



Saving Wildlife. Enriching Our Communities. Creating Connections to Nature.

LOS ANGELES ZOO
5333 Zoo Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Phone (323) 644-4200
www.lazoo.org

KAREN BASS
Mayor

NITHYA RAMAN
Council Member 4th District

ZOO
COMMISSIONERS

KAREN B. WINNICK
President

BERNARDO SILVA
Vice President

JUSTIN MIKITA

DARYL SMITH

ELNIE VANNATIM

October 21, 2025

The Honorable City Council
of the City of Los Angeles
c/o City Clerk, Room 395, City Hall
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

LOS ANGELES ZOO VISION PLAN MODIFICATIONS (C.F. No. 25-0783)

Honorable Members:

The Department of the Zoo (Zoo Department) hereby transmits this report pursuant to the City Council's action on August 20, 2025 (C.F. 25-0783) authorizing the Zoo Director to execute a Settlement Agreement for Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCP03390 (*Griffith J. Griffith Charitable Trust, et al. v. City of Los Angeles et al.*), and instructing the Zoo Department to prepare and transmit for City Council's consideration: (i) modifications to the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan, and (ii) recommended findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Recommendations for City Council

1. DETERMINE that the Proposed Project Modifications to the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan (Revised Project), as presented in the Zoo Department's report dated October 21, 2025 in the Council File, do not involve new or substantially increased significant impacts; that changed circumstances with respect to the project do not involve new or substantially increased significant impacts; and that no new information shows new or substantially increased significant impacts, or new and/or previously rejected feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that substantially reduce significant impacts, and no major changes are needed to the Revised Final Environmental Impact Report certified by City Council on August 2, 2023 (C.F. No. 21-0282), and no subsequent or supplemental Environmental Impact Report is needed pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, as supported by the Zoo Department's report and the Bureau of Engineering's report attached thereto.

DENISE M. VERRET
*Chief Executive Officer
& Zoo Director*



AN EQUAL EMPLOYMENT
OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

2. APPROVE the Proposed Project Modifications to the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan (Revised Project), as presented in the Zoo Department's report dated October 21, 2025 in the Council File.

Proposed Modifications to the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan (Revised Project)

The Zoo Department proposes modifying the Zoo Vision Plan approved by City Council on August 2, 2023 (C.F. No. 21-0828), which was approved as Alternative 1.5: The California Focused Conservation Alternative in the certified Revised Final EIR and the 2022 Los Angeles Zoo Draft Plan: Alternative 1.5 (Approved Project), as follows:

1. In constructing the Approved Project, the Zoo shall not construct the California Visitor Center structure depicted and described in the Approved Project;
2. In lieu of the California Visitor Center structure, in the vicinity of the site of the proposed California Visitor Center structure along the hilltop, the Zoo may establish an outdoor interpretive site consisting of no more than three outdoor shade structures of not more than 1,500 square feet each, with supporting amenities, including signage, seating, and restrooms (collectively, Interpretive Site Improvements);
3. Lighting for the Interpretive Site Improvements will be consistent with the design guidelines developed under the Approved Project, as stated on pages 4-100 to 4-101 in the Revised Final EIR certified by City Council on August 2, 2023 (C.F. No. 21-0828) (Revised Final EIR), related to addressing ecological concerns related to sensitive species.
 - a. Pathway lighting improvements constructed under the Approved Project within the immediate vicinity of the Interpretive Site Improvements will not exceed 6 feet in height, provided however that the Zoo may provide other lighting under the Approved Project as necessary to ensure safety, security, and proper maintenance, as determined by the Zoo in its sole discretion.
 - b. Digital advertising displays will not be constructed as part of the Approved Project within the immediate vicinity of the Interpretive Site Improvements, provided however that the City may provide other signage, including interpretive, directional, facility, and safety-related signs, pursuant to the Approved Project.
4. In constructing the Approved Project, the Zoo shall not construct the proposed Condor Canyon described in the Approved Project, or a tunnel in lieu of Condor Canyon as a modification to the Approved Project, pursuant to the Revised Final EIR.
5. If, prior to California Area construction, special status flora species (e.g., Nevin's barberry and city-protected trees/shrubs) are identified, they will be avoided to the extent feasible and mitigated consistent with the Approved Project's adopted Mitigation Measures as determined by the City's experts.

6. Within a contiguous area not less than 5 acres along and adjacent to the ridgeline in the California Area, the boundaries of which will be established by the Zoo in its sole discretion (“Subject Area”), the Zoo will withhold developing the Approved Project, provided however that the Zoo may locate, develop, and construct the Interpretive Site Improvements, trails, funicular, and related utility and other improvements, including restoring and enhancing California native plants, within the Subject Area, and the Zoo may continue existing uses, including but not limited to construction preparation and material storage, within the Subject Area.
7. Notwithstanding the above-noted limits on implementing portions of the Approved Project, the approved modifications to the Project do not preclude or limit the City’s discretion to otherwise approve development on any portion of the Zoo, including separately analyzing and approving separate future projects with similar features as the limited portions of the Approved Project.

Findings Pursuant to CEQA

As further detailed in the attached report from the Bureau of Engineering (BOE), which is incorporated by this reference into this report, and further incorporated into City Council’s determinations and approvals, none of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 requiring a subsequent EIR have occurred. Specifically, the following findings regarding CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 support City Council’s approval of the proposed project modifications:

1. Proposed changes in the project will not be substantial, will not require major revisions of the previous EIR, and will not involve new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
2. Changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken have not been substantial, will not require any major revisions of the previous EIR, and will not involve any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
3. No new information of substantial importance shows any of the following: (A) significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR from the project; (B) significant effects previously examined that would be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR; (C) mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (D) mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Based on this, no subsequent or supplemental EIR shall be required pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and Public Resources Code Section 21166. No technical changes or additions are necessary to address the Revised Project. Therefore, no additional CEQA environmental review is required.

Fiscal Impact Statement

There is no fiscal impact as a result of the approval and certification of this action as there is no obligation of funding.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Denise Verret". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Denise Verret
Chief Executive Officer & Zoo Director
Los Angeles Zoo

Attachment: September 22, 2025 City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering Analysis Under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 and Public Resources Code Section 21166 re Further Environmental Review (Project: Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan, Alternative 1.5, Approved August 2, 2023 (Council File No. 21-0828), as Modified by Proposed Project Revisions; Previously Certified EIR: State Clearinghouse No. 2019011053)

CC: Steven G. Martin, Deputy City Attorney
Maria Martin, Environmental Affairs Officer, Bureau of Engineering, Department of Public Works

**ANALYSIS UNDER CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15162-15164
FOR A PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED EIR**

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 22, 2025

TO: Denise Verret, Chief Executive Officer and Zoo Director, Zoo
Department
Norman Mundy

FROM: Norman Mundy, BOE Environmental Management Division

SUBJECT: ANALYSIS UNDER CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15162-15164 AND
PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21166 RE FURTHER
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

PROJECT: Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan, Alternative 1.5, Approved August 2,
2023 (Council File No. 21-0828), as Modified by Proposed Project
Revisions

PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED EIR: SCH# 2019011053

I. INTRODUCTION

This memo analyzes: 1) whether additional environmental review is triggered under CEQA prior to the City Council approving project changes to the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan, and 2) if further environmental review is needed, what level of additional environmental review is appropriate to comply with CEQA.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On August 2, 2023, the City Council certified a Revised Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and approved the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan, Alternative 1.5 (see Council File No. 21-0828). This EIR certification and project approval is final; no further administrative appeal of these decisions is available. The approved Project consists of the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan, Alternative 1.5 which would guide future development and modernization of the Los Angeles Zoo.

Electronic copies of the previously certified EIR, the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan Findings of Fact and Overriding Considerations, and the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan Mitigation Monitoring Program can be accessed via the following web link:

<https://engineering.lacity.gov/about-us/divisions/environmental-management/projects/los-angeles-zoo-vision-plan>

A copy of the previous final approval action, the CEQA Notice of Determination, is attached as Exhibit A.

The Project that was approved (Approved Project) is described in the EIR as Alternative 1.5: The California Focused Conservation Alternative.

The City's final project approval adopted mitigation to reduce the potentially significant impacts related to: Air Quality (Consistency with Applicable Air Quality Plan / Nonattainment Pollutants / Expose Sensitive Receptors to Pollutant Concentrations); Biological Resources Effects on Special-Status Species or Habitat / Interfere with Wildlife Movement or Corridors / Conflict with Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources); Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources (Archaeological Resources / Human Remains / Tribal Cultural Resources); Energy (State or Local Plan for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency Consistency); Urban Forestry Resources (Local Tree Policy or Ordinance Consistency / Loss of Urban Forest); Geology and Soils (Seismic Related Ground Failure / Landslides / Unstable Geological Unit / Paleontological Resources); Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Consistency with Plans, Policies or Regulations Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing GHG Emissions); Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Release of Hazardous Materials / Hazardous Materials within One-quarter Mile of a School / List of Hazardous Materials Sites); Hydrology and Water Quality (Water Quality / Groundwater Supplies and Recharge / Drainage Patterns); Land Use and Planning (Conflict with Land Use Plan, Policy or Regulation); Noise (Ambient Noise Levels); Public Services (Fire Protection / Police Protection / Schools); Recreation (Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities); Transportation (Project Consistency with Applicable Transportation Plans, Policies and Regulations / Hazardous Design Features / Emergency Access); Utilities (Water / Stormwater Drainage); and Wildfire (Emergency Response and Emergency Evacuation Plans / Exacerbated Wildfire Risk / Associated Infrastructure).

As approved, the City determined the Project will have significant and unavoidable environmental impacts in the following areas: Aesthetics (improvements to Zoo Drive/Western Heritage Way); and Transportation (vehicle miles travelled).

Since August 2023, when the City Council certified the EIR and approved the Project, changes to the Project description have occurred. The previously approved Project would have constructed a Visitor Center in the California area of the Zoo and would have created Condor Canyon, which would provide a continuous path of travel around the Zoo for Zoo visitors and service vehicles. The Project would be revised (Revised Project) to eliminate the California Visitor Center and Condor Canyon as elements of the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan.

The City Council is considering a discretionary action which would approve the Revised Project as described above.

III. SCOPE OF CEQA ANALYSIS

Section 21166 of the CEQA statute and State CEQA Guideline 15162-15164 set forth three potential levels of additional environmental review that may apply after a project has previously been approved subject to a certified EIR, and now a further discretionary action on the project is required. These are as follows.

1. Subsequent EIR

Once an EIR has been certified for a project, no subsequent EIR has to be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that one or more of the of the following exist:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant, environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Under CEQA, a subsequent EIR must be given the same notice and public review as an EIR. The subsequent EIR must state where the previously certified EIR is available and can be reviewed.

2. Supplement to an EIR

The lead agency may choose to prepare a supplement to a previously certified EIR rather than a subsequent EIR, if:

- (1) Any of the conditions described above that would require the preparation of a subsequent EIR exist, and
- (2) Only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previously certified EIR adequate to apply to the project in the changed situation.

The supplement to the EIR need contain only the information necessary to make the previously certified EIR adequate for the project as revised. A supplement to an EIR must be given the same kind of notice and public review as is given to a draft EIR, but may be circulated by itself without recirculating the previously certified draft or final EIR. When the public agency decides whether to approve the project, the decision-making body must consider the previously certified EIR as revised by the supplemental EIR. CEQA findings must be made for each significant effect shown in the previously certified EIR, as revised.

3. Addendum

The lead agency must prepare an addendum to the previously certified EIR if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary, or none of the conditions calling for a subsequent EIR have occurred. When the further discretionary approval is taken on the project, the decision maker must consider the addendum with the certified EIR prior to making its decision on the project. The addendum should include a brief description of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR, supported by facts.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

A. The Project changes do not involve new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, and thus they will not require any major revisions of the previous EIR

Under the Revised Project, as compared to the Approved Project analyzed in the certified EIR:

- The California Visitor Center would not be constructed;
- In lieu of the California Visitor Center structure, in the vicinity of the site of the proposed California Visitor Center structure along the hilltop, the Zoo may establish an outdoor interpretive site consisting of no more than three outdoor shade structures of not more than 1,500 square feet each, with supporting

amenities, including signage, seating, and restrooms (collectively, “Interpretive Site Improvements”);

- Lighting for the Interpretive Site Improvements will be consistent with the design guidelines developed under the Approved Project, as stated on pages 4-100 to 4-101 in the Revised Final EIR, related to addressing ecological concerns related to sensitive species.
 - Pathway lighting improvements constructed under the Approved Project within the immediate vicinity of the Interpretive Site Improvements will not exceed 6 feet in height, provided however that the Zoo may provide other lighting under the Approved Project as necessary to ensure safety, security, and proper maintenance, as determined by the Zoo in its sole discretion.
 - Digital advertising displays will not be constructed as part of the Approved Project within the immediate vicinity of the Interpretive Site Improvements, provided however that the City may provide other signage, including interpretive, directional, facility, and safety-related signs, pursuant to the Approved Project.
- In constructing the Approved Project, the Zoo shall not construct the proposed Condor Canyon described in the Approved Project, or a tunnel in lieu of Condor Canyon as a modification to the Approved Project, pursuant to the Revised Final EIR.
- If, prior to *California* planning area construction, special status flora species (e.g., Nevin’s barberry and city-protected trees/shrubs) are identified, they will be avoided to the extent feasible and mitigated consistent with the Approved Project’s adopted Mitigation Measures as determined by the City’s experts.
- Within a contiguous area not less than 5 acres along and adjacent to the ridgeline in the *California* area, the boundaries of which will be established by the Zoo in its sole discretion (“Subject Area”), the Zoo will withhold developing the Approved Project, provided however that the Zoo may locate, develop, and construct the Interpretive Site Improvements, trails, funicular, and related utility and other improvements, including restoring and enhancing California native plants, within the Subject Area, and the Zoo may continue existing uses, including but not limited to construction preparation and material storage, within the Subject Area.

The Approved Project included the construction of a California Visitor Center and of Condor Canyon, as well as development of 5 acres along and adjacent to the ridgeline in the *California* area.

The California Visitor Center would have been an 18,000 square-foot structure constructed on a ridgeline in the *California* planning area of the Zoo. The California Visitor Center would have provided dining, classrooms and event rental spaces, with a deck overlooking the entry plaza to the east. Instead of the Visitor Center, outdoor shade structures and amenities would be constructed to serve as interpretive sites.

Condor Canyon would have been cut through an existing ridgeline in the *California* planning area to depths of up to 60 feet both to complete the Primary Path Loop through the Zoo and to provide topographic variation and interest. Condor Canyon would have provided access through *California* to the *Rainforest* and *Bird Show and Animal Programs*.

A 5-acre area on the ridgeline in the *California* area would have been developed as part of the *California* area. This development would have included clearing of the area. Instead, development within this area will be limited to interpretive site improvements as well as trail, funicular and utility improvements. Existing uses may continue.

The Revised Project changes are a reduction in the intensity of development as compared to the Approved Project. They are not substantial changes.

Under the Revised Project, there will not be any new environmental impacts or an increase in the severity of any environmental impacts identified in the EIR. The changes will result in a decrease in the magnitude of impacts. This is especially true for the elimination of Condor Canyon and the associated excavation and construction emissions. With the foregoing of the Condor Canyon element, the associated circulation improvements (the Primary Looping Path) would not be constructed. This would not result in any new impacts to environmental resources or increase the severity of existing impacts. The EIR identified mitigation to reduce impacts to geology and soils that would occur from the construction of Condor Canyon, including grading and excavation. By eliminating the Condor Canyon feature, the geotechnical evaluation required by MM GEO-1 would not be necessary.

The Revised Project includes elimination of the California Visitor Center and associated ridgeline development, and replaces constructing a large building in its location with only limited development from establishing an outdoor interpretive site consisting of no more than three outdoor shade structures of not more than 1,500 square feet each, with supporting amenities, including signage, seating, restrooms, and limited lighting. As with Condor Canyon, the Project changes associated with the elimination of the California Visitor Center would result in a reduction of impacts and would neither create any new impacts to environmental resources or increase the severity of existing impacts due to the substantially reduced scale of development.

The Project changes would not directly affect the significant and unavoidable impacts to Aesthetics and Transportation that were identified in the EIR, because, as noted above, the changes reduce the scope of impacts by removing features in the California Area, such as the Condor Canyon, and reduce the scale of development by replacing the California Visitor Center with smaller features in and around its vicinity.

No revisions to the previous environmental document are required, including significance findings or mitigation measures, because the project changes will not be substantial and will not involve new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

B. Changes in circumstances under which the Project will be undertaken do not involve new significant, environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, and thus they will not require any major revisions of the previous EIR

Since adoption of the EIR, there have been several new designations of special status species under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), including the western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), as a candidate species. However, the mere listing of a species as special status does not, by itself, meet the conditions in CEQA Guidelines 15162 for changed circumstances or new information triggering the need for supplemental or subsequent EIR.

Particularly, a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not needed for evaluating the western burrowing owl related to this Project, because there is no evidence supporting that the species is present or will be impacted by the Project. Appendix A of the Biological Resources Technical Memorandum, which is presented in the certified EIR at Appendix E, identifies all of the species that were encountered during biological surveys of the Project site. The survey methodology states that the survey included “all observed plant and animal species being noted....” (Bio Technical Memo at p. 63.) Western burrowing owl was not identified or detected during any biological surveys conducted for the EIR. Additionally, the Zoo’s Director of Conservation, Dr. Jacob Owens, reviewed acoustic monitoring data in the oak woodland restoration area and the California area from December 2022 to January 2024 and there was not a single detection of a burrowing owl. He opined that the Zoo has very poor habitat for burrowing owls, especially considering the steep slopes that characterize most of the Zoo’s grounds; whereas, western burrowing owls prefer flat grasslands with low vegetation for their burrows, and nowhere on the Zoo’s grounds fits their habitat preference. Based on this, the western burrowing owl and its habitat would not be affected by the Project. Therefore, substantial evidence supports that the species is not present and will not be significantly impacted by the Project.

The issue of impacts to special status species present onsite was addressed in the EIR. The certified EIR noted that the project has “potential impacts to suitable nesting or foraging habitat for special-status native bird species” including “suitable habitat for the Cooper’s hawk, a CDFW Watch List species that is known to be present onsite.” (Bio Technical Memo at p. 68. The EIR noted that the phased implementation of construction by leaving some areas relatively undisturbed while other phases are under construction, would reduce impacts, as well as implementing the mitigations measures MM BIO-1, MM BIO-2, MM BIO-3, and MM BIO-4.

Notwithstanding a lack of substantial evidence showing that the western burrowing owl is present and impacted by the Project, the unlikely presence of this species (and other

special-status species) will be addressed in the same way as others found to be present onsite by the protections afforded from the phased construction and adopted mitigation measures MM BIO-1, MM BIO-2, MM BIO-3, and MM BIO-4, as follows:

- MM BIO-1: The Zoo shall prepare and implement a Biological Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (BRMMP) which will include measures to avoid and mitigate impacts to biological resources including special-status species. At the 30 percent design plan stage of each project phase, biological resource surveys which will identify all special-status plant or animal species present or potentially present with the area affected by that project phase. If special-status species would be impacted, specified avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures will be required.
- MM BIO-2: For each phase of Project development, the Zoo shall prepare and implement a Construction Mitigation Plan (CMP) that identifies avoidance, reduction, and mitigation measures for construction-related impacts to biological resources. The CMP would use the results of the biological resources surveys required by MM BIO-1 to specify measures to avoid and protect special-status plant and animal species that are present or potentially present to the maximum extent feasible.
- MM BIO-3: A Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) will be prepared and training will be provided to all personnel working on the site. The training will review the construction-related requirements of the BRMMP and the CMP, including all special-status species that occur or have the potential to occur. Stop-work provisions will apply if special-status species are encountered.
- MM BIO-4: Surveys for nesting birds would be conducted during nesting season prior to ground disturbance or vegetation removal, with reports prepared by experts consistent with MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2, and specific mitigation implemented to ensure the species are avoided and impacts are mitigated to less than significant if the species are located during the surveys.

(Revised Final EIR at pp. 53-60.)

As a result of these adopted mitigation measures, any impacts related to the change in circumstance from the listing of the burrowing owl will not result in any new significant environmental impacts and will not increase the severity of any identified significant impacts, because if the species or its habitat is found to be present during required pre-construction surveys, mitigation measures will require evaluating the presence of the species in the affected areas and require avoidance and mitigation where needed to reduce any impacts to less than significant.

Thus, similar to how special status species identified in the EIR were found to have no significant impacts from the project with the implementation of mitigation measures, there would be no significant impacts on the western burrowing owl if it is found to be present during surveys prior to construction. As stated in the EIR, “MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-3 would work together to refine the precise location and range of resources that may be adversely affected by Project construction and select appropriate programs to mitigate loss or damage, including protection and restoration measures and construction controls.”

(Revised Final EIR at p.3.3-61.) MM BIO-4 would address avoiding impacts to nesting bird species, which would include any western burrowing owl nests. Consistent with the EIR's conclusion, significant unavoidable adverse impacts to biological resources would not occur and, with mitigation, impacts to biological resources would be less than significant. (Revised Final EIR at pp.3.3-61 to 62.)

Based on this, the changed circumstances under which the project has been undertaken are not substantial, will not require any major revisions of the previous EIR, and will not involve any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Evaluation under a subsequent or supplemental EIR is not required pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 or CEQA Guidelines Section 15162.

C. There is no new information that has become available showing new significant impacts, substantially increased significant impacts, or new and/or previously rejected feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that substantially reduce significant impacts

No new information, present at the time of the certification of the EIR, has come to light that needs to be considered in this analysis. As discussed in the above-noted section regarding changed circumstances, the listing of the western burrowing owl as a special status species is not considered new information of substantial importance, particularly because substantial evidence supports that the species is not present on the Project site and the species will not be significantly impacted by the Project. Also, the certified EIR addressed mitigation measures for reducing impacts to special status species and their habitat that were observed onsite, and those mitigation measures will apply to the western burrowing owl under the existing EIR if the owl or its habitat are found to occur onsite during the surveys required under MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-4.

Based on this, the conditions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3) have not occurred. There is no new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, showing any of the following: significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR; significant effects previously examined that will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR; mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative. Therefore, no subsequent or supplemental EIR shall be required pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and Public Resources Code Section 21166.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis above, none of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 requiring a subsequent EIR have occurred. Specifically, the following findings regarding CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 support City Council's approval of the proposed project modifications:

- (1) Proposed changes in the project will not be substantial, will not require major revisions of the previous EIR, and will not involve new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- (2) Changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken have not been substantial, will not require any major revisions of the previous EIR, and will not involve any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- (3) No new information of substantial importance shows any of the following: (A) significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR from the project; (B) significant effects previously examined that would be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR; (C) mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (D) mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Based on this, no subsequent or supplemental EIR shall be required pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and Public Resources Code Section 21166. No technical changes or additions are necessary to address the Revised Project, and no additional CEQA environmental review is required.

Exhibit A: CEQA Notice of Determination

EXHIBIT A

CEQA NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION **ORIGINAL FILED**

(Article I – City CEQA Guidelines)

AUG 14 2023

LOS ANGELES, COUNTY CLERK

Public Resources Code Section 21152(a) requires local agencies to submit this information to the County Clerk. The filing of the notice starts a 30-day statute of limitations on court challenges to the approval of the project pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21167.		
LEAD CITY AGENCY AND ADDRESS: City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering 1149 S. Broadway, Suite 600, MS-939, Los Angeles, CA 90015-2213		COUNCIL DISTRICT 4
PROJECT TITLE (INCLUDING ITS COMMON NAME, IF ANY) Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan		CASE NO. Council File No. 21-0828
PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION: The Project is the implementation of Alternative 1.5: The California Focused Conservation Alternative as described in the Revised Final EIR and the 2022 Los Angeles Zoo Draft Plan: Alternative 1.5 (2022 Vision Plan). The Alternative 1.5 Project would guide physical transformation and improvement of facilities and operations of the Los Angeles Zoo (Zoo). The 2022 Vision Plan would serve as the blueprint for transformation and modernization of the Zoo over the next 20 years. The 2022 Vision Plan's proposed infrastructure and animal facility improvements prioritize animal welfare, conservation, sustainability, and community engagement. The 2022 Vision Plan also addresses operational deficiencies at the Zoo, including the quality and extent of animal habitat within exhibits such as the current lion exhibit area. The 2022 Vision Plan also addresses the currently constrained visitor circulation system and missing linkages between animal facilities, and a limited range of visitor-serving facilities. The 2022 Vision Plan would guide comprehensive animal facility improvements and capital projects to upgrade Zoo facilities and circulation to ultimately create a transformational zoo for the City, including expansion of the current elephant area by approximately 200 percent.		
PROJECT APPLICANT/RECIPIENT OF PROJECT: City of Los Angeles		
CONTACT PERSON Norman Mundy	STATE CLEARING HOUSE NUMBER 2019011053	TELEPHONE NUMBER (213) 485-5737
This is to advise that on August 2, 2023, the City Council of the City of Los Angeles as Lead Agency approved the project described above and made the following determinations:		
SIGNIFICANT EFFECT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project will have a significant effect on the environment. <input type="checkbox"/> Project will not have a significant effect on the environment.	
MITIGATION MEASURES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mitigation measures were made a condition of project approval. <input type="checkbox"/> Mitigation measures were not made a condition of project approval.	
MITIGATION REPORTING / MONITORING	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan was adopted for the project. <input type="checkbox"/> A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan was not adopted for the project.	
OVERRIDING CONSIDERATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted. <input type="checkbox"/> Statement of Overriding Considerations was not adopted. <input type="checkbox"/> Statement of Overriding Considerations was not required.	
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Environmental Impact Report was prepared and certified and findings were made for project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA. <input type="checkbox"/> An Environmental Impact Report was not prepared for the project.	
NEGATIVE DECLARATION	<input type="checkbox"/> A Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the project and may be examined at the Office of the City Clerk. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration was not prepared for the project.	
SIGNATURE:  For Maria Martin	TITLE: Environmental Affairs Officer	DATE: August 8, 2023
The documents constituting the record of proceedings in this matter are located at the Office of the City Clerk, 200 North Spring Street, 3rd Floor, Los Angeles, California 90012; the Board of Public Works Commission, 200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012; the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Street Services (StreetsLA), 1149 South Broadway, Suite 400, Los Angeles, California 90015; the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering (BOE), 1149 South Broadway, Suite 600, Los Angeles, California 90015; and any other relevant City department.		