

# **VISITOR FOCUS GROUPS AT THE NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK**

March 2004



Smithsonian Institution

Office of Policy and Analysis  
Washington, DC 20560-0405

**Office of Policy and Analysis  
Study Team**

Carole M. P. Neves, Director

Zahava D. Doering

Kathleen Ernst

David Karns

Amy Marino

Amy Nazarov

Andrew Pekarik

## **Background**

At the request of the National Zoological Park (NZN or Zoo), the Office of Policy and Analysis (OP&A) conducted four focus groups with visitors to provide input for NZN's current strategic planning process. NZN asked OP&A to gather feedback on three issues: (1) Visitor experience at NZN and comparisons with visits to other zoos, (2) Messages NZN is communicating to visitors, and (3) Impact of the media on perceptions of NZN. OP&A also explored the visitors' views of a "national" zoo.

## **Methodology**

OP&A conducted four focus groups at NZN on the Presidents Day holiday, Monday, February 16, 2004. The Zoo specifically requested focus groups as the research method. For internal reasons, it was necessary that the focus groups be conducted before the end of February. The day was unseasonably cold, though clear and sunny, with a high temperature of only 35 degrees and a slight wind. The chilly weather may have discouraged visitation and made recruitment challenging.

It is important to note both the benefits and the drawbacks of focus groups as a research method. Small group discussions convey emotional responses and provide helpful hints on issues that may require further study. Accurate assessment of visitor experiences, behaviors, and attitudes requires a sufficiently large sample of NZN visitors to be representative. The opinions of the 22 visitors who participated in this study may not be representative of all Zoo guests.

### *The Challenge of Recruitment*

The original design was to convene two one-hour long concurrent sessions at two appointed times with the option of conducting two additional focus groups at a third time. Participants in the focus groups were offered an honorarium of \$50. Group members accompanying recruits for the focus groups were offered the option to view a film. Due to recruitment difficulties, OP&A convened a total of four groups in three sessions. The groups were composed of four participants in the first session, six participants in each of the other three sessions, for a total of 22 people.

Recruiters stationed at two points around the Zoo—the Bat Cave and the Elephant House—found more difficulty than expected in recruiting participants. The response rate was estimated at around 10 percent. Some of the most common reasons people cited for refusing were time constraints, difficulties as a result of young children in the group, or lack of interest in participation. Additionally, recruiters observed many visitor groups comprised of one adult with one or more children; these visitor groups were not

approached for the study. No arrangement was provided for children accompanying single adults.

The most efficient recruiting hours were between 11:30 am and 1:00 pm, when visitation reached its peak. OP&A attributes its inability to convene more than one group at 11:00 am and at 3:00 pm to the low volume of visitor traffic during those times. Recruiters at the Bat Cave were unable to recruit any participants to join the 11am discussion. Two recruiters stationed at the Elephant House were able to recruit five participants for the first session, though one person did not return for the discussion. The volume of traffic at the Elephant House, near the exit to the Panda Exhibit and across from the concession stand, was consistently higher than the volume at the Bat Cave. The recruiter stationed at the Bat Cave relocated to the Elephant House at approximately 11am. All OP&A staff persons used this location to recruit participants for the remaining sessions.

### *Background of the recruits*

Twelve focus group participants resided in the Washington DC metro area; the remaining 10 were from Connecticut, Ohio, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, and New York. Recruiters attempted to include a balanced mix of male/female participants as well as adults with/without children. The participants were near evenly split by gender – 10 women and 12 men. Only those groups with children that had more than one adult were approached. Out of the 22 participants, eight were members of parties that included children. For eight participants, February 16th was their first visit to NZP; two visitors had been to the Zoo only once before; others had visited the Zoo several times. A more detailed description of the focus group participants is provided in Appendix A.

Focus group participants had previously visited 46 different US and international zoos and aquaria. A complete list of zoos they visited within the past several years is found in Appendix B.

## **Findings**

- I. NZP is better than or comparable to other zoos visited
- II. Zoo messages or themes are recognizable, but they are not reinforced or repeated sufficiently to recall unprompted
- III. Media reports on NZP appear to have marginally impacted visitors' observations

### I. The perfect zoo and comparisons with other zoos

When the OP&A study team asked participants to imagine the “perfect zoo,” participants referenced three key concepts:

- A. Physical Arrangement
- B. Care of Animals

## C. Care of Visitors

This discussion point was designed to provide insight into what NZP is doing well, and what services or features could be improved.

In general, the participants responded that zoos should be good for animals as well as for people.

### *A. Physical Arrangement*

Visitors believed that the “perfect zoo” is flat – no major hills or stairs – or alternatively provides transportation. It should be clean and well-maintained; it should have a beautiful natural setting with colorful plant life. Guests should be able see the animals without feeling that they are intruding on the animals’ lives.

Both the focus group participants and the visitors who declined to participate mentioned the physical arrangement and accommodations at NZP. Focus group participants said they did not feel crowded during their Zoo visit. They reported that “the width of the trail walks is good here” and that “NZP has a lot of space.” But this vast space and terrain also presented complications. Many participants suggested that because NZP “is on the side of a hill, it is a natural problem being so steep.” One participant in the same group said, “It would be nice to have a trolley to the top. Even something that takes people around – a steam engine train? Kids can’t walk all around the park.”

Among non-focus group participants, on two occasions, visitor groups – one senior citizen walking alone, and another party comprised of two adults with two small children – told recruiters that they wished the Zoo offered some type of transportation for the return uphill. The senior citizen explained that although she attends the Zoo regularly, she is limited to attending the animal exhibits within a certain range of the entrance/visitor center. Her health limitations prevented her from walking the length of the park or walking uphill for such a long stretch. Similarly, the small children were too tired to walk uphill, and their parents had no choice but to carry them back to the entrance/exit. In short, better ways of getting around – via golf cart, trolley, bus, train or tram – was a common visitor request and consideration in designing a more perfect NZP.

### *B. Care of Animals*

Almost overwhelmingly, participants in the study desired the opportunity to view the animals in their natural habitats. There was keen interest in seeing animals cohabitate, with more than one species living harmoniously in the same enclosure; several focus group participants made comparisons to Disney’s Animal Kingdom. The ideal zoo has “open space for the animals, and [it] doesn’t seem like they are in cages.” Another participant said, “It should be like you are in their habitat without bothering them.”

Participants revealed mixed feelings about video cameras in the animal enclosures. (Video cameras in the enclosures permits alternate on-screen views for both physical and

website visitors.) One visitor wanted to know when the pandas have “downtime” and “when can a hippo just be a hippo?” Conversely, some visitors thought the cameras afforded the animals more privacy by permitting a greater distance between animal and visitor but still allowing the visitor to watch the animal.

Another passionate and frequent visitor said that NZP should “Have a respect for animals in more ways. I don’t agree with animals doing shows. If you want to see that, you can go to a circus.”

Cleanliness was a prominent concern. Visitors were asked, “Should monkey houses smell?” The response from one participant suggests that some visitors equated odor and cleanliness with the stewardship and care of the animals. In the words of one:

*It would put me off to think the animals are not well cared for. I want to see the animals happy. Primates are clean animals and would not be happy if their enclosure was not taken care of.*

Another participant spoke of the same issue at the elephants exhibit. “The Elephant House and Ape House at NZP smell terrible. You just want to flee. It feels like it’s not being kept up or is without ventilation.” However, other research in this area suggests that some visitors appreciate the odors as part of the larger zoo experience. This may be a point of disagreement better examined by a larger statistically valid sample.

When visitors witnessed the animal quarters being cleaned, they thought the animals were well cared for and loved. For example, one participant witnessed a caretaker cleaning an Asian elephant’s hoof and said, “You could see that the Asian elephant enjoyed having her paw cleaned. You could see it on the elephant’s face.” Another participant added, “Visitors like seeing this and knowing the animals are loved.”

### *C. Care of Visitors*

Participants voiced a strong desire for more human (as well as animal) contact and interaction. Overall, visitors wanted to be “up-close and personal” with the animals and to view the animals in natural settings, and wanted more shells, bones and fur to touch, as well as information booklets to take home. Visitors also desire in-park transportation, as discussed earlier.

A key element in the care of visitors is the visitor food service – both quality and price – and a few of the participants’ suggestions mirrored earlier recommendations from visitor satisfaction surveys conducted at NZP. One participant said, “What about the low quality of the food? The Zoo could have something nutritionally better than fast food. Even snacks can be more than candy.” The dialogue continued, “I totally second that!” and the participant added his family’s experience with the high prices and limited selection. He ordered their daughter French fries, because, he said, there were no affordable alternatives – the chicken combo, for example, was \$8.95.

## *Information*

Group participants wanted more information, expressing that every exhibit should be informative. Focus group participants expressed an interest in knowing more about the individual animals in the Zoo. Visitors would like to have known that the animals were happy and learn more about how they live and how they came to NZP. A myth spread quickly in one focus group that Zoo animals are only recovered from circuses, etc. and are not taken from the wild. While this may be true in some circumstances, most of the animals were born in captivity at the Zoo or elsewhere. Participants wanted to know more about where the animals come from and about specific individuals. For example, some participants appreciated knowing the name of the baby elephant, Kandula, and wanted to know the names of more animals at the Zoo.

A mother who participated in one focus group offered this comment, “I feel like I’m at a loss while I’m here ... especially about whether or not something bites – that’s the big question. More information is necessary.” (Her child is both inquisitive and fearful of the animals at the Zoo.)

Participants are also interested in learning general, as well as specific, information throughout their Zoo visit. They cited examples at other zoos that charged an admission fee but provided a free audio guide that could be played at will or was triggered by sensors in the exhibit. Suggestions for NZP and the “perfect zoo” included audio guides and tours, as well as more written information such as booklets to take home.

Participants found the layout of NZP to be logical, but there was disagreement on whether the signage was adequate. While a frequent Zoo visitor found the signage to be poor in comparison with other zoos, other new visitors found the signage and layout sufficient to locate two or three favorite animals in a quick visit, or “if you’re not on a mission to see everything.” It was noted, however, that maps were not available until the park opened and should be available when the information desk is closed. Another visitor said:

*I lived in this area for three and a half years. We visited within a month or two of our arrival. But it was 18 months, maybe two years before I realized that you had a big bird area. And then I started looking at the signs ... I would say [that at] the other zoos and aquaria [I’ve visited], I never had any issue of finding things that I would assume would be there. But whereas here, I find the signage is not adequate.*

Visitors expressed similar opinions about notification that exhibits were closed or that the animals were not out on view. Suggestions included signage throughout the Zoo that would enable more interaction with NZP/FONZ staff, for example, “there are presentations here today.”

As noted, participants expressed a desire for more printed information. The information should be available at different sight levels (for children/adults) and free to take home.

One visitor said, “Zoos get parents because they bring the kids – both levels of intellectual engagement are important. Kids are more tactile and more visual learners; they need both visual and text.”

### *Interaction*

The participants clearly desired more interaction with both animals and staff at the Zoo. Docents, recognizable by some type of uniform, were a highly prized part of other zoo visits. Few, if any, of the participants encountered a docent on this particular visit to NZP. Another alternative discussed was electronic or pre-recorded audio information. Participants praised the “zoo key” concept at the Philadelphia and other zoos. Guests purchase a plastic key that can be inserted into a kiosk at an exhibit for more information about the animal.

In general, partakers appreciated the close proximity to the animals that is available at NZP. But they also wanted to touch the animals. While that may sound dangerous or infeasible, participants referred to designated petting areas or touching starfish and invertebrates in tidal pools, a feature available at the Monterey Bay Aquarium and elsewhere. Other participants discussed their experiences at zoos where peacocks and pea hens roam the sidewalks and bats fly free:

*Participant: At the bat house in the Frankfurt Zoo, the bats were freely swooping around.*

Moderator: Was that enjoyable?

*Participant: It was exciting once you got over the fear.*

There was some disagreement among the focus groups and among individual participants about the appropriate level of interaction with the animals – the struggle between space for the animal’s freedom and privacy, and human interaction and view. Some visitors said they didn’t want to see the cages or to interrupt the daily life of the animals. One visitor suggested that, if appropriate, rental binoculars would help the visitors see animals living in a more natural habitat.

### *The “National” Zoo*

Participants mentioned the concept of “National Zoo” infrequently. When asked how the “National” Zoo is or should be different, visitors responded in a variety of ways. One woman, visiting alone, said, “When I see ‘national,’ I expect bigger and better – it is in the nation’s capital and part of the Smithsonian, which is world renowned.” In the same discussion, a man offered:

*It should be more eclectic, representing the nation, not the habitat of DC. It could be more national and less regional. Now it’s a regional zoo that happens to be in the capital.*

Still another visitor suggested a different perspective, “Given that it’s the National Zoo



[and there are so many other attractions in the nation's capital], you are tired before you even get here.” To combat the fatigue factor, this participant hoped to see transportation added within the Zoo.

Another frequent Zoo visitor added this passionate portrayal of what it means to be “national”:

*The environment for the animals is also driven by the public. Santa Barbara just has animals in cages ... and you couldn't get away with that here. This is pretty much an international symbol ... When the panda was sick, that news was seen around the world. People prayed, people cried all over the world. I know I cried when that panda died. And no one will ever forget that day when they [NZZP] announced his death because he was such a huge symbol internationally. So I think the National Zoo has more of a burden to keep the animals as happy as possible.*

## II. Messages

What is (are) the idea(s) that NZZP hopes to communicate to visitors? Which idea does the Zoo get across the best?

NZZP provided the following list of messages to “test.”

- 1. The meaning and importance of biodiversity*
- 2. Being "green" (e.g. recycling)*
- 3. Saving habitat for animals*
- 4. Saving wildlife in other countries*
- 5. Saving wildlife in America*
- 6. Saving wildlife in our local communities*
- 7. The connection between human activities and wildlife*
- 8. People's connection to nature.*

Participant responses indicated that they found all these messages during a visit to NZZP and that the messages were the same as at other zoos. But they also found that at NZZP the messages are not reinforced or especially recognizable. One participant said, “They're all out there, but not carried through because of other problems.” Another visitor said, “These are all inter-related, but the biodiversity message is the most prominent.”

Without prompting, participants recalled messages that included the terms “conservation,” “diversity,” “recycling,” and “endangered habitats.” Some participants thought that NZZP's message is “to appreciate what the Earth has to offer,” or to inspire a “sense of wonder.” Others were critical of NZZP because, although it provides understanding and a commitment to protect wildlife, it does not explain what “you” as the visitor can do about it, or even what's causing the destruction of habitats or

threatening species.

Other messages the participants “got” included animals and destruction of their habitats, education, entertainment, sense of wonder, and life cycles. Participants said that the message of saving wildlife in the local community didn’t resonate – but perceived that the message of saving wildlife in other countries was important. One participant suggested that the same messages come from National Geographic and Animal Planet [networks] – “Appreciate what the Earth has to offer.”

Some participants found the message about “recycling” to be particularly strong. A visitor commented, “Being green – recycling and saving the planet – I’ve seen especially at this Zoo. More so here than at other zoos.” Another said, “After I visit the Zoo, I want to go home and go through my garbage and see if I threw out any cans.”

While some of the participants agreed that the Zoo tried to express the message of “people’s connection to nature,” and that “animals aren’t so different from people,” they preferred more information on the connection between human activities and wildlife – a message they said wasn’t well communicated at NZP.

Other visitors explicitly expressed an interest in learning more about the research at the zoo. “The National Zoo should emphasize research. Other museums do a better job at showcasing their research,” said one visitor. Another added:

*I think it’s really important for the National Zoo in particular to exude the enthusiasm that comes from researching animals ... I think I know that research goes on because I get the FONZ newsletter, but otherwise I wouldn’t know.*

Some participants desired more information on specific research efforts such as the captive breeding programs. One man said he was aware of a program at NZP only through a specialty hobbyist magazine about tropical fish.

One participant said:

*I’m not sure that any of those messages are actually communicated to me when I visit the Zoo ... I think they are things which I consider to be important, but when I come here, the two things that I go away with are: there are a lot of really good facts about the ways of the animals and what they eat naturally, and always please help us to build a new elephant house ... and I’m not saying these shouldn’t be there, but communicating these things are important in terms of the future of animals. If we can’t go to a zoo where it seems like they’re trying to create natural environments and learn, what else can we do? The Zoo is missing a really important opportunity to educate people. They’re not getting those messages across.*

Another member of the focus group mentioned that he did pick up on some of the messages, but added, “it depends on the exhibit,” noting that the Cheetahs and Think Tank Exhibits expressed messages.

### III. Media

Responses to inquiries regarding media reports differed among the focus groups. Some participants, even those who live in or near Washington, were unfamiliar with recent media reports about NZP. Others had followed the coverage more closely. One participant recalled reading “The big stories – the birth of an animal, the deaths, the shooting [of one teenager by another in 2002] – otherwise you don’t read about NZP.”

Participants said that, overall, negative media stories discourage visitation. A visitor said, “There are safety issues with the animals here. I don’t feel good about coming here.” In the same conversation, another participant said,

*Safety, health and well being of animals [means something] to a zoo-goer. If an elephant has some infections that could spread to people, it detracts from the zoo experience and takes the fun out of the day.*

Participants acknowledged that they remembered mainly negative stories or only saw negative media stories. A few participants expressed that NZP doesn’t advertise or promote the Zoo [enough]. Specific coverage that visitors recalled included:

- *Animal deaths during tenure of NZP’s current director;*
- *Issues of certification;*
- *Zoo closed for maintenance;*
- *Mismanagement of the Zoo;*
- *Improper care of the animals and animals being poisoned; and*
- *A shooting.*

Visitors recalled a few positive stories about zoos in general. For example:

- *A panda mating;*
- *Research, funding and re-releasing animals into the wild after rehabilitation.*

One participant offered this insight: “The media doesn’t like the Zoo. Even though it’s probably not 100 percent accurate, it’s influential.” Another participant revealed that, “Even if you cut in half [the credence you give to the media], it still leaves a little doubt [that the Zoo has problems].”

Most focus group participants were aware of the issues but visited the Zoo anyway, although some visitors noted concerns for their safety. There was an undeniable discomfort even within this small sample of visitors. Several parents with children were willing to visit the Zoo despite knowledge of negative media coverage. But other parents, referencing the poisoning death of the red pandas, commented, “parents

particularly and schools don't want to bring kids if it is perceived as unsafe." Several participants suggested, "The fundamental problem is that [NZIP] shouldn't do what causes a negative story." A change in leadership and temporary Zoo closure were among the suggested actions.

Ultimately, visitors would like NZP to share more positive stories with the public through the media. "Here you only hear the negative stories, but in Rhode Island, perhaps because the state is small, you hear everything, including positive stories." A local participant said, "NZP is not going to the media. All they write about is why animals died and how they got sick. The only happy news was animals being replaced." Yet another local visitor said, "There have been some things in the Washington Kids Post about baby animals. I saw lots of baby gorillas [here today], but I hadn't heard anything about them." Another visitor's experience matched this comment, "You don't hear much from the Zoo. There are no ads."

## **Conclusions**

Overall, the participants generally had positive opinions of the Zoo. But a few key issues suggest a need for follow-up research and/or some response. Many of the participants' observations coincide with the findings of earlier visitor studies at NZP.

NZIP, while spacious and park-like, includes a serious hill. Visitors dislike the hill's steep grade and want help to tackle it. Transportation within the Zoo, particularly for families with small children and senior citizens, is worth further investigation. Focus group participants expressed a willingness to pay for shuttle service; NZP could explore the logistics in greater detail.

Matters regarding visitor care included food quality and price, and overall cleanliness and odors in exhibits. Poor conditions and lax attention to visitor care in these areas imply that the animals are not receiving the best care. Participants equated visitor care and safety with animal care and safety.

Other issues of visitor care and experience suggest that more interaction, communication and information are necessary, at least for some visitors, as is more interaction with Zoo staff. NZP should maximize whatever possibilities occur for staff/visitor interaction. Improving communication should be a goal: NZP should make every effort to improve methods for informing visitors about what animals are active, what exhibits may be closed, and the feeding times, as well as information about the animals and how they came to live at the Zoo. This could be done simply through message boards throughout the park or through more elaborate methods such as video screens.

The participants were eager to learn more about their personal connection to the animals and behavioral modifications that may improve this relationship. Emphasizing NZP research and education with enhanced communication on these points would respond to this need.

Visitors appeared to take with them a broad message of “biodiversity” and “conservation,” but the messages were not more formal or identifiable than general ideas. Stressing the relationship between Zoo visitors and animals and enhancing information and educational opportunities – including more opportunities for interaction with staff – should serve to deepen the impact of intended NZP messages. Repetition is the key.

Finally, it is clear that NZP has not *used* the media, but rather that the media uses the Zoo. NZP might benefit from a more proactive approach to media coverage and initiate more positive-spin stories about the animals, research and events at the Zoo. Highlighting changes at the Zoo such as improvements in animal care and visitor safety, and other generally positive stories, should help to counter the negative press and soothe visitor concerns.

The one-day experience with 22 winter visitors is not a representative cross-section of NZP visitors. The refusals suggest that research strategies should be developed to provide supervised activities for children who are accompanied by only one adult, as well as to involve an audience beyond those at the Zoo. Additionally, there is a population of visitors and non-visitors who are uncomfortable in zoos. They may feel guilty, sad or confused about animal life in captivity. There is yet another population of lapsed visitors. In particular, more can be learned from those would-be visitors who have chosen NOT to attend the Zoo in recent months. To gather details on this audience, FONZ members who do not renew their memberships could be surveyed. OP&A suggests that further study should be conducted to include zoo enthusiasts who do not visit NZP. OP&A also suggests further research on visitors’ experiences.

**Recommendations.** NZP should consider ...

- Reinforcing messages through repetition
- Taking a more proactive approach to media coverage
- Increasing communication and interaction with visitors
- Adopting an aggressive communications strategy that controls the content of messages (advertisements) and encourages media to focus on positive Zoo coverage
- Creating transportation within the park, particularly for senior citizens and families with small children
- Exploring visitor experiences through alternative methods

## Appendix A: Focus Group Participants

Name	Gender	Residence	Prior Visits	Visitor Group	Age*	Race/Ethnicity*
Adrian	M	Cincinnati, OH	10	2 adults	44	Caucasian
Bob	M	Boston, MA	none	2 adults, 2 children	55	Caucasian
Chelsea	F	Northampton, MA	more than 20	2 adults, 1 child	28	Caucasian
Chris	M	Washington, DC	8 to 10	2 adults	30s	Caucasian
Eugene	M	Minnesota	none	2 adults	40	Caucasian
Iris	F	Flushing, NY	none	2 adults	over 65	Caucasian
Jason	M	Gaithersburg, MD	none	2 adult, 1 child	30s	African American
John	M	Silver Spring, MD	20	2 adults, 1 child	30s	Caucasian
Julie	F	Monroe, MI	1	alone	24	Caucasian
Kate	F	Alplaus, NY	1	2 adults	30s	Caucasian
Kathy	F	Hartford, CT	none	2 adults	30s	African American
Kelly	F	Boston, MA	?	2 adults	30	Caucasian
Libby	F	NW Washington, DC	8 to 10	2 adults	30s	Caucasian
Marc	M	Silver Spring, MD	more than 10	2 adults, 1 child	30s	Caucasian
Matt	M	Rockville, MD	60	2 adults, 1 child	37	Caucasian
Mitzi	F	NW Washington, DC	several	2 adults	30s	Asian
Nick	M	Hartford, CT <i>(Originally from Copenhagen)</i>	none	2 adults	30s	Caucasian
Pat	F	Chevy Chase, MD	many	3 adults, 3 children	over 65	Caucasian
Paul	M	Richmond, VA	1	2 adults	30s	Caucasian
Richard	M	Bethesda, MD	15 to 20	2 adults	50s	Caucasian
Sasha	F	Silver Spring, MD <i>(Originally from London)</i>	many	2 adults, 1 child	30	Caucasian
Travis	M	Lexington Park, MD	none	2 adults	29	Caucasian

\* Age and Ethnicity are based on observations unless otherwise revealed by the participant during the discussion

## Appendix B: Other Zoos and Aquaria Visited

Focus group participants had previously visited a variety of US and international zoos and aquaria. The following is a complete list visited within the past several years:

Baltimore Aquarium	Los Angeles County Zoo
Boston Aquarium	Madison Zoo (WI)
Boston Zoo	Miami Zoo
Bronx Zoo	Milwaukee Zoo
Busch Gardens (Tampa)	Minnesota Zoo
Cape Cod Zoo	Monterey Bay Aquarium
Catskill Game Farm	Munich Zoo
Central Park Zoo	Mystic Aquarium (CT)
Cincinnati Zoo	New England Aquarium
Como Park Zoo (MN)	New Orleans Zoo
Copenhagen Aquarium	Norristown Zoo
Copenhagen Zoo	Philadelphia Zoo
Denver Zoo	Richmond Zoo
Detroit Zoo	Roger Williams (RI)
Disney Animal Kingdom	San Diego Zoo
Frankfurt Zoo	Santa Barbara Zoo
Franklin Park (MA)	Shanghai Zoo
Guangzhou (China)	St. Louis Zoo
Gulfarium (FL)	Toledo Zoo
Henry Doorly (NE)	Toronto Zoo
Israel Zoo	Ueno Park Zoo (Tokyo)
London Aquarium	Underwater World in Mall of America
London Zoo	West Virginia Game Farm

*(Plus unidentified zoos in France and England).*