Rae Sandler (Ft. Lauderdale)

From: Anne Castro [annecastro@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2008 3:53 PM
To: Rae Sandler (Ft. Lauderdale); Brenda Chalifour; raesandler@bellsouth.net
Subject: FW: Contact Form.

Received on web site contact form. FYI

Anne Castro
annecastro@msn.com
954.914.9496

please consider the environment before printing this email

> From: wst_formmailer@secureserver.net
> To: annecastro@msn.com
> Subject: Contact Form.
> Date: Tue, 15 Jul 2008 18:18:33 -0700
>
> First Name : Grant
> Last Name : Campbell
> Address Street 1 : 2321 SW 44 St
> Address Street 2 :
> City : Dania Beach
> Zip Code : 33312
> State : FL
> Daytime Phone : 954-989-4921
> Evening Phone : 9540989-4921
> Email : campbell5017@bellsouth.net
> Comments : Pollution from FLL/Port Everglades expansions
>
> What many people don't realize, and is glossed over, or not even mentioned by the expansion proponents, is the fact that when you double the traffic, you of needs, double the pollution.
>
> Within a four mile radius of FLL, there are presently 6 major sources of pollution:
>
> 1. FLL itself, which can be expected to contribute an additional 5,000 tons of greenhouse gasses, and particulate matter per year.
> 2. Port Everglades, which can be expected to contribute an additional 5,000 tons of greenhouse gasses and particulate matter per year.
> 3. US 1, I-95, SR 84, and Griffin Road, are major highways that surround FLL, and will see an increase of vehicular traffic commensurate to the increased activity at FLL/Port Everglades.
> 4. FPL generation plant in Port Everglades.
> 5. FPL generation plant at 42 ST and 33 Ave.
> 6. Solid waste incineration plant on US 441 North of Griffin Road.
>
> All of the above pollution sources will see increases in traffic, and will certainly increase their pollutant contribution in proportion, affecting all of Broward County and parts of Miami-Dade County. We can expect an increase in greenhouse gasses and particulate matter of approximately 90% by the time the dual expansions are completed.
>

P/4.03
ROD/H-3

> Broward County is currently ranked 4th highest of Florida's 67 counties; 200th of 3,109 counties nationally, placing it in the 94th percentile in terms of polluted atmosphere. 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 1 million,and exceeds the risk of all other air toxics tracked by EPA combined.
>
> When high concentrations of pollutants blanket an area, the effect is to inhibit the distribution of vital oxygen. This affects not only populated areas, but green-ways as well. In waterways the effect is to inhibit the absorption of oxygen from the atmosphere which is already starved of oxygen, compounding the effect. The entire eco-system suffers. This is preventable. Strike down the unnecessary expansions planned for FLL and Port Everglades.
>
> Grant Campbell
> 2321 SW 44 St
> Dania Beach, Fl 33312
>
> This is the first of many comments to come.
>
>
>
>
>

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
Phone: 407-812-6331, Ext. 129 Fax: 407-812-6978

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

The airlines are reducing flights, laying of personnel and it will only get worse because of the high cost of fuel. Was the taken into consideration? ROD 3.0

Why are we going from 3 runways to 2 runways. ROD/15.15

Why haven't you considered the runway going over the FEC railroad tracks and US 1 as being fatally flawed. P/4.4

Timmothy Sandler
840 NW 7th Ave
Dania Beach FL 33004

F-LC057

Rae Sandler (Ft. Lauderdale)

From: Gary Luedtke [gluedtke@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2008 11:56 AM
To: virginia.lane@faa.gov
Cc: lieberman@broward.org; KJacobs@broward.org; LWexler@broward.org; DWassermanRubin@broward.org; JEggelletion@broward.org; felicia.goldstein@mail.house.gov; jodi.davidson@mail.house.gov
Subject: FLL South Runway Expansion

When I read in Yesterday's *Sun-Sentinel* that "The airport's south runway must be closed for three years while it is lengthened," my first reaction was pleasant,
thinking of three future years without airplanes overhead.

But then I thought of the future. Those three years of *all FLL's traffic crowding the main runway* is beyond comprehension.
Beyond that, when the project's completed, and the main runway is out of service for either maintenance or any emergency,
the (only remaining), smallest, sloped, south runway is also going to *have to handle the entire amount* of airport activity. This is beyond imagination for operation of our county's key economic engine.

The very reason the project is a boondoggle -
FLL is operated under the Informal Runway Use mode, and as FAA's responded - that will not change.
Every pilot, therefor; who is *responsible for the safety of their aircraft, cargo, and passengers* - **having the final choice of what (of any operational) runway to use,**
will be forced to use the shortest, elevated, *worse sloped*, remaining only south runway.
That is asking for catastrophe. P/3.37

It is my understanding, from them, that pilots are neither trained, nor certainly accustomed, to use of a sloped runway.

As it would be normally, any pilot, each who has final responsibility for safety, is going to choose to **wait if need be, and use the main runway, longest and flat.**

Gary Luedtke
4461 SW 34th Drive
Fort Lauderdale FL 33312
954 966-8013

Absolutely certain that **if needed**, a north parallel,

- as long and flat as its twin, for equal safety
- doing minimal eternal environmental (& John Lloyd Park) damage, FLL construction operations disruptions; beyond none to homesteads,
- *for flightpaths making use of the existing east-west 595 transportation corridor,*
- leaving FLL with **four runways as opposed to two**

7/24/2008

F-LC058

Gary Ludtke

as not this boondoggle
but with **not a single negative**, making common sense, the only practicable alternative.

F-LC058

BROWARD WORKSHOP

RECEIVED JUL 2 3 2008

July 21, 2008

Ms. Virginia Lane
Environmental Program Specialist
Federal Aviation Administration
Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive, Suite 400
Orlando, FL 32822-5024

Re: FEIS for Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport ("FLL")

Dear Ms. Lane:

I serve as the Co-Chair of the Transportation Committee for the Broward Workshop, a membership organization of approximately 100 CEOs and managers of many of Broward County's largest employers. The Workshop has existed since the early 80s and its mission is to focus on support for those issues and projects that will enhance our community and promote economic development. For more than 15 years, the Workshop has supported the expansion and redevelopment of Runway 9R/27L at FLL.

The development of the Master Plan and new south runway at FLL are very important to both the federal air network and the continued efforts to enhance the quality of life and economic development of our community. Both residents and visitors will be better served by the timely completion of these projects.

The Broward Workshop has spent significant time and resources to thoroughly review the documentation gathered by the FAA in support of the Final Environmental Impact Statement ("FEIS"). We want to acknowledge the extraordinarily in-depth and professional effort put forth by the FAA and its consultants to examine the environmental impacts and the pros and cons of the alternatives considered to alleviate current and projected needs through 2020. With 15 years of planning and such thorough studies, it is time to move forward on the design and development of this project.

We write to voice our support for Alternative B-1-b as reflected in the FEIS. We urge the FAA to issue its Record of Decision ("ROD") as early as possible.

ROD
19.1

F-LC059

The B-1-b proposal of a new 8000 foot south runway (9R/27L) and the closing of runway 13/31 will provide sufficient airfield capacity, eliminate the negative impacts of the cross-wind runway and provide the infrastructure necessary for balanced airfield use. Ultimately, the B-1-b alternative is the best alternative to ensure full redundancy and the safest operations.

We also express our strong support for a noise mitigation program that will ensure that those negatively impacted properties will qualify for mitigation measures through County, State and federal programs. We urge an early start to the noise mitigation program.

During the EIS process, several people raised issues as to the safety involved in the operation of an elevated runway with the gradient proposal for 9R/27L as reflected in the FEIS. I enclose an April 1, 2008 letter to Congresswoman Debbie Wasserman-Schultz with an attachment prepared by runway expert Laddie Irion and his staff at the request of the Broward Workshop. The report focuses on safety and contains a comparison of the 116 previously built U.S. runways that have steeper gradients than those proposed for 9R/27L at FLL.

The Broward Workshop will continue to monitor and support the progress of the FEIS, the issuance of the ROD and the implementation of the design and development of the improvements necessary to complete the runway and related Master Plan facilities and to implement the necessary noise mitigation measures.

Please feel free to call on us if we can assist in this important process.

Very truly yours,

George I. Platt, Co-Chairman
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

GIP/vdw

Attachments

cc: George Morgan, Chair, Broward Workshop
Terry Stiles, Chair, Airport Subcommittee
David L. John, Co-Chair, Transportation Committee

F-LC059

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

Date: July 28th, 2008

Regarding FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

My family and I have lived in Melaleuca Gardens in Dania Beach, Florida since 1987. The necessity to expand Ft. Lauderdale/Hollywood International Airport has been a well known fact since that time. We do not disagree that FLL needs to expand; we just feel that little attention has been aimed towards lengthening the northern part of the airport. This would affect businesses that can easily be re-located for a lot less money then it will take to soundproof our subdivision and the other neighboring divisions that account for about 9,000 people. Yes, it is true. We've been offered soundproofing reimbursement, and that should make our lives within our homes habitable. But what if we want to partake in the "few" beautiful days that our tropical utopia called Florida affords us infrequently? Yes, we know that more and more people can afford to fly lately, that plane ticket prices are a "bargain" with gas prices at such a high premium, that more and more people can afford to call South Florida home with rising home foreclosures and people leaving our beautiful state of Florida by the thousands each month. We are also aware of the multiple budget cuts for schools, fire stations and police coverage in Florida due to Amendment One that was passed by the voters last year. And not to mention the rising numbers of uninsured lives that require medical care but can't afford it. We are also aware of the ever increasing numbers of Airlines that are pulling out of FLL due to rising fuel costs. But if you build it, they will come by the year 2016, projected completion of the South Runway at FLL.....or will they?

ROD 15,114

Please re-consider the north runway as an alternative to the expansion needs of FLL. Maybe if the north runway becomes our new solution to the expanding needs of FLL then we can continue to keep tourists flocking to our beautiful state and enjoy John U. Lloyd State Park which as you know has been designated as the last existing natural beach on the Eastern Seaboard of the United States of America. If the southern runway is completed than John U. Lloyd State Park will no longer exist which would therefore make one last piece of national treasure non-existent as a travel lure for all the tourists we expect to arrive over the next 20 years.....or will they?

P 8,158

Also, where in the world are all the options to Fire Fighters if a calamity occurred on a Elevated Runway.....with a fuel leak or worse a fire, how will passengers be saved when they are stranded 47 feet above the ground ? Was it not the FAA's own outlook on South Florida Airports, mainly to let Miami Int. and Palm Beach Int. build out to the MAX, but keep FLL status quo because in your own words, "It's a matter of keeping the Western Air Corridor from Mid-Air collisions?.....if we(FAA) allowed FLL to expand it would not be a question of IF, but rather WHEN there would be mid-air COLLISIONS. Furthermore, with the expansion of the South Runway proposal(so Flawed), have you taken into consideration that by building it, it leaves No Diagonal runway, and again, if anything happens as a calamity on a new south runway, it leaves only ONE main runway, which frankly would be the only runway available not only thru construction, but it's

R 109,3

F-LC060

inevitable it would be prone to shut down if said calamities occurred. In closing, your 4th, or 5th, or maybe 6th EIS study is terribly flawed and I'm tired of Federal, State and local taxes that "We The People" are paying for, not be used for anymore studies. It seems to us that County Commissioners, FAA Officials, and big business keep coming up with another EIS study.....WHY I ask, is it to have people say the right things in their reports to satisfy all of you behind closed doors. What you are doing and proposing is not the will of the people, and for the people, and by the people... It would be wise on your part to take a Long Hard Look at the North runway proposal. It would be cost effective in so many ways, and it would also allow smaller planes to still access the existing South Runway, maintain the diagonal runway, especially when the other runways are Cleaned from time to time, and would allow 2 North Runways for landings and take-offs, and most of all, 23 acres of Federaaly Protected Mangroves would not be destroyed(Mitigated Away ?), as well as destruction of the only Natural Beach on the Eastern Seaboard of the United States of America.....All that for 1/3rd the proposed price tag of your South Runway Proposal.

P/3.37

Sincerely,

Tom and Julie Lietaert
726 N.W. 12th Avenue
Dania Beach, FL. 33004
954-921-9020
tom4you@bellsouth.net

F-LC060

Mr.& Mrs.Paul Comeau
1402 Argonaut Isle
Dania Beach, FL 33004
Phone/fax: 954-922-8036

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

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

We are in the 65 DNL noise zone at the present time. This new proposition is how you are going to spend 2 billion dollars of our tax money, and it is our tax money, one way or the other, for a runway that is not needed in these economic times and will not support the New Larger Aircraft (NLA) that takes an 11,000ft runway and 300ft wide times 2 for the taxi way. Leave only one operational runway during a 3 year construction period and if something happens shut down the airport. MAJOR BOONDOGGLE of EXTRAORDINARY PROPORTIONS. All of this to displace homeowners who have lived here for some 20 to 30 years or more. I believe all their numbers are flawed to try and make themselves look good. This is an excerpt from Grant Campbell's WHITE PAPER that pretty well says our feelings and concerns: "Add to the destruction of the wetlands, the increased safety risks through accident and air pollution, the displacement of residents in surrounding areas, particularly in the 40+ mobile home parks that will be totally eliminated, the shear lack of foresight in imagining that south Florida can somehow produce the fill that will be required for this project.
In the placement of the 6,000,000 cubic yards of fill required to build the runway opted for by the Broward County Commission, there are several key points that haven't received proper consideration.

P3.37, 22.15

- The area required to provide this fill is 7,322 acre feet, which if dug to a depth of 25 feet, would produce a lake with a surface area of 151 acres, or approximately 6 square miles.
- There is no area within reasonable trucking distance of FLL large enough to provide this fill.
- Lacking sufficient land area to provide this fill, we are presented with the hair-brained scheme of dredging the fill from the Intracoastal Waterway.
- No consideration has been given to the decimation of the marine wildlife or habitat already in existence.
- No provision for transporting the fill to the construction site has been made.

F-LC061

- If the fill is to be pumped directly to the site, then a pipeline must either be installed in the Dania Cutoff Canal or will need to be suspended across US 1 and the FEC Railroad tracks.
- Dredged fill must be allowed to drain prior to utilization as structural fill. If this is to be done in-situ, there is a very real threat of salt water intrusion into the Biscayne Aquifer from the salts leaching out of the fill.
- If the fill is to be pumped to an off site location less prone to contamination of the aquifer for drying, it must then be trucked to the site.
- 6,000,000 cubic yards of fill means 300,000 truckloads at 20 yards per load adding tremendous amounts of pollutants to an atmosphere that is already one of the worst in the country.
- To compact the 6,000,000 cubic yards of fill, 235,000,000 gallons (716 acre feet) of water will be consumed. This is nearly 1 percent of the total water usage for all of Broward County in 2004. This does not consider the water to mix the nearly 70,000 cubic yards of concrete or the water required to rinse the 7000 empty concrete trucks, all at a time when the entire south Florida area is on water restrictions.
- Not considered either is the fact that any salt that did not leach out prior to placing at the site will be washed out during the compaction process, still posing a threat to our potable water supply.
- Any option available for runway expansion at FLL will be seriously inadequate to handle the New Larger Aircraft that the FAA predicts will be the aircraft of the future.
- NLAs require runways11000 feet long and 200 feet wide.
- The bridge over US 1 will actually be 2 bridges, because the taxi way requires the same type of bridge. The same applies over the FEC Railroad tracks.
- With a runway and a taxi way each 150 feet wide and 300 feet between them plus the gradient on each side of the bridges, a tunnel for the FEC Railroad tracks will be approximately 1000 feet long., and if provisions are made for NLAs, an additional 150 feet in length must be added.
- NLAs will require hangars that will probably be too large to fit in FLL without tearing down existing facilities.
- A hangar large enough to accommodate a NLA will exceed airport height restrictions. This will be the equivalent of a 12 story building.
- The existing fuel pumping system will have to be entirely re-vamped.
- The concourses will have to be widened and the gates will have to be double or even triple-decked.
- Present delays will pale in insignificance to the delays in baggage handling and security screening.

P3,37

It seems to me that FLL will never be able to accommodate the growth in passenger traffic that this fantasy envisions, no matter the expenditure in effort or in money. Let us cut our losses now and abandon this fallacy."

ROD 2010

Sincerely,
Paul Comeau

F-LC061

FAX

TO FAX #407-812-6978

To:

ATTENTION:
Ms. Lane

From:

VERNELLE BENSON

RE: **FEIS-FLL South Runway Extension Proposal**

Date: July 28, 2008 Number of Pages: 2
Includes Cover Page
Phone: 954-983-3311
Fax: 954-983-3311
EMAIL: Bugben@bellsouth.net

Remarks:

Ms. Lane,

Please consider my letter for review.

Vernelle Benson
4564 SW 38th Terrace
Dania Beach, Florida 33312
Davis Isles Subdivision

F-LC062

Ms. Virginia Lane

FAA Orlando Airports District Office

5950 Hazeltine National Drive

Orlando Florida 32822-5024

RE: FEIS –FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

Why are we, the taxpayers, who work for a living have so little say in a proposal that will put an end to the lifestyle we all have worked our entire lives to have and enjoy? From the very inception of this airport expansion, it has become evident to me and many others who live in our area, that what we say accounts for nothing. The big money speaks and we, the 'little people', get taken from without regard or conscience.

This became very clear at the Broward County Commission meeting held in the fall to hear homeowner's complaints and to have a final vote whether to expand the airport and which route to take in doing so. First of all, there were over 1,200 residents affected by the proposed south runway (B1) in attendance, and under 50 persons paid and bused (from Tamarac) to the meeting by unknown persons, and who didn't live in this area. You ask how I know these numbers, those against the south runway wore red shirts and those for the south runway wore yellow shirts. Not only were the speakers(red shirts), who numbered into the 100's, given the attention of the commissioners, they were rudely dismissed as most of the commissioners ate dinner, talked on their cell phones, walked around on stage, had private conversations with teach other, and generally ignored both the speakers and their pleas to save their homes.

P3.37

Those who spoke for the airport expansion south runway were very few (less than a dozen Ft. Lauderdale business people), but unfortunately, they are the ones who have the money and the power, and those are the ones the commission listened to. It matters not that they are taking so many homes and ruining so many neighborhoods when there is a completely workable and much cheaper runway proposal on the table, and that is the north parallel runway (C1). They have the same set up in Miami and it works fine. The cost is approximately ½ the amount it will take to complete the south runway, but I feel there are ulterior motives behind the push on the south runway. After all, it's not their money they are spending, it ours and I don't believe for one minute that the taxpayers will not have to pay for this expansion. It may not be called that, but rest assured that is where the money will eventually come from.

If the South runway is approved to expand, that means our homes will be destroyed. These homes are located in the only water front neighborhoods affordable to the working class person. That means **our property can NOT be replaced, no matter what the cost since there is no other like properties left in the county. What would YOU DO IF IT WERE YOUR HOME WE ARE TALKING ABOUT???**

If you read this letter, thank you for your time. We only ask that you give us consideration in making a decision that will impact our lives, like no other has before.

Vernelle Benson

Vernelle Benson Davis Isles Subdivision -4564 SW 38th Terrace - Dania Beach, FL 33312

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
Phone: 407-812-6331, Ext. 129 Fax: 407-812-6978

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I THINK THE SOUTH RUNWAY OPTION IS TOTALLY UNNECESSARY. WITH THE COST OF AIRLINE FUEL RISING WITH NO END IN SIGHT, SEVERAL AIRLINES ARE CUTTING FLIGHTS AT FLL, AND ONE IS ELIMINATING SERVICE. ELEVATING THE RUNWAY OVER THE FEC RAILROAD & I95 IS A DISASTER WAITING TO HAPPEN. ALSO IT WOULD COMPLETELY DESTROY THE PEACE AND TRANQUILITY of JOHN LLOYD PARK - AND WOULD ALSO KILL MY NEIGHBORHOOD WHERE I HAVE LIVED FOR 31 YEARS. WITH PASSENGER LOADS DECLINING, THIS EXPANSION IS NOT NEEDED! THE WHOLE THING IS A BOONDOGGLE! THE LAND OWNERS EAST of the PROPOSED RUNWAY WILL REAP GREAT PROFITS – NANCY CRAFT SHAW - WE DON'T NEED ANOTHER RUNWAY!

ROD 20.0

SINCERELY,
JULIAN C. BYRD
817 N.W. 9TH AVENUE
DANIA BEACH, FL 33004
JULY 28, 2008

Julian C Byrd
954-921-1495

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 am a resident of Melaleuca Gardens, which area may be impacted by the expansion of the Ft. Lauderdale - Hollywood International Airport. Please allow me to say, that I and my husband, and all my neighbors on my cul-de-sac oppose the south runway alternative. As a matter of fact, Mr. & Mrs. John Lennon, Ron Leyden, and my husband and I were talking this very this evening during a lovely barbeque we had at our house: 805 Argonaut Lane, Dania Beach 33004 (The Lennons live next door and Ron, across the street). We ask you to please consider the North runway alternative: We live North of the airport has much land zoned industrial and there are no homes within miles of the North side. Believe me when I say, we live in a wonderful but fragile environment and we rely on your good wisdom and mercy not to take it away from us and the wildlife, the fish, turtles and nesting birds who live here. Thank you for your time

Sincerely,
Virginia Richards Anderson
805 Argonaut Lane, Dania Beach, FL 33004.

ROD 2010

F-LC064

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
Phone: 407-812-6331, Ext. 129 Fax: 407-812-6978

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

This is a decission that will change our lives greatly. We hope that all information will be reviewed and the impact of the South Runway would be understood as to the quality of life will be stressed.
Wondering why the rush to spend more money then will be generated isn't considered. Other Means of transportation can use up grading and allow those traveling locally to enjoy transportation. Airports can be managed more efficently. No matter how big an airport - weather has the control over man - Thank you for your time. Please review

Patricia Hart e mail from the airport director
517 NE 2nd pl that are buried from sight.
Dania Beach, Fl 33004

P/337

F-LC065

Page 1 of 3

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

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I am writing to express my concerns with the FEIS for FLL.

The number one concern I have is the missing documents from the FEIS.

As an example Appendix C, the FAA/Airport Sponsor's Correspondence was missing letters on the Broward County website. The missing letters were:

Broward County letter to FAA dated December 12, 2003

Leigh Fisher Associates Memo Revised August 24, 2006

Broward County letter to FAA dated August 10, 2007(From Broward County Mayor Eggelletion to Bart Vernace, FAA Orlando Airports District Office)

Broward County letter to FAA re: West Lake Park mitigation commitment dated December 4, 2007, from Marc Gambrill to Virginia Lane, FAA Orlando Airport District Office

Broward County letter to FAA re: Broward County Proposed Noise Mitigation Principles dated November 9, 2007 (From Kent George, Director of Aviation to Virginia Lane, FAA Orlando Airports District Office)

Broward County letter to FAA dated December 7, 2007 (From Kent George, Director of Aviation to Dean Stringer, FAA Orlando Airports District Office) – including the attachments mentioned in his letter

ROD. 1,2

I made the request to Broward County for these missing documents and they were added to their website.

But this information was still missing from the hard copy at Dania Beach City Hall, and the Dania Beach Library. This is unacceptable especially when the public who are to be making comments on the information contained in the FEIS have to literally chase down missing information. What else is missing from the FEIS?

There are numerous references to the letter from Kent George to Dean Stringer, dated December 7, 2007.

In Chapter 8, FAA's Preferred Alternative on page 3 it states: "Since presenting its goals and objectives to the FAA in 2004, Broward County has provided additional information regarding their preferred alternative (B1c).....In December 2007, Broward County developed information related to the economic impacts of airport development. Based on this information, Broward County concluded that the EIS alternatives with north airfield development would limit opportunities for future growth on the airport. The FAA has considered this Broward County economic information in the selection of its Preferred

ROD 15.9

F-LC066

Page 2 of 3

Alternative." Then we go on to page 6 in Chapter 8 under Airport Sponsors Concerns: "The Airport Sponsor expressed significant concern with regard to alternatives that include the development of a north runway. (refers to Kent's letter dated 12/7/07) Alternatives C1, D1, and D2 include the development of a new runway north parallel to existing Runway 9L/27R. All of these alternatives would result in substantial tenant relocations from the north airfield, would limit future tenant expansion capabilities, and would limit the potential for future on-airport development within the existing airport envelope. A large portion of the costs for tenant relocation would be the responsibility of the Airport Sponsor."

There are many facts missing. Where is the financial proof of the economic loss to the airport to relocate tenants on other parts of airport property? Where is the financial proof of economic loss to relocate tenants off of the immediate airport and locate them on property that is still owned by the airport in which they would still be collecting on leases?

Where is the updated Master Plan? How can you plan an airport without the long term layout?

P3.2

Why is the FAA approving lessening runways at an airport? Isn't the goal of the FAA to lay more concrete and build more runways? The FAA has taken a 3 runway airport down to a 2 runway airport. There can only be 2 runways because the final decision states a north runway can not be built because it will produce extreme economic loss to FLL.

ROD 15.15

Once again where is the updated Master Plan? P3.2

In the paragraph above it states: "A large portion of the costs for tenant relocation would be the responsibility of the Airport Sponsor." What large portion is the FAA referring to? Could it be the new hanger being built by Embraer Air at a cost of $18 million? Broward County Commissioners gave the ok to build the hanger without knowledge of which runway alternative the FAA would choose thus making it more costly for the C1 or D2 alternative.

"The Airport Sponsor has indicated that based on their economic impact analysis, which includes relocating the north airfield tenants, it is not willing to pursue a north runway development alternative." (Chapter 8, page 6) But the FAA and the airport sponsor is willing to reduce the number of runways.

The FAA states it will mitigate to relocate tenants on airport property. In the minutes from the Broward County Commission Public Hearing and Deliberation on the Runway Alternatives, June 5, 2007, Mr. Mark Perryman from Landrum & Brown was asked about the cost of the runways. His answer was, "Relative to some of the other comments that have been raised or questions that have been raised about the costs, the terminal costs – The costs that are in the EIS are for runways. They are for when facilities are to be displaced such as in C1, and in the D alternatives. It does include a very substantial amount for those facility relocations and reconstructions. That was not omitted." Irene Lieberman later asked Mr. Perryman, "I'm not sure I heard you correctly earlier, and I want to make sure. When you were asked a question about the C1 option, you had said that relocation was considered in that cost estimate. Mr. Perryman said, "In our detailed

ROD 15.9

F-LC066

Page 3 of 3

cost estimates, which we can provide you, we have 317 million dollars in facility relocation cost associate with C1."

It doesn't really matter to the FAA the environmental impacts associated with B1b. The FAA acknowledges the destruction of wetlands, the decimation of John U. Lloyd State Beach Park, the destruction of the City of Dania Beach, the unbearable noise impacts to homeowners and the devaluation of their property. But the FAA is basing its decision on exaggerated economic losses which will reduce the number of runways at FLL.

The useless document you refer to as the FEIS is incomplete and lacking in data and facts. P23.0

The true cost of the expansion is not shown. ROD 15.16

The airlines are on the brink of financial collapse due to the high cost of fuel. The cost of fuel will not be declining. The airlines have eliminated flights and service to FLL. The legacy carriers have made drastic reductions at FLL because it is a tourist destination. When times are tough the public tightens its purse strings. The cost of air travel will be beyond the reach of the average citizen. This will result in less enplanements and fewer flights. ROD 3.0

The FAA does not provide accurate noise impacts with an elevated runway. RLC 109.3

The FAA has eliminated various alternatives because they will encroach on I-95 and the CSX Railroad and are thus "fatally flawed," but did not eliminate alternatives that encroach on U.S. or the FEC Railroad as similarly flawed. P4.4

The FAA has made it more difficult for the public to submit comments. In this day of email most people do not have a fax machine and most do not send anything by mail. I personally do not own a stamp nor do I even know how much they are. I conduct all my correspondence via email. It was a huge disservice to the public to deny email responses. It has hampered the ease of responding. ROD 23.11

The FAA needs to answer these important questions.

Rae Sandler
810 NW 7th Ave.
Dania Beach, FL 33004
954-649-0396

Page 1 of 11

FLL

20

The FaLLacy in Airport Expansion

By

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 St
Dania Beach-FL 33004

FLL

FaLLacy in Airport Expansion

Plans for turning the closed Homestead Air Force Base into a commercial airport bogged down in 1998 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 to the negative environmental impact the facility would have on the flora and fauna of the area.

After gaining approval from the Federal Aviation Administration, the airport plan was subjected to further study to address concerns about how Biscayne National Park, two miles east of the base, and Everglades National Park, 10 miles to the west, would be affected by noise, air and water pollution from their new neighbor and the development expected to surround it. Plans called for the airport to handle more than 200,000 flights a year for passengers and cargo as well as attract new industry.

Miami-Dade County officials supported the airport plan as a way of relieving some of the traffic at Miami International Airport, 30 miles to the north, while helping to revitalize a hurricane-damaged area.

In 1992, Hurricane Andrew inflicted more than $400 million in economic losses to south Florida; the Homestead Air Force Base, which provided about 5,000 military and civilian jobs, was so badly damaged that it had to close.

In 1994 the base was converted into an Air Force Reserves installation with about 2,000 people that now occupies about a third of the former base's 3,000 acres. Then Homestead Mayor, Steve Shiver said, "It's extremely important," referring to the airport. "It's not the single savior but it definitely puts us on the right track." Federal studies to transfer 1,600 acres of the base to the county found the site compatible with a commercial regional airport, and the redevelopment plans won Miami-Dade County approval in 1996.

Conservationists, however, attacked the Federal Government's environmental report for failing to adequately address the effects on Biscayne National Park, a180, 000-acre Aquatic Park, and Everglades National Park, a wilderness park on 1.5 million acres of saw grass marshes, pineland, and mangrove and cypress swamps.

Critics saw the airport proposal as undermining the Federal Government's own multimillion-dollar restoration project to preserve the Everglades. The opponents, including the Sierra Club and the National Audubon Society, said noise from passenger jets would surpass what the National Park Service considers acceptable. They also worried about degradation of water quality in Biscayne Bay, fuel dumping and collisions with birds.

Environmental concerns led the Air Force and the Federal Aviation Administration to review the project again, and the scope of the new study was expanded to consider adverse effects on agriculture and tourism, air travel safety and traffic. The study also looked into alternative uses for the site, including a theme park, a marine research center, a space launching facility, and other government and military use. Public hearings were held on the study when was completed.

Miami-Dade County officials still hoped to establish a commercial airport at the former Air Force base with minimal impact to the surroundings. They said they had been looking for 14 years for a site to accommodate overflow from Miami International. None of the county's three general aviation airports can be expanded, they said, **because of their proximity to residential and business areas.**

These same issues affect FLL expansion!

In the FLL expansion plan, it is not only the wildlife environment that is affected; there is the human element that is being ridden rough-shod over by a callous County Commission that sees quality of business ahead of quality of life.

Certainly, the people in the immediate vicinity of the airport will face issues such as noise, air and water pollution, deflated home values and increased risk of accident, but what the County Commission has failed to recognize is the fact that all of Broward County will be affected in varying degrees by the air and water pollution.

A study by the Clean Air Task force has determined that South Florida is already one area where the Estimated Cancer Risk from HAPs (hazardous air pollutants) is Greater than 1 in 10,000, which places us in the highest 20% of states.

Lifetime Cancers per Million People in Broward County range from 318 from Inhaled diesel soot to 44 from other inhaled toxics

The Clean Air Task Force determined1 that the cancer risk posed by diesel soot is higher than all other air toxics combined.

> The calculated average US cancer risk of 363 cancers per million is over 8 times higher than the cancer risk of all other air toxics combined. The relative cancer risk of diesel PM is calculated as a ratio of the cancer risk of diesel PM divided by the cancer risk of other air toxics tracked by EPA. We calculated the cancer risk for diesel PM in the US by multiplying the CA cancer unit risk for diesel PM by the average national ambient concentration for diesel PM from Aspen model results for 1999. According to the 1999 NATA the combined risk from all 133 other air toxics tracked by EPA is 41.5 per million. Note: this risk is for inhalation as the only route of exposure. The relative ratio of national diesel soot risk to the risk of all other air toxics combined is therefore 363 / 41.5 = 8.75. County and state ratios were calculated similarly. MSA results were derived from the county-level data using population weighting.

How did CATF determine that the urban risk is 3 times higher than the rural risk?

Based on the single CARB unit risk multiplied by the average diesel soot concentration in the U.S., the nationwide average lifetime cancer risk posed by diesel exhaust is 363 cancers per million. In the analysis counties are designated as 'rural' or 'urban.' In the rural counties we estimate a risk of 142 cancers per million based on the average concentration in rural counties. In the urban counties, the risk is 415 cancer per million. The ratio of urban to rural risk 415/142 = 2.92, rounding up to a relative factor of 3.

How the Risk from Diesel Soot in Broward County Compares to Other Florida Counties:

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. (http://www.catf.us/publications/view/25)

Summary of the health effects of emissions from air pollution:

Pollutant Representative Health Effects

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, safety effects for aircraft from reduced visibility.

Volatile Organic Compounds:
- Contribution towards ozone formation,
- Odors and some

direct effect on buildings and plants.
(http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/aviation/r99013.pdf)

ESTIMATING COMMERCIAL JET AIRCRAFT EMISSIONS

This analysis estimates ground level emissions from aircraft; thus, the landing and takeoff cycle (LTO) defines the aircraft activity of interest. LTO emissions are all of these emissions which occur within the mixing layer, as discussed below. Emissions during flight at cruising altitude are not within the scope of this study.

An LTO cycle begins as the aircraft descends from cruising altitude and approaches and lands at the airport. The second step in the landing portion of the cycle is taxi to the gate and subsequent idle. The next three steps are the three operating modes in the takeoff portion of the cycle: taxi-out/idle; takeoff; and climbout. These five LTO cycle operating modes are defined by the existence of standard power settings for a given aircraft, so the modes represent an appropriate basis for estimating emissions.

The five major air pollutant species which comprise the most significant emissions from commercial jet aircraft are volatile organic compounds (VOCs), carbon monoxide (CO), oxides of nitrogen (NOx), particulates (PM), and sulfur dioxide (SO2). VOCs and CO emission rates are highest when engines are operating at low power, such as when idling or taxiing. Conversely, NOx emissions rise with increasing power level and combustion temperature. Accordingly, the highest NOx emissions occur during takeoff and climbout.

PM emissions result from the incomplete combustion of fuel. High power operation, such as takeoff and climbout, produce the highest PM emission rates due to the high fuel consumption under those conditions. PM emission test data for aircraft engines are sparse, and engine-specific PM emission factors are available for only a few engine models.

SO2 emissions are created when sulfur in the fuel combines with oxygen during the combustion process. Fuels with higher sulfur contents will produce higher amounts of SO2 than low-sulfur fuels. It is generally assumed that during combustion, all sulfur in the fuel reacts to form SO2 or sulfates.

The estimated annual average emissions from FLL by 2010 will be approximately 5000 tons. (Determined by averaging ten national airports total annual LTO cycle emissions.)

An astounding 77% of the nationwide CO (carbon monoxide) emissions are from transportation sources.

Nitrogen dioxide (NO2) is a brownish, highly reactive gas that is present in all urban atmospheres. NO2 can irritate the lungs, cause bronchitis and pneumonia, and lower resistance to respiratory infections.

The major mechanism for the formation of NO2 in the atmosphere is the oxidation of nitric oxide (NO), *which is produced by most combustion processes*

Nitrogen oxides (NOx) include various nitrogen compounds like nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and nitric oxide (NO). These compounds play an important role in the

atmospheric reactions that create ozone (O3) and acid rain. Individually, they may affect ecosystems, both on land and in water.

NOx forms when fuels are burned at high temperatures. The two major emissions sources are transportation vehicles and stationary combustion sources such as electric utility and industrial boilers.

Nitrogen oxides (NOx) include various nitrogen compounds like nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and nitric oxide (NO). These compounds play an important role in the atmospheric reactions that create ozone (O3) and acid rain. Individually, they may affect ecosystems, both on land and in water.

NOx forms when fuels are burned at high temperatures. The two major emissions sources are transportation vehicles and stationary combustion sources such as electric utility and industrial boilers. (FLL is surrounded by 2 airports and 2 FPL power plants, one of which is located in a major seaport with one of the largest fuel storage compounds in the state. All 6 pollution sources pretty well blanket central Broward) When is enough actually enough?

High concentrations of sulfur dioxide (SO2) affect breathing and may aggravate existing respiratory and cardiovascular disease. Sensitive populations include asthmatics, individuals with bronchitis or emphysema, children and the elderly. SO2 is also a primary contributor to acid rain, which causes acidification of lakes and streams and can damage trees, crops, historic buildings and statues. In addition, sulfur compounds in the air contribute to visibility impairment in large parts of the country. This is especially noticeable in national parks.

Sulfur dioxide (SO2) is released primarily from burning fuels that contain sulfur (like coal, oil and diesel fuel). Stationary sources such as coal- and oil-fired power plants, steel mills, refineries, pulp and paper mills, and nonferrous smelters are the largest releasers.

Volatile organic compounds (VOC) are defined by the Clean Air Act as chemicals that participate in forming ozone (O3). Ozone is a respiratory toxicant. The class of VOCs includes many specific chemicals which may also cause adverse health effects in their own right (such as cancer or reproductive toxicity).

VOCs are emitted from diverse sources, including automobiles, chemical manufacturing facilities, dry cleaners, paint shops and other commercial and residential sources that use solvent and paint. VOC emissions form O3 through complex chemical reactions with oxides of nitrogen (NOx) in the presence of sunlight.

When high concentrations of pollutants blanket an area, the effect is to inhibit the distribution of vital oxygen in green-ways. In waterways the effect is to inhibit the absorption of oxygen from the atmosphere which is already starved of oxygen, compounding the effect. The entire eco-system suffers.

Page 8 of 11

The runway expansion project is intended to give the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport a second runway that could accommodate big jets, allowing it to handle more traffic without an increase in delays. The Federal Aviation Administration has released an environmental impact statement on the project, but it doesn't consider that none of the runway options provide the capability of handling the NLA, or New Larger Aircraft, that are predicted to dominate air traffic in the near future.

These aircraft require runways at least 200 feet wide and 11,000 feet long, with a minimum of 600 feet between runways and taxi-ways, and 324 feet between taxi-ways, a requirement that FLL will never be able to meet. When the NLAs are dominant, they will not be able to land here, and FLL will again be struggling, after an expenditure of nearly a billion dollars.

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 questioned the safety of erecting a bridge that would allow the runway to pass over U.S. 1 and the FEC Railroad tracks. He also said the FAA failed to explain why such a large area of wetlands must be destroyed.

The EPA describes wetlands as the vital link between land and water, where the flow of water, the cycling of nutrients, and the energy of the sun meet to produce highly productive ecosystems. Wetlands may not be wet year-round. In fact, some of the most important wetlands are seasonally dry transition zones. They are among the most valuable, but often least understood, of all natural resources

Wetlands are often referred to as the "kidneys" of the landscape for their ability to remove excess nutrients, toxic substances, and sediment from water that flows through them, helping to improve water quality. Recently published studies on pollutant removal rates for natural and restored wetlands indicate that, depending on the type of wetland, the season, and other factors, wetlands can retain significant percentages of nitrates, ammonium, phosphorus, and sediment loads. Natural wetlands have also been effective in removing contaminants such as pesticides, landfill leachate, dissolved chlorinated compounds, metals, and storm water runoff.

Wetlands play an important role in reducing the frequency and intensity of floods by acting as natural buffers - slowing, absorbing, and storing significant amounts of floodwater. Since flooding is the most common natural hazard in the Nation, wetlands play an integral role in managing this risk, particularly through planning approaches that consider the entire watershed. Wetlands can also significantly mitigate the impacts of storm surges and waves. The nation's vital Gulf coastal landscape and associated infrastructure experienced crippling damage as a result of wind, tidal surge, and flood related impacts during the 2005 hurricane season. Experts have concluded that the significant historic losses of wetlands in southern Louisiana contributed to the magnitude of hurricane impacts. These events illustrated the economic, cultural, and ecologic

Page 9 of 11

consequences of losing protective coastal wetlands, which provide significant and sustainable protection to life and property.

The presence of wetlands on the landscape can also mitigate flood damage inland. A study by the Wetlands Initiative concluded that restoring wetlands along the 100 year flood plain of the Upper Mississippi River could increase storage capacity to 39 million acre-feet of flood water - a similar volume to the Mississippi Flood of 1993 that caused $16 billion in damages.

The ability of wetlands to store and filter water helps to protect and replenish surface and underground drinking water sources. Studies have concluded that the thousands of small wetlands that dot the U.S. Great Plains (called playa lakes) play a significant role in the recharge of the Ogallala aquifer - one of the Nation's largest aquifers and a principal source of groundwater used to irrigate agricultural land and provide drinking water in the Great Plains.

As nurseries of nature, wetlands are among the most biologically productive natural ecosystems in the world, comparable to rain forests and coral reefs in their productivity and in the diversity of species they support. Mixtures of vegetation and shallow water zones provide diverse habitats for a variety of species - plants, insects, amphibians, reptiles, birds, fish, shellfish, and mammals. Many species rely on these critical habitats for survival as sources of food, shelter, and breeding grounds. For example, frogs, toads, and salamanders depend on small, isolated wetlands during their development. It is estimated that one-half of all North American bird species nest or feed in wetlands, and despite the fact that wetlands comprise only 5% of the land surface in the conterminous U.S., they are home to an estimated 31% of plant species.

Commercially, wetlands provide an essential link in the lifecycle of 75% of the fish and shellfish harvested in the United States and up to 90% of the recreational catch. Many industries, in addition to the fishing industry, derive benefits or produce products that are dependent on wetlands. For example, coastal wetland and barrier systems can provide buffers that protect commercial and industrial infrastructure, including ports, and oil and gas structures. Commercial products harvested in wetlands include rice, cranberries, peat, hay, medicines, timber, and fur.

Wetlands provide infinite opportunities for recreation and cultural pursuits. They are inviting places for popular activities such as hiking, fishing, bird watching, photography, and hunting. In 2001, more than 82 million Americans took part in these types of recreational activities, spending approximately $108 billion.
(http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/awm/index.html)

Add to the destruction of the wetlands, the increased safety risks through accident and air pollution, the displacement of residents in surrounding areas, particularly in the 40+ mobile home parks that will be totally eliminated, the shear lack of foresight in imagining that south Florida can somehow produce the fill that will be required for this project.

Page 10 of 11

In the placement of the 6,000,000 cubic yards of fill required to build the runway opted for by the Broward County Commission, there are several key points that haven't received proper consideration.

- The area required to provide this fill is 7,322 acre feet, which if dug to a depth of 25 feet, would produce a lake with a surface area of 151 acres, or approximately 6 square miles.
- There is no area within reasonable trucking distance of FLL large enough to provide this fill.
- Lacking sufficient land area to provide this fill, we are presented with the hair-brained scheme of dredging the fill from the Intracoastal Waterway.
- No consideration has been given to the decimation of the marine wildlife or habitat already in existence.
- No provision for transporting the fill to the construction site has been made.
- If the fill is to be pumped directly to the site, then a pipeline must either be installed in the Dania Cutoff Canal or will need to be suspended across US 1 and the FEC Railroad tracks.
- Dredged fill must be allowed to drain prior to utilization as structural fill. If this is to be done in-situ, there is a very real threat of salt water intrusion into the Biscayne Aquifer from the salts leaching out of the fill.
- If the fill is to be pumped to an off site location less prone to contamination of the aquifer for drying, it must then be trucked to the site.
- 6,000,000 cubic yards of fill means 300,000 truckloads at 20 yards per load adding tremendous amounts of pollutants to an atmosphere that is already one of the worst in the country.
- To compact the 6,000,000 cubic yards of fill, 235,000,000 gallons (716 acre feet) of water will be consumed. This is nearly 1 percent of the total water usage for all of Broward County in 2004. This does not consider the water to mix the nearly 70,000 cubic yards of concrete or the water required to rinse the 7000 empty concrete trucks, all at a time when the entire south Florida area is on water restrictions.
- Not considered either is the fact that any salt that did not leach out prior to placing at the site will be washed out during the compaction process, still posing a threat to our potable water supply.
- Any option available for runway expansion at FLL will be seriously inadequate to handle the New Larger Aircraft that the FAA predicts will be the aircraft of the future.
- NLAs require runways11000 feet long and 200 feet wide.
- The bridge over US 1 will actually be 2 bridges, because the taxi way requires the same type of bridge. The same applies over the FEC Railroad tracks.
- With a runway and a taxi way each 150 feet wide and 300 feet between them plus the gradient on each side of the bridges, a tunnel for the FEC Railroad tracks will be approximately 1000 feet long., and if provisions are made for NLAs, an additional 150 feet in length must be added.

F-LC067

Page 11 of 11

- NLAs will require hangars that will probably be too large to fit in FLL without tearing down existing facilities.
- A hangar large enough to accommodate a NLA will exceed airport height restrictions. This will be the equivalent of a 12 story building.
- The existing fuel pumping system will have to be entirely re-vamped.
- The concourses will have to be widened and the gates will have to be double or even triple-decked.
- Present delays will pale in insignificance to the delays in baggage handling and security screening,

It seems to me that FLL will never be able to accommodate the growth in passenger traffic that this fantasy envisions, no matter the expenditure in effort or in money. Let us cut our losses now and abandon this fallacy.

ROD 20D

F-LC067

From: CAROL LASEK
5921 SW 33 Lane
Ft Lauderdale, Fl 33312
7/28/08

To: Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airport
District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Suite 400
Orlando, Florida 32822

This is in reference to FEIS
Ft/ South Runway
Attention

Dear Ms Lane. I am not in favor of the airport expansion. It will hurt our quality of life.
Sincerely - Carol Lasek

P/ 6.1 ROD 2000

F-LC068

7/28/08

To FEIS - FLL South Runway Ext

With the loss of Air Lines in & out of FLL. This is a CRAZY IDEA!

ENVIRONMENTALY - IS BAD!
HOME VALUES DROP MORE, Noise Levels WILL be TERRIBLE, besides The VIBERATING OF The homes FROM The THRUST OF ENGINES Airplane Fuel covering our homes, CARS etc. COULDN'T SIT OUT SIDE & enjoy South Florida..

ROD 2000

Sincerely
CARL Schoen
954-324-5886

F-LC069

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

Re: FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,
In light of the current trends in South Florida with respect to property values, recent tax cuts and a decline in growth, it is with the strongest urgency that we request you reevaluate the prudence of a runway expansion at Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood International Airport. Keep in mind that such an expansion would prove detrimental to families already struggling in the current economy. Because there are still C rated schools in the affected communities, we implore upon you to postpone what may prove to be a superfluous airport expansion and allow legislators to refocus economic resources on viable improvements to the tax paying community.

Thank you for your consideration.

ROD 2.10

Respectfully,

Wes and Kelly Sanford
5374 SW 33rd Ave
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312

F-LC070

July 27, 2008

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

My husband and I live at 4436 SW 26 Ave. in Dania Beach. We live in one of the homes just east of I-95 off of Griffin Road. We are very concerned about the extension of the South Runway and continue to try and figure out what continues to motivate this expansion. From our back deck we can observe airport traffic. Most of the time the flights seem sparse and rarely would we label it "congested". We don't mind living near the airport as we find it is very easy to make a flight and pick up our visitors. We consider FLL to be a good and interesting neighbor. However recent events have us very concerned.

1. It appears that the vote passed by Broward County Commission was thought to be a restricted runway. The FAA will not allow the runway to be restricted so I think the commissioners would deny the expansion if they want to remain true to their voters. I think the FAA rejection of the Commission restrictions now null and void the previous vote in favor for expansion or at least forces a re-vote.

P. 12.6

2. I hear that Miami expanded and tried to pass the cost on to there airlines and it only made airline travel more expensive. Will the current airlines stay if they have to raise seat prices to cover these new exorbitant charges? If the cost gets too high to land in FLL won't the planes just start using Miami Int'l or Palm Beach that is already being under utilized. We have a great tri-rail station that gets you down to Miami Int'l or Palm Beach without much trouble so I think if airline travel picks up they can use the existing runways at these other airports.

ROD 3.10, 3.49

3. The South runway design seems to have several serious flaws in it. The ramping of the runway leaves severe drop offs (over forty feet) that seem dangerous if a plane veers off runway or overshoot runway. It would take minor problems and make it deadly real fast. How will Fire/Rescue be able to respond especially if there is fuel leakage?

R/LC 109.3

4. FLL currently has a three runway system. Due to ramping of the South runway the cross field runway will be eliminated. We are going from three runways down to two and still call it an expansion?

ROD 15.15

5. The current forecast costs of $600-$700 million dollars are not a credible estimate when the costs of mitigation of land/homes and additional terminals are not included in the numbers. Why expand if we do not need more terminals?

P 6.2, ROD 15.16

6. Since scrutiny of the proposed project cause more alternatives to be brought to the table, the north runway became the more common sense way to go. It requires no more land to be purchased, uses existing flight chase way, is much less costly and allows the cross field runway to remain and give us four runway options instead of two. When I

ROD 15.14

F-LC071

asked an airport engineer official at one of the public meetings why they would attempt such a difficult engineering project when the North runway made more common sense he answered "That there is no saying we won't do the North runway as well." Well if the thinking is to eventually do the North runway as well then why not do that project first and see if even more expansion is needed before doing the expensive project?

8. Most county citizens are not aware what will be lost in the expansion. Much wetlands east of the airport will be taken. Many neighborhoods will be lost or forever impacted negatively. The additional amplified noise of the elevated runway will be heard even where no airport noise is currently heard. The tranquility of John Lloyd Stare Park will constantly be shattered. This community gem was recently honored as one of the top ten most beautiful American Parks on Good Morning America. Our roads and public places will be more congested. Do we want to become more Miamified?

RUD 13.8
P6.4, 6.5, 8.58,

9. We see that there is a lot of new home and business construction continue to be going on in this flight path for the South runway and we wonder why this is happening if this expansion is a foregone conclusion. Would it not been a more cost effective to buy vacant land or purchase homes for sale in the effected area during the last fifteen years. It would have been more economical probably made the project an easier sell to the affected community.

We have been watching this planned project for several years and remain concerned over facts that we have learned. We feel that the negatives far out weigh the pluses at this point in time, The air travel rate is actually going down, the airline industry is hurting and I am not sure can sell more costly tickets to use FLL. If they can't sell seat inventory they will leave and then who pays for the expansion? This is the kind of White Elephant situation that could bankrupt the county and cost its citizens dearly. We strongly believe that now is a good time to postpone any firm decision and see what the American economy does and how airline industry performs over the next several years. Meanwhile we can strongly consider all options and make choices that are wise.

2.10

Thank you for taking the time to care,

Sincerely,

Lisa + Ed Roberge

Lisa and Ed Roberge
4436 SW 26 Ave
Dania Beach, Florida 33312
Ed's CP (954)873-1267
Lisa's CP (954)336-9917

F-LC071

July 28, 2008
Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, Florida

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane

I live in Dania just South of the proposed new South Runway. I object to this construction because it will drastically impact my families quality of life. The soot on my roof needs to be washed off every year. This can not be good for anyones health. Has this been addressed and what will be the increase due to high traffic on the South runway?

P18.16
RUD 3.10

Also of course the noise which has not been addressed due to the elevated runway. What will the noise profile actually be in the NorthEast Dania neighborhood?

RUD 13.8

Why are the plans proceeding when you consider that airlines are going bankrupt and decreasing operations from FLL and this obviously is going to continue?

RUD 3.0, 3.10

Please do not proceed with this expansion unless it can be proved that it will be needed.

Thank you,

Stephen Reed
205 NE 1st Ct
Dania, FL 33004

F-LC072

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

Fort Lauderdale july 28- 2008
send by Fax 8 pm 30

My address: Gavet Astrid 4440 SW 34th drive Fort Lauderdale/Dania Beach 33312
Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms Lane,

The impact of noise is very important already, I could not imagine more than what we have.
As the city of Dania has allowed the environment to be impacted by letting the incinerator to be built on sate road 7, the FPL sub 'station, and the flight pattern already over my home, the small plane are so low they almost touches the tope of my big trees.

My biggest objection by **'Using the south runway extension' is because of the increase Amount of flight, therefore creating unbearable noise disturbing our lives because of the constant flight going over our homes.** P22.6

Our homes have been devalued as it is strongly object,
1/ why do you not use the North Runway with less impact.
2 /why do we paid regular property taxes like every one.
In other place the property taxes are free for **Such** inconvenient. ROD 15.14

Bests Regards,
Astrid GAVET

F-LC073

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,

MY WIFE AND I LIVE OFF GRIFFIN ROAD IN THE EXACT LINE OF THE FLIGHT PATTERN OF THE PROPOSED EXTENDED RUNWAY.

IN ADDITION TO ALL THE NEGATIVE POINTS POINTED OUT BY MY CONSTITUATES, MY MAJOR CONCERN IS THE 2703 TIMES MORE PROPERTY TAXES I WOULD BE PAYING IF I SOLD AND PURCHASED AN EQUAL VALUE HOME ELSEWHERE. MY WIFE AND I OWNED OUR HOUSE SINCE 1976 (32 YEARS) AND OUR PROPERTY TAXES FOR 2007 WAS $ 1992.00. WOULD THE FAA OR OTHER GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY BE WILLING TO PAY ANNUALLY THE ADDITIONAL PROPERTY TAXES FOR THE NEXT 30+ YEARS ON THE NEWLY ARMORED HOUSE? NOTE! MY WIFE IS 54 YEARS OLD AND IN EXCELLENT HEALTH. ROD 15.10

JOHN K. MOYANT
4661 SW 42ND TERR
FT LAUDERDALE FL 33314

SINCERELY YOURS
JOHN K. MOYANT
John K Moyant

F-LC074

FROM :MR Kris Johnson FAX NO. :9549670434 Jul. 28 2008 7:47PM P1

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 object to the proposed South Runway extension and do not give up my air rights. We have worked hard to have our homes and if it was your home you would protect it too. With the economy so bad and airflight prices at a all time record high, we sure do not need more runways. The airplanes already hatte our windows and dump jet fuel all over our cars and animals. If they need to spend so much money then give us back some of it in our taxes. Do not add more runways.

ROD 2010

Kris Johnson + Family
4614 S.W. 30th. Way
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33312

F-LC075

07/28/2008 19:06 9549205074 PAGE 01/01

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. — ROD 15.14

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. — P8.58

The current preferred option reduces the number of runways at the airport from 3 to 2. — ROD 15.15

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 3.10

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 15.14

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-LC076

FAX

Date: 7.28.08

TO: Ms. Virginia Lane, AICP

FAX: 407-812-6978

PHONE:

FROM: Carene A. Grant – Executive Assistant

FAX: 800-886-0079

PHONE: 954-515-3799

PAGES: 3

RE:

COMMENTS:

☐ URGENT

☐ PLEASE COMMENT

☐ PLEASE REVIEW

☐ FOR YOUR RECORDS

KAPLAN HIGHER EDUCATION 6301 Kaplan University Avenue – Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309 954-515-3799

F-LC077

KAPLAN HIGHER EDUCATION

ANDREW ROSEN
Chief Executive Officer

July 25, 2008

Ms. Virginia Lane, AICP
Federal Aviation Administration
Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Suite 400
Orlando, FL 32822-5024

FAX: 407-812-6978

Dear Ms. Lane:

I am writing on behalf of Kaplan Higher Education in support of runway expansion alternative B1b at Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport. ROD 14.0

Over the last six years, Kaplan Higher Education has added more than 1,000 new professional jobs in South Florida, and we expect to continue to grow in the years ahead. None of these jobs would have been created here were it not for the convenience and efficiency of Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport.

In 1999, Kaplan Higher Education had its business base in New York with a small presence in South Florida. Frequent, inexpensive and on-time flights from New York to Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport made it possible for us to conveniently visit our office here, manage our modest operation, and have the confidence to grow it. Had that efficient access to our South Florida office not existed, it is highly unlikely we would have chosen to expand here. As our company grew, we searched for a community that would serve as the permanent home for our expanding business. Broward County proved to a good choice for many reasons, but easy access was a key requirement.

Today, Kaplan Higher Education's offices on Cypress Creek Road serve as a headquarters for a nearly 12,000-employee global operation, and our growth continues.

It is imperative to the success of our business that travel to and from our widely dispersed operations remain convenient, predictable and user-friendly. Airport expansion will help ensure Kaplan's continued growth, the growth of the county's business community at large, and the attractiveness of Broward County to businesses considering relocating here.

6301 Kaplan University Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309
Tel: 954.515.4888 arosen@kuplan.edu

F-LC077

ANDREW ROSEN
Chief Executive Officer

I encourage the FAA to support Alternative B1b, which would lengthen the south runway at Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport to 8,000 feet and close the cross-wind 13/31 runway. This alternative will meet future travel demands and ensure safe operations in a variety of conditions.

Sincerely,

Andrew S Rosen

Andrew S. Rosen
Chief Executive Officer
Kaplan Higher Education

6301 Kaplan University Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309
Tel. 954.515.4888 arosen@kuplan.edu

F-LC077

> FAX MESSAGE <

DATE: Monday, July 28th, 2008

George A. Jason
4549 SW 37th Avenue
Dania Beach
Florida 33312-5403

FAX NUMBER
(954) 987-5051

FROM: George A. Jason

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

FAX # (407) 812-6978

NUMBER OF PAGES 3 **INCLUDING THIS COVER PAGE.**

RE: My thoughts on Ft. Lauderdale/Hollywood South Runway Extention.
Please look at the impact and expense and then consider the North Parallel Runway choice.
DO WE REALLY NEED TO EXPAND FLL?

ROD 15,14

F-LC078

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

Regarding: Final EIS - Ft. Lauderdale/Hollywood South Runway Extention

Dear Ms. Lane:

My home is directly under the flight path for the existing South Runway. Since 1991, I have enjoyed the convenience of being in the proximity to I-95, I-595, the Florida Turnpike and a wonderful small airport that was not only convenient, but also easy to commute in and out of. I enjoy living on canal access to Port Everglades and the Intracoastal. I also enjoy my shrubbed and flowered yard and my screened enclosed patio with a wonderful hot tub spa.

There is no way that I would accept sound proofing of my home, in the 65 DNL contour, as a mitigation and make me a prisoner in my own home... not able to enjoy the reason I moved to South Florida and bought my single home on the water with a beautiful yard that I keep manicured. As a matter of fact, I am 80 years old and I bought my piece of paradise to enjoy these last years of my life.

ROD 15.0

Now our Broward County commissioners (with the blessing of the FAA) are determined to move ahead with the worst choice in the "fatally flawed" Final EIS. The other alternatives are much cheaper, totally safer and would have much less impact on the homes and lives of surrounding residential areas; not to mention the impacts on major parks and wetlands. The safety of this South Runway Alternative has been questioned by professional pilots, fire fighters in case of an emergency and even Air Controllers. If a tire blows on this elevated runway, there will be no place for a plane to go, if it veers off the runway, except 45 ft. to the ground below!

P3.37

It would be far better to stop this outrageous neighborhood butchering, the destroying of beautiful South Florida parks and wetlands; before this boondoggle runway project moves forward and is constructed. The question is... is there even a need for this insane expansion? Why is Broward County and the FAA pursuing the building of an 8,000 foot escalated South Runway that rises up over railroad tracks and US-1 and destroying at least 12 acres of wetlands when John U. Lloyd Beach State Park will be all but obliterated with the impact from this planned expansion, especially when there are other alternatives that would cause less impacts and cost a great deal less?

Projections of this demand for expansion overestimate growth at the airport. Nowhere in the Final EIS does the FAA mention or talk about the increase in jet fuel prices and how this will impact the number of aircraft flying into and out of the airport. Nowhere in the Final EIS does the FAA mention the recent reduction in operations at the airport announced by American Airlines, United Airlines and Spirit Airlines. The reductions indicate that the expansion may not even be necessary because there is less demand than assumed in the Final EIS.

P3.47

F-LC078

The FAA relied on a study from 2002 for economic impacts to Broward County. Why didn't the FAA use more recent data? This data does not include the current negative economic forecast. Operations at the airport declined by 5.3% for air carrier enplanements and 10.7% for commuter enplanements in 2006, but the FAA still predicts operations at the airport will increase through 2020. The FAA is basing its expansion decision on benefits from the project through 2030 (reductions in operational delays) while at the same time only disclosing environmental impacts caused by the project through 2020.

ROD 3.0

What does all of this mean to me? I have enjoyed my home, my location and my life since 1991. Now, with serious flawed studies, a lack of concern for people's lives and the environment and a total disregard for the safety and cost of this South Runway, you are going to destroy many citizen's homes and lives. It would be different if there were no alternatives or if studies that were not faulted showed a need for this shotgun expansion. If there really is this need you claim, why wouldn't you select the North Parallel (C1) Runway. It is safer, much less costly and much, much less of an impact on surrounding neighborhoods, wetlands and the environment in general.

ROD 15.14

Since I finally found paradise in 1991, I hope my final years won't be destroyed by this senseless and unnecessary plan to ruin people's lives and a very desirable airport.

George A. Jason
4549 SW 37th Avenue
Dania Beach, Florida 33312

F-LC078

A facsimile from

Robert Vagi
4451 SW 34th Drive
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33312
954-472-7653

To: Ms. Virginia Lane
Fax number: 407-812-6978

Date: 7/28/2008

Regarding: FEIS – FLL South Runway Extension

Comments: 3 pages including fax cover

F-LC079

July 27, 2008

RE: FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension

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

Dear Ms. Lane:

I am strongly opposed to the expansion of the south runway at FLL for many reasons. There are serious flaws in the FEIS.

Why has the FAA chosen the worst choice when there are other alternatives that would be safer, less offensive and disruptive to the quality of life of its citizens as well as much less costly. At a time when our economy is struggling, shouldn't we spend our money wisely? Shouldn't the safety of the passengers and crew be of utmost importance when building a new runway. The proposed runway will be elevated to the extent that pilots have stated that they will not land on that runway because of serious, life-threatening situations. Paramedics and firefighters have stated that the elevated runway will have the potential for a greater loss of life in case of any emergency because they will not be able to reach the passengers and crew quickly because there is only one way to reach them and they will have to fight the debris and fuel, probably on fire, before they could ever reach a passenger to try to save their lives. P3.37

Why has the FAA indicated that is does not intend to comply with operational restrictions at the airport which is already written in the Interdocal Agreement between Broward County and the City of Dania Beach? Does this in fact insinuate that county and city governments have no say as to what will happen to the lives and families impacted by any situation that a Federal agency has a say so in? If that's the case, why have city and local governments at all? Why don't we call ourselves a dictatorship and have the "Feds" run the whole thing? P2.26

Why is the FAA basing its expansion decision on benefits from the project through 2030 (i.e. reduction in operational delays) while at the same time only disclosing environmental impacts caused by the project through 2020? P6.0

Why won't the FAA mention how much greater the noise level will be to citizens if the south runway is chosen as opposed to the north runway. P6.5

Based on the "facts" airport traffic is decreasing rapidly and there are airlines who service Ft. Lauderdale who have now gone out of business and have declared bankruptcy. Other major airlines such as Delta have expressed concerns of declaring bankruptcy as well. Is it necessary to expand the runway to accommodate more and larger planes to handle more traffic which is plainly not happening and is not going to happen in the foreseeable future? RUD3.10

With all of the financial concerns of the airlines, what makes the FAA think that the airlines will be able to uphold their end of the deal and provide financial support for this expansion? Could it be that it was never intended to be that way anyway and that the financial burden of this project was going to be "dumped" on the citizens anyway? P16.2 RUD 15.16

4451 SW 34TH DRIVE
FT. LAUDERDALE, FL 33312

F-LC079

Why are the FAA's estimates of increased air traffic based on the "pre-economy decline" with a total disregard for the current status of the economy or the direction in which it is heading and has been heading for over the past 2 years?

Why won't the FAA look at the "results" of the massive expansion project done at MIA and the fact that passenger usage and increased air traffic has not happened and that Miami is now stuck with the "huge" burden of this "ill-planned and ill-timed" non-functional white elephant? This is to say nothing of the fact that should air travel increase in the future that passenger could fly into MIA and be in Broward County in 45 minutes or less.

Why is it that the FAA does not even mention in the final EIS the recent reduction in operations of the airport "announced" by American Airlines, United Airlines, and Spirit Airlines? Even they indicate that the expansion may not be necessary because of decreased demand. Could these airlines and the people that run them not know what they are talking about?

Operations at the airport declined by 5.3% for air carrier enplanements and 10.7% for commuter enplanements is 2006, but the FAA still predicts that operations of the airport will increase through 2020. Even if operations increased dramatically tomorrow, it would take several years to make up the losses already realized by the airlines. We are going into 2009 which means that almost ⅓ of the projection period is already over. If the remaining 10 years of your projection were showing an increase – as you predicted – (which is highly unlikely) it still would not be enough to gain back the already suffered losses and justify this expansion project!

Why did the FAA eliminate various alternatives because they will encroach on I-95 and the CSX Railroad but did not eliminate alternatives that encroach on US 1 or the FEC Railroad? Could it be that those entities "don't count"?

Why have you not used a more recent impact study for your research? Using one from 2002 does not make any sense.

Has the FAA intentionally not factored in the project cost of the acquisition of the homes in the flight path. The majority of the homes are on the water with ocean access. Could it be that their intention with the help of the condemnation process is to pay 10 cents on the dollar for these homes – soundproof them and then resell them at market value to help finance this project?

Has anyone from the FAA not seen or heard that John U. Lloyd State Park has been cited as one of the top 4 most unique and scenic parks in our entire country and featured on Good Morning America? On July 17, 2008 Congressman Ron Klein boasted on the floor of Congress about the park noting it as a "National Treasure". Is there no concern for the effect and devastation that this expansion would cost that park?

It is the opinion of this citizen/voter that this expansion project be at the least postponed and at best cancelled. At least get all the current facts and analysis before plunging forward with a billion dollar project that would devastate the South Florida area and is clearly favored by the minority and not the majority.

Sincerely,

Robert Vagi

Robert Vagi

July 27, 2008

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

Dear Ms. Lane,

We, the undersigned, would like to enter our comments into the public record in reference to the proposed runway expansion at Fort Lauderdale International Airport, FL. While we have many objections above and beyond the following, we confine our objections in this letter to those of a predominantly safety of flight and operational issues.

All of us are commercial pilots with either major Part 121 air carriers or freight operators. We have, between us, scores of years of flying experience and tens of thousands of flight hours.

We find many critical flaws in the proposed B1b/c design which, when taken in total, leave us with the opinion that this runway design should be strenuously opposed on the basis of its overall reduction in safety margin.

The proposal plans call for the new runway 9R to be the primary departure runway with runway 9L as the primary landing runway. This, contrary to normal operation and logic, results in aircraft using the shortest, uphill runway when the aircraft is heaviest (takeoff) and using the longest, level runway when lightest, upon landing. This also results in the largest noise contour (takeoff) being over an environmentally sensitive area -- John Lloyd Park.

The uphill design of the proposed runway 9R requires a performance penalty for an aircraft taking off on that runway. This means that the proposed 8,600' runway has an effective length of 7,500' - 8,000', a length that could nearly be accomplished on the existing field without elevating the runway.

The elevated east end of the proposed runway 9R would be surrounded on three sides by Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) walls. These are sheer walls that would be catastrophic if an aircraft were to depart the runway, either to the side or on the east end, or if an aircraft approaching 27L were to land short.

Having a freight railroad running under the runway is unprecedented in the United States, and possibly in the world. This, combined with a multi-lane highway, means that the proposed runway is continuously exposed to whatever hazardous cargo is being transported beneath. The ease with which possible terrorists would have access to the underpasses is also a major concern.

Finally, and by no means the least of our concerns, the proposed runway design creates numerous unprecedented difficulties in the event of an aircraft accident or evacuation when the aircraft comes to rest on the eastern half of the proposed runway. The single entry point at the west end translates to an additional one and one half mile drive for the fire and rescue equipment, costing precious minutes.

An aircraft that stops off of the center line in the vicinity of the bridge design has potentially rendered one half of their emergency exits unusable lest the passengers slide over the edge of the bridge and onto the railroad or highway below. Similarly, emergency vehicles would be restricted in their approach to the side of the aircraft closest to the runway edge line.

Passengers assembling away from the disabled aircraft would be blocked from escape from the accident scene by the aircraft and firefighting equipment on one side and the edge of the railroad or highway bridge on the other, effectively trapping them. Jet A from ruptured fuel tanks would flow down the sloped runway and prevent fire fighting apparatus from gaining access to the crash site.

For these safety/operational reasons, in addition to the many other environmental and fiscal reasons of which you are well aware, we request that the FAA reject this ill-advised and inherently flawed runway design.

Sincerely yours,

Gary R. Hecker, B-737 First Officer, 641 SW 6th Ave, Ft Lauderdale, FL 33315

Kenneth Culver, B-737 First Officer, 900 Nature's Cove Rd, Dania Beach, FL 33004

facsimile transmittal

To: VIRGINIA LANE Fax: 407-812-6978

From: Mike McKeever Date: Monday. July 28, 2008

Re: Pages: 2 INCL COVER

CC:

Urgent For Review Please Comment Please Reply Please Recycle

Notes:

Mike McKeever, 705 NW 7th Street, Dania, FL 33004 Phone: 954-923-9464 Fax: 302-347-6294

F-LC081

Mike McKeever
705 NW 7th Street
Dania Beach, FL 33004

July 28, 2008

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

Dear Ms Lane,

I am writing in opposition to the proposed runway expansion at Fort Lauderdale / Hollywood International Airport, Florida. As I have stated both publicly and in writing during the Draft EIS phase, this runway design has bothered me from the very beginning.

Well, I finally realized why this particular design bothers me so much as a professional major airline Captain. Yes, there are runways that cross over roadways, and there are runways with sheer wall embankments on one or more sides and, of course, there are runways with a slope. There are no runways I have ever seen that cross a freight railroad, nor have I ever used a runway that could only be accessed from one end.

P4.4

However, I can say with complete assurance that never have all these design flaws been brought together so elegantly in one runway! This is kind of like taking an aircraft with too many deferred maintenance items. Each item individually is no big deal, but all taken together are setting up a scenario that would make "Murphy" proud.

Each and every deviation from an ideal runway strips away a margin of safety when using that runway. It is my belief that too many of these margins are missing in this design.

P4.4
RLC 109.3

Sincerely yours,

Mike McKeever

F-LC081

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

Dear Ms. Lane:

I am in the hotel business in Fort Lauderdale and have been in this town for 30 years. I am amazed that the process of getting the second runway has taken so long when we all know that Fort Lauderdale has needed this for many years. I understand the process and that it is complicated.

However the time has come that we move forward and build the second runway under alternative B1b. We can not continue to have the backups at the airport which are not only disrupting traffic in South Florida but also up and down the east coast. The delays in landing and take-offs are not only bad for business but cause more environmental damage because of the waste of fuel and time.

Broward County has continued, amazingly at times, to run a great airport. It is cheap, efficient and easy. I realize that the costs will be going up as a result of the construction and mitigation but we will still be very competitive.

I support this alternative and ask that we move on the process which is over 10 years behind. } ROD 19.0

Sincerely,

Christopher Pollock
Vice President
IAG Realty/Watermark Management Group
1850 SE 17th St. Suite 108
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

F-LC082

TOTAL P.01

GREAT AMERICAN FARMS, INC.

Alan J. Levy
President
Great American Farms, Inc.
11 S.W. 15th Street
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33315
Telephone: 954-761-9777
Fax: 954-761-7769
ajl75@bellsouth.net

Fax

To: Virginia Lane From: Alan Levy
Fax: 407-812-6978 Date: 7-25-08
Pages (w/cover): 2
Re: FINAL EIS + Runway Alternative B1b

Comments

F-LC083

GREAT AMERICAN FARMS

11 S.W. 15th Street
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33315
Phone 954-761-9777
Fax 954-761-7769
ajl75@bellsouth.net

July 25, 2008

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

Dear. Ms. Lane:

I strongly support the findings of the FAA for Airport Runway Expansion Alternative B1b for the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport.

Broward County residents depend on the airport for travel, jobs and a strong economy. This second major runway will greatly strengthen our financial future.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Alan J. Levy

ROD 19,0

F-LC083

Jul 25 08 11:34a Alan Levy 954-761-7769 p.2

July 28, 2008

Ms. Virginia Lane

FAA Orlando Airports District Office

5950 Hazeltine National Drive

Orlando, Florida 32822-5024

RE: FEIS- FLL SOUTH RUNWAY EXTENSION

Dear Ms. Lane,

We are residents of Melaleuca Gardens just south of the FLL Airport, We ask you to please take a few minutes to see the importance to us and all residents in this community about the south runway Extension.

1) Is it necessary to a 8000 Foot Runway-East Over the Railroad, over US1 and 12 acres of wetlands that will be destroyed, Is it necessary of an escalated 8000 Foot Runway starting on the west at 9 Feet above grade level rising to over 45 Feet East over Railroad and over US 1 **HOW SAFE WILL THIS BE?**

A: LC109.3

2)John U Lloyd Beach State Park- our State Park Which was recently shown on ABC'S Good Morning America on July 13, 2008 one of the four finalist in their search for the best National Park of the Month.

P8.58

3) Is it necessary to spent billions of dollars? On this project, which needless to say several Airlines have already cut back on flights at FLL and what about Airlines that have file for bankruptcy and the one that will in the future.

P16.2, ROD 3.10

4) What about us the residents? OUR QUALITY OF LIFE.

P6.1

We appreciate very much the time you will take in going over these key points for the Environmental Impact on FLL EXPANSION.

Sincerely,

Roberto & Blanca Mila

914 Nautilus Isle

Dania Beach, FL 33004

F-LC084