

# Sutter's Landing Feasibility Study & Ideas for Sacramento Zoo – Spring 2010

April 21, 2010 - Community Meeting

## Flip Chart Notes

### Expansion of Zoo at Land Park

- William Land Park is the “crown jewel” of Land Park.
- Expansion at Land Park would result in the loss of open areas which is not a good thing.
- A problem of keeping Land Park green and open.
- Land Park is already so well used; it would be a shame to make more of it available for the Zoo.
- Expansion of the Zoo at Land Park violates the intent of the William Land bequest which required that the park be used for the “recreation sport of children and a pleasure ground for the poor”; paid admissions are inconsistent with the bequest
- Expansion would monetize Land Park with entry fees.
- Land Park is a regional park that is not just for the Land Park community.
- Zoo is also a regional amenity.
- The Zoo should stay small and provide the best care possible to the animals it does have.
- There is room for expansion at the existing location.
- Reference LPCA board decision – does not support expansion at Land Park. C. Powell provided a memo / resolution from the board, at tonight's meeting.
- Staff should not have brought up the possible expansion of the Zoo at Land Park. It has been very divisive in the community.
- The idea of an expansion of the zoo at Land Park should be abandoned; expansion discussion should be “D.O.A.”.
- Take the expansion in Land Park off of the City website.
- Land Park neighborhood will work with the zoo to find solutions together.
- Land Park neighborhood will work with the zoo to find alternative locations for the zoo.
- Up to quadrupling potentially at Land Park?
- There are mixed feeling about whether there should be a Land Park expansion or not. Should the Zoo stay in Land Park or relocate? Or should the Zoo disappear all together?
- The Zoo Master Plan was adopted seven (7) years ago:
  - Determined that they could spend \$60 million in the current Zoo footprint.
  - Expansion of the Zoo would be a negative impact to the City and the Land Park area.

- The proposal to offer a train ride from Old Sacramento to the Zoo would take up parking in Old Sacramento while also taking people away from Old Sacramento.
- The 1988 City Council resolution determined that there should be no expansion of the zoo in Land Park.
- 1988 City Council Resolution: Expansion of the size of the Zoo must go somewhere other than Land Park.
- This is a rehashing of the 1988 consideration.
- There have been no changes to the facts or circumstances at Land Park as previously discussed 20+ years ago.
- The City Council reserves the right to reconsider the 1988 resolution.
- The City has different elected officials now (compared to the last Council resolution in 1988).
- The City and the Zoo have had many changes in the last 25 years.
- The opposition to expansion at Land Park is not a NIMBY movement.
- Sutterville / Land Park Drive intersection is already at LOS F, despite City General Plan to not let streets degrade below LOS D.
- Environmental reviews have been done that have determined that an expansion in Land Park would not be feasible.
- The State studied the effects of a train running from Old Sacramento to Zoo. An EIR was done which determined that there would be negative air quality, traffic, and visual impacts.

### **Relocation to Other Sites**

- Relocate zoo to Bartley Cavanaugh.
- Look at incorporating a zoo at Cal Expo.
- Sutter's Landing Park is not a good location (traffic, dump, etc... issues).
- Residents around Sutter's Landing Park are opposed to a Zoo in the area.
  - There are existing natural resources at SLP (wildlife, plant life).
  - SLP is one of the last quiet, family friendly neighborhoods in the downtown / midtown area.
  - A zoo at this location would take away from these existing features.
- Clarify that the construction of \$17million + for the proposed Sutter's Landing Parkway is not a cost to be borne by the Zoo.
- Clarify that the "penalty costs" of \$625,000/acre for constructing over a closed landfill are costs above the standard \$1.5-\$2.0 million/acre for zoo construction.

- What about relocating the zoo to the North Natomas Regional Park? It is in a floodplain, but they can plan appropriately to have species that can handle that.
- The options proposed are not extensive enough with larger areas of land; consider Stone Lakes and the buffer lands surrounding Sacramento Regional Sanitation District treatment plant.
- Move forward with looking at other options.
- Need a “no project” alternative.

### Process for Planning the Future Zoo

- Sacramento Zoological Society will not decide the future of the Zoo - the City will.
- There should be more hearings and then the City Council will be the final decision makers.
- Why was the expansion and / or relocation of the Zoo not dealt with before now (since initial discussions were done 20+ years ago)?
- Speakers are not being honest about communications (e.g. a quadrupling of the size of the Zoo in Land Park is not correct).
- Request that speakers shouldn't be oppositional and should act with civility.
- Discussion and dialogue should seek cooperation not confrontation.
- Appears that a Land Park expansion is a “done deal.”
  - Response: No decisions have been made – this is not a “done deal”.
- Why was the money for the SLP study expanded to include expansion at Land Park and other areas?
  - Staff Response: The study provides a template with criteria for studying other alternatives. The Request for Proposals and contract (approved by City Council) with the consultant requested that the analysis of Sutter's Landing Park identify site parameters and criteria for assessing and evaluating other potential sites for developing the Sacramento Zoo of the future, and determine what other potential sites should be considered.
- The “bubble” map showing areas of expansion in Land Park was removed from the report / website. Please include it in the report / on the website.
- Moderate labor costs.
- There is an increasing gap between revenues versus expenditures.
- Want quality not quantity.
- Don't keep raising the Zoo admission prices.
- Gate prices do not need to stay the same.
- The population of Sacramento will increase; entry fees will also increase.

- In the wake of increasing admission prices, there is a need to expand discount admission programs.
- The Zoo's priority should be animal care.
- Keep animals in the wild, not in zoos. Some animals need to be cared for. Look at perspectives / expertise from Europe.
- Appreciate "smallerization" of zoo; focus on certain select species at the zoo.
- Should have small animal exhibits at the existing zoo location. Large animals should be located elsewhere.
- False Choice: Economic fallacies in the report that lead to a conclusion that the zoo is not sustainable:
  - Report says that reduction of the number of large animal exhibits will reduce income; speaker believes that even with this reduction of exhibits, visitation will remain at current levels and that there will not be a drop-off in revenues.
  - Report says that zoo will need to increase admission prices to compensate for higher costs, but since costs aren't really going up by the amount projected, the admission prices can remain stable.
  - Report says that costs will increase annually due to higher labor and operating costs; speaker believes that labor cost increases will not occur to the extent depicted in report.

# SLP Community Meeting April 28, 2010

- Cheaper/easier to move ball fields at Land Park than the Zoo
- LPCA wants to work with Zoo but opposes expansion of Zoo at Land Park
- Protect public access to Land Park
- Heart of Land Park is picnic area
- Supportive of Zoo at SLRP but freeway access is necessary
- More interpretive facilities along American River Parkway
- Clean up activities along river
- Protect native plants and animals along river
- Viewing platforms
- *Last Child in the Woods*
- Keep it wild
- River as a natural asset
- Keep SLRP natural - no zoo
- Turn more of environment natural like SLRP
- Questions whether Sacramento needs a destination zoo
- Doesn't want American River Parkway impacted by zoo
- Zoo is an interpretive wildlife experience
- Children can access wildlife through television and books and don't need to go to the zoo
- Concerns with road/freeway access
- Animals in the zoo and existing wildlife at SLRP are not the same
- Access to the river should be preserved



# The Sacramento Zoological Society

3930 West Land Park Drive • Sacramento CA, 95822-1123

916.808.5888 • fax 916.264.5887 • www.saczoo.com

## SZS Board of Directors

Mary Healy,  
Executive Director  
Starr Hurley,  
President  
Jim Naify,  
Vice President  
Gail Lenhart,  
Secretary  
Kevin Barri,  
Treasurer  
Terry Kastanis,  
Past President

Katharine Ayers  
Barbara Bonebrake  
Lisa Bruno  
Nancy Cole  
Murray Fowler, DVM  
Patty French  
John Kaufman  
Betty Masuoka  
Linda McFarland  
Kimberly Oxholm  
Jeff Raimundo  
Elizabeth Stallard  
Jonathan Szymanowski, DMD  
Jill Trainer, Ph.D.  
Alan Yee, M.D.  
Nancy Zarenda

March 10, 2010

To: The Land Park Community Association Board of Directors

The Sacramento Zoological Society has been asked to respond in writing to the board of the Land Park Community Association about the Draft Feasibility Study prepared by Schultz & Williams for the City of Sacramento.

In March 2009, the City hired Schultz & Williams to examine the feasibility of moving the Zoo to Sutter's Landing. That site proved problematic based on a number of issues that would place a high financial premium on developing Sutter's Landing. The consultant then briefly reviewed other possible sites as a point of reference, including Arco Arena, Cal Expo, Job Corps, and Natomas Joint Vision.

In light of the significant costs of building a new zoo and given the current economic conditions, the consultant was also asked to comment on what improvements could be made to the current site to make it sustainable into the future.

The City and Zoo received the consultant's report as a Draft document and are currently reviewing the recommendations and pursuing the outreach process.

A report will be developed based on the recommendations of the study and that report will be shared with the community, including the City Parks Commission, to get feedback on the ideas. Once that process is complete, City staff will develop a report and staff recommendation for City Council.

The Zoological Society Board and staff want the Zoo to remain a good neighbor to Land Park and also a valuable asset to the Sacramento Region. For that to happen, we need to continue to enhance the site and find a way that we can be financially sustainable into the future. In order to maintain accreditation with the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, we must continue to improve animal habitats and the visitor experience for our guests.

We welcome a dialogue with the residents of Land Park as to how we can work together to make the Zoo the best it can be and a continued community asset for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Starr Hurley  
President, Sacramento Zoological Society Board

cc: Sacramento Zoological Society Board  
Sacramento Mayor Kevin Johnson  
Sacramento City Council

## MEMORANDUM

To: Interested Parties  
From: Craig Powell, Chair, LPCA Parks Committee  
Re: Policy Position of LPCA on Possible Zoo Expansion in William Land Park  
Date: April 21, 2010

### Summary

The "Sutter's Landing Regional Park Feasibility Study" concludes, at page A-16, that "[T]he support of the Land Park Community Association is critical to this option [expansion of the Zoo site in William Land Park]." Not only does the LPCA not support expansion of Zoo boundaries in William Land Park, the LPCA strongly opposes any such expansion. The LPCA has consistently and resolutely opposed any such expansion from the inception of its existence over 20 years ago.

The LPCA is the neighborhood organization for the Land Park community and currently has over 500 dues-paying members, placing it among the largest such neighborhood groups in the city.

The LPCA has the distinct privilege to have William Land Park as the focal point of its community. Consequently, the LPCA has long considered itself to have a special responsibility to help preserve and protect the public's right of free and unimpeded access to William Land Park, in keeping with both the letter and the spirit of the last will and testament of former Sacramento mayor, William Land, the park's founder (discussed further below). William Land Park is Sacramento's most popular park, visited by well over 1,000,000 people each year.

On March 18, 2010, the Board of the Land Park Community Association (LPCA), acting upon the recommendation of its Parks Committee and following numerous public and private meetings on the subject with Zoo officials and other interested parties, reaffirmed its long standing policy of preserving unimpeded public access to the park overwhelmingly approving resolutions opposing any expansion of the boundaries of the Sacramento Zoo in William Land Park. A copy of these LPCA board resolutions is attached.

### Historical Antecedents and Legal Foundation of William Land Park

William Land Park exists as a public park because former Sacramento mayor, William Land, made a generous of \$250,000 bequest to the City of Sacramento with the express stipulation, and on the specific condition, that his bequest be used by the city to establish a park to be used for the "*recreation sport of children and a pleasure ground*

*for the poor.*" His will created what is essentially a "charitable trust," which obligates the city, then and now, to abide by its terms as a covenant and condition of its ownership of the park.

Following years of protracted litigation over the meaning and intent of this provision of Mayor Land's will, the city finally used the mayor's testamentary bequest to purchase the land that now comprises the park and developed it into what most Sacramentans consider to be the crown jewel of the Sacramento park system.

Shortly after the park was opened, the Sacramento Zoo opened at its present location. In keeping with the express stipulation of Mayor Land's bequest, the Zoo was open and available to all Sacramentans, regardless of economic circumstance: it charged no fee for admittance. From its opening in the early 1920's until the 1950's, the Zoo was free to all Sacramentans. In the 1950's, it began charging an admittance fee of 10 cents.

Today, the general admission price is \$11.00 on weekends/holidays for people 13 and older, and \$7 for children ages 3 to 12. Clearly, the escalating price of admittance to the Zoo is not exactly what Mayor Land had in mind when he stipulated that the park be used for the "recreation sport of children and a pleasure ground for the poor." The "poor" have been effectively "priced out" of the Zoo. And while attending the Zoo is very educational and entertaining for children, it can hardly be considered a "recreation sport of children."

A quadrupling of the size of the Zoo's campus in the park, as originally proposed by the feasibility study's authors, would serve to "price out" the "poor" from those areas of the park that are the most heavily used by visitors: the large picnic grounds in front of Fairytale Town, the inexpensive Funderland amusement center, the Pony Rides and the large soccer fields that are on the eastern border of Fairytale Town. These areas are the very heart of William Land Park. Pricing out the less advantaged from these central park areas would violate both the letter and the spirit of William Land's bequest, as well as represent poor public policy, as discussed below.

#### The 1980's: Zoo Expansion 1.0

In the mid-1980's, the city proposed a strikingly similar plan to expand the Zoo in William Land Park ("Zoo Expansion 1.0"). The proposal led local residents and advocates of unimpeded public park access to create the "Association for the Preservation of Land Park," the organization that a few years later became the "Land Park Community Association." In short, the LPCA came into existence as a community organization for the very purpose of opposing Zoo encroachment on publicly accessible park land in William Land Park.

Following a four-year fight, the Sacramento City Council voted unanimously to oppose Zoo Expansion 1.0 (other than a minor boundary line adjustment on the Zoo's northern boundary) and passed a resolution establishing the present boundaries of the Zoo

as its permanent boundaries in William Land Park. The council resolution also provided that any further expansion of the Zoo was to occur at a site other than the park.

### The Feasibility Study

The feasibility study was commissioned by the city through a "request for proposal" (RFP) process that stipulated that the study would examine the feasibility of relocating the Zoo from William Land Park to the new Sutter's Landing Park. At a taxpayer cost of \$90,000, the contract for the study escaped review by the city council as it was below the \$100,000 threshold which triggers council review and approval.

The RFP did not specify that the funds would be used to examine other siting alternatives for the Zoo other than Sutter's Landing, nor did it specify that the study would examine expansion of the Zoo in William Land Park. At some point, without prior notice to, or input from, the public or the Land Park community, city officials rescoped the study to examine other possible Zoo sites, as well to examine expansion of the Zoo in Land Park - an option that would be in derogation of longstanding city policy set by a unanimous vote of the city council two decades ago.

The Land Park community and the LCPA were not provided an opportunity to provide input into: (a) the original scoping decision; (b) the city's rescoping decision; or (c) input to the study itself, despite being essential stakeholders in any discussion of Zoo expansion in William Land Park. This was a particularly egregious omission in light of the four-year fight over an almost identical proposal 20 years ago. While the city has announced a policy of acting in an "open" and "transparent" manner with in matters impacting Sacramento's neighborhoods, it has, in this instance, failed to act in accord with its stated policy.

### Public Policy Considerations

A significant expansion of the Zoo in William Land Park would essentially sacrifice one valuable public asset - the Park - for the sake of another valuable public asset - the Zoo. That would be both poor public policy and a mismanagement of public assets. It is also a completely false and unnecessary choice.

### The Economic Fallacy Behind the Zoo Expansion Argument

The Zoo argues that it must expand or it will ultimately fail financially. From discussions with Zoo officials, it appears that the Zoo's argument is based on the following assumptions and logic: (1) to maintain accreditation, the Zoo must, in the future, provide larger spaces for large animals; (2) larger spaces for large animals will lead to a reduction in the total number of large animal exhibits at the Zoo; (3) reducing the number of large animal exhibits will lead to a reduction in Zoo revenues; and (4) Zoo labor costs will rise at a rate of 9% per annum.

While assumptions #1 and #2 may be correct, we believe that assumptions #3 and #4 are false. The study's authors offer no evidence whatsoever to support their summary conclusion that a reduction in the number of large animal enclosures will lead to a reduction in Zoo revenues. In fact, the basic laws of supply and demand tells us that the Zoo is particularly well-situated to survive and prosper financially in the years ahead.

The Zoo is in essentially a monopoly position as the only traditional zoo in the greater Sacramento region. While the "supply" is fixed at one zoo, the demand of those wishing to visit the Zoo will naturally increase with the projected increase of population in our region. Consequently, the Zoo is in the enviable position of being able to regularly increase its admission prices in response to what will be a relentless increase in demand. This will protect its margins and keeping it on a firm financial footing in the future. Clearly, the Zoo will need to expand its current discount programs to prevent children from families of modest means from being priced out of attending the Zoo. But, fundamentally, the Zoo is under no long-term financial threat. The Zoo's track record of regular price hikes over the past 10 years supports this conclusion, despite the disappearance of elephants, rhinos, polar bears and other large mammals from the Zoo.

Assumption #4 - that labor costs will rise inexorably at the rate of 9% per year - is similarly baseless. The authors of the study provide no factual basis for their conclusion that the Zoo's labor costs will rise at a rate of 9% per year, an unreasonably high rate to assume given current inflation forecasts and weak labor markets for the foreseeable future. While the Zoo historically may have experienced such a rate of annual labor cost increases, that is not a justification or a basis to continue on such a path.

### Conclusion

The Zoo is a prized and important element of the Land Park community. We look forward to working with Zoo officials closely and cooperatively on a host of issues in the years to come, including traffic and parking challenges, the financial burden of unionized city employees on Zoo payrolls, and general park issues.

We believe that the Zoo should remain in Land Park and focus its attention on becoming one of the country's finest small zoos. It has made tremendous strides towards that goal in recent years and we applaud them for their achievements. If Zoo officials feel absolutely compelled to expand - and taxpayers are willing to support the considerable capital cost of paying for such expansion - then the Zoo must find another location in the Sacramento location.

If anyone would like to discuss these matters further, please contact LPCA Parks Committee chair, Craig Powell [REDACTED].

## SUTTER'S LANDING FEASIBILITY STUDY AND FUTURE IDEAS FOR THE SACRAMENTO ZOO COMMENT CARDS

"Please find a way to expand the zoo at its current location. It is a lovely, central location, with wonderful tree canopy. It does not seem feasible to build a new zoo in a different location and I don't like the vision of what the alternative location "Animal Park of the Future" would be like." 04/21

"Sutter's Landing is not a feasible location for relocating the zoo. Aside from the cost issues, the zoo would take up too much of this special place along the River. It would go too close to the River, impacting wildlife, destroying access for people to the River, and would chop up this wonderful gem along the American River Parkway. Please, let's keep Sutter's Landing wild and improve it as a natural resource in the heart of our City. There aren't any opportunities left near downtown for a natural, wild recreational space." 04/21

"DO NOT MOVE THE ZOO FROM LAND PARK!!!! My wife and I are Land Park residents and members of the LPCA. We would be heartbroken if the zoo left. Last year we were married at the zoo and often walk down and enjoy walking through the zoo. Minor expansions could be made to the existing site without negative impact to the park. The small grassy island just north of the zoo serves no purpose and the road between them and the island could be used to expand the zoo. Also, rather than just moving the zoo from Land Park, what about building an expansion on another site and charging one ticket price to get into both parks. You buy your ticket at one park and you have a week or a month to visit the other park too before the ticket expires. Plus, if the zoo leaves Land Park, Fairytale Town will be in jeopardy of failing. There is too much history and value to having the zoo in Land Park to just leave and go somewhere else." 04/21

"If methane will be leaking out of the landfill – for years – that would likely be irritating to some animals (vice versa for solar panels?) With high ground as rare as it is, the zoo is a great fit with the ambient traffic at Cal Expo, as long as it would open after 9 am and close either by 4 pm or after 7 pm. Other users of Cal Expo may not be so great if they are not held to proper traffic mitigation. The current access via the 5-points (Sutterville/ S Land Park / Del Rio) intersection is troublesome."

"A fresh idea: 2 or more zoos, connected by the train – administration at a third site – spreads out traffic/parking – increases zoo-related commercial opportunities (café, full-restaurant, 'Build a Bear', bookstore, etc.) amplifies THE experience by having unique and distinct animal groups at different 'nodes'. 'A Day at the Zoo' becomes truly a full day experience. Why not go *really* big and joint venture with arboretum (200 acres). The railroad is the key as it opens land south of the City as being appropriate for zoo expansion. Could resurrect River Otter taxi and make it part of people movement. – or include a paddlewheel with full meals and maybe Mark Twain theatre. Sorry, got a little carried away – but it IS time to think outside the box." -04/28

"Yes! Please do: (A) train from Old Sac to zoo (existing w/ improvements); (B) at Sutter's Landing – improve and restore for all: 1) for native river and riverbank wildlife; 2) people-interpretive facilities and

kiosks, flyers; minimally safer road with more law enforcement visits/patrols; 3) Riparian Oak woodlands for deer, etc.; after fire that jumped river a few years back; 4) Add wheelchair accessible viewing platform with or without scopes (neighborhood supports many differently abled people and those walking in with strollers, family bike rides, etc. (support the local neighborhood); 5) If more funds in future, bring back our native Tule elk (and tall fence for safety).” 04/28

“Sutter’s Landing should be ABANDONED for the zoo future site! The study stated several insurmountable reasons why. Reducing the animals (that I feel sorry for) is another option. The HAS to be moved (or consider closing it) in the near future and feel NO more land should be used in Land Park. Other locations should be considered, have not heard of any. Have you considered the City/County land 5000 acres in South Sac off Freeport Blvd east of town of Freeport? I know it has the sewer treatment plant in the northwest corner. 1) Have a Highway 5 access; 2) old railroad tracks are there; could extend Old Sacramento train down to zoo; 3) South Sac needs a large park with picnic areas, ball fields, access to Sacramento River, etc.” 04/21

“Please keep the zoo where it is! Make it the best little ‘boutique’ zoo there is. Buck the trend of new zoos and do something small, different, and unique. We don’t want a glitz animal park!”

I do not see Sutter’s Landing Park as an appropriate location for the zoo. We need to maintain the natural habitat along the River and to protect all the native animals. The zoo and the mini-freeway that would be necessary to get to it would destroy the native animals (many would die on the road itself) and any kind of meaningful experience of nature as the City grows, the need to maintain Sutter’s Landing as a wild place will continue to grow. I would prefer to see exhibit animals in their native habitat rather than in a zoo. To the degree that the zoo provides adequate space and habitat for animals and helps conserve them, prevent their extinction, I support it – but at any location that will displace native species. I am concerned about any roadway as a connector that will go through the park – whether to a zoo or just to connect to Richards Blvd. It is bad enough the I-5 separates us from Sacramento River. I don’t want a re-run with a new road that separates us from the American River.”

“Land Park is the perfect site for a small zoo. Not one larger. It would be perfect for a children’s zoo with small animals, birds, reptiles. Think BIG! Find land suitable for the large animals and grow into it. For large animals, how about near the airport on rice growing lands, or in the south area neighborhood of South area waste disposal facility?”

“Please consider converting the existing zoo to a zoo sanctuary for special needs animals or a multimedia facility with books and film and animal people who could lecture on the importance of keeping wild animals in the wild where they belong. Zoos do not teach children to respect animals because the animals are captive and have no choice.”

April 24, 2010

Dear Scot Mendel, JP Tindell and Mary Healy,

RE: Sutter's Landing and Sacramento Zoo

I attended the 4/21/10 community meeting at the Coolidge Community Center because I am a zoo supporter and neighbor of the zoo. Since 1958, I've enjoyed listening from home to the lions roaring and the gibbons singing.

First some comments about the meeting itself. I attended in hopes of hearing discussion of the options for the zoo's future. It's unfortunate that the time for audience participation was largely taken up by a few closed-minded Land Park Neighborhood Association (LPNA) board members.

I have never been a LPNA member and don't know anyone they represent. I doubt that they speak for the majority of zoo neighbors, LPNA members or not. I've heard that LPNA members have never voted on this issue (at least, not this time around). If that's so, then the LPNA board only speaks for the board itself.

Now that they've had their say, I hope they won't monopolize the 2 remaining public meetings. If they try, perhaps they could be limited to one speaker (and 2 or 3 minutes) per meeting, at least until non-LPNA speakers have had a chance.

On to the actual matters under discussion...

I've never been to Sutter's Landing Park and didn't even know that it had a name. It must be the place a friend of mine goes to walk. She likes that it's close, yet away from the city's hustle and bustle. It sounds like a nice place to leave "as is" (at least, as much as possible).

I don't know much about the other sites you mentioned either.

But, at this point, the various possible sites aren't really the primary question, are they? This may have started as a Sutter's Landing/zoo Feasibility study; but, from the zoo's perspective, the actual questions need to be more clearly stated before they can be intelligently discussed. The first question is whether we want our zoo to remain a small local zoo or become a big tourist attraction. If big, then we ask "where?" If small, then the questions are with or without expansion and with or without accreditation, followed by funding options and choice of animals to be housed.

Correct me if I'm wrong, but as I understand it, zoo size does not directly affect accreditation. Rather, being small affects our ability to keep large animals, which in turn affects our attraction (especially to children) and therefore our revenue-generating abilities, which then affects our financial ability to meet accreditation standards. Is that about right?

I tried to keep an open mind going into the 4/21/10 meeting. Nothing I heard there convinced me that the zoo should move.

For selfish reasons, I'd hate to lose "my" local zoo. I like smaller zoos. In the past, I've enjoyed my visits to the Micken Grove and Santa Barbara zoos more than to the San Diego zoo (although I'd jump at the chance to visit any zoo). At the same time I would expect us to meet or exceed accreditation standards, for the sake of our animals.

at the present location, there seems to be room for some, but not a lot of growth or "in-fill." I am sympathetic with those people who want to keep most of William Land Park available to the general (unpaying) public. But rather than limiting the zoo, how about closing the golf course? At \$12-17 per round, surely it restricts a lot more acreage to a much more select group of users than does the zoo. Sacramento has other inexpensive city golf courses, but no other zoo.

If the zoo expands a bit without becoming too big, the parking situation could probably be resolved. Is the golf course parking lot available to zoo visitors? If not, could it be? Much as I hate to say this, could it be made into a 2-level garage?

Does Holy Spirit School have a parking lot that the zoo visitors could use on weekends? Are city bus routes mentioned in all zoo publicity?

As for generating revenues, the park needs a refreshment stand for the general public. What about re-opening the front building (training classroom?, just south of the front entrance) as a food stand, selling both inside and outside the fence and with revenues going to the zoo? That was a food stand once, selling outside the zoo. (Don't tell Mom, but occasionally we used to save our lunch money so we could buy hot dogs there on our way home from school.)

In summary, so far, my preference is for the zoo to stay in William Land Park, with eventual expansion but not into a "big" zoo. The parking problems can be resolved, as well as finding more land in the park and generating sufficient revenues. I have confidence that our animals will continue to have the best care and conditions possible, whether we expand and have larger animals or focus on smaller animals. From the city-wide perspective, a bigger zoo might draw more tourists and bring in more revenue. But bigger isn't necessarily better. Too big certainly wouldn't improve the quality of life for me and other nearby residents. If we focus on smaller animals, we'd be providing sanctuary for animals that the lions-and-tigers-and-bears zoos ignore.

Thanks for holding these public meetings and allowing us to have a say and hear various sides of this complex issue.

Barbara Rudin

Sacramento CA 95822

cc: Starr Hurley, SZS Board President

## Scot Mende - The ZOO

---

**From:** "Bill Mahan" [REDACTED] >  
**To:** <SMENDE@CITYOFSACRAMENTO.ORG>  
**Date:** 4/30/2010 3:46 PM  
**Subject:** The ZOO

---

1. The Land Park Zoo is too small. Reconfigure it into a Children's Zoo, with appropriately small animals only.
2. Sell the large animals and use the income to begin a fund for a much larger space, perhaps in the buffer lands of the South Area Waste Treatment Plant. Or adjacent to those lands, inasmuch as homes now surround the northern boundary anyway. THINK BIG!
3. Actually the first zoo in Sacramento was much older than 83 years. A zoo was started in McKinley (then known as East Park) in 1872.

**From:** Robert Overstreet [REDACTED] >  
**To:** Scot Mende <SMENDE@cityofsacramento.org>, Barbara Bonebrake <bbonebrake@...>  
**Date:** 4/9/2010 8:02 AM  
**Subject:** Re: Zoo Feasibility Study Published

Hi all,

Thank you for keeping me on the mailing list. The report is a good one, but does not push far enough. Now that I don't have to deal with the politics of the situation, I believe the Zoo's and the City's best option is redesigning Land Park to eliminate or move the golf course rather than the zoo.

Create 85-100 acres adjacent to the existing zoo by reconfiguring the facilities in the entire park. Move the noisy ball fields and parking issues away from the residential areas and upgrade them. You probably save the golf fund money if you don't build another course. (Barbara, you know how the Sacramento area needs more course competition). There has to be a way to make this a win win for the Land Park neighborhood. It is recognized that some golfers will not be happy. It should also be recognized that the majority users of the Park will be good with the idea that a golf ball will not hit them at any given time.

Best wishes to all, I'll be watching from Rescue.

## Scot Mende - Horrible Idea to Build Zoo @ Sutter's Landing

---

**From:** colleen whalen [REDACTED] >  
**To:** <emarshall@cityofsacramento.org>, <smende@cityofsacramento.org>  
**Date:** 4/20/2010 1:53 AM  
**Subject:** Horrible Idea to Build Zoo @ Sutter's Landing

---

Hello:

I live within walking distance of Sutter's Landing. My home is near 26th & C Streets.

The reason I have loved living in the New Era neighborhood for 15 years is the excellent quality of life - quietude, lack of heavy car traffic and a "village" type atmosphere in an older, well established, urban forest. This is a cozy, walk-able neighborhood. I deliberately moved to New Era from Carmichael, because it meant I could permanently get rid of my car and bike everywhere, lowering my carbon footprint. I am horrified he City wants to bring in huge amounts of automobile traffic, and lay down a bunch of concrete parking lots to accommodate a zoo at Sutter Landing.

It will utterly destroy my neighborhood, bring in an egregious amount of gridlock and congestion due to highly increased numbers of automobile traffic. I am not a "NIMBY" nor am I resistant to change. What is infuriating about the City's plan to build a zoo in my neighborhood is:

#1 There is no money to pay for it.

The City has closed public bathrooms in the parks. Public schools have been shut down, teachers laid off, molested children had their programs cut at Child Protective Services - abused senior citizens had their programs cut at Adult Protective Services. I could write 4 paragraphs detailing the "scorched earth" budget cuts in City services.....and the City wants to build a ZOO?

***Please explain why building a zoo is a higher priority than funding battered women's shelters and providing job search services for the 13% of Sacramentan's who are unemployed. In reality, there is actually 26% in Sacramento because only people who are collecting EDD unemployment benefits are factored into the statistics.*** I worked as an ESL Literacy Worker at a community college - but because of semester breaks during summer and winter break - I didn't work in all 4 quarters and therefore am not eligible for unemployment benefits.

I have been out of work for one year and it burns my toast that a SETA branch at the Fremont Adult School in my neighborhood was shut down due to budget cuts, but the City wants to build a ZOO?

***What planet are you guys on?***

A zoo requires huge amounts of money to pay zoologists, wildlife biologists, janitorial staff, zookeepers to clean the cages, feed and water the animals, administrative staff, marketing staff, clerical staff - ***please explain how the City plans to PAY FOR THIS when we are experience the biggest deficit in municipal funding dating back to the Gold Rush Era.***

#2 The Sutter Landing zoo will destroy habitat of wildlife.

***We already have a "Freedom Zoo" - if it is not broken, don't fix it.*** The absolute LAST thing we

need is to destroy wild open space and irrevocably damage wildlife habitat. Sutter's Landing is quite close to pristine, riparian habitat for wild life within the urban grid. We already have a "Freedom Zoo" and can view wild animals in their natural habitat.

#3. Huge numbers of cars driving into a very sleepy, quiet, serene residential neighborhood will create enormous amounts of traffic congestion and gridlock. In Midtown we already have been aware for many years that car traffic is impacting our quality of life. I enjoy being able to walk and ride my bike safely in my neighborhood near 26th & C Streets. What are you planning to do - condemn residences with Eminent Domain in order to widen residential streets which will not be able to handle severely increased levels of car traffic?

I belong to two community gardens in the New Era neighborhood - 19th Street Community Garden and New Era Community Garden. It is unanimous with our members that building a zoo at Sutter's Landing is a TERRIBLE idea. I also belong to New Era and Boulevard Park Neighborhood Associations - all my friends in those groups are horrified the City wants to build a zoo in a neighborhood which is completely inappropriate.

Why not just kill all the wildlife at Sutter's Landing and build that new stadium the Maloof Brother's want with "corporate welfare" and stick the taxpayers with the bill? That is tantamount to building a new zoo in my neighborhood.

***Bottom Line - I think what the City is REALLY up to - is to create a huge construction project right next to where the homeless people sleep in the big open space area near Sutter's Landing. Building a zoo at Sutter's Landing will force homeless people out permanently.***

***The govt doesn't give a crap about the homeless and the reason why the cops were arresting homeless people and confiscating their clothes, backpacks, sleeping bags and tents was for the sole purpose of making Sacramento such an openly hostile environment for the homeless - that cops constantly breaking up their campsites, confiscating their property - would eventually FORCE all the homeless out of Sacramento and push them over to Stockton.***

The City's idea to build a zoo in my neighborhood STINKS.

In fact, it STINKS on ICE!

I am a long time member of the Environmental Council of Sacramento and spoke to several Board Members and the Director of Habitat about the City's plan to build a zoo at Sutter's Landing. I know all my environmentalist friends, community gardeners and homeowners will create a huge campaign to torpedo this horrible plan.


I plan to attend the April 28th meeting and vehemently protest the worst idea I've heard in years - even former Mayor Fargo's idea to kick out all the tenants at Downtown Westfield Plaza Mall and turn it into a Wal Mart mega store, and build a multiplex movie theatre which would destroy business at the Crest Theatre - and to give the Maloof brothers large sums of "Corporate Welfare" to build their new stadium at taxpayer's expense and give nothing back to the city's coffers was not as bad as the City's idea to build a zoo in a very quiet, sleepy little burg of a residential neighborhood.

Please respond in writing how the City is justifying the plan to build a zoo at Sutter's landing.

How are you going to pay for it - and why do you want to kill wildlife and destroy their habitat?

Sincerely,

Colleen Whalen

  
Sacramento, CA 95816

## Scot Mende - Re: Public Comment on Expansion of Sacramento Zoo

---

**From:** Mary Healy  
**To:** Jessica Rader  
**Date:** 4/28/2010 4:59 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comment on Expansion of Sacramento Zoo  
**CC:** JP Tindell; Scot Mende

---

Thank you for taking the time to send this. We will be sure to capture your comments in our summary report.

All the best,

Mary

---

**Mary Healy**  
Director/CEO

**Sacramento Zoo – Wildly Inspiring!**  
3930 West Land Park Drive, Sacramento, CA 95822  
916.808.5886 // Fax: 916.264.5887  
[saczoo.com](http://saczoo.com) // [mhealy@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:mhealy@cityofsacramento.org)

The Sacramento Zoo has been an accredited member of the Association of Zoos and Aquariums since 1979.

>>> Jessica Rader [REDACTED] 4/28/2010 4:16 PM >>>

Dear Ms. Mary Healy,

This email is in support of the Sacramento Zoo remaining in Land Park, even if it does have to expanded to occupy more land within the park, which may displace some picnic areas. As Land Park residents with a small baby, we greatly appreciate having so many child-appropriate facilities (the Zoo, Fairytale Town, Funderland, the duck pond...) within stroller distance from one another. Please keep the Zoo in Land Park.

Thanks,

Jessica and David Stolcenberg.

**Scot Mende - Zoo expansion**

---

**From:** Jodi Leighton [REDACTED]  
**To:** <smende@cityofsacramento.org>  
**Date:** 4/29/2010 12:34 PM  
**Subject:** Zoo expansion

---

I am against the zoos expansion. In fact, I would like to see the zoo closed down. In the meeting I attended on Wednesday, most of the reasons that were given to expand were for the community's needs - and not the animals. The people that spoke up at the end about why they wanted to see the zoo closed talked about the animals needs more than people who wanted to see it thrive. It's true that the zoo is here only to increase revenue by selling and buying animals and in hopes that one will have a baby - cause that is the lucrative attraction. In the 21st Century, we don't need to see a Snow Leopard in human captivity to learn about it. There's TV, documentaries, movies, and the internet that can be an educational tool.

Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,

Jodi Leighton

There may be times when we are powerless to prevent injustice, but there must never be a time when we fail to protest.

—*Elie Wiesel, writer and Nobel laureate (1928–)*

**Scot Mende - Zoo Expansion**

---

**From:** "Joshua M. Horowitz" [REDACTED]  
**To:** <mhealy@cityofsacramento.org>  
**Date:** 5/14/2010 2:09 PM  
**Subject:** Zoo Expansion

---

Hi Mary,

It was nice to meet you last week at the Benefactor reception and learn more about the Zoo and its mission. The reception was a great event and Patti and I loved the chance to feed the giraffes and to get an up-close look at the big cats. We enjoyed Harrison's enthusiasm, too!

As we discussed, Patti and I are Land Park residents and we disagree with the LPCA's opposition to possible expansion of the Zoo in Land Park. We see LCPA as an impediment to many projects that would make Sacramento a better city and have refused to join because of its "no" mentality. It seems to us that the Zoo is a significant part and draw of Land Park and should remain there if possible. There are areas of the park that could be better utilized (do we really need another golf course in Sacramento?). Re-imagining the park to permit Zoo expansion seems to us to be in the Zoo's, Land Park's and the City's best interests. If there is any assistance we can render to the Zoo's expansion effort, including speaking as Land Park residents in favor of expansion in the park, please let us know.

Thanks again for a great time last Thursday.

Kind regards,  
Josh Horowitz

[REDACTED]

**Scot Mende - Re: Thoughts on Zoo in Natomas?**

---

**From:** Keith Weaver [REDACTED]  
**To:** JP Tindell <jptindell@cityofsacramento.org>, Rosemarie Ruggieri [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 4/20/2010 4:11 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Thoughts on Zoo in Natomas?  
**CC:** Randi Kay Stephens <RStephens@cityofsacramento.org>, Scot Mende <SMENDE@cityofsacramento.org>, Ron Spingarn [REDACTED], Beth Mahony [REDACTED], "Michael Cordrey (NNLL)" [REDACTED]

---

Thanks everyone for the input on the Zoo. I raised the question to see if, as a group, we were interested in incorporating the potential for Zoo relocation into plans for the NNRP. The feedback I heard echoed the consultant's report in that there are too many issues with a Zoo at NNRP (although other Natomas sites may be attractive). So, it sounds like the best idea is to stay the course with respect to our moving forward with NNRP. Thanks again.

-Keith

---

**From:** JP Tindell <jptindell@cityofsacramento.org>  
**To:** Rosemarie Ruggieri [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Randi Kay Stephens <RStephens@cityofsacramento.org>; Scot Mende <SMENDE@cityofsacramento.org>; Ron Spingarn [REDACTED]; Beth Mahony [REDACTED]; Michael Cordrey (NNLL) [REDACTED]; Keith Weaver [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tue, April 20, 2010 1:39:30 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Thoughts on Zoo in Natomas?

Hello everyone,

I did want to make sure all understand that the City is not in an extraordinary rush to make final decisions about relocating the Zoo. Full relocation with expansion could take 20 years to accomplish. The potential alternative sites mentioned in the consultant's report need to be more fully analyzed for their suitability. There will be additional public outreach regarding alternative locations that may make it to this next analysis phase, after the same information being presented at the April public meetings and later to the Parks & Rec. Commission is also presented to City Council later this year. There will be much more vetting with electeds, staff and the public to come.

Please contact me if I can help respond to any other ideas, concerns, or questions. Thank you.

>>> Rosemarie Ruggieri [REDACTED] 4/18/2010 10:28 AM >>>  
 Now that house guest are slowly moving on...I want to clarify below, I think it is a good idea to get behind a push to get the zoo to North Natomas, but not necessarily at the NNRegional Park. We have many plans for that park and those plans have been confirmed by those 1,000 plus residents recently.

Rosemarie Ruggieri wrote:

> Hi all,

>  
 > We have been zoo members since 2006 and my family loves the zoo and I  
 > have been reading much about finding a new zoo location. This is the  
 > first time I have heard about using the NNRP in this way, so please give  
 > us a little time to think and talk about this.

>  
 > There are many questions we should ask to see if we would welcome this  
 > change to our plan to develop the NNRP. There is already many amenities  
 > planned for this 140-acres and we recently surveyed interested residents  
 > to see what we developed first. A zoo was never in that plan or recent  
 > survey that was responded to by over 1,000 people.

>  
 > First, so what will be taken out if we choose to go this way? That is,  
 > with other existing "okayed" uses for the very near future, such as a  
 > ball park, soccer fields, aquatic center etc.? Would plans would now  
 > have to be downsized and/or eliminated?

>  
 > Second, as a resident who lives the closest to the NNRP, I want to know  
 > what potential nuisances that having a 75 acre zoo within one block of  
 > residential homes bring? Smell, sewage, traffic, parking? And what  
 > plans there are to mitigate it?

>  
 > Also as a zoo member, I have heard a lot about their funding  
 > frustrations. Can the zoo sustain good maintenance on a zoo that large?  
 > They appear to have a tough time maintaining the zoo in its current  
 > size.

>  
 > And located where in the park area?

>  
 > Finally, the NNRP was supposed to have many open space areas that were  
 > available to all to use casually. With organized ball fields who will  
 > claim control over their area, now a potential 5-acre area for classes  
 > on sustainable landscaping and now a potential zoo, how much park is  
 > left for a park?

>  
 > I think this might be a great idea--jobs, good for business, less of a  
 > commute for us to travel to the zoo, but...these are questions I thought  
 > of in just the first few minutes. I am sure that is the  
 > contract-negotiator and litigator in me. I want to be enthusiastic, but  
 > we need to ask questions to make sure we all want this prior to the push  
 > for seeking advocates.

>  
 > Going back to getting ready for setting up Genevieve's first birthday  
 > party. Have a great weekend!

>  
 > R

>  
 >  
 >

> Keith Weaver wrote:

>> I'd like to suggest the question of what everybody thinks about

>> bringing the Sacramento Zoo to Natomas?  
>> A first-class Zoo could be a big draw to Natomas to help replace the  
>> Arena moving. If we wanted to, we could probably push this more and  
>> talk to the Natomas Chamber of Commerce as they could be a big  
>> advocate, similar to their involvement in the Arena proposal process.

>>  
>> The report says Sutter's Landing is not attractive due to lack of  
>> transportation access and the former landfill site creates many  
>> expensive problems. They considered moving the Zoo to 3 Natomas  
>> locations (among others citywide): 1) Arena site 2) NNRP site and 3)  
>> Natomas Joint Vision site (north of Elkhorn, not yet City owned). The  
>> Arena and Joint Vision sites were 2 of the Top 3 chosen in the report.

>>  
>> It would be a new vision for all 3 of these sites and so I'd be  
>> interested to hear whether 1) you think the Zoo would be good to have  
>> in Natomas, 2) if so, which site would be your preference, and 3)  
>> whether you think it's worth trying to incorporate into the vision of  
>> the NNRP?

>>  
>> Thanks.

>>  
>> -Keith

>>  
>>  
>>

>> -----  
>> \*From:\* JP Tindell <jptindell@cityofsacramento.org>  
>> \*To:\* Rosemarie Ruggieri [REDACTED]; Ron Spingarn  
>> [REDACTED]; Beth Mahony [REDACTED]; Michael  
>> Cordrey (NNLL) [REDACTED]; Keith Weaver  
>> [REDACTED]  
>> \*Cc:\* Randi Kay Stephens <RStephens@cityofsacramento.org>  
>> \*Sent:\* Fri, April 16, 2010 11:42:05 AM  
>> \*Subject:\* Future of Sacramento Zoo public meetings

>>  
>> Below is information on upcoming meetings on the future of the Sacto.  
>> Zoo that I mentioned at our meeting last evening, for your  
>> information. The consultant's report (see website link below) does  
>> make mention of other sites in Sacto. in addition to Sutter's Landing  
>> Park and Land Park, including North Natomas.

>> ++++++

>>  
>> \*You're Invited to Community Meetings  
>> Topic: Sutters Landing Feasibility Study and Future Ideas for the  
>> Sacramento Zoo\*

>>  
>> This meetings will be an overview of 2 years of work by the City and  
>> Zoological Society studying future opportunities for the Sutters  
>> Landing Park site and the Sacramento Zoo. The purpose is to receive  
>> public feedback on work done to date. The City Parks & Recreation and  
>> Community Development Departments and Sacramento Zoological Society

>> staff are gathering information to develop recommendations based on:  
>> Zoo consultant report, Zoo staff expertise, and Stakeholder / Public  
>> input.  
>>  
>> Date: Wednesday, April 21, 2010  
>> Time: 6:00-7:30 p.m.  
>> Location: Belle Cooledge Community Center, 5699 South Land Park Drive,  
>> Sacramento  
>>  
>> Date: Wednesday, April 28, 2010  
>> 6:00-7:30 p.m.  
>> Location: Hart Multipurpose Senior Center, Marshall Park, 915 27th  
>> Street, Sacramento  
>>  
>> Date: Wednesday, May 5, 2010, Parks & Recreation Commission,  
>> 7:00 p.m.  
>> Location: Oak Park Community Center, 3425 Martin Luther King, Jr.  
>> Blvd., Sacramento  
>>  
>> The Zoo Feasibility Study is posted online at:  
>> <http://www.cityofsacramento.org/dsd/planning/new-growth/SuttersLanding.cfm>  
>>  
>>  
>> Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or  
>> comments.  
>>  
>> Scot Mende, New Growth & Infill Manager  
>> Community Development Department  
>> Voice: 808-4756  
>> Mobile: 879-4947  
>> E-mail: [smende@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:smende@cityofsacramento.org) <<mailto:smende@cityofsacramento.org>>  
>> Address: 300 Richards Blvd, 3rd floor, Sac CA 95811  
>> What Meg Whitman & I have in common: We both listen to NPR.  
>>  
>

April 12, 2010

Scot Mende  
Community Development Department  
City of Sacramento

Subject: The Future of the Sacramento Zoo

Dear Scot,

Thank you and all concerned for providing the opportunity to participate in discussions about the future of our Zoo. I have several comments which I will bullet below for convenience and clarity sake, in addition, I will provide my background for reference purposes.

- ❖ I personally believe, as do others, that keeping a focus on being “the best regional zoo” is a good niche for Sacramento. Being the best at what we do best, and continuing to provide an expanded conservation and education emphasis, seems like a logical approach for Sacramento.
- ❖ Improving the educational/entertainment aspect, including trained animals for that aspect would go a long way in achieving that “best regional zoo” acclaim.
- ❖ More isn’t necessarily better when it comes to zoos, rather, emphasizing optimal animal health, exhibits, and education within a limited number of animals and species seems to be the best approach for our zoo.
- ❖ The current zoo site offers good linkage with Sacramento’s Old Town, including our “world class” train museum, as well as convenient access to the Capitol and surrounding attractions.
- ❖ The Old Sac train is a novel and appropriate transportation option to further the linkage between Old Sac and the Zoo.
- ❖ Expanding the zoo either or both across West Land Park and Land Park Drives would be a more cost effective approach than relocating, while still keeping with the heart, purpose and intent of William Land’s original land donation.
- ❖ Maintaining links with both Fairytale Town and Funderland, would maintain the family oriented and historical quality of the Zoo.
- ❖ Convenient freeway access via both I-5 and Hwy. 99 via Sutterville is a continuing plus for the current site.
- ❖ As for Sutter’s Landing, I would hesitate to place any permanent “residents”, (human or animal) over such a piece of land. In addition, Sutter’s Landing has access issues, including the only freeway access being a heavily Impacted Business 80.
- ❖ I personally agree with much of the ULI report with regard to the current site, including the figure of approximately 40 acres for an optimal regional facility.

My background includes being raised in the community of North Highlands, north of Sacramento city, but still within the County boundaries. The Zoo, Fairytale Town and Funderland and the ponies were a favorite destinations of our family and friends

throughout our lifetimes. In later years, I became personally involved in Boy Scouts and wildlife pursuits, which led to many hours spent at our Zoo. Eventually, I studied to become a biological conservationist, and later spent 30 years in the Planning and Community Development of Sacramento County after brief jobs in wildlife biology and park ranger positions.

I currently live immediately south of the Zoo in the Land Park Terrace neighborhood, so close that we can hear the lions and gibbons daily! We have raised our family here, and specifically chose our neighborhood for the walking access to all the amusements for families nearby. We have been actively involved as Zoo Society members, as well as Land Park Little League and Soccer, among many other community focused things.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

Sincerely,

Patrick Watters – Zoning Administrator (retired, Sacramento County)

[REDACTED]

Sacramento, CA 95822

[REDACTED]

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

DISTRICT 3 - SACRAMENTO AREA OFFICE

2800 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE, MS 19

SACRAMENTO, CA 95833

PHONE (916) 274-0635

FAX (916) 263-1796

TTY 711

*Flex your power!  
Be energy efficient!*

June 8, 2010

03SAC0015

03-SAC-051 PM 1.444

Sutter's Landing Regional Park  
Feasibility Study

Mr. Scot Mende

City of Sacramento

300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor

Sacramento, CA 95811-0218

Dear Mr. Mende:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Sutter's Landing Regional Park Feasibility Study. This feasibility study was developed to determine if Sutter's Landing Regional Park is a viable location for the future Sacramento Zoo. The Sacramento Zoo currently attracts 500,000 visitors annually. It is projected that if the Sacramento Zoo is relocated to Sutter's Landing, it could attract up to 1.5 million visitors annually. Sutter's Landing Regional Park is adjacent to State Route (SR) 51. Caltrans appreciates the opportunity to work with the City as the feasibility studies for this and alternate sites become available.

Our comments on this feasibility study are as follows:


- The Sutter's Landing Regional Feasibility Study Park Project proposes to develop a 60-acre zoo near SR 51. The Institute of Transportation Engineers data indicates the total trips generated by this development are about 400 trips for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Currently, this section of SR 51, as well as the SR 51 E Street ramps, are operating at Level of Service (LOS) F, and this project would add congestion during the peak periods.
- It is anticipated that the trips generated from this proposed project will significantly impact the state facility. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) or traffic analysis should be completed to assess the impacts to SR 51, SR 160, US 50, and the new Sutter's Landing Parkway, including all interchange ramps, ramp intersections with local streets, merge/diverge, and mainline operations. The "Guide for Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies" can be found on our website at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/operationalsystems/>. The TIS should use a Select Zone Analysis to identify trip distribution of the proposed project on the State Highway System (SHS). A queuing analysis and merge/diverge analysis should be completed, especially where the highway facility is already at LOS F. We would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the scope of the TIS before the Study begins.

Mr. Scot Mende  
June 8, 2010  
Page 2

- Feasible mitigation is available. Once the TIS is completed and the project impacts to the SHS are assessed, the project sponsor should contribute its “fair share” mitigation fees toward projects that improve SR 51, such as new or expanded overcrossings, ramp widening, ramp intersection improvements, signalization modification, or mainline highway improvements. The City and Caltrans should coordinate the feasible mitigation measures that will help to reduce congestion in the area.

If you have any questions about these comments please contact Terri Bridges at (916) 274-0648.

Sincerely,

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

ALYSSA BEGLEY, Chief  
Office of Transportation Planning – South

**Scot Mende - Re: Long Term Planning for the Future of the Sacramento Zoo**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** <SMENDE@cityofsacramento.org>  
**Date:** 6/18/2010 5:34 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Long Term Planning for the Future of the Sacramento Zoo

---

I attended the first meeting, but too many speakers at end for input. soooo:  
I found the local group to be somewhat disingenuous. They gave the charter for the park as an excuse for not expanding the zoo. However, if you follow the charter ( for the poor and children), how can you possibly justify setting aside most of the park for a golf course. Can the poor afford golf??. Can children frolic on the greens?? If you attend the zoo, you will quickly realize that it is a children's zoo. I don't know how to expand financing, but the zoo itself should be expanded into the park and expand as a children centered zoo. It will not take picnic area away if the golf course is turned into picnic area for the good of the "poor and children".  
Donald Yost  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED] >  
**To:** <smende@cityofsacramento.org>  
**Date:** 7/1/2010 9:53 AM  
**Subject:** Sutter's Landing - Zoo location proposal

Hello,

I am a long-time resident of north mid-town and currently live in east Sacramento. I heard a meeting is to be held tonight re: the zoo relocation proposal. I won't be able to make the meeting, because I am out of town. But I want to let you know I object to the zoo being at Sutter's Landing. The site is better suited to provide public access to the river, and a bike path.

Development of either residential/industrial would harm what natural elements & wildlife exist there today. Traffic issues on 28th Street would plague that area. C & E Street already have enough through-traffic from commuters. A number of my friends own houses in the area. Their quality of living would decrease along with the increase in traffic. I hope projects having less impact on the environment and neighborhood will be considered for this location. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kristin Riggs

[REDACTED]



## A Further Vision for Sacramento Zoo



### **Background**

Born Free USA is a Sacramento-based non-profit that works to change the lives of animals for good. Working with our partner organization, the UK-based Born Free Foundation (founded by the stars of the legendary film *Born Free*, Bill Travers and Virginia McKenna, and their son Will, who is our CEO), we help protect some of the world's most imperiled species and rescue individual animals from cruelty and exploitation. Additionally, at the Born Free USA Primate Sanctuary in Texas, we provide care for more than 500 rescued primates.

Our primary areas of focus are exotic animals kept as “pets”, wild animals trapped or killed for fur, animals exploited in the wildlife trade, and animals used in entertainment. As part of our program, Born Free USA runs “Zoo Check”, which allows us to monitor the conditions at zoos across the country. As such, we are always interested in reviewing zoo expansion and relocation plans as well as the costs and benefits (or perceived benefits) associated with those developments.

Of course, being headquartered in Sacramento, we have a particularly keen interest in the future of the Sacramento Zoo, and have been following the issue since we learned in 2008 of the City of Sacramento's \$90,000 feasibility study focused on moving the Sacramento Zoo from its current location at Land Park to Sutter's Landing.

We understand that moving the zoo to Sutter's Landing has been deemed not feasible. However, possible future plans for the zoo may still involve a move to a larger, undetermined location or possible expansion at Land Park. While the prospect of allowing existing animals the opportunity to have more spacious accommodations would be commendable if this is indeed the goal, it is not clear that an increase in zoo size will result in improved welfare or more space per animal, or simply allow for the acquisition of more total animals and more parking and visitor amenities and attractions.

### **Key Goals**

Regardless of whether the zoo moves to a new location, expands into Land Park, or re-invents itself within the confines of its current location, Born Free USA wants to see the zoo evolve into a place that makes good on its claims of conservation, provides meaningful education, and makes the interests and welfare of animals a primary consideration.

Key elements for attaining the above goals include:

- A specific and targeted percentage of park revenue dedicated to the conservation of species in the wild.
- Making sure that any animals that are kept have their physical, climatic and behavioral needs met by the captive environments offered.
- Providing spacious and “natural as possible” enclosures for all animals.
- Housing only rescued animals with a focus on native species.
- Offering educational programs that are regularly evaluated with measurable outcomes.
- Offering conservation and wildlife protection information that has practical application in the daily lives of park visitors.

### **Issues of Concern**

Like many public animal menageries, we find that the Sacramento Zoo falls short of meeting many of these goals.

For example, Born Free USA was recently made aware that the Sacramento Zoo spends less than \$10,000 annually on conservation projects to help animals in the wild. This amounts to less than one half of one percent of the facility's annual revenue. We naturally were a bit taken aback to learn that the city was spending nine times more on a zoo move study than the zoo was spending contributing to the security of species in the wild.

There are likely many underlying assumptions about the value of the zoo that lead to such skewed spending. For instance, it is often assumed that zoos, by mere virtue of their existence, contribute to meaningful conservation education. However, there is little evidence to support this assumption.

While a 2009 National Research Council report is frequently cited by zoo curators as evidence of the educational value of zoos, this report combined all "informal learning opportunities" including museums, television documentaries, after-school programs, personal hobbies, and everyday experiences such as walking in parks. As a result, the report cannot be used to accurately draw conclusions about the educational value of zoos specifically.

Indeed, the report demonstrates that there are many ways to engage children and adults in nature, science, and conservation. To our knowledge, there still exists no behavioral research demonstrating an association between viewing animals in a captive setting and either knowledge about the animal or intention to take action to conserve the animal in the wild.

Moreover, a study commissioned by the American Zoo and Aquarium Association itself<sup>[1]</sup> found that "...research specifically documenting the impact of conservation messages in zoos, and by extension aquariums, is in its infancy;" and that, "...little to no systematic research has been conducted on the impact of visits to zoos and aquariums on visitor conservation knowledge, awareness, affect, or behavior."

In *The Modern Ark* (1997), Vicki Croke noted that zoo visitors spend on average three minutes or less viewing each exhibit and typically do not read informational signs. Our recent observations at the Sacramento Zoo echo these findings. At the Sacramento Zoo, most exhibits have one small sign, some graying and peeling, with a paragraph or two about the animal inside. Guests could, however, spend an additional three dollars to buy a plastic key to insert into a box to hear more about the animal on display. When Born Free staff visited the zoo, not a single parent or child was seen inserting the key and listening to the information, suggesting entertainment, not education, as a primary motive for visiting the zoo.

We acknowledge that the Sacramento Zoo has made improvements to the animal enclosures over the years and, over time, has eliminated the display of species that are particularly inappropriate or difficult to maintain in captive environments. However, we still find that keeping 500 plus individual animals of more than 130 species on just 14 acres of land (and not all of that land dedicated to the animals) leaves a lot of room for improvement.

While the Sacramento Zoo's accreditation with the Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA) has no doubt served as a catalyst for the improvements in animal enclosures and the elimination of the keeping of certain species, it is important to point out that AZA accreditation does not guarantee good animal welfare or ensure public safety.

Indeed, the enclosure from which Tatiana, the tiger who recently escaped from the San Francisco Zoo and fatally mauled 17-year-old Carlos Sousa Jr., met AZA requirements. In addition, in 2003, Castro, a Sumatran Tiger at the Sacramento Zoo, attacked and injured a zookeeper during feeding time. And, in 2005, in the African lion exhibit at the Sacramento Zoo, Aslan, a male lion, attacked and killed a lioness, Massina.

Born Free USA maintains a *partial* list of attacks on humans and other incidents involving animals at Association of Zoos & Aquariums (AZA)-accredited animal exhibits in the U.S. and Canada since 1990.

---

<sup>[1]</sup> Dierking, et al., *AZA Visitor Learning in Zoos and Aquariums—A Literature Review* (2001-2002).

Captive feline attacks on humans are responsible for hundreds of injuries, many resulting in death. [http://www.bornfreeusa.org/popups/a2a\\_aza\\_exhibited\\_animal\\_incidents.php](http://www.bornfreeusa.org/popups/a2a_aza_exhibited_animal_incidents.php)

## **Moving Forward**

A further vision for the Sacramento Zoo is what Born Free USA calls the “Planet Daily Concept.”

Sacramento, being the State Capitol, could become a center for promoting the protection and conservation of our State’s biodiversity and for inspiring people to live in harmony with the natural world. The zoo could focus on fostering appreciation and understanding of the amazing variety of habitats and wildlife in the State of California.

Our city zoo could be reinvented to serve as a rehabilitation facility for native wildlife and a permanent home with spacious “natural as possible” enclosures for those individuals that cannot be returned to the wild. Each year, numerous wild animals, including bobcats, skunks, bears, and wolves, are kept as “pets” or used as props in travelling shows, eventually end up needing rescue and sanctuary. The Sacramento Zoo could be the answer.

In addition, given that California is a world leader in terms of technology, the reinvented park could showcase and recognise this distinction by providing extraordinary interactive experiences. Through satellite, 3D, virtual reality, and IMAX technology, visitors can ‘experience’ life in the farthest flung corners of the globe and learn about real conservation issues and solutions “from the source” via experts on the ground where projects are being undertaken.

As part of the “Planet Daily Concept,” the zoo could also provide practical advice and guidance (on-site or online) about how each and every one of us can be more wildlife-friendly. *Real* conservation is about ensuring that our use of garden pesticides and fertilizers does not undermine the survival of native species. It’s about taking an active role in conserving ecosystems - our mountains and forests, prairies, rivers, wetlands, and oceans. It’s about ensuring that what we buy each day – our food and clothes, furniture, and more - does not threaten the natural world around us.

The “Planet Daily Concept” is about putting real people in touch with the real world – here at home **and** far away.

## **Examples**

Examples of parks that have incorporated elements of this “Planet Daily Concept” include:

- The Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum, Tucson, AZ <http://www.desertmuseum.org/>
- The Folsom Zoo Sanctuary, Folsom, CA <http://www.folsomzoofriends.org>
- Turtle Bay Exploration Park, Redding, CA <http://www.turtlebay.org/>

In addition, the recent proposal to convert the San Francisco Zoo into a “rescue zoo” provides an excellent example of model language for a similar ordinance for the evolution of the Sacramento Zoo.

### **Sec. 5.10. San Francisco Zoo.**

(a) It shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that the San Francisco Zoo:

1. be committed to educational and interpretive concepts, exhibits, and programs that stress the intrinsic worth of every animal as an individual living being, as well as a species;
2. ensure that responsible and appropriate behavior toward all animals is expressed throughout the Zoo;
3. shall stress the importance of preservation of local and world-wide ecosystems through conservation and education in all San Francisco Zoo programs;
4. operate with animal welfare as the priority and that a basic tenet of zoo policy shall be the

provision of the best possible care, environment and quality of life to individual animals at the zoo;

5. hold no animal unless the animal's basic requirements for physical and psychological well-being can be met. Every practical effort shall be made to enhance each animal's quality of life through providing the best possible physical environment and environmental and behavioral enrichment programs;

(b) It shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that the San Francisco Zoo prioritize future animal acquisitions of wildlife, exotic and domestic animals from rescue situations, donations, and/or confiscations by law enforcement authorities ("rescue sources") by:

1. exhausting all avenues for acquiring animals through rescue sources before turning to other sources for future animal acquisitions; and
2. ensuring that a minimum of 50 percent of all incoming animals per calendar year are sourced from rescue situations.

However, importantly, no city has yet embraced the total vision of the 'Planet Daily Concept'. Sacramento could be the first.

### **Conclusion:**

Born Free USA would like to see the Sacramento Zoo evolve into a place that invites the community and its visitors to re-connect with nature and to be inspired by the beauty, wisdom and wonder of natural systems; a place that invites us to be a part of the natural world, not merely outside observers at a biological yard sale of haphazardly arranged species and artificial habitats.

Caged animals tell us that there is something fundamentally wrong with the way we and they live. They remind us of our own disconnect with the natural world and should cause us to wonder whether we are forcing them to join us in an attempt to fill this void. This is especially true of wild animals who are captured in the wild or bred in captivity to fill exhibit space or serve as entertainers. It sends a message that wildlife is ours to exploit - a message that inherently conflicts with conservation goals.

On the other hand, providing care and natural-as-possible enclosures for animals rescued from tragic circumstances (often at the hands of humans), allows us express our compassion for individual animals without asking us to ignore the fact that situation is unnatural and not the rightful place for wildlife.

Let's create a place that truly inspires visitors to live well on a daily basis in their own local, native habitats and to extend compassion and respect to wild animals by committing to real conservation aimed at keeping wildlife in the wild.



Monica Engebretson  
Senior Program Associate  
Born Free USA  
July 1, 2010

## **Sutter's Landing Feasibility Study & Ideas for Sacramento Zoo**

### **July 1, 2010 – Parks & Recreation Commission Meeting**

#### **Commissioner Comments / Questions**

##### **Cynthia Cooke:**

- The 1988 City Council resolution determined that there should be no expansion of the zoo in Land Park and that expansion of the Zoo must go somewhere other than Land Park. The Policy considerations section of the staff report should have included reference to the 1988 resolution.
- General Plan policies support relocation & expansion – not expansion in place.
- The staff report should also reference environmental reviews that were prepared in conjunction with the 1988 and 2002 Land Park Master Plan analyses.
- Focus on undeveloped or underutilized spaces. Look more deeply/seriously at alternate locations such as North Natomas Regional Park (while programmed for other uses, it is largely undeveloped and unfunded), and Bartley Cavanaugh (an underutilized golf course with a really nice clubhouse).
- Consider relocating the administrative offices off-site (e.g., south of Sutterville Rd)
- Land Park functions today with great synergy and diverse energy; every space is programmed and functions well. Even the “spaghetti streets” are well utilized.

##### **Jeff Harris:**

- Explore revenue-generating uses such as the conservation carousel
- Consider upgrading the façade at the zoo entrance

##### **Dave Tamayo:**

- Define what the City wants the zoo of the future to be
- Get direction on how to make progress on planning for zoo of the future

##### **Jonathan Rewers**

- Over the next 20 years, need to invest to evolve
- After 20 years, the zoo must have significantly expanded or moved
- Recognize that there is a cost premium when re-purposing the existing 14 acres (compared to the cost of building on unprogrammed vacant lands)
- Present to the Council as a series of choices
  - Remain or move?
  - Look for a new site?
  - Criteria for moving? (timeframe, size, location)
- Decisions and criteria must include financial considerations
- Consider the option of no Zoo in our City
- Consider a task force (with PRC commissioners, Planning Commissioners, Zoo Board, neighborhood, etc.) to retain focus on developing & implementing zoo of future
- Determine what kind of zoo the City residents want

## Jay Hansen

- What did we get for \$90k from the consultant?
  - Staff Response: Determined that Sutter's Landing Park is not a very feasible site for a future zoo; consultant developed a template for evaluating alternative sites; developed some ideas for short-mid term enhancements on site; identified need for regional funding initiative; facilitated the public dialogue on the future of the zoo; hired a nationally known outside consultant with expertise that current staff does not have

## Public Comments

- The zoo depends on revenue to sustain collections
- \$11 is the maximum ticket price for a small zoo
- The Zoo Board welcomes discussion with the community on how to maintain viability
- Zoo curriculum and programs meet the CA science standards for K-12. The Zoo is a ray of light and opportunity in a time of reductions and elimination of essential education programs.
- Sutter's Landing is a diamond in the rough. The zoo is a Trojan horse for the Sutter's Landing Parkway (road that would negatively impact wildlife, skate park, etc.). The Sutter's site should be utilized for "experiential environmental education".
- The Sutter's Landing site should be a park – not a parkway road. The bike trail, kayaking opportunities and open space are wonderful amenities for midtown residents. Look to Portland for applicable models: Forest Park (5000 acre 8-mile loop trail west of downtown on hillsides overlooking the Willamette River)
- Land Park is very popular as is; there are no real "extra spaces".
- Intensification of park space would further impact spillover parking into the neighborhoods and would exacerbate traffic delays at the 5-way intersection south of the zoo
- This is the same discussion as 1988 and 2002 that led to Land Park Master Plans limiting growth of the zoo in its current location; the zoo vision in 1988 was largely the same as today; that vision was rejected because bringing more people into Land Park would negatively impact the quality of the park.
- LPCA is a friend – not foe – of the zoo
- Sutterville / Land Park Drive 5-way intersection is already at LOS E, and is unmitigatable. The intersection backs up for a long distance
- Any parking lot would displace other uses / loss of trees & greenspace

## Commission Recommendation

Motion by Dave Tamayo; seconded by Darrel Woo: Identify a process for deciding what kind of zoo the City wants; and start the process for selecting a preferred site for a future zoo

# Land Park Community Association

Issues Affecting Expansion of the Sacramento Zoo in  
William Land Park



# William Land Park Policy

- William Land Park is the City's Premier Regional Park
- The zoo is an integral part of William Land Park, but is only one of many amenities, all of which are entitled to coexist
- The City Council of the City of Sacramento sets land use policy within its parks
- The City has had a policy for more than 20 years that if the zoo wishes to expand, it must seek another site that would accommodate expansion



# History of Zoo Expansion Policy

- Prior Expansions in 1959, 1970 and 1988.
- 1988 – “Zoo 2002” adopted by the City Council and agreed to by SZS.
  - Permitted final expansion and fixed the current boundary
  - Directed SZS to seek another site for future expansion
  - Adopted a set of policy guidelines which:
    - Precludes future expansion in William Land Park
    - Prohibits the construction of a bridge over Land Park Drive
    - Rejects the use of park land for a parking structure
    - Certified an EIR that required mitigation of traffic impacts at the Sutterville Road/Del Rio Road/Land Park Drive intersection.



# 2003 Zoo Vision Plan

- Agreed to by SZS
- Based upon no further expansion of the zoo in William Land Park
- Recognized that William Land Park is completely built out and cannot accommodate more intensive uses
- Expansion will displace other uses which have equal right to exist in the park
- EIR notes that parking demand without zoo expansion already “violates the integrity of Fairytale Town, ball fields or the golf course.”



# Study Defects

- Sutter Landing Feasibility Study ignores history and prior policy limitations imposed on the zoo
- Although staff ignores environmental considerations they are directly relevant to feasibility
- CEQA does not apply to a feasibility study, but feasibility depends on CEQA documents and mitigation measures already required. This study ignores them

# Impediments

## General Plan Inconsistency

- Feasibility study makes land use recommendations which are inconsistent with the City's 2009 General Plan update:

General Plan Policy ERC 5.1.1: “**New Zoo.** The City shall support the relocation of the existing Sacramento Zoo to facilitate its expansion.”

General Plan policy LU 9.1.1: limits conversion of open space to urban uses and places a high priority on preserving open space lands.

# Impediments

## Traffic Issues Not Considered

- The Feasibility Study disregards existing condition of failure of the Land Park Drive/Del Rio/Sutterville Road intersection during peak periods
  - Intersection already operates at LOS E or worse, which is contrary to City's standard and the intersection cannot expand
  - Curtis Park Village will contribute to further degradation of traffic conditions
  - **General Plan Policy M 4.3.1 Neighborhood Traffic Management.** The City shall continue wherever possible to design streets and approve development applications in such as manner as to reduce high traffic flows and parking problems within residential neighborhoods

# Impediments

## Environmental Infeasibility

- Other proposals for zoo expansion were rejected as environmentally infeasible. This proposal for “modest expansion” exceeds the expansion approved in 1988 and includes elements that were rejected in 2003.

“The Expanded Zoo Alternative would occupy the existing zoo grounds as well as two adjacent areas of William Land Park. Zoo boundaries would expand north to 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue replacing the currently existing formal gardens with animal exhibits. The Zoo would also expand to the southeast to include approximately 4 acres at the corner of Land Park Drive and Sutterville Road...

“This alternative has been eliminated from consideration due to land use consistency feasibility, and additional environmental concerns.”

# Impediments

## Land Uses Not Allowed in Parks

- If the Zoo seeks a state-of-the-art facility, it would need to incorporate uses that are not permitted in city parks by policy statements of the Council:

“High end premium experiences provide revenue support for community access, educational components, and increased attendance

Premium restaurant, conference, hotel facilities, entertainment venues, fee-based animal encounters”



# This Is a Land Use Policy Issue

- Land use decisions for regional park uses are made by the City Council under established ordinances and policies, not by the dictates of the AZA
- Other users in William Land Park have equal rights to park facilities: ball fields, soccer, joggers, Funderland, Pony rides, picnickers, amphitheater, etc., etc., etc.
- The feasibility study is flawed and incomplete
- SZS has ignored its affirmative responsibility to seek another expansion site and raise capital to enlarge the zoo at another site for more than 20 years.