Appendix D

FINAL EIS – ADDENDUM DOCUMENTS

This appendix contains information that has been identified as having been inadvertently omitted from the Final EIS. The following is the list of information included in this appendix:

- **Glossary** – terms omitted from the Glossary

- **Chapter Six, Environmental Consequences, Section 6.K, Summary Of Alternatives Including Potential Environmental Impacts And Benefits** – Table 6.K.1 was omitted from the Final EIS during the printing process: Table 6.K.1, Summary of Alternatives Including Potential Environmental Impacts and Benefit

- **Appendix C FAA/Airport Sponsor’s Correspondence**
  Nine documents were listed in Appendix C.1 Airport Sponsor’s Correspondence, however, five documents were omitted from the Final EIS during the printing process. These five documents are provided in this appendix as Appendix D.1
ADDENDUM TO THE GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Avigation Easement - The legal right of one party to use part of the rights of a piece of real estate belonging to another party. This may include, but is not limited to the right of passage over, on, or below the property; certain air rights above the property, including view rights; and the rights to any specified form of development or activity. An avigation easement (covenant) runs with the land and all future owners learn of the easement when they buy the property.

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan - A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) documents procedures for FLL to eliminate or reduce pollution of stormwater runoff. A SWPPP has been prepared for FLL in accordance with the requirements set forth in the Federal Register Notice entitled Final Re-issuance of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Multi-Sector General Permit (MSGP) for Industrial Activity Volume 65, Number 210, dated October 30, 2000.

Throughput - Hourly runway throughput means the maximum number of aircraft that can land and depart at an airport or runway system during a period of one hour.
Table 6.K.1
SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BENEFIT
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFITS/COSTS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B1b</th>
<th>B1c</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Hourly Capacity Estimate</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Airfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Weather Average Includes East Flow/West Flow and VFR/IFR conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Hourly Capacity Estimate</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Airfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Weather Average Includes East Flow/West Flow and VFR/IFR conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012: Average Minutes of Delay Per Operation</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012: Benefit Over No Action</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020: Average Minutes of Delay Per Operation</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020: Benefit Over No Action</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COSTS (Estimates in 2007 Dollars):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 637,680,200</td>
<td>$ 641,098,000</td>
<td>$ 485,191,000</td>
<td>$ 1,376,948,800</td>
<td>$ 749,687,200</td>
<td>$ 607,855,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfield Design</td>
<td>$ 67,714,300</td>
<td>$ 67,714,200</td>
<td>$ 55,059,100</td>
<td>$ 137,694,800</td>
<td>$ 74,186,400</td>
<td>$ 68,070,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisitions &amp; Facility Relocations</td>
<td>$ 101,337,700</td>
<td>$ 101,337,700</td>
<td>$ 37,389,600</td>
<td>$ 383,217,700</td>
<td>$ 473,361,400</td>
<td>$ 419,639,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs:</strong></td>
<td>$ 806,732,200</td>
<td>$ 810,149,900</td>
<td>$ 576,139,700</td>
<td>$ 1,297,235,000</td>
<td>$ 1,297,235,000</td>
<td>$ 1,095,565,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BENEFIT/COST RATIO</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation period: 2007 - 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation period: 2007 - 2030</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIRPORT NOISE IMPACTS WITHIN 65+DNL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012:
- Residential Dwelling Units | 13 | 632 | 652 | 118 | 372 | 840 | 28 | N/A |
- Population (# of persons) | 33 | 1,538 | 1,592 | 1,285 | 973 | 1,928 | 71 | N/A |
- Noise Sensitive Facilities | No Impact | No Impact | No Impact | No Impact | No Impact | No Impact | No Impact | N/A |
- Area of 65 DNL in Square Miles | 5.0 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 4.9 | N/A |

2020:
- Residential Dwelling Units | 696 | 1,046 | 1,051 | 1,051 | 477 | 1,250 | 285 | 801 |
- Population (# of persons) | 1,772 | 2,447 | 2,472 | 2,472 | 1,492 | 4,235 | 717 | 1,926 |
- Noise-Sensitive Facilities | No Impact | No Impact | No Impact | No Impact | No Impact | No Impact | No Impact | N/A |
- Area of 65 DNL in Square Miles | 6.0 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 5.5 | 6.3 |

**COMPATIBLE LAND USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td>No Direct Impact</td>
<td>No Land Use/Zoning Changes</td>
<td>No Land Use/Zoning Changes</td>
<td>No Land Use/Zoning Changes</td>
<td>No Land Use/Zoning Changes</td>
<td>No Land Use/Zoning Changes</td>
<td>No Land Use/Zoning Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Uses</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012:
- Acquire all or part of the Hilton Hotel and the Dania Boat Sales | 13 | 632 | 652 | 118 | 372 | 840 | 28 | N/A |
- No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes |

Partial acquisition of the Dania Boat Sales warehouse may be necessary
- No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes |

2020:
- Acquire all of the Hilton Hotel and the Dania Boat Sales | 696 | 1,046 | 1,051 | 1,051 | 477 | 1,250 | 285 | 801 |
- No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes |

Partial acquisition of the Dania Boat Sales warehouse may be necessary
- No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes | No Land Use/Zoning Changes |
Table 6.K.1
SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BENEFIT
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B1b</th>
<th>B1c</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical, Architectural, Archeological, &amp; Cultural Resources</td>
<td>No Affect</td>
<td>No Affect</td>
<td>No Affect</td>
<td>No Affect</td>
<td>No Affect</td>
<td>No Affect</td>
<td>No Affect</td>
<td>No Affect</td>
<td>No Affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4f Properties (Recodified as 303c) and Section 6(f) L&amp;WCF Act</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Direct Impact to 15.17 acres</td>
<td>Direct Impact to 15.41 acres</td>
<td>Direct Impact to 15.41 acres</td>
<td>Direct Impact to 0.13 acres</td>
<td>Direct Impact to 21.67 acres</td>
<td>Direct Impact to 15.40 acres</td>
<td>Direct Impact to 21.67 acres</td>
<td>Direct Impact to 15.54 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Resources</td>
<td>Consistent with FCMP 14</td>
<td>Consistent with FCMP 14</td>
<td>Consistent with FCMP 14</td>
<td>Consistent with FCMP 14</td>
<td>Consistent with FCMP 14</td>
<td>Consistent with FCMP 14</td>
<td>Consistent with FCMP 14</td>
<td>Consistent with FCMP 14</td>
<td>Consistent with FCMP 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish, Wildlife, &amp; Plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federally Listed Species &amp; Critical Habitats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indian Manatee</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Stork</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smalltooth Sawfish</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
<td>May affect, but not likely to adversely affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson’s Seagrass</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Surveys for Florida Burrowing Owl would be conducted prior to initiating construction</td>
<td>Surveys for Florida Burrowing Owl would be conducted prior to initiating construction</td>
<td>Surveys for Florida Burrowing Owl would be conducted prior to initiating construction</td>
<td>Surveys for Florida Burrowing Owl would be conducted prior to initiating construction</td>
<td>Surveys for Florida Burrowing Owl would be conducted prior to initiating construction</td>
<td>Surveys for Florida Burrowing Owl would be conducted prior to initiating construction</td>
<td>Surveys for Florida Burrowing Owl would be conducted prior to initiating construction</td>
<td>Surveys for Florida Burrowing Owl would be conducted prior to initiating construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Listed Species</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>No Significant Increase</td>
<td>No Significant Increase</td>
<td>No Significant Increase</td>
<td>No Significant Increase</td>
<td>No Significant Increase</td>
<td>No Significant Increase</td>
<td>No Significant Increase</td>
<td>No Significant Increase</td>
<td>No Significant Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impact: Final Demand Employment Associated with Construction Spending for All Industries in Region</td>
<td>Not applicable due to no construction activity</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources and Energy</td>
<td>No Adverse Affect</td>
<td>No Adverse Affect</td>
<td>No Adverse Affect</td>
<td>No Adverse Affect</td>
<td>No Adverse Affect</td>
<td>No Adverse Affect</td>
<td>No Adverse Affect</td>
<td>No Adverse Affect</td>
<td>No Adverse Affect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.K.1
SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BENEFIT
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport

FOOTNOTES
1/ Maximum capacity presents a condition of balanced arrival and departure demand, arrival peak, and departure peak. By comparison, practical capacity takes into consideration actual demand able to use available runways according to the aircraft types and runway length characteristics of each alternative. The practical capacity is lower than the maximum capacity for those alternatives that have shorter runways.
2/ VFR: Visual Flight Rules - Rules and procedures specified in Federal Aviation Regulations Part 91 for aircraft operations under visual conditions (i.e. “good” weather).
3/ Average minutes of delay per operation was computed using a queue modeling methodology. Demand, defined in terms of counts of arrivals and departures in five-minute intervals, was modeled against the estimated capacity of each alternative in good (VFR), and poor (IFR) weather conditions. Both east and west operating flows were analyzed.
4/ Benefit over No-Action was computed by subtracting each alternative’s delay from the delay resulting from the No Action Alternative.
5/ Alternatives D1 and D2 would not be fully operational by 2012. In 2012 the noise impacts for Alternative D1 would be the same as Alternative B1b; and for Alternative D2 the noise impacts would be the same as Alternative B4.
6/ The estimated land acquisition includes the full acquisition of the Hilton (former Wyndham) Hotel and the Dania Boat Sales. It does not consider the potential acquisition of the marina.
7/ This analysis quantifies the annual costs and benefits of each alternative through the year 2030. The net present value of costs and benefits was calculated and is expressed in 2007 dollars. Net present value of benefits divided by the net present value of costs yields a benefit/cost ratio that can be used to compare the relative benefit of each alternative. A ratio greater than one (1.0) indicates that the benefits yielded by the project outweigh the costs of developing the project. A ratio of 2.0, for example, indicates that the benefits are twice as large as the costs. The higher the ratio, the greater the benefits provided by the project.
8/ Ratio for 2006 - 2020 evaluation period indicates the project’s ability to provide a positive return on investment over a shorter period of time (from the end of construction to 2020) while the 2030 ratio (evaluation period of 2006 - 2030) represents the benefits accrued over the life of the project (from the end of construction to 2030). These ratios provide a comparison of projects that differ significantly in terms of cost, time to be fully implemented, benefits in the near term, and ability to deliver benefits in the long term.
9/ NAAQS: National Ambient Air Quality Standards, established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
10/ Includes single-family homes, multi-family units, and mobile homes.
11/ Includes schools, churches, nursing homes, and libraries.
12/ For the 2012 scenario, Alternatives B1b and B1c (the Airport Sponsor’s Proposed Project) represent the same condition with the exception that Alternative B1c includes implementation of Broward County Aviation Department’s existing voluntary noise abatement program. All other alternatives represent unabated operating conditions. By 2020, the County’s existing voluntary noise abatement program would no longer be in effect. The FAA’s proposal could include operational abatement measures.
13/ For Land Use Compatibility, the runway development alternatives were examined.
14/ FCMP: Florida Coastal Management Program

Source: Landrum & Brown, 2008
APPENDIX D.1
DOCUMENTS OMITTED FROM FINAL EIS – APPENDIX C

Appendix C (FAA/Airport Sponsor’s Correspondence) of the Final EIS stated that copies of the following nine documents were included in Appendix C. Five documents were inadvertently omitted from the printing of the Final EIS. Those five documents are identified below and are provided in this appendix.

The list below contains the names of the nine documents originally listed in Appendix C of the Final EIS:

- **Broward County letter to FAA dated December 12, 2003**  
  (From Tom Jargiello, Director of Aviation to Dean Stringer, FAA Orlando Airports District Office)

- **Broward County letter to FAA dated November 1, 2004**  
  (From Tom Jargiello, Director of Aviation to Dean Stringer, FAA Orlando Airports District Office)

- **August 7, 2006 letter from Virginia Lane, FAA Orlando Airports District Office**  
  To: Tom Jargiello, Director of Aviation  
  Re: Environmental Impact Statement Fort Lauderdale Hollywood International Airport, FAA EIS Noise Modeling Assumptions for the Sponsor’s Proposed Project

- **August 22, 2006 letter from Mr. Tom Jargiello, Director of Aviation**  
  To: Virginia Lane, FAA Orlando Airports District Office

- **Leigh Fisher Associates Memo Revised August 24, 2006**

- **Broward County letters to FAA**
  - Broward County Mayor Eggelletion dated August 10, 2007, 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 Airports 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)
The five documents inadvertently omitted from the printing of the Final EIS are listed below and copies of these documents are provided in this appendix.

- **Broward County letter to FAA dated December 12, 2003**
  FROM: Tom Jargiello, Director of Aviation
  TO: Dean Stringer, FAA Orlando Airports District Office
  RE: Broward County Board of County Commissioners’ decision on December 9, 2003 regarding the runway alternatives at Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport

- **Broward County letter to FAA dated August 10, 2007**
  FROM: Josephus Eggleston, Mayor, Broward County, Florida
  TO: Bart Vernace, Assistant Manager, FAA Orlando Airports District Office
  RE: Broward County (Sponsor) Preferred Runway Alternative

- **Broward County letter to FAA dated November 9, 2007**
  FROM: Kent George, Director of Aviation
  TO: Virginia Lane, FAA Orlando Airports District Office
  RE: Broward County Proposed Noise Mitigation Principles

- **Broward County letter to FAA dated December 4, 2007**
  FROM: Marc Gambrill, P.E., Acting Director, Planning and Development Aviation, Broward County Aviation Department
  TO: Virginia Lane, FAA Orlando Airports District Office
  RE: Use of Wetland Mitigation Credits at West Lake Park

- **Broward County letter to FAA dated December 7, 2007**
  FROM: Kent George, Director of Aviation
  TO: Dean Stringer, FAA Orlando Airports District Office
  RE: Alternative D2 and Broward County’s comments on the tenant relocation, future tenant expansion capabilities, and future aviation development growth
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  TO: Virginia Lane, FAA Orlando Airports District Office
  RE: Use of Wetland Mitigation Credits at West Lake Park

- **Broward County letter to FAA dated December 7, 2007**
  FROM: Kent George, Director of Aviation
  TO: Dean Stringer, FAA Orlando Airports District Office
  RE: Alternative D2 and Broward County’s comments on the tenant relocation, future tenant expansion capabilities, and future aviation development growth
August 10, 2007

Mr. Bart Vernace, Assistant Manager
Orlando Airports District Office, FAA
5950 Hazeltine National Drive, Suite 400
Orlando, Florida 32822

Re: Broward County (Sponsor) Preferred Runway Alternative

Dear Mr. Vernace:

Please allow this letter to serve as official notification of Broward County's preferred runway alternative. On December 9, 2003, the Board of County Commissioners formally designated what is essentially Alternative B1C in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement as its preferred runway alternative noting the modification which uses Engineered Material Arrester Systems (EMAS) to reduce the 1000' safety clearance zone.

On June 5, 2007, the Board of County Commissioners ratified the B1C Alternative as its preferred runway alternative. The vote for this alternative was six to three. For your information, there was only one other alternative that received any interest, Alternative D2, and it failed two to seven.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 954-357-7009.

Sincerely,

Josephus Eggellion, Mayor
Broward County, Florida

Cc: Board of County Commissioners (e-copy)
Pam Byangacco, County Administrator (e-copy)
Bertha Henry, Deputy County Administrator (e-copy)
Walt Houghton, Interim Aviation Director (e-copy)
Mark Perryman, Landrum and Brown (e-copy)
SPECIAL PUBLIC HEARING OF DECEMBER 9, 2003

Motion 1. Approved 7 - 2.

Approved a modified south runway expansion which stays within the confines of Northeast 7th Avenue using value-added engineering to arrive at the most effective runway length with use restrictions. This alternative is to be developed consistent with the following guidelines:

A. Continue with the Environmental Impact Statement process to include flight tracking along i 595 and other restrictions including other towers.

B. Commence a process to engage a qualified firm to complete preliminary engineering, including evaluation of alternatives, designed to maximize the utility and acceptability of the runway alternative selected.

C. Work with the Federal Aviation Administration through the EIS process to provide a detailed, enforceable program that ensures the runway will be operated in a fashion that improves upon the noise mitigation benefits already incorporated in the County's various Interlocal Agreements and Development Orders.

D. Amend the Airport Layout Plan to reflect the runway alternative selected and to add "no runway alternatives should expand east beyond NE 7th Avenue."

E. Provide for noise mitigation in excess of minimum requirements.

F. Utilize airport funds and PFC's for advanced noise mitigation.

G. Evaluate options for shortening Runway 13-31, such that the results of this work can be included in the Environmental Impact Statement, if appropriate.

H. Develop new options for review by the Board of County Commissioners that would foster land use compatibility between Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport and surrounding communities so that the County's policies will be included in mitigation proposals in the Environmental Impact Statement. Additionally, staff was directed to work with the cities to ensure land use compatibility for residential development.

1. Prepare a financial plan for review by the Board of County Commissioners that would expeditiously establish a Noise Mitigation Bank. Also staff was directed to contact the airlines and air traffic controllers to fund noise mitigation in the 60 to 65 DNL. Research the feasibility of the County building affordable replacement housing and funding same.

J. Develop conceptual plans for noise abatement flight tracks for arriving and departing aircraft to be reviewed by the Board of County Commissioners and discussed with the Federal Aviation Administration.

K. Commence a process to engage a qualified appraisal firm to evaluate acquisition of properties in the runway protection zone.

L. Commence the process of updating the Airport Master Plan to include concepts that decommission the crossed runway, and define a framework for managing aircraft operational demand and growth through planned facility development. Additionally, staff shall examine mechanisms for limiting future arrival through infrastructure development, the number and location of gates and other means, including the review of the eastside land use Master Plan. Further, the Board directed staff to evaluate a North Parallel runway, while preferring the South runway.

Motion 2. Approved 5 - 4

A. Follow a competitive bid process for the implementation of a Green Airport Initiative.
November 9, 2007

Ms. Virginia Lane
Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) - Orlando District Office
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Orlando, FL 32822-5024

Re: Broward County Proposed Noise Mitigation Principles

Ms. Lane:

Pursuant to the FAA's request, this letter represents the Broward County Aviation Department's (BCAD) submission of the Noise Mitigation Principles that are proposed for inclusion in the FAA's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision (ROD) associated with development and extension of the preferred runway alternative and other associated projects at the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport (FLL). Below is an outline of the seven (7) noise mitigation principles the County is recommending to be considered by the FAA regarding existing and forecasted conditions for FLL.

1. **Apply the long-term/ultimate unrestrained contour** - Apply mitigation principles and identify mitigation eligibility areas using the long-term/ultimate unrestrained contour of the Runway Alternative approved in the ROD.

2. **Establish mitigation areas based on neighborhoods** - Utilize the contours of the approved project, establish areas eligible for mitigation with the objective of keeping neighborhoods intact by incorporating natural boundaries and neighborhood blocks.

3. **Voluntary acquisition of mobile home parks in the +65 DNL** - Relocate of residents and acquisition of the mobile home park/business. Convert the property to a compatible use. In accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, provide relocation assistance for residents to either County developed affordable housing or other locations. Future use of the acquired property would be controlled by recorded restrictive covenants.

4. **Sound proofing and easement** - Soundproofing offered to all eligible single- and multi-family units; in addition compensation for outdoor impacts will be offered above Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions at a valuation that will be determined at implementation of the program.

5. **Purchase assurance / sales guarantee** - For those that decline soundproofing, implement a purchase assurance program to acquire the property at Fair Market Value. Future use of the acquired property would be controlled by recorded restrictive covenants.

6. **Voluntary acquisition of existing residentially zoned vacant parcels** - Voluntarily acquire existing residentially-zoned, vacant parcels at Fair Market Value and coordinate with the local communities to change the zoning and land use plan to compatible use. Future use of the acquired property would be controlled by recorded restrictive covenants.

7. **Provide noise mitigation in excess of minimum federal guidelines.**
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Please feel free to contact BCAD staff with any questions or concerns regarding this matter at (954) 359-6181.

Sincerely,

Kurt George
Director of Aviation

cc: Bertha Henry, Interim County Administrator
Zach Williams, Assistant County Administrator
Dick Brosward, Assistant County Administrator
Debbie Bowers, Assistant to the County Administrator
Yasmi Gofin, Assistant County Attorney
Doug Webster, Assistant to the Department Director, Aviation Department
Marc Gambrill, Acting Director of Planning & Development, Aviation Department
December 4, 2007

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

RE: Use of Wetland Mitigation Credits at West Lake Park for Airport
Sponsors Proposed Project at Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport
Broward County, Florida

Dear Ms. Lane:

In response to your letter request dated October 18, 2007, Broward County acknowledges that mitigation may be required to offset wetland impacts resulting from runway development at FLL. Broward County may offset these impacts as appropriate by encumbering existing mitigation credits previously developed by Broward County at existing mitigation sites, by performing on-site mitigation if necessary, and by using mitigation credits identified in the United States Army Corps of Engineers Permit No. SAJ-2002-00072 (IP-LACO) and the South Florida Water Management District Individual Resource Permit No. 06-04016-F issued for West Lake Park.

Should you require additional information do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully,

Marc Gambrill, P.E.
Acting Director, Planning and Development Aviation

cc: Kent George, Director Aviation
Debbie Bowers, Assistant to County Administrator
Barbara Hill, Assistant County Attorney
File

December 7, 2007

Mr. Dean Stringer
Manager, Orlando Airports District Office
Federal Aviation Administration
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Suite 400
Orlando, FL 32822

Dear Mr. Stringer:

I would like to take this opportunity to address various comments made by and correspondence written by the Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport (FLL) Air Traffic Control Tower Manager Robert Berlucchi concerning the Sponsor's Preferred Alternative, the B1c Alternative, for a new runway at FLL. Mr. Berlucchi favors the D2 Alternative, which we believe is far inferior to the B1c Alternative, which will result in an increase in capacity and a reduction in aircraft delays.

The Broward County Aviation Department (BCAD) feels that there is additional information to supplement the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on the D2 Alternative that needs to be considered by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in light of Mr. Berlucchi's observations. We have concluded that the D2 Alternative will result in significant and costly tenant relocation, loss of any future tenant expansion capabilities, complete elimination of any future runway development growth and, when completed in its entirety, create an unbalanced airfield vs. terminal/landside situation. Supportive information follows:

In the DEIS, we feel the land deficiency in the D2 Alternative is understated. The attached D2 Alternative, Exhibit 1, analysis indicates there will be a deficiency of 42.14 acres of land on FLL to relocate the current tenants on the North side to other locations on the airport, which would necessitate utilizing all of the area on the West side. Additionally, if the land that would be available under the Sponsor's Preferred Alternative, the B1c, is analyzed, see Exhibit 2, approximately 147.57 new acres of land would become available for future tenant expansion and new opportunities (Exhibit 3 shows Existing Conditions and is included for informational purposes).
Therefore, if the D2 Alternative was pursued, a loss of approximately 189.71 acres would be realized, not the 42.14 acres estimated in the DEIS.

Following that analysis, the replacement facilities, infrastructure development and tenant relocation costs are estimated to total $550.4 million, as delineated below:

- Based on the current 1,428 million square feet of facilities on the North side; vertical construction costs of $290/SF in Broward County; estimated replacement construction cost for aprons, taxiways, parking, and other infrastructure, the costs to reconstruct facilities for the current tenants would be $520 million.
- Required adjoining physical infrastructure costs, including improvements to Lee Wagener, Perimeter Road and Ravenswood Road; widening of S.W. 42 Street; tunnel construction for cargo facilities; and Perimeter Road reconfiguration, result in an estimated infrastructure cost totaling approximately $24 million.
- For construction of facilities and infrastructure, 25% is added for design and construction administration, estimated at $136 million.
- Total tenant relocation costs of $6.4 million were based on a "move cost" factor for each business based on the nature of the business operations.

With the loss of approximately 189.71 acres, FLL will realize economic opportunity losses estimated at $1.3 billion direct impact and $1.72 billion indirect impact calculated below (using a 4.5% discount factor with 2% yearly inflation factor over the standard airport lease period of 20 years):

- Broward County Office of Economic Development (OED) provided an analysis of the economic benefit of the current North side tenants, resulting in $58 million direct and $82 million indirect annual benefits.
- Based on the current 139 acres occupied by tenants on the North side and using the benefits derived by OED, results in a direct and indirect per acre benefit respectively, of $417,000 and $590,000 on an annual basis.
- Applying the direct and indirect per acre figures above to the 189.71 acres loss under the D2 Alternative, results in a $76.1 million direct and $111.9 million indirect net economic benefit loss annually.

In addition to the economic impact to the region, FLL has calculated lost revenue opportunity in the form of ground rent, landing fees and fuel flowage fees totaling approximately $7 million annually.

In closing, the resultant net present value lost benefit impact over a 20 year period, both direct and indirect, equates to a conservative amount of $3.02 billion, plus $550.4 million of infrastructure costs if the D2 Alternative is chosen.

Please feel free to contact me if there should be any questions. Thank you in advance for your consideration of this information.

Sincerely,

Kara D. George, A.A.E.
Director of Aviation

KGG/ml

Attachments

cc: Bertha Henry, Interim County Administrator
    Dick Brossard, Assistant County Administrator
    Debbie Bowers, Assistant to the County Administrator
    Mark Perryman, Landrum & Brown
    Bart Vernace, Federal Aviation Administration