Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024
Fax: 407-812-6978

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I believe in the Final Environmental Impact Statement on FLL Expansion you have potential major errors along with unanswered questions due to lack of proper data. The EIS studies were done only to 2020 for environmental impacts but FAA has based its' expansion decisions on benefits through 2030. FAA has also recently stated that it does not intend on complying with operational restrictions contained in the Inter-local Agreement between Broward County and the city of Dania Beach which will mean even more environmental impact than the present EIS show. Even if I believed that the EIS was truly accurate there are better alternatives.

The South Runway Alternatives will have a greater impact on wetlands, parks & residents than the North Runway C1 Alternative would have. The wetlands on the South are a high quality wetlands area where the wetlands on the North are a low quality wetlands area which will have less impact to these wetlands. With our Eco-system being destroyed as fast as it is why would we not choose an alternative that would have the least amount of impact? The EIS report acknowledges that there are endangered species that will be affected to some degree if the South runway is built. Should we not be trying to protect them to the very best of our ability instead of our second best? Also the surrounding parks will be impacted more from the South Runway Alternatives than the North Runway C1 Alternative. John U Lloyd State Park was just featured on Good Morning America and Congressman Klein heralded the park as a "national treasure" on the Floor of the House on July 17, 2008. With this type of national exposure Broward will attract more tourists. It has coral reefs just 100 yards off shore. To what affect will the vibration from the planes shock waves have on the well being to the coral? Also what about the oil spillage from the planes? The marine life must deal with the fuel spillage as planes use this approach to the airport. Why would we want to go ahead with South Runway Alternatives creating even more deafening noise throughout more of the park while destroying wildlife & the environment with more pollution than need be when the North Runway C1 Alternative would have a far less impact? Tourists mean a stronger economy for Broward but if you destroy the very thing they come for you will hurt all of Broward County. Also FAA has not taken into consideration the present air quality from the nearby power plant added to more and larger planes for the Raised South Runway in the final EIS. How will this affect people with breathing problems in the area and those visiting? The home of my niece constantly has oily black dirt on furniture and countertops created from the power plant and the present airplanes flying over/near them. How much worse will this be with the South Runway Alternatives and at what health risk and damage to houses and other belongings?

The South Runway Alternatives will also increase the noise in the area and will negatively impact the quality of life to residents. My niece lives in line with the present south runway, with the north runway being just to the north, and the present noise can be extremely loud and disruptive at times. The planes wake me up &/or keep me awake at night or in the morning when I visit. Many times we have to stop talking because we cannot hear each other or simply can not enjoy a movie, TV or music. FAA plans to have the same types planes take off and land on the new south runway as is presently using the North runway but the contour lines for the projected noise for the proposed South Runway Alternatives shows the noise level as being much smaller than the present North runway. How can that be? Added to that, the Final EIS does not even address the greater noise level of a 40 foot high (plus or minus) raised runway. The noise from a Raised South Runway will be deafening and travel much farther than the contour charts show. The Greenbelt buffer will provide no relief for and will in no way shield the ugly image of the runway. FAA has not addressed the Resident's enjoyment of Florida's gorgeous

F-LC024

weather being severely impacted by the South Runway Expansion. They live out-of-doors all year around in South Florida and the question of "how do you soundproof it" has not been answered. The fact is, is that the North Parallel Runway Alternative would have less impact in all of the above areas. Add to all of this the fact that FAA has failed to comply with its own environmental laws for years and there is no reason to believe that they will live up to their own mitigation assurances.

Not only is the Raised South Runway Alternative the most expensive to build of all the alternatives but the cost estimate to build it did not include the cost of buying out hundreds of homes and property in Melaleuca Gardens and Atlantic Village which will be in the Runway Protection Zone and all of which the FLL/Broward will have to pay for. That means it will cost a lot more than what the cost estimate said it would take to build the Raised South Runway Alternative. The North Parallel Runway Alternative would not only be cheaper to build but there is land readily available, at no cost, to the business' that would have to be moved. However the cost estimates did not take this into account but rather added this cost onto their report along with moving costs when in fact FAA will pay for moving business not the FLL/Broward. So if you deduct these costs it makes the North Parallel Runway Alternative even less expensive than stated in the cost estimates. So taking all of the above into consideration what makes the Raised South Runway Alternative so much better than the North Parallel Runway? FAA has also not addressed the devaluation of homes in the area and the cost to the homeowners.

With the present economy in a downward spiral and fuel prices spiraling upward projections of demand overestimate growth at the airport. The Final EIS does not address the cost increase of jet fuel and how this will impact aircraft flying in & out of the airport nor the recent, or future, reduction in operations at the airport by airline companies. Operations at the Airport declined by 16% overall in 2006. Considering all this, it means that expansion may not be necessary as indicated by the Final EIS.

The FAA eliminated other alternatives as being fatally flawed because they encroached on I-95 and CSX Railroad. Why did they not eliminate alternatives that encroach on US 1 or the FEC Railroad as flawed? Why did FAA use 2002 data and not more recent data when looking at economic impacts to Broward County? This data did not include the current negative economic forecast for the airlines. South Florida is land locked between the Everglades and the ocean. Roads are already congested in the area and there are water shortages, coming power problems, poor school systems, high crime, high taxes and not enough land. If the airport expansion goes ahead and in this present economy can not produce the income to pay for itself after construction of new runways, gates, roads, buildings and whatever else needs to be done it will fall "we the Taxpayers" paying the ultimate price for it as Broward County goes bankrupt. Taking everything into consideration how can FAA justify the Raised South Runway Alternative?

Sincerely,
Kay Beers
215 North Canal Rd. #20, Lansing, MI 48917

F-LC024

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024
Fax: 407-812-6978

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I believe that in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the FLL Expansion there are numerous errors, along with many unanswered questions due to the lack of proper data. The EIS studies were done to 2020 for the environmental impacts, but FAA has based its' expansion decisions on benefits through 2030. Will these impact studies be done, when & what will they show for these ten years? FAA has also recently stated that if does not intend on complying with operational restrictions contained in the Inter-local Agreement between Broward County and the city of Dania Beach which will mean even more impact on the environment than the present EIS shows. Even if I believed that the EIS is accurate, there are better alternatives.

The South Runway Alternatives will have a greater impact on wetlands, parks & residents than the North Runway C1 Alternative would have. The wetlands on the South are high quality wetlands, where the wetlands on the North are low quality wetlands which would have less impact on these wetlands. With our Eco-system being destroyed as fast as it is why wouldn't we choose an alternative that would have the least amount of impact? The EIS report acknowledges that there are endangered species that will be affected if the South runway is built. Shouldn't we be trying to protect them to the very best of our ability instead of our second best? Also the surrounding parks will be impacted more from the South Runway Alternatives than the North Runway C1 Alternative. John U Lloyd State Park was just featured on Good Morning America and Congressman Klein heralded the park as a "national treasure" on the Floor of the House on July 17, 2008. Because of this "national treasure", with this type of national exposure, South Florida stands to attract more tourists to this area. As a Northern FL resident & student I found this very exciting for Southern FL. With that said, why would you want to go ahead with the South Runway Alternatives creating even more deafening noise throughout the park for your visiting tourists while destroying wildlife & the environment with more pollution than need be, when the North Runway C1 Alternative would have a far less impact? More tourists would mean a stronger economy for Broward County, but if you destroy the very thing they come for, you will hurt all of Broward County. Also FAA has not taken into consideration the present air quality from the nearby power plant added to more and larger planes for the Raised South Runway in the final EIS. How will this affect the many people with breathing problems like my grandmother, her neighbors & myself when I visit? It is my concern as a tourist & visitor the South Runway Alternatives could & will have huge impacts on our current health. In my Grandparents home my Grandmother is constantly wiping up a residue of oily, black dirt left behind on her furniture & countertops created from the power plant & the present planes flying over/near them. How much worse will this get with the South Runway Alternatives, what risks will this bring to our health & what risks are you willing to bring to your potential visitors? My mother says "The South Runway Alternatives & the health risks it will bring may be the very reason my vacations to Ft. Lauderdale will be no more".

The South Runway Alternatives will also increase the noise in Dania Beach and will negatively impact the quality of life to residents. My grandparents live in line with the present south runway, with the north runway being just to the north, and the present noise can be extremely loud and disruptive at times. The planes flying now wake me up &/ or keep me awake at night. With the South Runway Alternative this will only get worse. Who wants to take a vacation & have sleepless nights? I don't. Many times my Grandparents & I have to stop talking because we cannot hear each other. Even worse when we vacation with my Grandparents we LOVE to sit down & watch movies together as a whole FAMILY. We simply can not enjoy a whole movie, a TV show or even music without the noise of an interrupting plane. The noise from a raised South Runway will be deafening

F-LC025

and far worse than the contour charts show because it is already bad. There is no way that you will be able to hide the ugly image of the runway or stop noise. FAA has not addressed how I can enjoy South Florida's gorgeous weather at my Grandparents House playing or swimming outside with my Grandparents, family & friends. How will you soundproof the outside? Added to that, the Final EIS does not even address the greater noise level of a 40 foot high (plus or minus) raised runway. The noise from a Raised South Runway will be deafening and travel much farther than the contour charts show. The Greenbelt buffer will provide no relief for and will in no way shield the ugly image of the runway. The fact is, is that the North Runway Alternative would have less impact in all of the above areas. Add to all of this the fact that FAA has failed to comply with its own environmental laws for years and there is no reason to believe that they will live up to their own mitigation assurances.

Not only is the Raised South Runway Alternative the most expensive to build of all the alternatives but the cost estimate to build it did not include the cost of buying out hundreds of homes. That means it will cost a lot more than what the cost estimate said it would take to build the Raised South Runway Alternative. The North Parallel Runway Alternative would not only be cheaper to build but there is land readily available, at no cost, to the business' that would have to be moved. However the cost estimates did not take this into account but rather added this cost onto their report along with moving costs when in fact FAA will pay for moving business not the FLL/Broward. So if you deduct these costs, it makes the North Parallel Runway Alternative even less expensive than stated in the cost estimates. So taking all of the above into consideration what makes the Raised South Runway Alternative so much better than the North Parallel Runway?

The Final EIS does not address the present economy in a downward spiral and fuel prices getting more expensive, airline companies going out of business or cutting back flights and how this will impact aircraft flying in & out of the airport. Considering all this, it means that expansion may not be necessary as FAA said.

The FAA eliminated other alternatives as being fatally flawed because they encroached on I-95 and CSX Railroad. Why did they not eliminate alternatives that encroach on US 1 or the FEC Railroad as flawed? Why did FAA use 2002 data and not more recent data when looking at economic impacts to Broward County? This data did not include the current negative economic forecast for the airlines. South Florida is land locked between the Everglades and the ocean. Roads here are congested already and they have water restrictions, poor school systems, high crime, high taxes and not enough land. If the airport expansion goes ahead and in this present economy can not produce the income to pay for itself plus construction of new runways, gates, roads, buildings and whatever else needs to be done it will fall on people like my Grandparents of Broward County to pay the ultimate price for it. Taking everything into consideration how can FAA justify the Raised South Runway Alternative?

Sincerely,
Maria Harris
2672 Shannon Street, Orange Park, FL 32065

F-LC025

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024
Fax: 407-812-6978

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I believe that in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the FLL Expansion there are numerous errors, along with many unanswered questions due to the lack of proper data. The EIS studies were done to 2020 for the environmental impacts, but FAA has based its' expansion decisions on benefits through 2030. Will these impact studies be done, when & what will they show for these ten years? FAA has also recently stated that it does not intend on complying with operational restrictions contained in the Inter-local Agreement between Broward County and the city of Dania Beach which will mean even more impact on the environment than the present EIS shows. Even if I believed that the EIS is accurate, there are better alternatives.

The South Runway Alternatives will have a greater impact on wetlands, parks & residents than the North Runway C1 Alternative would have. The wetlands on the South are high quality wetlands, where the wetlands on the North are low quality wetlands which would have less impact on these wetlands. With our Eco-system being destroyed as fast as it is why wouldn't we choose an alternative that would have the least amount of impact? The EIS report acknowledges that there are endangered species that will be affected if the South runway is built. Shouldn't we be trying to protect them to the very best of our ability instead of our second best? Also the surrounding parks will be impacted more from the South Runway Alternatives than the North Runway C1 Alternative. John U Lloyd State Park was just featured on Good Morning America and Congressman Klein heralded the park as a "national treasure" on the Floor of the House on July 17, 2008. Because of this "national treasure", with this type of national exposure, South Florida stands to attract more tourists to this area. As a Northern FL resident & student I found this very exciting for Southern FL. With that said, why would you want to go ahead with the South Runway Alternatives creating even more deafening noise throughout the park for your visiting tourists while destroying wildlife & the environment with more pollution than need be, when the North Runway C1 Alternative would have a far less impact? More tourists would mean a stronger economy for Broward County, but if you destroy the very thing they come for, you will hurt all of Broward County. Also FAA has not taken into consideration the present air quality from the nearby power plant added to more and larger planes for the Raised South Runway in the final EIS. How will this affect the many people with breathing problems like my grandmother, her neighbors & what will it do to me when I visit? It is my concern as a tourist & visitor that the South Runway Alternatives could & will have huge impacts on our current health. In my Grandparents home my Grandmother is constantly wiping up a residue of oily, black dirt left behind on her furniture & countertops created from the power plant & the present planes flying over/near them. How much worse will this get with the South Runway Alternatives, what risks will this bring to our health & what risks are you willing to bring to your potential visitors

The South Runway Alternatives will also increase the noise in Dania Beach and will negatively impact the quality of life to residents. My grandparents live in line with the present south runway, with the north runway being just to the north, and the present noise can be extremely loud and disruptive at times. The planes flying now wake me up &/ or keep me awake at night. With the South Runway Alternative this will only get worse. Who wants to take a vacation & have sleepless nights? I don't. Many times my Grandparents & I have to stop talking because we cannot hear each other. Even worse when we vacation with my Grandparents we LOVE to sit down & watch movies together as a whole FAMILY. We simply can not enjoy a whole movie, a TV show or even music without the noise of an interrupting plane. The noise from a raised South Runway will be deafening and far worse than the contour charts show because it is already bad. There is no way that you will be able to

F-LC026

hide the ugly image of the runway or stop noise. FAA has not addressed how I can enjoy South Florida's gorgeous weather at my Grandparents House playing or swimming outside with my Grandparents, family & friends. How will you soundproof the outside? Added to that, the Final EIS does not even address the greater noise level of a 40 foot high (plus or minus) raised runway. The noise from a Raised South Runway will be deafening and travel much farther than the contour charts show. The Greenbelt buffer will provide no relief for and will in no way shield the ugly image of the runway. The fact is, is that the North Runway Alternative would have less impact in all of the above areas. Add to all of this the fact that FAA has failed to comply with its own environmental laws for years and there is no reason to believe that they will live up to their own mitigation assurances.

Not only is the Raised South Runway Alternative the most expensive to build of all the alternatives but the cost estimate to build it did not include the cost of buying out hundreds of homes. That means it will cost a lot more than what the cost estimate said it would take to build the Raised South Runway Alternative. The North Parallel Runway Alternative would not only be cheaper to build but there is land readily available, at no cost, to the business' that would have to be moved. However the cost estimates did not take this into account but rather added this cost onto their report along with moving costs when in fact FAA will pay for moving business not the FLL/Broward. So if you deduct these costs, it makes the North Parallel Runway Alternative even less expensive than stated in the cost estimates. So taking all of the above into consideration what makes the Raised South Runway Alternative so much better than the North Parallel Runway?

The Final EIS does not address the present economy in a downward spiral and fuel prices getting more expensive, airline companies going out of business or cutting back flights and how this will impact aircraft flying in & out of the airport. Considering all this, it means that expansion may not be necessary as FAA said.

The FAA eliminated other alternatives as being fatally flawed because they encroached on I-95 and CSX Railroad. Why did they not eliminate alternatives that encroach on US 1 or the FEC Railroad as flawed? Why did FAA use 2002 data and not more recent data when looking at economic impacts to Broward County? This data did not include the current negative economic forecast for the airlines. South Florida is land locked between the Everglades and the ocean. Roads here are congested already and they have water restrictions, poor school systems, high crime, high taxes and not enough land. If the airport expansion goes ahead and in this present economy can not produce the income to pay for itself plus construction of new runways, gates, roads, buildings and whatever else needs to be done it will fall on people like my Grandparents of Broward County to pay the ultimate price for it. Taking everything into consideration how can FAA justify the Raised South Runway Alternative?

Sincerely,
Anna Gill
1314A West College, Murfreesboro, TN 37130

F-LC026

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024
Fax: 407-812-6978

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I believe that in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the FLL Expansion there are numerous errors, along with many unanswered questions due to the lack of proper data. The EIS studies were done to 2020 for the environmental impacts, but FAA has based its' expansion decisions on benefits through 2030. Will these impact studies be done, when & what will they show for these ten years? FAA has also recently stated that it does not intend on complying with operational restrictions contained in the Inter-local Agreement between Broward County and the city of Dania Beach which will mean even more impact on the environment than the present EIS shows. Even if I believed that the EIS is accurate, there are better alternatives.

The South Runway Alternatives will have a greater impact on wetlands, parks & residents than the North Runway C1 Alternative would have. The wetlands on the South are high quality wetlands, where the wetlands on the North are low quality wetlands which would have less impact on these wetlands. With our Eco-system being destroyed as fast as it is why wouldn't we choose an alternative that would have the least amount of impact? The EIS report acknowledges that there are endangered species that will be affected if the South runway is built. Shouldn't we be trying to protect them to the very best of our ability instead of our second best? Also the surrounding parks will be impacted more from the South Runway Alternatives than the North Runway C1 Alternative. John U Lloyd State Park was just featured on Good Morning America and Congressman Klein heralded the park as a "national treasure" on the Floor of the House on July 17, 2008. Because of this "national treasure", with this type of national exposure, South Florida stands to attract more tourists to this area. As a Northern FL resident & student I found this very exciting for Southern FL. With that said, why would you want to go ahead with the South Runway Alternatives creating even more deafening noise throughout the park for your visiting tourists while destroying wildlife & the environment with more pollution than need be, when the North Runway C1 Alternative would have a far less impact? More tourists would mean a stronger economy for Broward County, but if you destroy the very thing they come for, you will hurt all of Broward County. Also FAA has not taken into consideration the present air quality from the nearby power plant added to more and larger planes for the Raised South Runway in the final EIS. How will this affect the many people with breathing problems like my grandmother, her neighbors & even me when I visit? It is my concern as a tourist & visitor the South Runway Alternatives could & will have huge impacts on our current health. In my Grandparents home my Grandmother is constantly wiping up a residue of oily, black dirt left behind on her furniture & countertops created from the power plant & the present planes flying over/near them. How much worse will this get with the South Runway Alternatives, what risks will this bring to our health & what risks are you willing to bring to your potential visitors? My mother says "The South Runway Alternatives & the health risks it will bring may be the very reason my vacations to Ft. Lauderdale will be no more".

The South Runway Alternatives will also increase the noise in Dania Beach and will negatively impact the quality of life to residents. My grandparents live in line with the present south runway, with the north runway being just to the north, and the present noise can be extremely loud and disruptive at times. The planes flying now wake me up &/ or keep me awake at night. With the South Runway Alternative this will only get worse. Who wants to take a vacation & have sleepless nights? I don't. Many times my Grandparents & I have to stop talking because we cannot hear each other. Even worse when we vacation with my Grandparents we LOVE to sit down & watch movies together as a whole FAMILY. We simply can not enjoy a whole movie, a TV show or even music without the noise of an interrupting plane. The noise from a raised South Runway will be deafening

F-LC027

and far worse than the contour charts show because it is already bad. There is no way that you will be able to hide the ugly image of the runway or stop noise. FAA has not addressed how I can enjoy South Florida's gorgeous weather at my Grandparents House playing or swimming outside with my Grandparents, family & friends. How will you soundproof the outside? Added to that, the Final EIS does not even address the greater noise level of a 40 foot high (plus or minus) raised runway. The noise from a Raised South Runway will be deafening and travel much farther than the contour charts show. The Greenbelt buffer will provide no relief for and will in no way shield the ugly image of the runway. The fact is, is that the North Runway Alternative would have less impact in all of the above areas. Add to all of this the fact that FAA has failed to comply with its own environmental laws for years and there is no reason to believe that they will live up to their own mitigation assurances.

Not only is the Raised South Runway Alternative the most expensive to build of all the alternatives but the cost estimate to build it did not include the cost of buying out hundreds of homes. That means it will cost a lot more than what the cost estimate said it would take to build the Raised South Runway Alternative. The North Parallel Runway Alternative would not only be cheaper to build but there is land readily available, at no cost, to the business' that would have to be moved. However the cost estimates did not take this into account but rather added this cost onto their report along with moving costs when in fact FAA will pay for moving business not the FLL/Broward. So if you deduct these costs, it makes the North Parallel Runway Alternative even less expensive than stated in the cost estimates. So taking all of the above into consideration what makes the Raised South Runway Alternative so much better than the North Parallel Runway?

The Final EIS does not address the present economy in a downward spiral and fuel prices getting more expensive, airline companies going out of business or cutting back flights and how this will impact aircraft flying in & out of the airport. Considering all this, it means that expansion may not be necessary as FAA said.

The FAA eliminated other alternatives as being fatally flawed because they encroached on I-95 and CSX Railroad. Why did they not eliminate alternatives that encroach on US 1 or the FEC Railroad as flawed? Why did FAA use 2002 data and not more recent data when looking at economic impacts to Broward County? This data did not include the current negative economic forecast for the airlines. South Florida is land locked between the Everglades and the ocean. Roads here are congested already and they have water restrictions, poor school systems, high crime, high taxes and not enough land. If the airport expansion goes ahead and in this present economy can not produce the income to pay for itself plus construction of new runways, gates, roads, buildings and whatever else needs to be done it will fall on people like my Grandparents of Broward County to pay the ultimate price for it. Taking everything into consideration how can FAA justify the Raised South Runway Alternative?

Sincerely,
Mitchell Harris
2672 Shannon Street, Orange Park, FL 32065

F-LC027

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024
Fax: 407-812-6978

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I believe that in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the FLL Expansion there are numerous errors, along with many unanswered questions due to the lack of proper data. The EIS studies were done to 2020 for the environmental impacts, but FAA has based its' expansion decisions on benefits through 2030. Will these impact studies be done, when & what will they show for these ten years? FAA has also recently stated that it does not intend on complying with operational restrictions contained in the Inter-local Agreement between Broward County and the city of Dania Beach which will mean even more impact on the environment than the present EIS shows. Even if I believed that the EIS is accurate, there are better alternatives.

The South Runway Alternatives will have a greater impact on wetlands, parks & residents than the North Runway C1 Alternative would have. The wetlands on the South are high quality wetlands, where the wetlands on the North are low quality wetlands which would have less impact on these wetlands. With our Eco-system being destroyed as fast as it is why wouldn't we choose an alternative that would have the least amount of impact? The EIS report acknowledges that there are endangered species that will be affected if the South runway is built. Shouldn't we be trying to protect them to the very best of our ability instead of our second best? Also the surrounding parks will be impacted more from the South Runway Alternatives than the North Runway C1 Alternative. John U Lloyd State Park was just featured on Good Morning America and Congressman Klein heralded the park as a "national treasure" on the Floor of the House on July 17, 2008. Because of this "national treasure", with this type of national exposure, South Florida stands to attract more tourists to this area. As a Northern FL resident & student I found this very exciting for Southern FL. With that said, why would you want to go ahead with the South Runway Alternatives creating even more deafening noise throughout the park for your visiting tourists while destroying wildlife & the environment with more pollution than need be, when the North Runway C1 Alternative would have a far less impact? More tourists would mean a stronger economy for Broward County, but if you destroy the very thing they come for, you will hurt all of Broward County. Also FAA has not taken into consideration the present air quality from the nearby power plant added to more and larger planes for the Raised South Runway in the final EIS. How will this affect the many people with breathing problems like my grandmother, her neighbors & even me when I visit? It is my concern as a tourist & visitor the South Runway Alternatives could & will have huge impacts on our current health. In my Grandparents home my Grandmother is constantly wiping up a residue of oily, black dirt left behind on her furniture & countertops created from the power plant & the present planes flying over/near them. How much worse will this get with the South Runway Alternatives, what risks will this bring to our health & what risks are you willing to bring to your potential visitors? My mother says "The South Runway Alternatives & the health risks it will bring may be the very reason my vacations to Ft. Lauderdale will be no more".

The South Runway Alternatives will also increase the noise in Dania Beach and will negatively impact the quality of life to residents. My grandparents live in line with the present south runway, with the north runway being just to the north, and the present noise can be extremely loud and disruptive at times. The planes flying now wake me up &/ or keep me awake at night. With the South Runway Alternative this will only get worse. Who wants to take a vacation & have sleepless nights? I don't. Many times my Grandparents & I have to stop talking because we cannot hear each other. Even worse when we vacation with my Grandparents we LOVE to sit down & watch movies together as a whole FAMILY. We simply can not enjoy a whole movie, a TV show or even music without the noise of an interrupting plane. The noise from a raised South Runway will be deafening

F-LC028

and far worse than the contour charts show because it is already bad. There is no way that you will be able to hide the ugly image of the runway or stop noise. FAA has not addressed how I can enjoy South Florida's gorgeous weather at my Grandparents House playing or swimming outside with my Grandparents, family & friends. How will you soundproof the outside? Added to that, the Final EIS does not even address the greater noise level of a 40 foot high (plus or minus) raised runway. The noise from a Raised South Runway will be deafening and travel much farther than the contour charts show. The Greenbelt buffer will provide no relief for and will in no way shield the ugly image of the runway. The fact is, is that the North Runway Alternative would have less impact in all of the above areas. Add to all of this the fact that FAA has failed to comply with its own environmental laws for years and there is no reason to believe that they will live up to their own mitigation assurances.

Not only is the Raised South Runway Alternative the most expensive to build of all the alternatives but the cost estimate to build it did not include the cost of buying out hundreds of homes. That means it will cost a lot more than what the cost estimate said it would take to build the Raised South Runway Alternative. The North Parallel Runway Alternative would not only be cheaper to build but there is land readily available, at no cost, to the business' that would have to be moved. However the cost estimates did not take this into account but rather added this cost onto their report along with moving costs when in fact FAA will pay for moving business not the FLL/Broward. So if you deduct these costs, it makes the North Parallel Runway Alternative even less expensive than stated in the cost estimates. So taking all of the above into consideration what makes the Raised South Runway Alternative so much better than the North Parallel Runway?

The Final EIS does not address the present economy in a downward spiral and fuel prices getting more expensive, airline companies going out of business or cutting back flights and how this will impact aircraft flying in & out of the airport. Considering all this, it means that expansion may not be necessary as FAA ~~said~~.

The FAA eliminated other alternatives as being fatally flawed because they encroached on I-95 and CSX Railroad. Why did they not eliminate alternatives that encroach on US 1 or the FEC Railroad as flawed? Why did FAA use 2002 data and not more recent data when looking at economic impacts to Broward County? This data did not include the current negative economic forecast for the airlines. South Florida is land locked between the Everglades and the ocean. Roads here are congested already and they have water restrictions, poor school systems, high crime, high taxes and not enough land. If the airport expansion goes ahead and in this present economy can not produce the income to pay for itself plus construction of new runways, gates, roads, buildings and whatever else needs to be done it will fall on people like my Grandparents of Broward County to pay the ultimate price for it. Taking everything into consideration how can FAA justify the Raised South Runway Alternative?

Sincerely,
Nathaniel Harris
2672 Shannon Street, Orange Park, FL 32065

F-LC028

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024
Fax: 407-812-6978

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I believe in the Final Environmental Impact Statement on FLL Expansion you have potential major errors along with unanswered questions due to lack of proper data. The EIS studies were done only to 2020 for environmental impacts but FAA has based its' expansion decisions on benefits through 2030. FAA has also recently stated that it does not intend on complying with operational restrictions contained in the Inter-local Agreement between Broward County and the city of Dania Beach which will mean even more environmental impact than the present EIS show. Even if I believed that the EIS was truly accurate there are better alternatives.

The South Runway Alternatives will have a greater impact on wetlands, parks & residents than the North Runway C1 Alternative would have. The wetlands on the South are a high quality wetlands area where the wetlands on the North are a low quality wetlands area which will have less impact to these wetlands. With our Eco-system being destroyed as fast as it is why would we not choose an alternative that would have the least amount of impact? The EIS report acknowledges that there are endangered species that will be affected to some degree if the South runway is built. Should we not be trying to protect them to the very best of our ability instead of our second best? Also the surrounding parks will be impacted more from the South Runway Alternatives than the North Runway C1 Alternative. John U Lloyd State Park was just featured on Good Morning America and Congressman Klein heralded the park as a "national treasure" on the Floor of the House on July 17, 2008. With this type of national exposure Broward will attract more tourists. Why would we want to go ahead with South Runway Alternatives creating even more deafening noise throughout more of the park while destroying wildlife & the environment with more pollution than need be when the North Runway C1 Alternative would have a far less impact? Tourists mean a stronger economy for Broward but if you destroy the very thing they come for you will hurt all of Broward County. Also FAA has not taken into consideration the present air quality from the nearby power plant added to more and larger planes for the Raised South Runway in the final EIS. How will this affect people with breathing problems in the area and those visiting? My daughters home constantly has oily black dirt on furniture and countertops created from the power plant and the present airplanes flying over/near them. How much worse will this be with the South Runway Alternatives and at what health risk and damage to houses and other belongings?

The South Runway Alternatives will also increase the noise in the area and will negatively impact the quality of life to residents. My daughter lives' in line with the present south runway, with the north runway being just to the north, and the present noise can be extremely loud and disruptive at times. The planes wake me up &/or keep me awake at night or in the morning when I visit. Many times we have to stop talking because we cannot hear each other or simply can not enjoy a movie, TV or music. FAA plans to have the same types planes take off and land on the new south runway as is presently using the North runway but the contour lines for the projected noise for the proposed South Runway Alternatives shows the noise level as being much smaller than the present North runway. How can that be? Added to that, the Final EIS does not even address the greater noise level of a 40 foot high (plus or minus) raised runway. The noise from a Raised South Runway will be deafening and travel much farther than the contour charts show. The Greenbelt buffer will provide no relief for and will in no way shield the ugly image of the runway. FAA has not addressed the Resident's enjoyment of Florida's gorgeous weather being severely impacted by the South Runway Expansion. They live out-of-doors all year around in South Florida and the question of "how do you soundproof it" has not been answered. The fact is, is that the North Parallel Runway Alternative would have less impact in all of the above areas. Add to all of this

F-LC029

the fact that FAA has failed to comply with its own environmental laws for years and there is no reason to believe that they will live up to their own mitigation assurances.

Not only is the Raised South Runway Alternative the most expensive to build of all the alternatives but the cost estimate to build it did not include the cost of buying out hundreds of homes and property in Melaleuca Gardens and Atlantic Village which will be in the Runway Protection Zone and all of which the FLL/Broward will have to pay for. That means it will cost a lot more than what the cost estimate said it would take to build the Raised South Runway Alternative. The North Parallel Runway Alternative would not only be cheaper to build but there is land readily available, at no cost, to the business' that would have to be moved. However the cost estimates did not take this into account but rather added this cost onto their report along with moving costs when in fact FAA will pay for moving business not the FLL/Broward. So if you deduct these costs it makes the North Parallel Runway Alternative even less expensive than stated in the cost estimates. So taking all of the above into consideration what makes the Raised South Runway Alternative so much better than the North Parallel Runway? FAA has also not addressed the devaluation of homes in the area and the cost to the homeowners.

With the present economy in a downward spiral and fuel prices spiraling upward projections of demand overestimate growth at the airport. The Final EIS does not address the cost increase of jet fuel and how this will impact aircraft flying in & out of the airport nor the recent, or future, reduction in operations at the airport by airline companies. Operations at the Airport declined by 16% overall in 2006. Considering all this, it means that expansion may not be necessary as indicated by the Final EIS.

The FAA eliminated other alternatives as being fatally flawed because they encroached on I-95 and CSX Railroad. Why did they not eliminate alternatives that encroach on US 1 or the FEC Railroad as flawed? Why did FAA use 2002 data and not more recent data when looking at economic impacts to Broward County? This data did not include the current negative economic forecast for the airlines. South Florida is land locked between the Everglades and the ocean. Roads are already congested in the area and there are water shortages, coming power problems, poor school systems, high crime, high taxes and not enough land. If the airport expansion goes ahead and in this present economy can not produce the income to pay for itself after construction of new runways, gates, roads, buildings and whatever else needs to be done it will fall "we the Taxpayers" paying the ultimate price for it as Broward County goes bankrupt. Taking everything into consideration how can FAA justify the Raised South Runway Alternative?

Sincerely,
Roberta Slee
215 North Canal Rd. #219, Lansing, MI 48917

F-LC029

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024
Fax: 407-812-6978

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I believe that in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the FLL Expansion there are numerous errors, along with many unanswered questions due to the lack of proper data. The EIS studies were done to 2020 for the environmental impacts, but FAA has based its' expansion decisions on benefits through 2030. Will these impact studies be done, when & what will they show for these ten years? FAA has also recently stated that it does not intend on complying with operational restrictions contained in the Inter-local Agreement between Broward County and the city of Dania Beach which will mean even more impact on the environment than the present EIS shows. Even if I believed that the EIS is accurate, there are better alternatives.

The South Runway Alternatives will have a greater impact on wetlands, parks & residents than the North Runway C1 Alternative would have. The wetlands on the South are high quality wetlands, where the wetlands on the North are low quality wetlands which would have less impact on these wetlands. With our Eco-system being destroyed as fast as it is why wouldn't we choose an alternative that would have the least amount of impact? The EIS report acknowledges that there are endangered species that will be affected if the South runway is built. Shouldn't we be trying to protect them to the very best of our ability instead of our second best? Also the surrounding parks will be impacted more from the South Runway Alternatives than the North Runway C1 Alternative. John U Lloyd State Park was just featured on Good Morning America and Congressman Klein heralded the park as a "national treasure" on the Floor of the House on July 17, 2008. Because of this "national treasure", with this type of national exposure, South Florida stands to attract more tourists to this area. As a Florida resident I find this very exciting. John U Lloyd State Park has coral reefs just 100 yards off shore. To what affect will the vibration from the planes shock waves have on the well being to the coral? Also what about the oil spillage from the planes? The marine life must deal with the fuel spillage as planes use this approach to the airport. With that said, why would you want to go ahead with the South Runway Alternatives creating even more deafening noise throughout the park for your visiting tourists while destroying wildlife & the environment with more pollution than need be, when the North Runway C1 Alternative would have a far less impact? More tourists would mean a stronger economy for Broward County, but if you destroy the very thing they come for, you will hurt all of Broward County. Also FAA has not taken into consideration the present air quality from the nearby power plant added to more and larger planes for the Raised South Runway in the final EIS. How will this affect the many people with breathing problems? It is my concern as a tourist that the South Runway Alternatives will have huge impacts on all these questions that the FAA FEIS has not yet fully addressed.

The South Runway Alternatives will also increase the noise in the area and will negatively impact the quality of life to residents. If tourists in the hotel, with all of the soundproofing put in, still complain about the noise from airplanes I can't imagine how bad it will be for residents in the area if South Runway Alternative is done. There is no way that you will be able to hide the ugly image of the runway or stop noise. I hear that South Floridians spend a lot of time outdoors year round because of their gorgeous weather. How will you soundproof when people are outside of their homes? Added to that, the Final EIS does not even address the greater noise level of a 40 foot high (plus or minus) raised runway. The noise from a Raised South Runway will be deafening and travel much farther than the contour charts show. The Greenbelt buffer will provide no relief for and will in no way shield the ugly image of the runway. The fact is, is that the North Runway Alternative would have less impact in all of the above areas. Add to all of this the fact that FAA has failed to comply with its own

F-LC030

environmental laws for years and there is no reason to believe that they will live up to their own mitigation assurances.

Not only is the Raised South Runway Alternative the most expensive to build of all the alternatives but the cost estimate to build it did not include the cost of buying out hundreds of homes. That means it will cost a lot more than what the cost estimate said it would take to build the Raised South Runway Alternative. The North Parallel Runway Alternative would not only be cheaper to build but there is land readily available, at no cost, to the business' that would have to be moved. However the cost estimates did not take this into account but rather added this cost onto their report along with moving costs when in fact FAA will pay for moving business not the FLL/Broward. So if you deduct these costs, it makes the North Parallel Runway Alternative even less expensive than stated in the cost estimates. So taking all of the above into consideration what makes the Raised South Runway Alternative so much better than the North Parallel Runway?

The Final EIS does not address the present economy in a downward spiral and fuel prices getting more expensive, airline companies going out of business or cutting back flights and how this will impact aircraft flying in & out of the airport. Considering all this, it means that expansion may not be necessary as FAA said.

The FAA eliminated other alternatives as being fatally flawed because they encroached on I-95 and CSX Railroad. Why did they not eliminate alternatives that encroach on US 1 or the FEC Railroad as flawed? Why did FAA use 2002 data and not more recent data when looking at economic impacts to Broward County? This data did not include the current negative economic forecast for the airlines. South Florida is land locked between the Everglades and the ocean. I heard from a friend that the roads are congested already and they have water restrictions, poor school systems, high crime, high taxes and not enough land. If the airport expansion goes ahead and in this present economy can not produce the income needed to pay for the cost of new runways, gates, roads, buildings and whatever else needs to be built, it will ultimately fall on people like me through tax dollars to bail Broward County out. Taking everything into consideration how can FAA justify the Raised South Runway Alternative?

Sincerely,
Stephanie Mitchum
1102 Green Pine Cr., Orange Park, FL 32065

F-LC030

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024

Dear Government Officials,

I live under the flight path of both the Municipal and FLL airports, (5360 SW 34th Way). On any given day I can clean the glass top table in my back yard and by evening it is layered in aircraft fuel soot.
The most dirty soot you can imagine. If we use our yard we are breathing this continually. So forget the noise impact, I can live with that, what I can't live with is the thought a visit to my house by my family and grandkids means their ingesting carcinogenic soot from over flying aircraft.

Rod 7.10

Grant Campbell's "The FaLLacy in Airport Expansion" is right on target, I have physical proof of it.

If the Homestead Air Force Base conversion was stopped over the possible environmental damage to two nearby national parks, when environmental groups concerned about noise, and air and water pollution in two national parks voiced strenuous objections in the name of protecting wildlife and fauna; THEN WHAT ABOUT US HUMANS?

Let's do what is right for our families and neighbors. Need reasons? Take some time to study the facts below.

David Pool
560 SW 34th Way
Fort Lauderdale, Fl.

1. Some facts generated from The Clean Air Task Force as relates to Broward County: http://www.catf.us/publications/view/25
   - In Florida, Broward County is 4th highest of 67 counties; nationally, 200 of 3,109 counties, placing it at the 94th percentile.
   - The *lifetime* cancer risk from *diesel soot* in Broward County exceeds the risk of all other air toxics tracked by EPA combined.
   - The average lifetime diesel soot cancer risk for a resident of Broward County is 1 in 3,142. This risk is **318 times greater** than EPA's acceptable cancer level of 1 in a million.
   - In 2004, deaths from firearm homicide were 11,829; from HIV, 14,095; from workplace accidents, 5,307; while the deaths from toxic emissions were 23,600, only7,631 less than the other causes combined.

2. Below is a summary of the health effects of emissions from air pollution as the EPA sees it. http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/aviation/r99013.pdf

   Pollutant Representative Health Effects

F-LC031

Ozone:
- Lung function impairment, effects on exercise performance.
- Increased airway responsiveness, increased susceptibility to respiratory infection, increased hospital admissions and emergency room visits, and pulmonary inflammation, lung structure damage.

Carbon Monoxide:
- Cardiovascular effects, especially in those persons with heart conditions (e.g., decreased time to onset of exercise-induced angina).

Nitrogen Oxides:
- Lung irritation and lower resistance to respiratory infections.

Particulate Matter:
- Premature mortality,
- Aggravation of respiratory and cardiovascular disease,
- Changes in lung function and
- increased respiratory symptoms,
- Changes to lung tissues and structure, and altered respiratory defense mechanisms.

Volatile Organic Compounds:
- Eye and respiratory tract irritation, headaches, dizziness, visual disorders, and memory impairment.

Pollutant Representative Environmental Effects
Ozone:
- Crop damage,
- Damage to trees
- Decreased resistance to disease for both crops and other plants.

Carbon Monoxide:
- Similar health effects on animals as on humans.

Nitrogen Oxides:
- Acid rain,
- Visibility degradation, particle formation, contribution towards ozone formation.

Particulate Matter:
- Visibility degradation and monument and building soiling.

F-LC031

safety effects for aircraft from reduced visibility.

Volatile Organic Compounds:

- Contribution towards ozone formation,
- Odors and some

direct effect on buildings and plants.

F-LC031

407 812 6528

All comments must be postmarked or faxed no later than **midnight, Monday, July 28, 2008.**
Comments can only be accepted with the full name and address of the individual commenting.

To:

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024

FROM: CHRIS HARRIS
2331/2341 SW. 44TH ST
DANIA BEACH, FL
33312

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I AM A HOMEOWNER @ 2331 S.W. 44TH ST. THE CLOUD THAT IS THIS AIRPORT EXPANSION HAS CAST IT'S SHADOW NOW FOR OVER 20 YEARS UPON ME AND MY FAMILY. I HAVE TRIED TO SELL BUT CANNOT DUE TO THE INDECISIVE NATURE. I CAN'T SPEND MONEY ON MY HOME ALSO DO TO THIS. P|3.11

AIRPORT USE IS DOWN DRAMATICALLY GET REAL, AND DO THE RIGHT THING. THERE IS NO CURRENT STUDY TO JUSTIFY THIS GROSS MISMANAGEMENT. LEAVE MY FAMILY ALONE, LEAVE MY HOUSE ALONE. ROD|2010

Chris Harris

CHRIS HARRIS
954-701-2070

F-LC032

Via Facsimile: Total number of pages faxed including this one = 5

July 28, 2008

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, FL 32822-5024

RE: Comments regarding the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) Proposed Development and Extension of Runway 9R/27L and Other Associated Airport Projects at the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport (FLL)

Dear Ms. Lane:

Greetings.

First, thank you and your staff for your response to my last comment letter submitted May 21, 2007. In specific response to your responses let me note:

1. I indicated I was incorporating by reference comments submitted to the FAA dated April 20, 2001, April 29, 2002 and July 23, 2002. The comments were made to a previous DEIS and SDEIS on the exact same subject matter as the restarted EIS process in 2005 resulting in the DEIS and now the FEIS. The comments, questions, concerns, etc. raised in previoulsy submitted comment letters are as valid to the current FEIS as they were to the former DEIS and SDEIS. Once again, I incorporate by reference the comments referenced above {(which include the 3,000 petitions against Broward County's prefered runway alternative (and as such FAA's preferred alternative)}.

PLEASE NOTE: IN MY COMMENT LETTER DATED MAY 21, 2007, I NOTED IF NECESSARY I WOULD FORWARD THESE DOCUMENTS TO YOU ALTHOUGH I PRESUME YOUR OFFICE HAS THESE DOCUMENTS READILY AVAILABLE. PLEASE ADVISE IF YOU NEED ME TO SEND ALONG THE COPIES ONCE AGAIN. OTHERWISE I WILL ASSUME THAT THEY WILL BE INCLUDED IN

ROD/1.1, 22.4

1/5

F-LC033

THE ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD.

2. I noted that costs reflected in the DEIS were artificially low as mitigation costs are not included. You indicated that the analysis provided was not intended to be a "benefit/cost analysis" and the costs for mitigation are included in Chapter Eight. The costs presented are woefully inadequate given the "guiding principles" for mitigation. I indicated that all we have asked for since the beginning is an open, full disclosure, scientific, fact based, reality, total cost accounting for the proposes expansion of FLL. Unfortunately, we didn't get this with the DEIS, and we still don't have it in the FEIS.

PLEASE NOTE: WHEN WILL WE SEE A BENEFIT/COST ANALYSIS THAT PROVIDES US WITH A FULL AND TOTAL COST ACCOUNTING OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT? OVERALL, HOW MUCH WILL EVERYTHING COST AND WHO WILL PAY?

R/LC110.1

Second, as it relates to the FEIS, thank you for the minimum of 30 days for public review prior to the FAA issuing the Record of Decision. However, as was the case with the time allowed for public comment on the DEIS, the time allowed for comment on the FEIS (a $10 million dollar voluminious document designed to push through a project) is totally inappropriate -- especially since we have had to spend time to locate documents that were referenced in the FEIS but not included. For example, the December 7, 2007 letter from Kent George, Director of Aviation at BCAD to the FAA regarding the D2 Alternative (hereinafter referred to as the Kent George letter). We know there are other documents missing (from both the information on the FLL website and the hard copies placed in the libraries), and are trying to track those down as well. There are many people who do not have these documents (some may not even notice that they are missing). However, the materials that are missing are so critical to our ability to provide you with comments that something must be done to ensure that you have met the letter, spirit and intent of public review and comment required by NEPA.

ROD/1.2

For example, the Kent George letter signs the death warrant on the D2 Alternative. Unfortunately, we are learning that the letter is not substantiated by factual data. In fact, I am currently in the process of reviewing public records at BCAD to be able to show you that the D2 Alternative is possible, and the FAA should have evaluated this alternative -- regardless of the alleged "reluctance of the Local Sponsor." But for the inaccurate Kent George letter, which was formalized without input by the Local Sponsor (i.e., Broward County

ROD 23.9

2/5

F-LC033

Commission), we believe an analysis and evaluation of D2 may have led the FAA to prefer the D2 Alternative over the B1b Alternative -- especially since it makes more sense, is safer, is better received by pilots and ATC staff, calls for less negative impacts, less mitigation costs, less environmental degradation, less overall costs, etc. I wonder if the FAA can really claim that they have done their own due diligence on the EIS (meeting the letter, spirit and intent of NEPA) when they summarily and blindly accepted a letter as fact by a staffer of the Local Sponsor (not the decisionmaking body, the Board of County Commissioners).

ROD 23.9

I am also reviewing public records at BCAD along with minutes of the Broward County Board of County Commissioners to prove to you that it appears that the FAA has been bamboozled by Broward County once again. Since you restarted the EIS process in 2005 and since D2 was suggested as an Alternative, BCAD and Broward County have been taking actions to clearly box you into not choosing D2 but rather choosing the Broward County Boondoggle Escalated South Runway. For example, leases on land on the north and west sides of FLL have been improved and extended. Basically, with these changes in leases, Broward County has increased tenant acreages and improved their facilities in order to make it look like they don't have enough acreage to relocate tenants, and even if they had the acreage the costs have increased substantially given improved facilities and extended lease dates. Broward County has systemmatically planned and implemented strategies to make their self-fulfilling prophecy to build an escalated south runway a reality -- so they can basically grab the land that will eventually become uninhabitable (because we all know the soundproofing/avigation easement concepts will fail/will not fly). I wonder if the FAA can really claim that they have done their own due diligence on the EIS (meeting the letter, spirit and intent of NEPA) when summarily and blindly accepting all these moves made by Broward County. Granted, the decisionmaking body, the Board of County Commissioners, approved these changes in leases; however, they did so with the advice and counsel of staff (aviation director) who said none of this would affect the analysis, review and/or selection of any Alternative (including D2). However, according to the FEIS, the FAA stop looking at Alternative D2, for example, given costs of relocation, shortages of acreage, etc.

ROD 23.10

Bottom line: Based on the FAA summarily and blindly accepting the Kent George letter alone, we think you have failed to meet the letter, spirit and intent of NEPA. We believe a bit of due diligence which we are doing now, the FAA would have learned that the Kent George letter cannot be substantiated. With a bit of due diligence, the FAA would have realized that they were being bamboozled by Broward County when they recently changed leases (the Embraer and Sheltair

ROD 23.9

3/5

F-LC033

Leases are two good examples). It doesn't take $10 million and a cadre of consultants to figure this out but somehow the FAA missed these items -- or did they?

Anyway, I will continue with my review of the FEIS and public records to substantiate additional comments. I will forward this information as soon as I can -- some of the timing depends on getting response to public records requests and making the time to review the records -- which is something I would have thought the FAA would have done.

There are other issues we are looking into as well to include (1) the woefully inadequate mitigation plan for the homes that will basically become uninhabitable (what about the loss of tax base for all those that collect taxes in Broward County?); (2) the lack of mitigation for the obliteration of John U Lloyd Beach State Park (which recently received national attention as it was featured on Good Morning America Show as one of the four finalist for the designation as the most unique and scenic park in the nation, and Congressman Ron Klein heralded the Park as a National Treasure in remarks on the floor of Congress); and (3) the Conceptual Mitigation Plan for wetlands that will be destroyed (West Lake Park is not acceptable as it is already protected), etc.

ROD/15.0 P/13.25

P/8.58

P/10.1

I would think that the FAA would also have to reassess things given these new economic times which certainly impact all your forecasts, estimates, projections, predictions (anything but reality) bases for much of the material in the FEIS. I would think the FAA would want to review recent correspondence between Kent George and the Broward Sheriff's office which basically suggests less and less air traffic at FLL. I would think the FAA would want to complete its compliance review of revenue spending that was recently communicated from the FAA to Kent George to be completed in November prior to moving forward with this boondoggle.

ROD/3.0, 5.10 P/3.47

It will take us some time to cut through all of this; however, we are confident that once we finish our review and provide you with the documentation we have uncovered you will need to rearrange your schedule to allow further review before moving forward to a Record of Decision. Better yet, isn't it time to remove the "red line"/"cloud"/"land grab" moniker over the affected homes in the noise contours produced for the proposed Broward County escalated boondoggle south runway project? It is outrageous that these people suffer every day with the threat of forced condemnation over their heads because someone somewhere is playing games.

ROD/ 15.0

4/5

F-LC033

I am also incorporating by reference all comments submitted in response to this recent FAA FEIS. I am aware that many of these comments thankfully address the technical flaws in the FEIS and, therefore, incorporate these by reference as if they were my own.

Keep well.

Oh, by the way, not allowing the public to submit comments via email certainly does not meet the spirit and intent of NEPA. How ridiculous to force them to put comments in snail mail or find a fax. This is silly!

ROD 23.11

Brenda Lee Chalifour
2001 S. Surf Road, 4B
Hollywood, FL 33019
305-281-8708
brendaleechali4@aol.com

5/5

F-LC033

All comments must be postmarked or faxed no later than **midnight, Monday, July 28, 2008.**
Comments can only be accepted with the full name and address of the individual commenting.

DANIEL J. PAYNE
837 NW 10TH AVE
DANIA BEACH, FL 33004
Daniel J. Payne
7-23-08

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I DO NOT ASK FOR ANYTHING OTHER THAN FAIRNESS AND NOT TO BE MADE A PRISONER IN MY HOME. I MOVED TO DANIA BEACH BECAUSE I SOUGHT A COMMUNITY THAT PROVIDED AFFORDABLE HOMES, HAD A LOW CRIME RATE AND WAS PEACEFUL. I HAVE SPENT MY ENTIRE ADULT LIFE PROTECTING THE WEAK AND THOSE IN NEED OF PROTECTION, YOU SEE I'M A RETIRED 30 YEAR VETERAN OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND A FORMER UNITED STATE MARINE CORPS SERVICE MAN, SO YOU CAN CLEARLY SEE THAT I'M ONE THAT HAS GIVEN MUCH TO ENSURE ALL IN OUR SOCIETY ARE PROTECTED. IF THE AIRPORT EXPANSION DOES HAPPEN, I ASK THAT YOU "DO NOT" SOUND PROOF MY HOME. I HAVE NEVER BEEN A PRISONER, SO DO NOT MAKE ME ONE WITHIN MY HOME. AS I HAVE STOOD-UP FOR 33 YEARS PROTECTING OTHERS, I NOW ASK ONLY FOR SOMEONE IN A POSITION OF AUTHORITY, A PERSON WITH HONOR, TO STAND-UP FOR ME, TO SPEAK FOR ME AND TO PROTECT ME AND MY FAMILY, OUR AMERICAN DREAM.

ROD 15.10 P/bd

F-LC034

All comments must be postmarked or faxed no later than **midnight, Monday, July 28, 2008.**
Comments can only be accepted with the full name and address of the individual commenting.

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

The FAA's Preferred Alternative is worst possible choice considering the fact that there is a North Runway option Alternative C1 that is 270 million cheaper to implement and has less impact on the Evironment. The South will have severe impacts on John U Lloyd State Park, West Lake Park and approx 15 acres of Wetlands the North has virtually No impact. P/3.37 P/8.58

Quality of Life will be severely impacted by noise for Dania Beach, Town of Davie, and Hollywood. The elevated will only exacerbate the noise impact. Current 0:1 Fuel Prices have not been considered. P/6.1 ROD/3.03 3.10

At least 3 Airlines are leaving FLL more certainly will follow. T.A.F are consistently over Estimated and Given the current State of Affairs should be evaluated Again. The FAA is relying on a study from 2004 instead of using current data. ROD 13.7

Robert A. Anton
838 Argonaut Isle
Dania Bch FL 33004

F-LC035

All comments must be postmarked or faxed no later than **midnight, Monday, July 28, 2008.**
Comments can only be accepted with the full name and address of the individual commenting.

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

The EIS should be revalluated because there are other alternatives that are less Costly and whose Configuration will ultimately provide more capacity for FLL (2 Runways vs. 4). ROD 15.14

The economy does not warrant such an expense at this time with the Cruise industry being slow, Airlines having financial problems and pulling out of FLL. ROD 3.03 3.10

Also the effects on the environment of John U Lloyd State Park. P/8.58

Candice Doerr
833 NW 10 Av
Dania Bch, Fl
33004.

F-LC036

All comments must be postmarked or faxed no later than **midnight, Monday, July 28, 2008.**
Comments can only be accepted with the full name and address of the individual commenting.

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I feel the EIS should be re-evaluated due to the economic downturn (4) loss of flight operations at FLL; the baseline operations (4) projections used in the EIS (4) are no longer valid.

ROD/ 3.0, 3.10

Sincerely,

DERRICK N. HANKERSON
746 SW 3 ST
DANIA BEACH, FL 33004
954 374 9199

All comments must be postmarked or faxed no later than **midnight, Monday, July 28, 2008.**
Comments can only be accepted with the full name and address of the individual commenting.

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I m in disagreement with the FAA noise study. There study is not a true representation of the noise recieved from the use of the south runway.

P/22.6

thank you for time and help

Dean Grant
503 NE 2nd Place
Dania bch 33004
dean and holly e bellsouth.net

July 28, 2008

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltime National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024

Re: FEIS-FLL South Runway Expansion

Dear Ms. Lane:

Please consider how devastating this runway will be to our local community. Our property will be reduced in value, and our enjoyment of our homes forever changed. We enjoy living on a canal which eventually leads to the inter coastal waterways. We moved here so that we could enjoy what nature has to offer. How sad it will be that we won't even want to go outside of our homes to enjoy that nature, when it will be obscured by the deafening sounds of airplanes. I am on social security disability after a spinal fusion years ago. I spend all of day at home, and I enjoy the sounds of the birds, and the lack of annoying sounds. I don't want to loose that enjoyment.

P/13.19, 18.16

Please put yourself in our shoes, would you want to be facing this issue? I'm sure that you would contact whomever you could that had the power to change your way of life.

Thank you for your consideration and assistance in STOPPING this runway from proceeding.

ROD/20.0

Carol Collier
3460 SW 44th St
Dania Beach, Florida 33312

F-LC039

at&t

From: "Dee H." <ssamelia@webtv.net>
To: raesandler@bellsouth.net
Subject: Regarding FEIS-FLL Runway Exp.
Date: Monday, July 28, 2008 11:19:02 AM

To: Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, FL 32822-5024

Dear Ms Lane,

Please consider all the wrong things that may happen if the south runway plan at FLL goes through.

First, we don't need another runway with the way the country is trying to get out of the deep economic position it is getting into.

ROD/3.0

The cost, probably close to 2 billion dollars, is not going to help at all! The dangerous plan to elevate the runway 45 Ft. above a heavily used road (US1) is unbelievable to even think of, including, how to get to people on that elevation if the plane aborts on it, or God forbid, has an accident before taking off, not to mention the untold and horrible destruction possible for those people traveling underneath that elevated runway.

R/LC013

Well, that's all I can say besides all the other points you must have already heard, except maybe you should see the mess Miami Int'l. got itself into by overextending itself.

Thank You.
M/M Charles Hauth
718 NW 10th Ave.
Dania Beach, FL 33004

F-LC040

Print | Close Window

Subject: FLL expansion comment
From: "Grant Campbell" <campbell5017@bellsouth.net>
Date: Sun, Jul 20, 2008 8:52 pm
To: <info@mymgha.net>

FLL and Port Everglades are in such close proximity, that when the expansions of each are completed, they will abut. Within Port Everglades existing footprint, there is a very large FP&L generating plant. Less than 4 miles west of there is another FP&L plant, and less than ½ mile west of that is a solid waste incinerator. FLL is ringed by I-95, SR 84/I-595, US 1 and Griffin Road, putting the six highest pollutant generating facilities in Broward County within five miles of each other. When the existing pollution level is combined with the added pollution levels that the expansions will produce, the effect on people, wildlife and habitat will be disastrous.

With the variable winds common to South Florida, the pollution risk is not restricted to the immediate vicinity, but will affect all of Broward County and parts of Miami Dade County as well, subjecting well over two million people, as well as the avian, marine and terrestrial wildlife, to elevated risk from pollution induced illnesses.

Within a five mile radius of this pollution center are located John U Lloyd State Park, The Anne Kolb Nature Center, West Lake Park, Frost Park, T Y Park, Snyder Park, Secret Woods Nature Center, and four major golf facilities. Well within the area of risk are many more public areas that will be affected by both air and noise pollution. To add icing on the cake, the whole area is surrounded by the Broward Urban Trails "New River Loop", which consists of the New River, the ICWW, and the Dania Cutoff Canal.

Noise pollution is an area that is entirely neglected by the FAA, the Broward County Commission and the management teams of FLL and Port Everglades as it relates to our open spaces, our greenways and our waterways. Although the National Park Service published a study on the negative effects of noise pollution on the wildlife near airports, the FAA simply ignores it as do the other proponents. In a letter to the FAA, Heinz Mueller, chief of the EPA Office of Environmental Assessment, said there had been an insufficient assessment of the project's likely effect on air quality. He said the FAA's noise projections were unrealistically low. And he said the FAA failed to explain why such a large area of wetlands must be destroyed.

He also questioned the safety of erecting a bridge that would allow the runway to pass over U.S.1 and the FEC Railroad tracks. This expansion has been said to be unsafe by at least two commercial airline pilots because of the amount of slope required to span the FEC Railroad tracks and US1 at the eastern portion of the runway, and because of the elevation required at the west end of the runway to provide vertical clearance for Interstate 95. A sloped runway in itself seems difficult to negotiate safely, but when it is elevated at both ends, is only 8000 feet long and only 150 feet wide, it seems to this outsider, to be a tragic event waiting to happen.

The proposed north runway expansion alternative would be the safer option because it would be at a ground level elevation. In an email from Gary Boettcher, the President of the Coalition of Airline Pilots Associations, he said, "We land commercial a/c on runways only 5500 feet long with varying degrees of slope on both ends. What may be unsafe for a particular a/c could be perfectly safe for another." If this is true, there is no reason that the north runway could not be extended to 7000 to 8000 feet at considerably less expense in terms of both time and money without extending

F-LC041

the footprint of the airport. A runway of this length at ground level would certainly be within the parameters deemed safe by Mr. Boettcher.

None of the options currently available to FLL will accommodate the NLA, or group VI aircraft that will soon dominate air traffic, which to me, makes any expansion absolutely fruitless, when one considers that FLL will never be able to handle the envisioned air traffic of the future.

As stewards of the earth and of our own destinies we cannot and must not allow this to happen just for the sake of putting a few more dollars into some already well-stuffed pockets.

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 St
Dania Beach, Fl 33312

Copyright © 2003-2008. All rights reserved.

F-LC041

Print | Close Window

Subject: Comme4nt on FLL expansion
From: "Grant Campbell" <campbell5017@bellsouth.net>
Date: Sun, Jul 20, 2008 9:19 pm
To: <info@mymgha.net>

"Florida is in the middle of one of the worst water shortages in its history! Recent rainfall is making a dent in the multi-year shortfall affecting the state, but a full rainy season's worth of above-average totals, in the right places, is needed. Until that happens, every resident and business needs to do their part to conserve water now"! (From the website of the South Florida Water Management District)

At a time when the entire South Florida area is in the worst water crisis in recorded history, the expansion project at the Fort Lauderdale International Airport will consume a minimum of 234,000,000 gallons of water (5,372 acre feet) in the compaction of the fill required to build the elevated runway,(*nearly 1% of the total water use for all of Broward County in 2004, the latest year I could find numbers for, and when there were no water restrictions in effect*) This does not consider the mixing water for 70,000+ yards of concrete that will be required, nor the rinsing water required in washing out the 7000 empty concrete trucks. The north alternative expansion project would require less than 20% that amount, and better still, the "no expansion" alternative would not require any wastage of precious resources.

P/10.21

If the runway is built, the damage to the wetlands will be permanent, and costly in terms of endangered wildlife. The mangroves that will be destroyed are already considered threatened and the destruction of the breeding habitat of endangered marine life and threatened avian species such as the Smooth-billed Ani, whose existing nesting area is in the path of the runway expansion, along with its breeding area in John U Lloyd Park, will be eternal and irreparable. Do we learn nothing from our past mistakes?

P/15.4, 11.8

This rape of our diminishing wetlands is no less reprehensible than the destruction of the Amazon Rain Forest that has everyone here so up in arms. Is it not hypocritical to complain about someone else doing essentially the same things that we plan to do, no matter the scale?

The American Forestry Association is currently in a campaign to plant 3,000,000 trees around the globe in an effort to combat global warming. "Planting trees in the right places for the right reasons is the best dollar-for-dollar investment you can make to improve our environment. We plant to repair hurricane or flood damage - have cleaner air - reclaim abandoned strip mines or farms - prevent erosion into salmon streams - fight back invasive species of trees - and make cooler, cleaner cities. Trees reduce greenhouse gases by absorbing carbon dioxide, save energy, help filter our water, and so much more!" We, on the other hand, are planning a destruction that will partially offset this effort, and this is counter-productive to say the least.

If we must build a runway, which I fail to see the need for in light of the recent and still to come layoffs, downsizing and probable bankruptcies in the airline industry, let's build the north runway option and utilize the land area intended for the "Great Wall of Broward" in the planting of trees and the development of the wetlands that we are slated to destroy. We can help rebuild our environment rather than help to destroy it.

ROD/20.0

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 St
Dania Beach, Fl. 33312

Copyright © 2003-2008. All rights reserved.

F-LC041

at&t [Print] [Close]

From: alan@vaporpost.com
To: raesandler@bellsouth.net
Subject: Runway expansion
Date: Monday, July 28, 2008 5:01:31 PM

As a resident of Mapleridge, we are effected greatly by the decision that will be made to expand the runaways.

In addition to the increased noise, it will further impact our plumeting home values and that is something the economy of Fort Lauderdale cannot afford to have happen. In addition, the recent information regarding the fact that the airport traffic has slowed, makes it less plausible to have this expansion approved.

P/13.19
ROD 13.10

I ask you to postpone this decision until more facts come to the surface reagrding the neccesity of this action.

Sincerely,

Alan Olem
Richard DiNublia
5370 SW 38th Way
Fort Lauderdale, Fl 33312

F-LC042

From: jwyachts

at&t

[Print] [Close]

From: jwyachts <jwyachts@earthlink.net>
To: raesandler@bellsouth.net
Subject: Expansion
Date: Monday, July 28, 2008 12:49:52 PM

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airport District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024

Re: PEIS - FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

We are against the expansion of the south runway to the the Hollywood/ Ft. Lauderdale Airport. With the economy being as it is we believe the least that can be done today is to wait and reexamine the issue when the economy turns around. At that time new solutions may present themselves that represent a more recommendable compromise.

ROD 20.0

The quality of live here in south broward is of tantamount concern to all of us.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Howard Waldman
Oakridge community
3441 SW 52nd St.
Ft. Lauderdale, Fl. 33312

F-LC043

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive, Suite 400
Orlando, FL 32822-5024
Fax: 407.812.6978

Dear Ms. Lane:

Enclosed are my comments to the EIS strongly opposing the proposed runway expansion at Fort Lauderdale International Airport.

1. We are in the early stages of what will rapidly become a global energy crisis. Most oil and gas industry experts, including people in industry, in government and in non-governmental organization, all agree that we have in the past 2-3 years, or will in the next year or 2, reached the halfway point in oil and natural gas production. This means that in just over 100 years we have used up half of all of the available oil and natural gas. And we have used the half that is easiest to extract, so the costs of production are only going to increase. Couple that with the fact that large developing nations such as China and India are only just now reaching the point where it will soon be feasible for them to achieve the American dream of at least one car for every household, and you can see that demand is only going to increase while supplies are decreasing.

The airline industry's fleet is configured to be profitable only when oil is less than about $100 per barrel. Oil is now at about $130 per barrel, and we are already seeing cutbacks in the airline industry. Even if oil prices only stay at current levels, airlines will have to raise their prices further and decrease the number of flights in order to stay alive. Air travel will decrease as fuel becomes scarcer and more expensive.

Does the EIS analysis incorporate the impact of reductions in flights at Fort Lauderdale International Airport that have already taken place? Is there still a 6 minute delay forecasted in 2010 with the current flight reductions, let alone the flight reductions that will occur as fuel prices continue to increase?

ROD 3.10

Why are we even considering an expensive boondoggle to solve a short-term problem that really isn't even a problem yet, when air travel is going to decrease over the next 5-10 years? Could it be that the owners and executives of a few local construction and engineering firms, and lets not forget the legal, accounting and other service firms that support them, have convinced our local government that air travel will continue to increase? Even though we will by all accounts run out of cheap and easy to produce oil reserves in the next 5-10 years? So by the time this runway is built, the transportation industry will be in the throes of massive change and all that money will have gone only to line the pockets of a few already wealthy individuals???

P 16.2

F-LC044

2. What is the real total cost of the runway? Why are we spending over $2 billion to reduce the total number of runways at Fort Lauderdale International Airport?

P/16.2
ROD 15.15, 15.16

3. How were the environmental pollution impacts assessed? Especially on homes close to the flight path of the expanded runway? Were actual measurements taken, or were computer models used? If modeling only was used, were these models ever compared to actual values found in the environment near other airports to evaluate the accuracy of the models? Were the effects of combinations of different pollutants, and their degradation products included in the assessment? This extended runway will take flights directly over homes at very low altitudes immediately prior to landing or after take-off. Were the effects of higher concentrations of pollutants due to the lower altitudes considered?

ROD/7.0, 7.6
P/7.13, 7.3, 7.5, 7.9,

4. John U. Lloyd State Park Beach has consistently received excellent ratings, most recently when ABC's Good Morning America (on Sunday, July 13th) highlighted John U Lloyd Beach State Park as one of the four finalists in their search for the best national parks this month. It is a large local tourist draw and valuable recreational area for local residents. The expansion of the south runway would seriously degrade the quality of the park, and quite probably irrevocably harm it.

P/8.58

Please seriously consider these issues and comments when the final decision is made. The proposed expansion of the current south runway at Fort Lauderdale International Airport just doesn't make sense!

ROD/20.0

Sincerely,

Christine Testerman
3371 SW 44. St.
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312
954.8542941

at&t

[Print] [Close]

From: "Tylicki Michael" <Michael.Tylicki@HCAhealthcare.com>
To: <raesandler@bellsouth.net>
Subject: Ft. Lauderdale Airport Expansion
Date: Monday, July 28, 2008 2:57:53 PM

Virginia, I applaud Broward Counties decision to finally choose a direction to head towards on the expansion project, unfortunately it was an ill-advised direction. Numerous studies are flawed and the outcomes skewed. The blinded leadership with its inability to run the airport has proven to be wasteful, neglectful, our future rests with this group of uninspired, dog and pony conmen. The chosen project is the most expensive causing the most disruption of services, the most renovation to the airport support structure. This lack of fiscal control is highlighted by the recession we are in, high gas prices, loss of home values, high taxes. Fort Lauderdale is the 4th lest expensive airport in the nation without room to grow. The lack of accountability though out the airport administration and Broward County brings the term dismissive negligent to a new height.

ROD/20.0

Regards Michael Tylicki

719 NW 8th Ave.

Dania Bch Fla.

33004 23 year resident of Dania

Michael Tylicki CHE

Director of Plant Operations

Westside Regional Medical Center

8201 W Broward Blvd

Plantation Florida 33324

Phone 954.476.3932

Fax 954.476.3962

michael.tylicki@hcahealthcare.com

at&t

From: robert dobiecki <dobeme@yahoo.com>
To: raesandler@bellsouth.net
Subject: No to Fort Lauderdale airport expansion
Date: Monday, July 28, 2008 12:24:31 PM

We the voters say No to Fort Lauderdale Airport expansion.

The voters and people living in the surrounding community do not want to expand the Fort Lauderdale Airport.

We do not want more congestion.

We do not want more noise from the airport expansion.

We do not want more tax dollars wasted.

We live in a peaceful community. Why impact a fragile waterfront environment with commercial greed and risk community safety and peace.

We do not want the environment impacted by airport expansion.

If you want more runways build them west of the city and keep Fort Lauderdale airport as it is. Why convert a working useful airport buy gambling with taxpayer money and reducing the number of runways. Money should not be spent on risky airport expansion ventures.

ROD/20.0

A voter and concerned citizen,
Robert Dobiecki
922 Nautilus Isle
Dania Beach, Florida 33004-2356

F-LC046

Valerie Vougiouklaki
822 NW 8th Ave
Dania Beach Florida 33004 Tel: 954-924-9004

July 20, 2008

Ms Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Suite 400
Orlando FL 32822-5024 FAX NO: 407-812-6978

RE; FEIS – FLL SOUTH RUNWAY EXTENSION PROPOSAL

ROD/20.0 P/4.4, 8.58, 6.1

I understand that FAA has approved the expansion of the south runway at Ft Lauderdale International Airport. This letter is to place on record my disapproval of the proposed new runway. Why on earth do you want to proceed with an elevated runway, over the railway and US1, damaging the environment at John Lloyd Park, the beaches and most importantly, the quality of life of so many Broward residents?

Here in Melaleuca Gardens we already absorb the heavy pollution from I-95, the airport at FLL and US1, not to mention the two railways one west of I-95 and the other east of US1, but for the moment let's concentrate on the airport, which produces the highest amount of pollution.

You will be jeopardizing my health, my home life, my indoor and outdoor freedom – what's the use of living here if I cannot step outside my door to enjoy "outdoor living" – I thought this was a "free" country .....don't make me a prisoner in my own home!

Consider the fact that the major airlines have cut back on their operations at FLL – we don't have the traffic/visitors to warrant spending such an exhorbitant amount of $$$ for expansion. We don't have so many visitors anymore - what's there for tourists here, it's too expensive to visit here .... hotel costs are premium, customer service everywhere is disgusting, the beaches are dirty, the environment has been destroyed by the greed of developers .....the area is already so congested - it's not the Ft Lauderdale it used to be. You may consider the cruise traffic, but let's be honest, how much do they spend in Ft Lauderdale – zero – they transit from the airport to the port and back – very few actually stay and spend $$$, and in today's economy, this will decrease for sure. It would be wiser to spend the money on developing alternative transportation such as a decent train infrastructure.

If you have to expand, why don't you relocate the airport to the Everglades .... It will cost a lot less than the expense of the expansion, you can build more runways (if you still maintain that delays are a major problem and the reason for expansion), the access will still be convenient for everyone and the money will be spent more wisely.

Please reconsider your decision, think about the people first, look after the loyal residents here, not the projected visitors ..... before you destroy the lives of so many. Don't force me to move my business and home elsewhere.

ROD/20.0

Valerie Vougiouklaki

F-LC047

Vassi Vougiouklakis
822 NW 8th Ave
Dania Beach Florida 33004 Tel: 954-924-9004

July 20, 2008

Ms Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Suite 400
Orlando FL 32822-5024 FAX NO: 407-812-6978

RE; FEIS – FLL SOUTH RUNWAY EXTENSION PROPOSAL

I hear that FAA has approved the expansion of the south runway at the Ft Lauderdale International Airport. This letter has been created to address the expansion of the south or north or any runway at this airport. When I first wrote to your organization regarding the runway, and mostly concerning the south runway which will start from 5' high and end up to 40' in the air and around 9000' length – approx. 1/2 mile from my house, destroying the last of the remaining green area, which absorbs the heavy pollution of I-95, the Airport and US1, not to mention the two railways, one west of I-95 and the other east of US1; but let's concentrate on the airport business, which is you. You know as well as I, that airplanes produce the highest level of pollution. You know jet turbines and turbo props are uncontrolled noise engines and pollutants, and they are very unhealthy for humans, animals and the environment, but unfortunately, no improvements have been made for those engines so far, as they need the maximum velocity they can produce to lift the heavy load into the air. I agree we need planes but I don't want to sleep with them in my bed! I don't really care what you do as long as you don't put that exhaust into my nose and that noise into my ears! Do you intend placing kiosks around the area selling gas masks and ear plugs???

Why do you want an airport in the heart of a city? Do you want us to live under the bellies of the planes, checking for leaks! Are you taking advantage by manipulating those people suffering from the weak economy, making them prisoners inside their own homes and only offering to insulate their property - if that's not a crime, what do you call it! How will that help me, will it stop the noise, stop my house vibrating, do I have to spend 24 hours a day inside my home? What about my parks, beaches, where am I supposed to go for exercise?

If you want your airport expanded, come over with your bulldozers and eliminate the entire area and do whatever you want, but first, place me in a home similar to what I have today. I don't want money ... I want a similar home in a comparable location. ROD/ 15.0

At a recent meeting I commented to an airport representative, that in forward-thinking countries, they relocate airports or build new airports away from cities. He replied he cannot get a permit to relocate the airport to the Everglades because it's a protected area for the eco-system and wildlife ... does that mean that the humans of this country are not protected?

I think we will resolve this in Court, as I am not willing to stand by and watch FAA and Ft Lauderdale Commissioners run down my life, my environment, the air I breathe and my home. It's up to you if you want us to trust FAA again or keep you on the black list. Go ahead destroy our homes, parks, beaches, name it and make us breathe 90% CO2 and 10% fuel.

My final words ..... I thought FAA is for the people - to protect us, to be sure that planes are safe, airports are compliant with safety and security, the environment, etc Are you really doing your job? ROD 20.0

Vassi Vougiouklakis

F-LC048

at&t [Print] [Close]

From: lucillebarile@bellsouth.net
To: raesandler@bellsouth.net (Rae Sandler)
Date: Friday, July 25, 2008 10:57:09 AM

---------- Forwarded Message: ----------
From: ygernant@bellsouth.net
To: "barile, lucille" <lucillebarile@bellsouth.net>, annecastro@msn.com
Date: Fri, 25 Jul 2008 13:27:50 +0000

Anne,
I forgot to put my address on my original letter. This is a correction.

---------- Original message from ygernant@bellsouth.net: ----------

Please forward this on to the appropriate person(s) for me.

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive, Suite 400
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024
Fax: 407-812-6978

Why is it that we are trying to appease the Cruise Lines by expanding the runways for those taking cruises when the most time they spend in Fort Lauderdale is to transfer from airplane to ship. They do not enrich our local economy saving their money for the "Islands" and their purchases of liquor at "how low can you go" tax-free prices. These people spend no time at our restaurants, hotels or using rental vehicles or taxiis.

I don't believe it is fair for me, my family, friends and neighbors should suffer with the increased noise and soot (from jet engines) by the destruction caused by additional, unneeded flights. ROD 20.0

Sincerely,

Yolanda M. Gernant
2740 SW 46th Court
Dania Beach, FL 33312
ygernant@bellsouth.net

F-LC049

Subject: Re: RESPONSE TO FAA FEIS REGARDING THE SOUTH RUNWAY]
From: "Constance" <weckerr@bellsouth.net>
Date: Sun, Jul 27, 2008 8:49 pm
To: <info@mymgha.net>

please inquire where is the letter from the pilots association that they will take off on an elevated runway. I heard they wont agree to it. ROD 13.46

The sheriff department says that the end of the runway cannoy be protected its like in war a no mans land ANYONE CAN GET INTO THERE.

Who is going to pay to build a tunnel for the FEC railroad to go under US1. P/22.7, 22.15

Please print and fax unable to this at this time

Copyright © 2003-2008. All rights reserved.

From: Constance Wecker

Robert Wecker
203 NE 3rd Ave
Dania FL 33004

F-LC050

Date: Monday, July 28, 2008

Attn: Virginia Lake

RE: Fort Lauderdale Airport Runway Expansion FEIS

Dear Ms. Lake,

We are writing this in the hope that the FAA will consider the actual environmental impact of a lengthened south runway with the following factors taken in to account.

The preferred option significantly extending the southern runway over US1 is also the most expensive (over $250 Million more by some estimates) and it will have a significantly greater negative impact on residential neighborhoods East and South of the airport. P/22.6, 22.15

The preferred option also appears to pose the greatest environmental threat to John U Loyd State Park. This is a natural resource that cannot be recovered. P/6.58

The current preferred option reduces the number of runways at the airport from 3 to 2.

FLL is not currently meeting projected utilization numbers which puts the need for an expansion in question. Given the current economic environment one would think that the EIS projections would have to be revisited. ROD/3.0

Other alternatives, such as a second north runway parallel to the already existing north runway would have significantly less impact on Broward County residents and environmental interests. Such an alternative would also allow for additional lengthening of the South runway which would much more effectively address any future growth. ROD/15.4

We ask that you take these concerns in to consideration and recommend that other alternatives be pursued in the interest of the future growth of the airports and the residents of Broward County.

Thank you,

Amy & Lenny Mujica
610 NW 7th St.
Dania Beach, Fl 33004
954-534-7722

F-LC051

July 15, 2008 Via Fax 407/812-6978

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Dr., #400
Orlando, FL 32822-5024

Dear Ms. Lane:

Where does anyone begin? It's all been said before and it seems like no one is listening to the families that will be impacted by the airport expansion.

It's very personal to me. I became a widow at the early age of 29 with two daughters, one and five. We had no plans for such a catastrophe. I feel fortunate that I have been able to survive but have always lived on a fixed income. I have been in my home since 1972 and cannot imagine moving. I certainly can't afford the drastic increase in monthly rent or mortgage payments. Even more worrisome is the increase in property taxes that would put me over the top. Any yet, staying at the property will not be as it was. Yes, the homes can be soundproofed but what about the time spent outside. The noise and pollution will change all that.

ROD/ 3.0

This airport expansion of the Southern runway has been going on for so long. Each time there is a change in the factors for and against it. Now because of the energy crisis, we hear that some airlines will drop flights and even complete service to and from the Hollywood/Ft. Lauderdale Airport while others will increase their number of flights. Thus, no major variation in the number of flights. This doesn't warrant an expansion.

P/3.58

I watched Good Morning America the other day. They mentioned John U. Lloyd Park as being one of the most visited and best national parks in the country. An expansion of the airport will not only destroy the serenity of this park but will eventually affect the birds and other wildlife that make the park their home.

P/22.15

Of course, I wonder why the FAA and others continue to discuss an expansion when there is no commitment of funds available for such an expansion. People's lives are continually disrupted time and time again over the years for someone's dream. Yes, a few will reap the benefits, but so many more will be devastated emotionally and financially. Then again, has a decision already been determined and all of our efforts are in vain?

A worried homeowner,

Sharon Dunham
817 NW 8th Avenue
Dania Beach, FL 33004

F-LC052

at&t [Print] [Close]

From: "Grant Campbell" <campbell5017@bellsouth.net>
To: <info@mymgha.net>
Subject: Comment on FLL expansion
Date: Sunday, July 20, 2008 9:54:58 PM

Much has been said about the fact that the expansions at FLL and Port Everglades are not going to require taxpayer dollars. Port Everglades, however is exploring avenues to raise public money for much of its expansion. FLL says, "Don't worry. The FAA is footing the bill for the runway expansion".

ROD/ 22.15

The FAA gets its' money through assessments on every passenger that enters or leaves an airport in the US via an airline, and surcharges to the airlines that the airlines quite happily pass on to the passengers. Who will ultimately pay for the expansion? Our grand-children's grand-children will still be paying when we have been forgotten except for the fact that we didn't do enough to stop the expansion.

For those who think the FAA is paying for airport expansion, here is how they get the funds to do so:

AVIATION COMPONENT	COMPUTATION FORMULAE	PERCENT
Domestic Passenger Ticket Tax *(Including Areas of Canada and Mexico Not More Than 225 Miles from the Continental United States)*	7.5% from October 1, 1999, to September 30, 2007 *	49
Domestic Passenger Flight Segment	$3 per Segment during Calendar Year (CY) 2002 **Indexed to Consumer Price Index (CPI)** after CY 2002	20
Passenger Ticket Tax at Rural Airports *(Having Less Than 100,000 Boardings and More Than 75 Miles from an Airport with 100,000 Boardings)*	7.5% of Ticket Cost Beginning Oct. 1, 1997 (Excludes Flight Segment Component)	1
International Departure and Arrival Taxes *(Where Domestic Tax Does Not Apply)*	$12 Per Person **Departure Tax** Plus $12 Per Person **Arrival Tax** Beginning Oct. 1, 1997 **Indexed to CPI** Beginning Jan. 1, 1999	15
Special Rule for Flights between Continental US and Alaska or Hawaii	$6 **Departure Tax** for International Facilities **Indexed to CPI** Beginning Jan. 1, 1999 **Plus a Portion of the Domestic Passenger Ticket Tax**	
Frequent Flyer Tax	7.5% of **Frequent Flyer Award Value**	2
Waybill Domestic Freight and Mail	6.25% of Shipment Cost *	5
Commercial Fuel Tax	4.3¢ Per Gallon *	6

F-LC053

General Aviation Fuel Tax	Aviation Gasoline – 19.3¢ Per * Gallon Jet Fuel – 21.8¢ Per Gallon *	2 TOTAL 100%

*These rates are from a by-gone era, and will rise if they haven't already.

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 St
Dania Beach, Fl, 33312

F-LC053

Rae Sandler (Ft. Lauderdale)

From: raesandler@bellsouth.net
Sent: Sunday, July 27, 2008 4:44 PM
To: brendaleechali4@aol.com; annecastro@msn.com; Rae Sandler (Ft. Lauderdale)
Subject: Fwd: Runway Extension at FLL

---------- Forwarded Message: ----------
From: PBACJP@aol.com
To: raesandler@bellsouth.net
Subject: Fwd: Runway Extension at FLL
Date: Sun, 27 Jul 2008 20:33:22 +0000

Curtiss J. Pulitzer
Principal
Pulitzer/Bogard & Associates, LLC
954-894-6430 ▪ Fax 954-894-6431 ▪ Cell 917-520-4153
www.pulitzerbogard.com

From: PBACJP
To: virginia.lane@faa.gov
CC: info@mymgha.com, Cljandj
Sent: 7/27/2008 4:30:37 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time
Subj: Runway Extension at FLL

Dear Ms. Lane,
I am a resident of Hollywood Oaks, which is under the direct flight path of the south runway 1.5 miles to the west of the airport. Presently, the noise of the prop planes that use the existing shortened runway is very loud as our home is in the direct flight path to the south runway. I cannot even imagine the noise we will endure should the airport runway be extended. Furthermore, our home is valued way over a million dollars. The new runway proposal will severely reduce the values of my and my neighbor's homes and our homeowner's association will be prepared to sue if this goes forward.

P/13.19

I am also very puzzled why the north runway option, which had minimal impact on residential neighborhoods,was not the preferred option. Also, given the drastic reduction in flights at the airport, I see no reason for the costly expansion to move forward. I fly out of FLL nearly every week on business, and I am never delayed more than a few minutes. This pales in comparison to NY, Philly, Chicago, Boston, DC or any other major airport including MIA. Furthermore, if this foolishness must persist, you must demand that flights on the south runway cease after 10 PM at night till 7 AM and that the north runway be used solely for takeoffs, to the east, which are far

ROD/3.10, 15.14

F-LC054

noisier than landings, and that the south runway be used only for landings from the west. That is presently the typical landing patterns for the north runway today and helps mitigate noise over residential neighborhoods.
Hopefully this whole folly will be terminated.
Thank you for considering my opinion

Curtiss J. Pulitzer
Principal
Pulitzer/Bogard & Associates, LLC
954-894-6430 ▪ Fax 954-894-6431 ▪ Cell 917-520-4153
www.pulitzerbogard.com

Get fantasy football with free live scoring. Sign up for FanHouse Fantasy Football today.

Get fantasy football with free live scoring. Sign up for FanHouse Fantasy Football today.

July 23, 2008

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive, Suite 400
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024
Fax 407 812-6978

Dear Ms. Lane,

As a resident and tax payer in Broward County, and a senior citizen living on a limited income we are writing to protest the expansion of the South Runway at Fort Lauderdale Airport.

1. The economy is in a down slide, some say going towards a depression. The gas price going out of sight along with everyday grocery survival.

2. Airlines are downsizing and hiking fares and fees. With the weak cash flow may lead to multiple bankruptcies and liquidation of major U.S.airlines in 2009.

3. This will effect our Environment. John U Lloyd Beach State Park was one of the four finalists high-lighted on ABC's Good Morning search for the best national parks and would be obliterated along with the use of our backyard and pool with the expansion of the South runway. P|8.58

4. The EIS analysis should be updated based on the reduced operation levels, and doesn't it impact the baseline as well as projections used in the analysis? ROD|3.0

5. The real price cost of the runway should be presented. Why are we spending over $2 billion dollars to reduce the number of runways from 3 to 2 at Fort Lauderdale? Why is the Florida Department of Transportation giving money towards expansion which could be upwards of between $50 million and $100 million over the next few years, we have been told over and over again no taxpayers money would be spent on the expansion, the last time I looked the FDOT money comes from our public taxpayers money. I am sure we have more pressing transportation issues that need this money. P|16.2 ROD 15.15, 15.16

6. Why were no operational restrictions placed on the expanded South runway, like from 12 midnight till 6 AM? P|2.6

With the way the economy is going and the budget cuts placed on Broward County from our State Legislator, we do not need this expansion at Fort Lauderdale Airport. ROD 20.0

These are tough times, no one in the lower or middle income class will be able to afford to fly.

Sincerely,
Richard Sokol
Betty Sokol

Richard and Betty Sokol
609 N W 10th. Street
Dania Beach, Florida 33004-2338