi-modal improvements or expansion of transit facilities to improve transit performance at the Zoo. Under the Project, visitors and employees would continue to mainly use passenger vehicles to travel to and from the Zoo, which presents a barrier to mobility and accessibility in the region and generate air emissions and GHGs. Lack of regional transit access at the Zoo reduces the productivity of the transportation system to serve Zoo visitors and employees using non-vehicular modes. MM T-2 would require implementation of a comprehensive TDM Program which would include measures to incentivize the use of non-vehicular modes, including transit, for both employees and visitors, and expansion of transit service connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.15-5. Regional Circulation Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Analysis (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Relationship to Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to the Zoo. With implementation of MM T-2, the Project would be consistent with this regional policy.</td>
<td>Consistent with Mitigation. The streets on the Project frontages (Zoo Drive and Western Heritage Way) are identified in the Mobility Plan 2035 as providing a Tier 2 Bicycle Lane as part of the City of Los Angeles’s Bicycle Network. These facilities currently exist and would be maintained with development of the Project. The realignment of Western Heritage Way/Crystal Springs Drive and reconfiguration of the south parking lots would be designed to all applicable City standards, including bicycle facilities. The Project would not modify existing multi-use trails in the vicinity, maintaining access for bicycles adjacent to the Zoo and regionally (i.e., Los Angeles River trail). However, changes to operations and configurations of these roadways would potentially increase vehicle speeds. MM REC-1 would require the Zoo to consider pedestrian safety and amenities provided in the final design/engineering of a proposed roundabout or below-grade crossing in Phase 7 of the Project. With implementation of MM REC-1, the Project would be consistent with this regional policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan</td>
<td>Policy 2.6. Bicycle Networks: Provide safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent. The streets on the Project frontages (Zoo Drive and Western Heritage Way) are identified in the Mobility Plan 2035 as providing a Tier 2 Bicycle Lane as part of the City of Los Angeles’s Bicycle Network. These facilities currently exist and would be maintained with development of the Project. The realignment of Western Heritage Way/Crystal Springs Drive and reconfiguration of the south parking lots would be designed to all applicable City standards, including bicycle facilities. The Project would not modify existing multi-use trails in the vicinity, maintaining access for bicycles adjacent to the Zoo and regionally (i.e., Los Angeles River trail). However, changes to operations and configurations of these roadways would potentially increase vehicle speeds. MM REC-1 would require the Zoo to consider pedestrian safety and amenities provided in the final design/engineering of a proposed roundabout or below-grade crossing in Phase 7 of the Project. With implementation of MM REC-1, the Project would be consistent with this regional policy.</td>
<td>Policy 2.7. Vehicle Network: Provide vehicular access to the regional freeway system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent. The circulation system around the Zoo currently provides and would continue to provide access to both I-5 and SR-134. Proposed Phase 1 offsite roadway improvements at the intersection of Zoo Drive and Western Heritage Way may employ grade changes, stoplights, and other circulation improvements to address peak backups and congestion on both I-5 and SR-134.</td>
<td>Policy 2.10. Loading Areas: Facilitate the provision of adequate on and off-street loading areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent. Phase 3 of the Project would construct a new Zoo service center with improved driveway access and two new 160-degree radius turnaround locations for larger trucks to facilitate deliveries and improve loading efficiency, avoiding conflicts with internal Zoo circulation and operations of surrounding roadways.</td>
<td>Policy 3.1. Access for All: Recognize all modes of travel, including pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicular modes – including goods movement – as integral components of the City’s transportation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with Mitigation. The Project does not include multi-modal improvements or expansion of active transportation facilities to ensure accessibility to the Zoo. Under the Project, visitors and employees would continue to mainly use passenger vehicles to travel to and from the Zoo, which presents a barrier to mobility and accessibility in the region and generate air emissions and GHGs. Lack of regional transit access and pedestrian/bicycle facilities at the Zoo reduces the productivity of the transportation system to serve Zoo visitors and employees using non-vehicular modes. However, MM T-2 would require implementation of a comprehensive TDM Program which would include measures to incentivize rideshare/carpooling, parking management, and use of non-vehicular modes for both employees and visitors, including expansion of transit service connection to the Zoo. With implementation of MM T-2, the Project would be consistent with this regional policy.</td>
<td>Policy 2.6. Bicycle Networks: Provide safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent. The streets on the Project frontages (Zoo Drive and Western Heritage Way) are identified in the Mobility Plan 2035 as providing a Tier 2 Bicycle Lane as part of the City of Los Angeles’s Bicycle Network. These facilities currently exist and would be maintained with development of the Project. The realignment of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.15-5. Regional Circulation Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Analysis (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Relationship to Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.5. Multi-Modal Features: Support “first-mile, last-mile solutions” such as multi-modal transportation services, organizations, and activities in the areas around transit stations and major bus stops (transit stops) to maximize multi-modal connectivity and access for transit riders.</td>
<td>Western Heritage Way/Crystal Springs Drive and reconfiguration of the south parking lots would be designed to all applicable City standards, including bicycle facilities. The Project would not modify existing multi-use trails in the vicinity, maintaining access for bicycles adjacent to the Zoo and regionally (i.e., Los Angeles River trail).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.7. Regional Transit Connections: Improve transit access and service to major regional destinations, job centers, and inter-modal facilities.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The Zoo currently provides approximately 54 bicycle parking spaces and would continue to provide bicycle parking at the Zoo Entry under the Project. The streets on the Project frontages (Zoo Drive and Western Heritage Way) are identified in the Mobility Plan 2035 as providing a Tier 2 Bicycle Lane as part of the City of Los Angeles’s Bicycle Network. These facilities currently exist and would be maintained with development of the Project. Connections to the Los Angeles River bicycle path would remain under the Project to provide regional connectivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.8. Provide bicyclists with convenient, secure, and well-maintained bicycle parking facilities.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The Mobility Plan recommends several TDM Program Elements to consider, including telecommuting and flexible work hours, carpool/vanpool, transit pass subsidies, and bicycle facilities, among others. The Zoo currently provides and would continue to utilize compressed work weeks and flexible work schedules. This is due to the unique hours of operation, schedules, and employee shifts that align with non-peak hours, thereby reducing traffic congestion. As part of the TDM Program under <strong>MM T-2</strong>, the Zoo would consider allowing telecommuting for City employees (particularly for GLAZA, administrative, and marketing employees who are not required on-site) or alternative work schedules, such as the 9/80 or 4/10 schedule, at discretion of the Zoo General Manager. As a City department, Zoo employees are offered transit subsidies through the City’s Transit Subsidy Reimbursement Program. In addition, the Zoo currently provides and would continue to provide bicycle parking at the Zoo Entry. The proposed Phase 1 road realignment would also allow the Zoo’s southbound bus stop to be moved to Western Heritage Way between the Zoo and Autry Museum of the American West, improving the efficiency of public transportation access to the Zoo, the North Hollywood High School Zoo Magnet Center, and Autry Museum. However, increased visitation and employment would drive transportation impacts related to increased VMT. The Project does not include multi-modal improvements or expansion of active transportation facilities to ensure accessibility to the Zoo. Under the Project, visitors and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Relationship to Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.15. Transportation</td>
<td>employees would continue to mainly use passenger vehicles to travel to and from the Zoo, which presents a barrier to mobility and accessibility in the region. Lack of regional transit access and pedestrian/bicycle facilities at the Zoo reduces the productivity of the transportation system to serve Zoo visitors and employees using non-vehicular modes. <strong>MM T-2</strong> would require implementation of a comprehensive TDM Program which would include measures to meet the goal of reducing employee VMT by 10 percent and reducing visitor VMT below projected conditions by the maximum extent feasible. With implementation of <strong>MM T-2</strong>, the Project would be consistent with this regional policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4.13. Parking and Land Use Management: Balance on-street and off-street parking supply with other transportation and land use objectives.</td>
<td>Consistent with Mitigation. The Mobility Plan notes that an abundance of free parking has the effect of incentivizing automobile trips and making alternative modes of transportation less attractive. The Zoo currently provides free parking. Parking fees are only charged for priority spaces on peak attendance days. The parking lots are largely unmanaged and are available to Zoo visitors, Autry Museum visitors, Zoo Magnet Center staff, and other Griffith Park visitors, including hikers and cyclists. Survey data collected for this analysis indicates that most employees (85 percent) drive to the Zoo, most commonly as single-occupant vehicles. Further, most visitors (95 percent) drive passenger vehicles and do not have ready access to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities that allow reasonable transportation to the Zoo. <strong>MM T-2</strong> would require implementation of a comprehensive TDM Program which would include measures to which would include measures to meet the goal of reducing projected visitor and employee VMT and incentives to reduce vehicle trips to the Zoo, particularly on peak days. Implementation of MM T-2 could be funded by revenue generated by a Paid Parking Program. With implementation of <strong>MM T-2</strong>, the Project would be consistent with this regional policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4.14. Wayfinding: Provide widespread, user-friendly information about mobility options and local destinations, delivered through a variety of channels including traditional signage and digital platforms.</td>
<td>Consistent. The Project involves several improvements to wayfinding both within the Zoo and on surrounding roadways and access points. Improved signage on Zoo Drive and realignment of Crystal Springs Drive would create a direct route for drivers, and pedestrians to reach the Zoo Entry through the parking lot. Relocation of the bus stop to a more convenient location between the Zoo and the Autry Museum of the American West would foster improved wayfinding using available transit services on Metro Bus Line 96 and the Parkline Shuttle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5.1. Sustainable Transportation: Encourage the development of a sustainable transportation system that promotes environmental and public health.</td>
<td>Consistent with Mitigation. The Project would result in a net increase in daily VMT that would range from roughly 80,000 during the mid-week to 158,000 new daily weekend VMTs by 2040. Total VMT associated with development of Project Phases 1-3 would increase 65 percent over the existing baseline by 2030, and 78 percent by 2040. The Project does not include multi-modal improvements or expansion of active transportation facilities to ensure accessibility to the Zoo. Under the Project, visitors and employees would continue to mainly use passenger vehicles to travel to and from the Zoo, which presents a barrier to mobility and accessibility in the region. Lack of regional transit access and pedestrian/bicycle facilities at the Zoo reduces the productivity of the transportation system to serve Zoo visitors and employees using non-vehicular modes. <strong>MM T-2</strong> would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5.2. Support ways to reduce VMT per capita.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.15-5. Regional Circulation Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Analysis (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Relationship to Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>require implementation of a comprehensive TDM Program which would include measures to incentivize rideshare/carpooling, parking management, and use of non-vehicular modes for both employees and visitors, including expansion of transit service connection to the Zoo. With implementation of <strong>MM T-2</strong>, the Project would be consistent with these regional policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5.4. Continue to encourage the adoption of low and zero emission fuel sources, new mobility technologies, and supporting infrastructure.</td>
<td>Consistent. Consistent with LAMC Section 99.05.106.5.3.3, the Project would provide at least 20 percent of the total number of additional parking spaces as electric vehicle spaces. In addition, as described in Section 2.3.3, <strong>Vision Plan Guiding Principles</strong>, a minimum to two charging stations shall be provided for each designated parking area of Zoo vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood Community Plan</td>
<td><strong>Land Use Element: Circulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent with Mitigation. As the adopted Hollywood Community Plan references the Mobility Plan 2035, please also see above detailed policy consistency analysis. The Zoo is a major regional destination drawing visitors and employees from throughout the Los Angeles region and greater Southern California area. Currently, most trips are made by personal vehicle and nearly all employee trips are made via single-occupant vehicles. Survey data collected for this analysis indicates that most employees (85 percent) drive to the Zoo, most commonly as single-occupant vehicles. Further, most visitors (95 percent) drive passenger vehicles and do not have ready access to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities that allow reasonable transportation to the Zoo. The proposed Phase 1 realignment of Crystal Spring Drive would also allow the Zoo’s southbound bus stop to be moved to Western Heritage Way between the Zoo and Autry Museum of the American West, improving the efficiency of public transportation access to the North Hollywood High School Zoo Magnet Center, Autry Museum, and the Zoo. However, increased visitation would drive transportation impacts related to increased VMT and existing transit services would not adequately serve increased demand from employees and visitors due to lack of regional connections, diversity of transit services, and efficiency of transit. While the Zoo is not a transit provider and does not have responsibility for provision of transit services, the Zoo is served by Metro Bus Line 96 and the Parkline Shuttle and works collaboratively with these agencies to ensure affordable, efficient, convenient, and attractive transit services. The Project does not include multi-modal improvements or expansion of active transportation facilities to ensure accessibility to the Zoo for employees and visitors. Under the Project, visitors and employees would continue to mainly use passenger vehicles to travel to and from the Zoo, which presents a barrier to mobility and accessibility in the region. Lack of regional transit access and pedestrian/bicycle facilities at the Zoo reduces the productivity of the transportation system to serve Zoo visitors and employees using non-vehicular modes. <strong>MM T-2</strong> would require implementation of a comprehensive TDM Program which would include measures to incentivize rideshare/carpooling, parking management, and use of non-vehicular modes for both employees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.15-5. Regional Circulation Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Analysis (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Relationship to Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Griffith Park Vision Plan</td>
<td>Consistent. The Griffith Park Vision Plan applies only to areas of the Park controlled by RAP, which excludes Zoo property. The Project would involve construction of a multi-story parking structure outside of RAP controlled property. The proposed parking structure would be up to five stories in height in Phase 7, the final phase of the Project, to accommodate 2,000 spaces within the northern parking lot. The proposed parking structure would lie entirely within Zoo property in the northern parking lot. The proposed parking structure has been identified as needed to accommodate the growth in visitation projected under the Project and meet the Zoo's goals for long-term development and programming. Without it, Zoo parking demand would exceed supply 15 days in 2025, 25 days in 2027, and 51 days in 2030 (Appendix N). The Griffith Park Vision Plan does not identify a need for new parking structure in Griffith Park, but notes that if a need arises, then the parking structure should be developed outside the Park and served by a shuttle. The Griffith Park Vision Plan applies only to areas of the park controlled by RAP, which excludes Zoo property. Since the Zoo was not included in the Griffith Park Vision Plan process, the Griffith Park Vision Plan does not apply to Zoo property, including the northern parking lot. As the Griffith Park Vision Plan does not apply to Zoo property, the proposed structure included in the Project would not conflict with this aspect from the Griffith Park Vision Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan</td>
<td>Consistent with Mitigation. The Project would improve the Zoo Drive/Western Heritage Way intersection with a signal in Phase 1 and potentially a roundabout or below-grade crossing to enhance accessibility and safety for pedestrians in Phase 7. The Project would also realign Crystal Springs Drive and reconfigure the south parking lots in accordance with all applicable City standards, including sidewalks and pedestrian crossings and a contiguous guest parking lot, which would improve the safety and comfort for pedestrians. Changes to operations and configurations of these roadways would potentially increase vehicle speeds. <strong>MM REC-1</strong> would require the long-term Zoo Drive/Western Heritage Way intersection improvements be considerate of pedestrian, bicyclist, and equestrian safety with regard to the Main Trail and that use of this important trail is not hindered by implementation of the improvement. With implementation of <strong>MM REC-1</strong>, the Project would be consistent with this local policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan
City of Los Angeles
### Table 3.15-5. Regional Circulation Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Analysis (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Relationship to Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As it has for more than 110 years, parking should remain free in Griffith Park (Page 64).</td>
<td>Consistent. The Project would expand parking capacity at the Zoo’s existing lot by adding 300 spaces to the southern parking lot and construction a 2,000-space multi-level parking structure in the northern parking lot. The Zoo currently provides free parking. Parking fees are only charged for priority spaces on peak attendance days. The parking lots are largely unmanaged and are available to Zoo visitors, Autry Museum visitors, Zoo Magnet Center staff, and other Griffith Park visitors, including hikers and cyclists. While free parking supports equitable access to Griffith Park, the Mobility Plan notes that an abundance of free parking has the effect of incentivizing automobile trips and making alternative modes of transportation less attractive. Survey data collected for this analysis indicates that most employees (85 percent) drive to the Zoo, most commonly as single-occupant vehicles. Further, most visitors (95 percent) drive passenger vehicles and do not have ready access to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities that allow reasonable transportation to the Zoo. A parking management plan that includes a fee structure paired with incentives to reduce vehicle trips to the Zoo, particularly on peak days, would increase the Project’s consistency with City policies to reduce trips. A parking fee program, as included in MM T-2, would potentially charge fees for visitors that currently enjoy free parking to reach Griffith Park attractions and trails. However, parking fees are charged at other Griffith Park attractions, including Griffith Observatory. Parking fees are used to enhance multi-modal transportation to the park to increase accessibility, including the Parkline Shuttle, providing free shuttle service within the Park. Additionally, the Griffith Park Vision Plan applies only to areas of the Park controlled by RAP, which excludes Zoo property. Thus, since the Zoo was not included in the Griffith Park Vision Plan process, the Griffith Park Vision Plan does not apply to Zoo property, including the northern parking lot. Therefore, a parking fee program within Zoo property would be consistent with the Griffith Park Vision Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the impact on trail users’ access, safety and tranquility prior to undertaking Park trail and road repairs and improvements (Page 66).</td>
<td>Consistent. The Project proposes a funicular and an aerial tram to improve accessibility within the Zoo and the Zoo has identified these features as important to improving patron mobility. These facilities would only operate in the Zoo and would not extend into undeveloped areas of Griffith Park subject to the Griffith Park Vision Plan. The funicular would become operational in Phase 1 to climb a hillside in the California planning area to bring visitors to and from the proposed California Visitor Center. The aerial tram would become operational in Phase 3 to connect the Zoo Entry and orientation plaza with the Africa Visitor Center in the Africa planning area. These improvements would improve accessibility for Zoo visitors and are included in the Project specifically to address unmet needs for transportation within the Zoo. These facilities would only operate in the Zoo and would not extend into undeveloped areas of Griffith Park. It should be noted that the Griffith Park Vision Plan applies only to areas of the Park controlled by RAP, which excludes Zoo property. Therefore, the proposed funicular and aerial tram within Zoo property would be consistent with the Griffith Park Vision Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this time, there is no clearly identified need for new recreational rides, such as railroads, aerial tramways, or funiculars (Page 68).</td>
<td>Consistent. The Project proposes a funicular and an aerial tram to improve accessibility within the Zoo and the Zoo has identified these features as important to improving patron mobility. These facilities would only operate in the Zoo and would not extend into undeveloped areas of Griffith Park subject to the Griffith Park Vision Plan. The funicular would become operational in Phase 1 to climb a hillside in the California planning area to bring visitors to and from the proposed California Visitor Center. The aerial tram would become operational in Phase 3 to connect the Zoo Entry and orientation plaza with the Africa Visitor Center in the Africa planning area. These improvements would improve accessibility for Zoo visitors and are included in the Project specifically to address unmet needs for transportation within the Zoo. These facilities would only operate in the Zoo and would not extend into undeveloped areas of Griffith Park. It should be noted that the Griffith Park Vision Plan applies only to areas of the Park controlled by RAP, which excludes Zoo property. Therefore, the proposed funicular and aerial tram within Zoo property would be consistent with the Griffith Park Vision Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.15-5. Regional Circulation Plans, Policies, and Programs Consistency Analysis (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Relationship to Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles</td>
<td>Consistent with Mitigation. The Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles notes that land use patterns - the location of housing, jobs, schools, shopping, and open space - often dictate transportation patterns. Creating land use patterns that make walking, cycling, and taking transit viable modes of transportation to multiple destinations reduces the need for driving, and therefore reduces pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. The Plan also notes that a “City Built for Health” also has an accessible and efficient multi-modal transit system and refers to the Mobility Element for City policies related to circulation (see detailed analysis of Mobility Element policies above). Under the Project, increased visitation and employment would drive GHG and air quality impacts related to increased VMT for the Zoo, which is a regionally serving attraction. Further, the Project does not include multi-modal improvements or expansion of active transportation facilities to reduce vehicle trips and trip lengths for visitors and employees. <strong>MM T-2</strong> would require implementation of a comprehensive TDM Program which would include measures to expand non-vehicular transportation modes to the Zoo to reduce trips, VMT, and congestion, and improve air quality/reduce GHG emissions. With implementation of <strong>MM T-2</strong>, the Project would be consistent with this regional policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation of **MM T-1** would reduce this impact by requiring the preparation of a Construction Impact Mitigation Plan, which would include provisional measures to reduce construction traffic, maintain public safety and associated VMT.

**Operational**

As previously described, the Zoo’s location is isolated from major transit hubs. The only public transit service that currently serve the Zoo are the Metro local bus route (Route 96) and the Parkline Shuttle (refer to Existing Conditions). Therefore, the vast majority of the Zoo’s visitors and employees drive to the Zoo (refer to Table 3.15-3). Further, employee vehicular commute rates are 15 percent higher than those for the City.

Project implementation would substantially increase daily VMT due to the addition of new employees and an increase of approximately 1.2 million new annual visitors. The largest increases in visitor VMT would occur post-completion of the proposed new California, Africa, and Treetops Visitor Centers in Phases 1, 2, and 3 (2020 through 2030), when the greatest increase in Zoo attendance is anticipated to occur. As shown in Table 3.15-6, Zoo attendance growth anticipated to occur under the Project would increase daily visitor VMT by approximately 58,324 VMT on Saturdays and Sundays, for a total of 139,287 daily visitor VMT. Throughout all phases, visitor VMT is equal to approximately 75 percent of total daily VMT on weekdays and 90 percent of total daily VMT on weekends.
Table 3.15-6. Projected Daily VMT for Visitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days of the Week</th>
<th>Daily Visitor VMT</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Per Visitor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>42,061</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/W/TH</td>
<td>32,583</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/S</td>
<td>80,963</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>53,499</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>11,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/W/TH</td>
<td>41,444</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>8,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/S</td>
<td>102,981</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>22,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>58,677</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>16,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/W/TH</td>
<td>45,454</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>12,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/S</td>
<td>112,947</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>31,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>67,733</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>25,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/W/TH</td>
<td>52,470</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>19,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/S</td>
<td>130,380</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>49,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>72,361</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>30,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/W/TH</td>
<td>56,055</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>23,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/S</td>
<td>139,287</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>58,324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: M/F = Mondays and Fridays; T/W/TH = Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays; S/S = Saturdays and Sundays
Source: Fehr & Peers 2020. See Appendix N.

The employee share of total VMT is anticipated to almost double from a high of 12,555 daily VMT during the mid-week period under existing (2019) conditions to 24,250 daily VMT in 2040. Daily employee VMT would increase 27 percent over existing conditions by 2025, 43 percent by 2027, 74 percent by 2030, and 93 percent by 2040 (Table 3.15-7). At Project buildout in 2040, daily employee VMT is projected to increase by up to 11,785 on Mondays and Fridays for a total of 24,436 daily employee VMT (Table 3.15-6).
Table 3.15-7.  Projected Daily VMT for Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days of the Week</th>
<th>Daily Employee VMT</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Per Visitor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>12,651</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/W/TH</td>
<td>12,555</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/S</td>
<td>9,978</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2025</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>16,091</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>3,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/W/TH</td>
<td>15,969</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>3,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/S</td>
<td>12,692</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>2,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2027</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>18,066</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>5,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/W/TH</td>
<td>17,929</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>5,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/S</td>
<td>14,250</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>4,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2030</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>21,972</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>9,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/W/TH</td>
<td>21,805</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>9,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/S</td>
<td>17,331</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>7,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2040</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>24,436</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>11,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/W/TH</td>
<td>24,250</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>11,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/S</td>
<td>19,274</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>9,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: M/F = Mondays and Fridays; T/W/TH = Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays; S/S = Saturdays and Sundays.
Source: Fehr & Peers 2020. See Appendix N.

As described in Section 3.15.2, *Impact Assessment Methodology*, the TAG’s established VMT threshold for event centers and regional-serving entertainment venues is a net zero increase in VMT. Given the nature of regional attractions, that typically attract visitors from a wide area this is a challenging standard to meet. Therefore, Project-related increases in VMT over the planning horizon of the Vision Plan would be considered potentially significant.
Table 3.15-8. Projected Daily VMT for Visitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily VMT Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2040 Zoo VMT Per Visitor</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Zoo VMT Per Employee</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 State VMT Per Capita</td>
<td>23.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 County VMT Per Capita</td>
<td>21.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 City VMT Per Capita</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 City VMT Per Employee</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the City’s TAG requires VMT from event centers and regional-serving entertainment venue projects to be analyzed against a threshold of zero net increase in VMT, OPR’s Guidelines recommend that a significant impact occurs when a residential or office project’s VMT exceeds a level of 15 percent below the existing regional or city VMT per capita and per employee, respectively. Based on regional VMT data, 15 percent below the County’s daily VMT per capita would be approximately 18.6. A 15 percent reduction in the City’s daily VMT would be approximately 7.9 VMT per capita and approximately 11 VMT per employee. The Zoo’s projected 2040 visitor VMT (11.92 VMT per capita) would be approximately 46 percent below the County’s average daily VMT per capita and 28 percent above the City’s average daily VMT per capita. Zoo employee daily VMT projected for 2040 (19.23 VMT per employee) would be 12 percent below the County’s current average daily VMT per capita and 49 percent above the City’ current average daily VMT per employee; as noted above, employee vehicular commuting also substantially exceeds City averages.

To provide perspective on available information on VMT for other regional attractions, the transportation assessment for the Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center Draft EIR determined that the average attendee vehicle trip length for Clippers games at the Staples Center is 18.7 miles, and average attendee vehicle trip length for concerts at The Forum is 20.3 miles. Therefore, existing and projected Zoo visitor and employee VMT per capita and per employee, respectively, are comparable to other regional event centers in the region.

As discussed under Impact T-1 above, this significant increase in VMT would be inconsistent with the adopted state, regional and local planning framework. For example, the City’s Mobility Element 2035 has a goal of reducing citywide VMT by 5 percent every 5 years through 2035, the California 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan calls for a 15 percent reduction in light duty VMT from Business as Usual by 2050, and SCAG’s 2016 RTP/SCS has a goal to reduce per capita transportation emissions 18 percent by 2035. The Zoo’s projected 61 percent increase in VMT by 2030 and 71 percent increase in VMT by 2040 would be inconsistent with the emissions and VMT reduction goals of state regional and City plans.
Because the Zoo is a regional destination located in a relatively transit poor area, with Zoo visitor mode share characterized by heavy reliance on vehicular travel, Zoo employee contributions to VMT are critical to potential mitigation efforts as the Zoo can work with employees to reduce trips and VMT more easily than with visitors. Implementation of **MM T-2** would require the Zoo to reduce employee VMT by 10 percent below existing conditions and reduce projected visitor VMT through implementation of a TDM Program, which would include measures to encourage and enhance active transportation, transit opportunities, ridesharing, and telecommuting. These TDM measures could be funded in part by revenue generated from a Paid Parking Program, as recommended under **MM T-2**.

Further, three bicycle and pedestrian bridges over the Los Angeles River and connecting to the Los Angeles River Bike Path were recently completed (in 2020) in the vicinity of Griffith Park. Three new pedestrian and bicycle connections to Griffith Park and the Project site are anticipated to be completed in advance of implementation of Phase 1 of the Zoo Vision Plan in 2025. These bridges will connect communities on the north and east side of the Los Angeles River to the Los Angeles River Bike Path (see Figure 3.15-3 and Figure 3.15-4). These would provide new opportunities for active transportation to Griffith Park and the Project site. The City is also currently planning to build two connecting bicycle facilities from the Los Angeles River Bike Path to Griffith Park adjacent to the Zoo. One connection point is approximately 0.4 miles east of the Zoo entrance, south of the intersection of Zoo Drive & Western Heritage Way. The other planned bicycle connection is near the intersection with Zoo Drive & Riverside Drive, approximately 0.8 miles north of the Zoo entrance. The planned neighborhood greenway and improvement of the existing bicycle facility on Riverside Drive will facilitate easy access between the Zoo, the bicycle path, and connections across the river into Glendale and Atwater Village. Continued growth of these networks will expand the Zoo’s bikeshed (3 miles) to extend farther into residential communities in southern and western Glendale and encourage increased active transportation from surrounding neighborhoods to Griffith Park and the Project site, further reducing future VMT.

Mitigation to reduce Project VMT with a comprehensive, adaptive TDM program, along with active transportation improvements to ensure access to non-vehicular modes of travel, would substantially reduce the significance of this impact and would better align the Project with statewide and Citywide goals for VMT and GHG reduction. Nevertheless, based on the City’s established net-zero VMT threshold, which stipulates that any net increase in VMT for event centers and regional-serving entertainment venues would be significant, the projected increase in Project VMT would be **significant and unavoidable**.
**3.15 Transportation**

| T-3: | Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? |

**Construction**

As described in Section 2.4, *Vision Plan Implementation*, construction of the proposed Project would be implemented through a 20-year development program encompassing most of the Zoo campus in seven phases, including near-term Phases 1, 2, and 3 that would be completed by 2030 and long-term Phases 4, 5, 6, and 7 that would be implemented through the Vision Plan’s horizon (2040). Each phase of the Project would generally entail the following stages: pre-construction design and permitting; demolition and grading; site preparation (including installation of utilities and stormwater infrastructure); construction; architectural coatings/finishing; and final landscaping. Building construction, paving, and architectural coating activities would occur within each phase, sequentially.

Construction traffic would include heavy haul trucks, cement trucks, equipment delivery trucks, and construction worker vehicles. Demolition would require the use of typical construction equipment, such as backhoes, to break up and remove existing asphalt, concrete, and building materials. Heavy equipment, such as bulldozers and excavators, and heavy trucks would be used to haul away large amounts of debris to a City-approved mixed C&D debris recycling facility. During excavation, heavy haul trucks would be needed for import and export of materials. The majority of excavation and soil export would occur during the construction of the Zoo Entry and California (Phase 1) and Africa (Phase 3) planning areas. The timing and frequency of heavy haul trucks would be dictated by the rate of excavation activities within the California and Africa hillside areas. This phase would also involve delivery trucks trips, construction worker vehicle trips, and other construction-related trips that would add dozens of additional trips per day to the surrounding street network and I-5 and SR-134 freeways throughout the construction period. However, construction-related increases in traffic would be intermittent across the Project’s seven phases and lower in volume than the projected operational vehicle trips associated with the proposed Project. Therefore, it would not contribute significantly to long-term traffic safety hazards.

Increased construction traffic on freeways and streets, particularly large haul trucks and other heavy equipment (e.g., cement trucks and cranes), may disrupt traffic flows, reduce lane capacities, and generally slow traffic movement. In addition, such traffic could interfere with or delay transit operations and disrupt bicycle and pedestrian circulation. For example, construction activities associated with the proposed Project may require the temporary or extended closure of adjacent traffic lanes and sidewalks on surrounding streets (i.e., Zoo Drive and Western Heritage Way) and recreational trails (i.e., Main Trail) to accommodate road realignment, intersection improvements, excavation for utilities, operation of construction equipment, etc. With the exception of proposed road and intersection improvements in Phase 1 and construction of the parking structure in Phase 7, all
construction equipment would be staged within visitor-restricted areas of the Zoo campus. Nevertheless, frequent heavy truck traffic entering and exiting the intersection of Zoo Drive & Western Heritage Way could interfere with pedestrian and bicycle flows along both streets, particularly during periods of high pedestrian activity such as events and festivals within Griffith Park and at the Zoo. Other potential construction-related impacts include idling, parked, or queued heavy trucks that could potentially obstruct visibility. Specific construction access points and haul routes would be determined during the pre-construction design and permitting associated with each individual construction phase.

As a result, construction activities and potential conflicts between vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, and equestrians within Griffith Park would be potentially significant. Implementation of MM T-1 would require preparation of a Construction Traffic & Access Management Plan to address construction traffic routing and control, safety, construction parking, and vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian safety. The Construction Traffic & Access Management Plan would require construction flaggers be present during all haul trips to maintain the flow of traffic and allow safe passage for pedestrians across crosswalks, along the Main Trail, and crossing towards the North Hollywood High School Magnet Center. The Construction Traffic & Access Management Plan would address temporary traffic impacts that could occur during each construction activity. With the implementation of MM T-1, construction-related hazards would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

Construction areas within the Zoo would be temporarily fenced and blocked off to Zoo visitors and general employees during construction activities. All construction equipment would be staged within the construction fencing. If construction equipment is moved between planning areas, this would occur in the early morning before the Zoo opens to the public. Therefore, construction activities within the Zoo would not result in safety hazards and impacts would be less than significant.

**Operational**

**Intersection and Driveway Hazards in the Project Vicinity**

The design of each Project phase would be required to undergo review by City agencies, including a review of roadway improvements and operations so that vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian access are adequately accommodated without obstructing, hindering, or impairing drivers’ reasonable and safe views of other vehicles, people walking, or people bicycling on the same street and/or restricting the ability of a driver to stop a motor vehicle without danger of an ensuing collision. Design features of individual development projects would need to be consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 policies, Walkability Checklist standards, and Vision Zero policies, which focus on eliminating existing hazards and designing the transportation network so as to enhance safety of all ways of travel. Although the Project would add vehicle trips to the surrounding roadways, this general increase in vehicle traffic volumes would be distributed among multiple streets in the Transportation Assessment area and would not be considered to substantially increase traffic hazards.
The Vision Plan proposes both onsite and offsite roadway improvements to provide for adequate internal parking lot circulation (refer to Section 2.3.6, Proposed Circulation & Transportation). For improved efficiency and safety, Western Heritage Way would be realigned to the southeastern perimeter of the south parking lot in Phase 1 of Vision Plan implementation. This would create a unified visitor parking lot and eliminate the need for pedestrians, whether Zoo visitors parking in the overflow parking lot, or North Hollywood High School Zoo Magnet Center students and staff, to cross this roadway to access these destinations. This proposed road realignment would also allow the Zoo’s southbound bus stop, currently located at the southwestern corner of the main parking lot, to be relocated to Western Heritage Way between the Zoo and the Autry Museum of the American West. This bus stop would be relocated adjacent to the entrance to the Autry Museum and the crosswalk that leads to the Zoo Entry promenade. As such, the proposed relocation of the Metro bus stop would improve the efficiency of public transit access to both attractions. The existing main parking lot south driveway (Driveway 2) would be relocated to the southwestern edge of the reconfigured parking lot. The existing driveway serving the overflow parking lot and the North Hollywood High School Zoo Magnet Center would be eliminated, thereby reducing the potential vehicle and bicycle conflicts at that location. The realigned roadway and south driveway would be engineered to comply with LADOT standards and designed to intersect the roadway at a right angle to address line of sight, turning radii, spacing, etc. The roadway would also provide necessary sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian movement controls to meet the City’s requirements to protect vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian safety. The roadway would also be designed to accommodate mobility services for TNCs (e.g., Uber, Lyft, etc.). The existing Class II bicycle facility would be maintained on Western Heritage Way/Crystal Springs Drive following the roadway and driveway realignments. The driveway would be designed and configured with sufficient sight-distance to avoid potential conflicts with transit services, bicycles, and pedestrian traffic, consistent with the Citywide Design Guidelines. Therefore, the Project would not substantially increase hazards or conflicts, and would contribute to overall vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian safety. The proposed signalization of the Crystal Springs Drive & Zoo Drive intersection would also occur during Phase 1 of the Vision Plan. Signalization of the intersection would provide pedestrian crosswalks and walking signals to increase safety for bicycles, pedestrians, and equestrians crossing Zoo Drive.

The Vision Plan also contemplates long-term improvements to this intersection to address vehicular congestion, including a roundabout or grade separation of the intersection planned for Phase 7 of the Vision Plan, if needed. The roundabout option would reduce stopping at the intersection and would therefore facilitate speeding and cut-through traffic through Griffith Park, potentially increasing vehicle speeds and conflicts between bicycles and pedestrians. The grade separation option would place the north-south movements below the east-west movements with connections by ramps. Grade separation would also increase vehicle speeds and speeding, induce vehicle demand for use of Griffith Park as a cut-through facility for commuters, and decrease safety for all roadway users, all of which would be potentially inconsistent with the goals and policies outlined in the Griffith Park Vision Plan (refer to
Impact T-1). The Griffith Park Vision Plan emphasizes moderating vehicle speeds and discourages the use of Park roadways as cut-through facilities, travel behavior which presents a safety hazard for Park visitors who share and cross park roadways, and is disruptive to the tranquility of the Park. The implementation of the roundabout or grade separation options to the intersection of Zoo Drive & Western Heritage Way would have the potential to create safety hazards for bicycles, pedestrians, and equestrians due to increased speeds and speeding through Griffith Park. However, these designs are still conceptual and final designs for intersection improvements would be developed in consultation with LADOT and RAP to prioritize safe travel for people driving, walking, and bicycling within the Transportation Assessment area.

The roadway and intersection designs would undergo more detailed design and review prior to approval of a grading permit. The street designs would be subject to approval by LADOT, RAP, and the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD), along with other City agencies. Therefore, the changes to the transportation network would be consistent with City policies and design standards and would not result in significant driving hazards. Thus, with compliance with City standards and regulations and review and approval by various City agencies, the proposed Project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for people driving, and impacts related to driving hazards would be less than significant.

**Internal Zoo Transportation Hazards**

Proposed internal circulation changes would improve pedestrian and vehicle mobility and safety by simplifying travel through the Zoo campus. The proposed internal circulation system would separate all service traffic from pedestrian routes to improve the visitor safety and operational efficiencies. The proposed Primary Path Loop would provide a complete and intuitive circulation loop for visitors to enjoy all the Zoo’s exhibits, rather than the current out-and-back path Zoo visitors use today. Clear guest pathways would streamline circulation and avoid confusion or “cutting through” landscaping and exhibit areas. These internal circulation improvements would also be graded at no more than 5 percent slope to provide more ADA-accessible and pedestrian-friendly navigation for visitors. The two proposed turnarounds for large delivery trucks at the Gottlieb Animal Health and Conservation Center and the Service Center would be accessed via dedicated service roads to avoid conflicts with visitor traffic.

As described in Section 3.9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, development of the proposed ATS and funicular at the Zoo would increase the potential for safety hazards associated with engineering functions. The ATS would comply with the current applicable safety regulations, including Safety Requirements for Passenger Tramways (ANSI B77.1) as well as CCR Title 8, Subchapter 6.1, Article 8 Wire Rope and Strand Requirements. Similarly, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the California planning area’s funicular would comply with the current American National Standard for Funiculars—Safety Requirements (ANSI B77.2). Implementation of the current engineering design and
operational standards for the proposed ATS and funicular would ensure there are no near-term or long-term safety impacts associated with operation of these structures. Therefore, incorporation of the ATS and funicular at the Zoo under the proposed Project would result in no significant impacts to safety.

Proposed Project improvements to the Zoo’s internal circulation would result in minor beneficial and less than significant operational impacts to transportation safety hazards.

**T-4:** Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

**Construction**

Project implementation would involve demolition, excavation, and construction of roadways, pathways, and access routes both internal and external to the Zoo. Construction activities would result in temporary changes to roadways, access points, and staging areas that currently provide emergency access to the Zoo and nearby areas in Griffith Park.

As described in Section 3.13, Public Services, roads surrounding the Zoo provide direct emergency access to the western and southern sides of the Zoo and the southeastern area of Griffith Park. Temporary disturbance of these roadways during Phase 1 (2020-2025) has the potential to temporarily block emergency access due to realignment and repaving of roadways and staging of large construction equipment. Specifically, the collective effect of potential reconstructing the Zoo Drive/Western Heritage Drive intersection and realigning Crystal Springs Drive during the same phase would potentially cause congestion during peak hour conditions that would obstruct emergency access. Emergency vehicles may also be required to navigate detours and other temporary traffic controls that can often change regularly during construction. Dedicated emergency access points to the Zoo may change or be incidentally blocked by these temporary conditions.

Construction of internal Zoo improvements, including visitor-serving uses, pathways, and access roads, would occur over seven phases where each phase would be completed prior to groundbreaking on the next phase. During construction of each phase, the area affected would be closed and fenced off for regular access while the remainder of the Zoo would remain open and accessible. This proposed phasing plan would limit disruption or obstruction of access and evacuation routes within the Zoo during construction. However, during Phase 1, the Zoo Entry and California planning areas would be under construction concurrently and closed to the public, which would impair both access and evacuation through the front gates. Also, throughout construction, internal rerouting and temporary closures of the proposed planning areas may block evacuation routes or cause circuitous or inefficient evacuation, as well as limit emergency access to internal areas of the Zoo.

To ensure emergency access is maintained during Project construction, a construction-phase Zoo circulation and access plan would ensure that an alternate entrance and secondary access is available and clearly indicated and that emergency responders could proceed directly to the most efficient entrance without undue delay or confusion. LAFD would be notified of any
Project traffic control plans implemented during construction of external roadway improvements (e.g., Crystal Springs Drive/Western Heritage Way) to coordinate emergency response routing. With this coordination, the proposed Project would not interfere with emergency access to the site. Similarly, current Zoo access plans on file with LAFD would ensure that any temporary access routes delineated during construction would inform emergency responders of alternate primary and secondary entrances.

Implementation of **MM T-1**, requiring a Construction Traffic & Access Management Plan with measures for controlling and ensuring continued access to the Zoo and through the interior of the Zoo circulation system, would address impacts from construction of proposed improvements on emergency access. The Construction Traffic & Access Management Plan would also establish procedures for coordination with local emergency services, training for flagman for emergency vehicles traveling through the work zone, and other measures as necessary to facilitate emergency vehicle travel. Thus, the Construction Traffic & Access Management Plan would ensure the continued provision of emergency access during construction of the proposed Project. Implementation of **MM T-1** would ensure that construction impacts on emergency access would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

**Operational**

The proposed Project would include improvements to existing roadways and circulatory systems both within and surrounding the Zoo, which would improve direct emergency access to the Zoo. Emergency access to the Zoo is currently available via Crystal Springs Drive, Zoo Drive, and Griffith Park Drive. Access into the Zoo is available at the employee and service entrance located south of the Zoo Entry from Crystal Springs Drive and at the Gottlieb Animal Health and Conservation building from Griffith Park Drive. Under the Project, emergency vehicles would access the Project site through either:

- The Zoo’s existing main service and administrative entrance on the east end;
- An improved delivery vehicle entry at the Gottlieb Animal Health and Conservation Center on the west end; or
- A new vehicle entrance proposed at the existing employee parking area at the north end of the Zoo within the California planning area.

As described in Section 3.13, *Public Services*, the proposed Project would include improvements to existing roadways and circulatory systems both within and surrounding the Zoo that would improve emergency access. Improved vehicle entry at the Gottlieb Animal Health and Conservation Center and a new vehicle entrance emergency vehicle access from Zoo Drive would expand and enhance emergency access to the interior of the Zoo and the perimeter fence line. In addition, proposed realignment of Crystal Springs Drive and improvement of the Crystal Springs Drive & Zoo Drive intersection would reduce congestion and improve emergency vehicle response to the Zoo. These external circulation improvements would occur in Phase 1 of the Project, which would provide improved access to the Zoo early in Project implementation. Proposed offsite improvements at the intersection
of Zoo Drive and Western Heritage Way would also reduce congestion on local roads and both I-5 and SR-134. Proposed parking improvements, including an additional 300 spaces at the east end of the Zoo Magnet Campus during Phase 1, the construction of a multi-story above ground parking structure on the north parking lot during Phase 7, and the addition of staff parking lots at the Gottlieb Animal Health and Conservation Center and proposed service center building, would expand parking availability, thereby reducing congested circulation as vehicles make multiple rounds in search of open parking spots. Such external improvements could reduce overall traffic congestion and increase site accessibility for emergency response vehicles as well.

Proposed improvements to internal service roads would occur phase by phase to allow for more efficient and direct emergency access to areas within the Zoo. Emergency vehicle access to the interior of the Zoo would be expanded and enhanced by the proposed improvements to the Project site’s internal circulatory system, including the reconfiguration of internal pedestrian and non-pedestrian service roads lining the boundaries of the Zoo, leading either to the Gottlieb Animal Health and Conservation Center or the proposed Service Center Building. Installation of a perimeter tram road and improved service roads would provide improved emergency vehicle access to high fire hazard areas along the Zoo’s perimeter. Service roads would be closed to visitors, allowing efficient and direct emergency response to areas within the Zoo. Further, proposed improvements to pedestrian paths would also expand site accessibility, given that proposed circulation improvements would be required to meet LAFD and California Fire Code standards. Improvement of existing Zoo perimeter roads and construction of new perimeter roads within the California planning area in Phase 1 would also improve emergency vehicular access to the Zoo’s high fire hazard areas. These improvements would create more direct and efficient emergency response access to all areas within the Zoo and would not degrade or further exacerbate existing emergency access to the Zoo.

Proposed improvements to site circulation and access would maintain or improve emergency access to the site. Therefore, Project operational impacts to emergency access would be less than significant.

3.15.4 Mitigation Measures

**MM REC-1 shall apply.**

**MM T-1 Construction Traffic & Access Management Plan**

The Zoo shall prepare, implement, and maintain a Construction Traffic & Access Management Plan during the pre-construction design and permitting for each Project phase to address traffic management during construction. The Construction Traffic & Access Management Plan shall be subject to LADOT approval and designed to:

- Minimize traffic impacts on the surrounding street network within Griffith Park and surrounding areas to the maximum extent feasible during each construction phase;
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- Minimize impacts to existing public recreational uses and parking to the greatest extent practicable;
- Ensure safety for both those constructing the proposed Project and the surrounding community;
- Minimize the impacts of truck traffic within Griffith Park;
- Avoid conflicts with planned events and festivals within Griffith Park to the greatest extent possible; and
- Provide for coordination with adjacent or nearby construction projects.

To achieve these outcomes, the Plan shall, at a minimum, include the following:

1. **Ongoing Requirements throughout the Duration of Construction**

   - A detailed Construction Traffic & Access Management Plan for work zones shall be maintained. At a minimum, this shall include parking and travel lane configurations; warning, regulatory, guide, and directional signage; and area sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and parking lanes. The plan shall include specific information regarding the Project’s construction activities that may disrupt normal pedestrian and traffic flow and the measures to address these disruptions.
   - Work within the public right-of-way (i.e., road realignment, intersection improvements, construction of the proposed parking structure) that is performed before 9:00 AM and after 2:00 PM on weekdays during the school year shall require flaggers and traffic controls to avoid conflicts with pick-up and drop-off at the North Hollywood High School Magnet Center.
   - Any requests for work before or after normal construction hours within the public right-of-way shall be subject to review and approval through the After-Hours Permit process administered by the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety.
   - A Zoo-funded on-site construction monitor shall be present to ensure safety when work occurs within the public right-of-way (i.e., road realignment, intersection improvements, construction of the proposed parking structure), or when more hazardous activities are occurring such as heavy-haul materials delivery or oversize transport. The Construction Traffic & Access Management Plan shall identify the activities that would prompt the presence of an on-site monitor.
   - Trucks shall only travel on a City-approved construction route. Construction routes shall avoid Griffith Park roads to the maximum extent feasible. Truck queuing/staging shall not be allowed on City streets. Limited queuing may occur on the construction site itself.
   - Staging areas for construction materials and equipment shall be limited to fenced-off areas within the Zoo campus (with the exception of the road realignment and intersection improvements during Phase 1 and construction of the parking structure during Phase 7).
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- Materials and equipment shall be minimally visible to the public; the preferred location for materials is to be onsite, with a minimum amount of materials within a work area in the public right-of-way.
- Off-street parking shall be provided for construction workers, which may include the use of a remote location with shuttle transport to the site, if determined necessary by the City.
- At the discretion of the City, construction work shall not be permitted during City-approved or RAP-sponsored large events or festivals (e.g., Griffith Park Trail Race, Harvest Festival, concerts at the Greek Theatre) within Griffith Park.

2. Project Coordination Elements That Shall Be Implemented Prior to Commencement of Construction

- The Zoo shall advise the traveling public of impending construction activities through active outreach measures (e.g., information signs, portable message signs, media listing/notification, social media, and implementation of an approved Construction Traffic & Access Management Plan).
- The Zoo shall obtain needed City permits (e.g., Use of Public Property Permit, Oversize Load Permit), as well as any Caltrans permits required, for any construction work requiring encroachment into public rights-of-way, detours, or any other work within the public right-of-way.
- The Zoo shall provide timely notification of construction schedules to all affected agencies (e.g., Metro, RAP, LAFD, LAPD, Public Works Department, and BOE), as well as adjacent facilities (e.g., Autry Museum of the American West, Zoo Magnet School, Wilson-Harding Golf Course).
- The Zoo shall coordinate construction work with affected agencies in advance of start of work. Coordination with Metro regarding construction activities that may impact Metro bus lines (e.g., Metro Line 96) or result in closures lasting over 6 months shall be initiated at least 30 days in advance of construction activities.
- The Zoo shall obtain LADOT approval of any haul routes for earth, concrete, or construction materials and equipment hauling.

**MM-T-2 Zoo Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program**

The Zoo shall prepare and implement a comprehensive TDM program to provide trip reduction strategies for Zoo visitors and employees. The TDM program shall be prepared by a qualified transportation planner and submitted by the Zoo to LADOT for review and approval prior to construction activity. The goal of the TDM Program shall be to reduce Zoo employee VMT by 10 percent below existing conditions by 2040. The TDM Program shall also apply all feasible VMT reduction strategies for visitor vehicle trips to reduce visitor VMT below projected conditions to the maximum extent feasible. The TDM Program shall be developed and approved prior to operation of Phase 1 of the Project and shall be maintained and adjusted as needed continuously.
The TDM Program shall be overseen by a Zoo TDM Coordinator. The Zoo TDM Coordinator shall be qualified transportation planner and may be a City/Zoo employee or contractor. The Zoo TDM Coordinator shall monitor visitor and employee mode share with annual surveys, collect and analyze parking and transit use data, and develop annual reports for submittal to BOE and LADOT. The surveys shall capture trip origin data, travel mode, number of people in the party, and other key data and indicators for TDM program performance relative to VMT. The Zoo TDM Coordinator shall ensure that monitoring efforts capture all Zoo-related travel behavior. Annual monitoring reports shall include trip length surveys completed at least biannually by a sample of Zoo patrons and annually by Zoo employees (e.g., trip origin data collection). Monitoring results shall be used to determine the appropriate TDM measures to employ in the coming year to maximize reductions in VMT per capita, champion transit and alternative mode transportation to the Zoo for visitors and employees, develop appropriate incentives to increase the Zoo’s transit mode share incrementally over time, and develop effective marketing tools to advertise transit and non-vehicular travel mode availability and incentives.

Each annual TDM Program monitoring report shall:

- Describe the TDM efforts in place at the time to reduce vehicular trips;
- Summarize collected survey data and results;
- Evaluate parking utilization and transit use, comparing trends and annual changes;
- Analyze the results of trip reduction measures in reducing VMT relative to projected VMT increases;
- Evaluate change in available transportation infrastructure and programs serving the Zoo,
- Report the effect on Zoo employee and visitor VMT per capita and compare to current Citywide VMT per capita; and
- Provide recommendations for adjustments to the TDM Program to adaptively manage VMT reductions for visitors and employees.

The TDM Coordinator shall oversee annual monitoring and reporting to evaluate the effectiveness of the TDM measures being implemented at the Zoo and recommend adjustments as needed to the TDM Program on an annual basis. The annual report shall be submitted to LADOT for review. The TDM measures shall be assessed and adapted as necessary based on the results of this review. Final annual reports and data (e.g., survey data) shall be shared with the City and made readily available for public review and use.

The TDM Program shall be prepared consistent with the Mobility Element and in consultation with LADOT, as well as RAP, if required for measures affecting Griffith Park. Information regarding the TDM program shall be distributed to all Zoo employees and shall be posted on the Zoo’s website and other marketing materials for Zoo visitors and updated annually as needed based on the annual reports.
The TDM Coordinator shall consider a range of measures for the TDM Program to reduce employee and visitor VMT per capita, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. **Measures to Reduce Zoo Employee VMT Per Capita**
   - Encourage employee participation in existing vanpool programs, including City employee and Metro vanpool programs, or develop/expand the Zoo vanpool program.
   - Provide employee incentives to participate in a vanpool program and regularly advertise the opportunities to vanpool through a variety of employee communication formats.
   - Implement a paid parking program to discourage employee vehicle trips to the Zoo and generate revenue that the Zoo may use to expand transit ridership for employee trips. Pricing options of onsite employee parking spaces include pay-per-use or weekly/monthly parking passes.
   - Partner with rideshare companies such as Uber or Lyft to guarantee availability of an emergency ride home or provide access to City vehicles for this purpose.
   - Offer employee TDM benefits for use of active transportation commuter modes, including ridesharing, transit, bicycling walking, carpool/vanpool, etc. Incentives for Zoo employees could include flexible scheduling or options for telecommuting.
   - Maximize opportunities for Zoo employee to telecommute as part of regular scheduling.
   - Provide a transportation information center and a commuter club to support a collaborative approach among employees to TDM.
   - Provide onsite bicycle facilities (i.e., shower, racks, and lockers) for Zoo employees in an amount and location informed by annual employee surveys and monitoring reports.
   - Encourage bicycles as a primary commute mode for employees and provide incentives for biking to work, including providing free or discounted equipment to employees such as helmets, locks, bicycle commuter gear, and bicycles (electric or non-electric).
   - Coordinate with LARiverworks, RAP, and LADOT to identify and facilitate new bicycle and pedestrian linkages and bridges between the Zoo and neighboring communities, particularly linkages to Los Angeles River Bike Path. The Zoo, RAP, and LADOT in consultation with the City of Glendale shall consider development of a new bicycle and pedestrian bridge across Colorado Boulevard, linking neighborhoods within the City of Glendale to Griffith Park, south of the Project site. The Zoo, RAP, and LADOT shall ensure that all bicycle and pedestrian linkages and bridges to Griffith Park are well-signed and provide lighting, are regularly patrolled by law enforcement.
   - Continue to seek grant funding to support expanded TDM measures to reduce employee VMT per capita.
2. Measures to Reduce Zoo Visitor VMT Per Capita

- Offer discounted Zoo entrance tickets for patrons using transit to visit the Zoo. Visitors must provide proof of arrival via transit to receive discounted rate. Advertise the availability of ticket discounts for transit through social media and in coordination with RAP, LADOT, and Metro.
- Coordinate with Metro to increase bus service frequency to the Zoo bus stop.
- Seek funding opportunities to provide proportional share funding in coordination with RAP to expand Parkline Shuttle service to increase access to Griffith Park and Zoo from nearby Metro light rail stations, as follows:
  - Expand Parkline Shuttle service to connect to the Metro B Line Vermont/Sunset station in the south and the Metro B/G (formerly, Orange) Line North Hollywood station in the north. Shuttle routes should be coordinated with LADOT and RAP.
  - Extend Parkline Shuttle service hours to begin at 9:30 AM, before the Zoo opens each day. This expanded service should first be targeted to occur during peak demand periods such as Easter, Memorial Day, and during Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) holidays, such as the week of spring break.
  - Coordinate with RAP to monitor the success of the Parkline Shuttle during such peak periods and to fund expansion of the service over time, as needed, to facilitate and accommodate increased ridership. The program shall then be expanded to broaden the hours and days of operation as needed to meet demand.
  - Coordinate with RAP on how best to advertise and perform outreach to user groups regarding the availability of this transit service and methods to increase ridership (e.g., social media outreach).
- Seek funding opportunities to provide proportional share funding in coordination with Metro and LADOT to provide an express shuttle service to and from Los Angeles Union Station and the Zoo.
  - Provide Union Station shuttle during operating hours on weekends and legal holidays. This new service shall first be targeted as a pilot program to occur during peak demand periods such as Easter, Memorial Day, and during LAUSD holidays, such as spring break week. If successful, the program shall then be expanded to broaden hours and days of operation.
  - Coordinate with Metro and LADOT on how best to advertise and perform outreach to user groups regarding the availability of this transit service and methods to increase ridership (e.g., social media outreach).
- Maintain and expand onsite bicycle parking for Zoo visitors in an amount and location informed by visitor surveys and annual monitoring reports.
- Maintain and expand short-term bicycle parking within the Zoo to meet changing demands evaluated in the TDM Program annual reports.
• Provide well-lit, clearly signed, bicycle parking that is convenient and in close proximity to the Zoo Entry to encourage bicycling by visitors.
• Provide secure short-term bicycle parking and/or a bicycle parking attendant, bicycle valet, or indoor bicycle parking facility to prevent theft and ensure parking availability for Zoo visitors.
• Design bicycle racks with space-efficient configurations, such as vertically staggered racks and two-tier racks.
• Provide a bike share station at the Zoo as a part of the Metro Bike Share, Ofo, or a new bike share program specific to Griffith Park. Funding shall be determined based on the area required for the bike station. The bike share station shall be well-lit and located at a safe and convenient location adjacent to the Zoo entrance.

• Develop and implement a paid parking program for Zoo visitors to discourage personal vehicle trips to the Zoo and provide a secure funding source to help subsidize TDM, transit improvement, and other trip reduction measures, considering the following options:
  • A Peak Period Parking Program would charge for preferred parking during the highest visitation periods, including all weekends (Saturdays and Sundays), holidays, the spring months (April and May), and December, collecting fees for preferred parking on approximately 170 days of the year (based on the 2020 calendar year).
  • An Everyday Parking Program would charge for preferred parking 364 days of the year (every day the Zoo is open).
  • Maintain at least 15 percent of parking spaces as free parking to meet the needs of disadvantaged households and ensure that low-income visitors may continue to visit the Zoo.
  • The Zoo’s TDM Coordinator shall prepare a quarterly report on the effectiveness of the Paid Parking Program and monthly revenue generated.
  • Continue to seek grant funding to support expanded TDM measures to reduce visitor VMT per capita.

### 3.15.5 Impacts Summary

**Project Consistency with Applicable Plans, Policies, and Ordinances**

Implementation of **MM T-2**, which would require implementation of a comprehensive TDM Program, would ensure the Project reduces projected VMT in accordance with the California Climate Change Scoping Plan, SCAG’s 2016 RTP/SCS, and Mobility Plan 2035. Therefore, the Project along with required mitigation measures would meet all VMT goals within these plans. Final policy consistency would be determined as part of Project review and approval process with the City. However, based upon this preliminary analysis, the Project, with implementation of required mitigation measures identified in this EIR and required
consistency with existing regulations, would be consistent with the SCAG RTP/SCS, Los Angeles General Plan, Hollywood Community Plan, Griffith Park Vision Plan, and Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles. The Project would not cause significant environmental impacts due to conflicts with any transportation plan, policy, or regulation, and impacts, and the Project would not preclude the City’s implementation of any adopted policy and/or program. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

**VMT**

Implementation of the TDM Program (MM T-2) would reduce Zoo employee VMT by 10 percent. With implementation of MM T-2, daily employee VMT would be reduced to approximately 19,775 on Mondays and Fridays (the highest employee VMT days of the week) in 2030 and 21,992 in 2040 on Mondays and Fridays. This would result in a net increase from existing (2019) conditions of approximately 7,124 in 2030 and 9,341 in 2040. The TDM Program would also reduce daily visitor VMT below the projected 139,287 VMT in 2040.

While MM T-2 would substantially reduce Project VMT, based on the City’s established VMT threshold, which stipulates that any net increase in VMT for event centers and regionally-serving entertainment venues would be significant, the projected increase in Project VMT would be significant and unavoidable.

**Transportation Hazards**

Implementation of MM T-1 would minimize impacts related to construction traffic that would occur during each phase of construction over the 20-year planning horizon. Additionally, public notices, designated detour routes, and Zoo-provided construction flaggers would ensure continued pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle safety within the vicinity of the Project site throughout the duration of construction. By requiring haul trips to be restricted between 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM, peak early morning and afternoon construction truck trips would be reduced, which would reduce impacts on the surrounding transportation network during morning and evening commutes. By developing parking and access plans, construction of the proposed Project would generate reduced impacts on public roadways, and with designated haul routes approved prior to the commencement of construction, MM T-1 would prevent substantial truck traffic in residential neighborhoods. By requiring flaggers, Project construction would avoid pedestrian safety impacts associated with pick-up and drop-off at the North Hollywood High School Magnet Center. Implementation of MM T-1 would reduce construction-related transportation impacts to less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Coordination and required approval of final roadway designs would ensure less than significant operational impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle safety associated with the short-term and long-term intersection improvements at the intersection of Zoo Drive & Western Heritage Way.
Emergency Access

Implementation of **MM T-1** would reduce construction-related impacts on the street network and allow for the continued emergency access to the Project site. By requiring haul trips to be restricted between 9:00 AM and 2:00 PM, impacts on the surrounding transportation network would be reduced during the AM and PM peak hours. Additionally, **MM T-1** would require coordination with all affected agencies (e.g., Metro, RAP, Police Department, Fire Department, and DCP) and all owners and tenants of property within a radius of 500 feet. With this coordination and the implementation of measures identified in the Construction Traffic & Access Management Plan (e.g., flaggers), potential effects on emergency access would be minimized. As such, implementation of **MM T-1** would reduce construction-related impacts to *less than significant with mitigation*.

Proposed improvements to site circulation and access would maintain or improve operational emergency access and operational impacts to emergency access would be *less than significant*. There would be no unavoidable adverse impacts on emergency access associated with implementation of the proposed Project.