

JUL 23/ 2008 / WED 09:30 AM

FAX No.

P. 001/001

DAVID W. HORVITZ
LAS OLAS CITY CENTRE
401 EAST LAS OLAS BOULEVARD
SUITE 2200
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA 33301
TELEPHONE (954) 523-7771
FAX (954) 523-9594

BY FAX

407-812-6978

July 23, 2008

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

Re: FLL expansion

Dear Ms. Lane,

The expansion recommended by the FAA to FLL is smart and important to both the life-style of South Florida's population and its economy. It solves numerous problems. Whether by professionalism or by political machinations, the results of this interminable process is the right one. As a frequent private flyer and airline victim, I applaud your decision.

Sincerely,

David W. Horvitz
David W. Horvitz

POD 19.0

FROM: A

FAX NO.:

JUL 22 2008 01:40PM FL

July 22/08

MS. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando airports district office
5950 Hazelton National Dr. Suite 400
Orlando FL 32822-5024

RE: FEIS - FLL South Runway.

Dear MS Lane.

My name is Gilles pt amand
I reside at 4532 S.W. 25 AV.
FT lauderdale (Just west of airport)
for more than 15 years; and we
(my neighbors agreed) have been in
a state of limbo with the airport
expansion, it is time to move on

The county needs the airport
expansion, it will bring new jobs

F-LC131

F-LC132

- 2 -

With The construction of airport runway, soundproofing houses and thousands of related jobs with Tourism etc... It is a win win situation. The new proposal for compensation for home owners is fair and equitable

Please Ms Lane don't let a few people of an owner association speak for all of us. We are ready for the extension, it will be great for the economy and future of Broward county.

Gillespie & Arnold
4532 SW 25 AV
FT LAUDERDALE FL 33312
714-1007-1057

1090

Ms. Virginia Lane
FAA Orlando Airports District Office
5950 Hazelcine National Drive
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024
FAX 407 812 6978
Regarding: FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

HAVING LOOKED AT THE STATS IN THE ECONOMIC STUDY AND THE PROJECTED USE OF THE AIRPORT THE NUMBERS ARE PROTECTIOUS OF THE AISC! THE AIRLINES IN TODAY'S ECONOMY ARE DIFFERENT, LIKE THE AUTO MANUFACTURERS IN THIS COUNTRY THEY ARE IN FINANCIAL TROUBLE. THE ROADS AND MAJOR HIGHWAYS DRIVEN HERE NEED ATTENTION AND MORE TRAFFIC CREATED BY MORE TOURIST OR OVER POPULATION. THE EXPANSION OF SOUTH RUNWAY AT FT LAUDERDALE, IS HARMFUL TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND DISPLACING PEOPLE FROM THEIR HOMES. STEP BACK, LOOK AGAIN LETS NOT RUIN OUR STATE PARKS AND BEACHES.

ROD
1200
P 830
P U-T
P U-S

CHRIS BARILE
W. 121 SE 1ST AVE
DANIA BEACH FL
33004

H. 5099 SW 28 AVE
DANIA BEACH, FL 33312

I'm writing regarding the FAA's FEIS. I can understand a need to expand the airport but not in such a dramatic way. Recently 4 airlines pulled all of their flights out of Ft. Lauderdale. So many of the news reports say that the airlines are cutting the number of flights dramatically due to high fuel costs. Many of the airlines will fold or consolidate, cutting the number of flights available. With this occurring I don't see the need to dramatically expand the airport. I still say two parallel North parallel runways will be sufficient. The money that will be spent is incredible. It's said that it will be paid by the patrons on the planes. Again with fuel cost the number of travelers is going down dramatically. We all know that oil won't fall much leaving gas prices high and leaving all of these scenarios in tact going forward. If the North runways are used the noise mitigation wont be as dramatic as it would be if the South runway is used. It just doesn't add up to me, especially since the runway has to go over the railroad tracks which will be astronomical in costs.

ROD 370
P 6.4
P 6.5


Louis C. Serra
8250 NW 15th Ct.
Pembroke Pines, FL. 33024

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

I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed the runway expansion at the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood airport. ROD 20.0

Inn today's economic climate it would seem to be more appropriate to step back and see where the economy goes instead of displacing people and spending money. Further the decrease in airport traffic must be recognized and evaluated.

Sincerely


Stanley Margulies, MD
324 SW 51 St.
Hollywood, FL 33312

Felicia Hickey
830 NW 8th Avenue
Dania Beach, Florida 33004
feliciah@bellsouth.net

VIA FAX: (407) 812-6978

July 28, 2008

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

Re: FEIS and the FLL Airport Expansion

Dear Ms. Lane

I am a resident of Melaleuca Gardens in the City of Dania Beach, which as you know is the residential neighborhood directly to the South of FLL. I am writing to express my opinion and concern regarding the way Broward County and the FAA are going about the possible runway expansion. I have been following the progress since I purchased my home in 2000 and am continually amazed at the lack of common sense being used by the County Commissioners and now, possibly the FAA if the "preferred alternative" is selected.

If the FAA selects the option that the County Commissioners proposed last year, the impact to my neighborhood and the quality of life for the neighborhood residents is ruined forever, as we as damage to the environment. Basing expansion of the runway on projected use of the runway vs actual use data which is available now, doesn't justify the hundreds of millions of dollars that would be spent (at tax payers expense), for such an expansion. Do we really want another MI sized operation based in Fort Lauderdale, even if the space to expand was available? Is there truly a need for another MIA sized operation in Fort Lauderdale? How seriously were the other expansion options reviewed and considered or were the lobbying efforts for the largest, grandd: most costly to build alternative, just too strong to choose one of the other options?

There are so many additional reasons, based on fact and statistics that I could comment on, but the biggest question that continues to plague me, that doesn't seem to be receiving attention is the common sense element.

Sincerely
Felicia Hickey

PG.1
ROD 15.14

F-LC136

July 28, 2008

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

Via Fax: (407) 812-6978

Re: FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension
From Pat & Kelly Sullivan (529 NW 7th St., Dania Beach, FL 33004)
Complex - Melaleuca Gardens

Dear Ms. Lane,

We are writing this letter to express our thoughts regarding the FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension project.

We hope that you can understand and respect our point of view on this. One thing that we are not in favor of is the effect that this project will have on John U. Lloyd State Park here in Dania Beach. As you know, just recently this park had the national spotlight when it was featured on Good Morning America as one of the nation's favorite parks. What will this destroy at John U Lloyd State Park? Beauty, nature, birds, fish, not to mention countless tourists and also local residents that frequent this park on a daily basis such as ourselves for activities such as biking, hiking, nature walking, swimming, fishing, etc. Also, please take into consideration what kind of impact this will have on the environment such as destroying 12 areas of wetlands.

It seems to us that the airlines are pulling back on this project. In all honesty we really believe that this project will cost in the neighborhood of over 2 billion dollars. There are other alternatives to this South Runway Expansion project that we really wish you would highly consider as opposed to what we have stated above.

Both Patrick & I really hope that you take our concerns as well as the concerns of others that will be seriously affected by this project in our community seriously.

Sincerely,
Patrick Sullivan

P 8.58

ROD 3.10

F-LC137

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
FAX 407 812 6978
Regarding: FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

*I have lived near FLL since 1960 therefore I have seen change and growth. In this economy it is not necessary to spend two billion dollars - that being said "FORGET IT"!
Pete Sie spoke to security do not like elevated runways "Forget it"!
Our "National Treasure, John V Lloyd State Park with a coral reef ecosystem will suffer along with tourism"!
Living near the Ft... "Forget it"!
Airlines are suffering in this economy no longer using FLL. They are soaking back. Lobby not the FAA? "Forget it"!*

NO SOUTH RUNWAY = Think about your study. It was done before our economy is where it is today.

*Lucille Barile
5099 SW 28 Avenue
Dania, Beach, FL 33312*

F-L6139

July 28, 2008

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

Regarding: FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane:

My husband and I live in Davis Isles which is off Griffin Road and the Dania Beach Cutoff Canal. My husband built this home in 1969. We have a boat behind our house. This is a beautiful area of which there are few places like this still available in South Florida which would be destroyed if the South Runway is expanded. We are retired and spend a lot of time on our screened porch.

Planes fly over our area daily and we are used to the sound of a few planes. If the South Runway is extended we would have to stay indoors and our quality of life would surely decline. Another great loss would be the John U Lloyd Beach State Park which would be obliterated. This is such a beautiful park and it would be a big loss.

The FAA has indicated that it does not intend to comply with operational restrictions at the expanded south runway. This means the runway will be in operation 24 hours a day and the noise impact will be horrible.

I suggest that the FAA should consider the North Runway C1 Alternative which would impact only low quality wetlands, and impacts less of these wetlands than the south runway alternatives. With the energy crisis, the increase in jet fuel prices, and the recent reduction in operations by American Airlines, United Airlines and Spirit Airlines indicate that expansion may not be necessary.

Please don't expand the South Runway and destroy our quality of life in South Florida. This will definitely cause a negative visual blithe on our community which we love.

Very truly yours,

*Doris Pfenniger
Richard C. Pfenniger*

Doris Pfenniger
Richard Pfenniger
4613 S. W. 37th Avenue
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33312

F-L6138

ROD 15.15
ROD 15.16
R1C109.3
P 8.58
ROD 20.0

P 18.16
P 16.1
P 8.58
P 2.6
P 6.4
P 6.5
ROD 3.0
ROD 3.10

FAX COVER SHEET

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

FROM: Robert E. Elkins, 4400 S.W. 26th Ave.
 Ft. Lauderdale, FL, 33312-5728

FAX NO: 954-981-6169 (Call first)

RE: FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension

DATE: July 28, 2008

MESSAGE: I should like to add my voice and those of my family to the thousands of residents in this area who are protesting the extension of the Ft. Lauderdale airport South runway. How can you in all conscience allow the lives of thousands of people to be disrupted and even destroyed, to satisfy the greedy politicians and airlines who are trying to control our way of life? I beg you to consider your decision carefully before it is too late and let us live our lives in peace. Don't destroy us. Please.....Please.....Please.....Thank You.

Robert E. Elkins
 Robert E. Elkins

ROD 20.0

F-LC140

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,

What about people who don't have a savings account and invest all their money in the houses they live in? I put more than half my paycheck into maintenance, improvements and landscaping! The value of my house will drastically fall down. What's going to happen when I retire to a Condo? Trying to sell my house as a plane lands and vibrates my luger!? AS OF NOW MY ALARM CLOCK IS A "6 AM TAKE OFF" OF A JUMBO CARGO FLIGHT!

JARRETT FLORES

4415 SW 34th Tr

DAVIA BEACH, FL 33312

(954) 983-1143

F-LC141

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 Hazeltime 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 AM NOT AGAINST PROGRESS BUT I AM AGAINST THE EXTENSION OF THE FT. LAUDEDALE SOUTH RUNWAY. THE ESTIMATED COST, THE NEGATIVE ECONOMIC FORECAST AND THE NUMBER OF RESIDENCE (5000+) AFFECTED DOES NOT MAKE ANY SENSE! THE AIRPORT IS SURROUNDED BY ROADWAYS, DEVELOPMENT, AND RESIDENCES. IF THIS RUNWAY IS BUILT, WHAT HAPPENS AFTER 2030. THE FAA SHOULD BE THINKING ABOUT A LARGER REGIONAL AIRPORT NEAR THE I-75, I-595, SAWGRASS, US71 INTERSECTIONS. THERE MUST BE A BETTER COMMON SENSE SOLUTION. IF THIS RUNWAY IS BUILT THE SUN SENTINAL HEADLINE SHOULD READ "PARADISE LOST!"

GENE BIEBER
805 NW 8TH AVE.
DANIA BEACH, FL. 33004

F-77147

2008-07-28 11:58 GENE BIEBER 9549205271>>

P 1/1

Laurence N. Raymond
4500 SW 43rd Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314

07/28/2008

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

FAX: 407-812-6978

RE: FEIS - FLL South Runway

Dear Ms. Lane

The proposed construction at Fort Lauderdale International Airport (FLL) of an elevated runway, at the site of the current South runway 9R27L will present an untenable environment for residents in the flight path. This contention is augmented by the determination that the FAA has no intention to comply with the operation restrictions contained in the Interlocal Agreement between Broward County and the City of Dania Beach.

The expenditure of \$1,000,000,000 - \$2,000,000,000 to provide a proposed benefit of the absence of a 6 minute delay of scheduled take-off time in 2030 and beyond is somewhat questionable. To state the obvious, in the past year we have entered a petroleum crisis which has altered American and world costs of transportation, both air and ground, in both the private and commercial sectors. Daily 6 o'clock news broadcasts indicate the increasing problems the airline industry is experiencing with respect to fuel costs, to the extent that several airlines (American, United and Spirit) are planning to reduce FLL operations. The cost of flying is increasing and will most certainly put such transport out of the grasp of individuals world wide. In this country, the coin has finally dropped on the idea that we have ignored the use of rail as a transport means, and Amtrak is responding appropriately. There is a logically high probability that all airports will experience decreased use. In point of fact, the additional FLL capacity requirements previously forecast for 2006 have not been substantiated in 2008. In addition consolidation of carriers currently on going or anticipated as well as reduced operations previously allowed to requires modification of past capacity requirements. Thus the expenditure of funds to fix something which is not yet broken, lacks fiscal responsibility.

Aside from the logic of such massive expenditures to build a runway which is not likely to deliver the anticipated rewards and the addition of terminal gates to accommodate the increased use which will not materialize, there are other issues which should be addressed, ergo, the effect that this construction will have on the population in the surrounding area. This population is part of the environment, and is thus impacted. Based upon the FEIS, there are 1000 residences accommodating ~2300 individuals, directly in the eastern and western approaches who will be effected. This amounts to a group of individuals whose lifestyle will be radically modified, both

F-77147

RECEIPT-PHARM
PAGE 01

07/28/2008 11:38 9543219778

1/2

ROD 1514

ROD 3110
ROD 3110
ROD 3110

in terms of financial hardship and auditory / vibrational insult. There is a second group, not directly addressed, who will be challenged by sound due to the elevation of the runway along its length, due to the effective loss of the sound berm. There is an indication the home sound remediation will be implemented. This will incur considerable cost, and will most likely not be effective. In addition, vibrations and release of fuel products will add to the homeowners problems as well as loss of a life style unique to South Florida. Are we to remain indoors? Acquisition of homes in the Melaleuca Gardens and the Atlantic Village properties will add considerably to the already projected costs as well as disenfranchising a significant population. In the context of areas of National interest effected by the runway, John U. Lloyd Beach State park will be negatively effected. This park was recently hailed as one of the four most unique parks in the United States on Good Morning America, and remarked upon by Congressman Ron Klein on the floor of Congress (July 12, 2008). Finally, the town of Dania Beach will be negatively effected, due to the loss of a significant portion of its tax base and a reduction in population.

R L C 109.3

ROD 15.9

D 8.5.8

ROD 15.9

Finally, it would be of interest to determine the algorithm used to determine that the North Runway Alternative is rejected and the South Runway is the Preferred Alternative, in spite of the logical conclusion that FLL does not really need another runway.

I and the population who will be impacted if the South runway is built, request a reconsideration of either the construction of the runway or the abandonment of the project.

Sincerely

 Laurence N. Raymond

4/2

F-7-143

07/28/2008 11:38 9543219778

RECEIVED-PHARM

PAGE 02

Ms. Virginia Lane
 FAA Orlando Airports District Office
 5050 Hazeltine National Drive
 Orlando, FL 32822-5024

Regarding: FEIS-FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

As a flight attendant for a major airline we are trained to evacuate an airplane and send the passengers away from the aircraft to safety. If we had to evacuate on the proposed south runway extension (on a bridge and on an incline) where would we send the passengers? Downhill with the fuel flowing after them?


Again the south runway extension with the incline at the east end would not have a safe overrun. In the cases of 2 most recent crashes, Southwest in Midway (MDW) and Air France in Toronto (YYZ) the absence of adequate stop ways resulted in the death of 1 child in MDW and the total write off of a large airliner in YYZ.

Although I am a South Florida resident for the past 37 years I have mostly flown out of Chicago, Dallas or New York. Being a commuter I use FLL or MIA to go to work. I don't need to tell you what FLL looked like in 1976 when I first moved here! Currently any airline I commute on whether to ORD, DFW or LGA/JFK out of FLL has cut back on flights to these cities. Overall capacity is being cut 10% system wide.

ROD 3.0
ROD 3.10

How can an extended south runway of just 3,000 ft. be justified not only for the cost of building it but of sound proofing and/or buying out the existing 3,500 homes from residents who are against such a proposal? This all when the number of people flying now and in the foreseeable future is declining?

Having said all that, if a runway is to be built for future growth in maybe 15 - 20 years (the need to design aircraft to withstand such elevated fuel prices) then and only then should an expansion call for an 'additional' runway (4 instead of 2) on the north side.



James E. Quatromoni
 Flight Attendant cert.#3052049
 4581 SW 38 Terr.
 Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33312

F-7-144

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

Regarding: FEIS-FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane

As an airline Captain for a major air carrier and a safety advocate for the Air Lines Pilots Association, I see a serious design flaw with the proposed extension of runway 9R27L in FLL (FAA preferred alternatives: B1b and B1c). Airports throughout the country with taxiways over roadways have posted signs prior to crossing warning the pilots not to stop on the bridge (an example that comes to mind is taxiway A (alpha) in ORD). The reason for this restriction originates with the inability of Crash Fire Rescue (CFR) to effectively reach the disabled distressed aircraft on the bridges. The proposed extension plan for the South runway in FLL has airliners landing on a runway spanning over an 8 lanes highway, a 2 tracks railroad right of way plus associated easements. It is without saying emergencies will lead to airplanes stopping on or about that elevated area of the runway thus rendering CFR assistance to the passengers more difficult and less effective than if an un-elevated design (like the addition of a North parallel runway) had been approved by the FAA.

R LC1093
ROD 4.0

There is no doubt in my mind additional runways have to be build to meet future population growth. The proposed 9R27L extension plans for the closure of runway 13/31. Thus FLL would go from 3 runways to 2 runways. Without runway 31/13, during high northerly winds in the winter months (peak tourists season), airliners will not be able to take off and land at FLL. Landing on the East-West runways will be prevented due to cross-wind limitations.

ROD 15.15

To conclude, I must say I am opposed to the extension of the South runway in FLL. The building of a North parallel runway is a better alternative, it will obviously add 1 more runway, a safer runway and will cost less.

ROD 20.0

Captain Eddy P Hoste
ATP#2350137
4581 SW 38th Terrace
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33312

F-LC145

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 HOME OWNER
LIVING IN THE AVON HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD.
I HAVE WORKED HARD, MY ENTIRE LIFE
AND FINALLY SAVED ENOUGH MONEY TO
BUY "A PIECE OF PARADISE" AT:
4504 SW 28 TERC

DANIA BEACH FL 33312.

I AM VERY MUCH AGAINST ANY
FAA PROPOSAL TO FURTHER EXTEND
AIRPORT RUNWAYS AND OR INCREASE
FLIGHT NUMBERS.

ROD 20.0

THERE IS ALREADY TOO MUCH
NOISE AND AIR POLLUTION FROM THIS
AIRPORT. STOP THE INTERUSION OR!
PAY ME DOUBLE MY PROPERTY VALUE!

ROBERT J VALISSIA WELLS

F-LC146

Valerie Ong
2065 SW 28 TER
Fort Lauderdale FL 33312

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

July 25, 2008

Dear Ms Lane:

Now that we are in a severe energy crisis and United, American and Spirit have drastically cut back on operations at FLL, it is critical that the EIS analysis be updated based on these reduced operation levels, which will directly impact the baseline as well as projections used in the analysis. Is there still a 6 minute delay forecasted in 2020 with these reductions?

ROD 3.10

Why isn't the real cost of the runway presented? Why are we spending more than \$2 billion dollars to reduce the number of runways at FLL from 3 to 2? With the reduction of the major carriers, it is clear that there is no need for a second "long" runway.

ROD 15.16

ABC's Good Morning America (on Sunday, July 13th) highlighted John U Lloyd Beach State Park as one of the four finalists in their search for the best national parks in the US. The expansion of the South runway will obliterate this park. Countless species of birds, animals and plants will be wiped out of a habitat and our families will lose a treasured place to relax and enjoy the tiny bit of Florida nature that still remains in our greed-driven economy.

P 8.58
P 6.4
P 6.5

Public outcry is bound to grow as more taxpayers learn that the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has already given Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport (FLL) millions of dollars toward expansion, with more to come. This FDOT money is public taxpayer money. I know we have more pressing transportation issues that we should deal with rather than this Big Broward Boondoggle White Elephant Airport Expansion.

ROD 20.0

Thank you for your consideration of these points.

Sincerely,

Valerie Ong

F-LC147

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.

My Email - 2.sparke@bellsouth.net

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

FROM: IUAN E SHEILA PARKE
4197 SW 37 AVE.
DANIA BCH, FL 33312
From: IUAN E. PARKE
SHEILA J. PARKE

Regarding: FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

My wife SHEILA & myself moved from PLANTATION to DANIA BCH Approximately 1 1/2 yrs ago. We moved from a beautiful HOME to be on the water. THIS was always our dream. Since we are both 58 yrs old, we hoped to live in DAVIS ISLES for our remaining days however long that may be. WE both work stressful jobs & need our off TIME to relax & enjoy the water & our community.

ROD 20.0

THE South Runway Extension will destroy our dreams, diminish our property value and make us hate our community. It will be impossible to enjoy our friends and family with this Runway Extension (Noise upwards). If we could put the ones coming up with this idea IN our position it would definitely be overturned.

Destroy Baseball teams, football teams, "Wayne H. BUT Destroy Peoples Lives MAKES NO SENSE. JOHN LLOYD PARK WILL BE JUST ANOTHER dump facility for HIRZBERG & CO.

TO THE F. 01

F-LC148



Air Transport Association

Tel: 202-626-4000
Fax: 202-626-4139

Air Transport Association
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

DATE: JULY 28, 2008

FAX TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO: Virginia Lane
407-812-6978

FROM: Katherine Andrus
Assistant General Counsel
202/626-4091/kandrus@airlines.org

RE: Comments on the Final EIS

NO. OF PAGES TO FOLLOW: 3

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone (collect, if necessary), and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.

F-12150

July 28, 2008

From: Peter A. Mir
3700 SW 47th Court
Dania Beach, FL 33312

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

Subject: FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane:

I am concerned homeowner in the area affected by your plans to extend the South Runway. I recently bought my home in Davis Isles for \$560K in 2005. I bought my home because it was a great neighborhood. My house has an awesome backyard for entertaining and a dock with ocean access. The thought that you would destroy my happiness to save 6 minutes on flights is reprehensible.

It is much easier to do the North runway C1 alternative where personal lives will not be impacted as much. It is much easier to move some businesses than it is to uproot the happiness of the citizens of Broward County that are affected by the proposed South runway extension. R00 15.14

This brings up the point of do we really need another runway. I have read recently that several airlines have cut back flights to FLL. Operations declined by 5.3% for air carrier enplanements and 10.7% for commuter enplanements in 2006. So if there is less traffic why the need to expand and ruin peoples happiness. It has been a tough few years with the hurricanes, insurance rates, gas prices, housing crisis and to think you want to do this on top of everything we are already going through is unimaginable and down right wrong. R00 3.10
R00 3.0

As it is right now I think it more than noisy enough with the small commuter planes above my home. I can not imagine a 737 overhead. That would be awful. Please do the right thing and cancel the south runway extension and look at other alternatives if you must. The alternatives are there. R00 2.0

Respectfully Submitted,

Peter A. Mir - Concerned Homeowner

F-12149



AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION

July 25, 2008

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

Via Facsimile

Dear Ms. Lane:

On behalf of the airline members of the Air Transport Association of America, Inc. ("ATA"), I respectfully offer the following comments on the Federal Aviation Administration's ("FAA") Final Environmental Impact Statement ("Final EIS") for the Development and Extension of Runway 9R/27L and Other Associated Projects at Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport ("FLL").²

First and foremost, we commend FAA for rejecting the sponsor's preferred alternative, which would have incorporated into the project mandatory implementation of operational noise abatement actions.³ This unprecedented approach would have resulted in approving a runway extension project while at the same time artificially limiting the capacity of that runway.⁴ FAA wisely has opted not to hold the runway extension project hostage to conditions derived from a local agreement to which the FAA is not a party,⁵

¹ ATA is the principal trade and service organization of the U.S. scheduled airline industry. The airline members of the association are: ABX Air, Inc.; AirTran Airways; Alaska Airlines, Inc.; American Airlines, Inc.; ASTAR Air Cargo, Inc.; Atlas Air, Inc.; Continental Airlines, Inc.; Delta Air Lines, Inc.; Evergreen International Airlines, Inc.; Federal Express Corporation; Hawaiian Airlines; JetBlue Airways Corp.; Midwest Airlines; Northwest Airlines, Inc.; Southwest Airlines Co.; United Airlines, Inc.; UPS Airlines; and US Airways, Inc. Associate airline members are: Air Canada, Air Jamaica, and Mexicana. ² Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport Final Environmental Impact Statement, Landrum & Brown (June 2008), accessed at <http://www.broward.org/airport/felb.htm> on June 24, 2008. ³ See Final EIS at 8.3 to 8.4. ⁴ See Response to Comments 2.6, Final EIS Appendix P ("The runway use restrictions contained in the Interlocal Agreements reduce airfield capacity in the short-term as compared to the unrestricted runway use with Alternative B1b.") ⁵ See FEIS at 83. Response to Comments 8.23, Appendix P ("The FAA is not a party to, nor bound by any local agreements or local ordinances that would limit runway use at FLL. Therefore, the FAA would not approve a preferred alternative that imposes limits on the use of a newly redeveloped runway.")

F-LC150

and instead to refer the issue of noise abatement procedures to a noise compatibility study under 14 C.F.R. part 150.⁶

However, we remain concerned about the proposed expansion of the noise mitigation program well beyond the 65 DNL contour in order to "address a neighborhood/subdivision area as a whole to ensure, to the extent practicable, that community cohesion will be maintained. . . ." While we recognize that FAA guidance permits use of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grants to sound-insulate homes outside of the 65 DNL when contiguous to homes within the noise-impacted area "if necessary to achieve equity in the neighborhood,"⁸ this exception is limited by that same guidance to a "reasonable additional number of otherwise ineligible parcels."⁹ In this case, the proposal to expand noise mitigation broadly on the basis of neighborhoods or subdivisions, instead of through a more refined case-by-case analysis, would nearly double the number of properties considered eligible for federal grants - from 1,051 to 2,074 housing units.¹⁰

This is not a trivial distinction - the Final EIS estimates that this approach would add over \$52 million to the cost of a sound insulation program,¹¹ and \$178 million to a purchase assurance/sound insulation program.¹² Including such a large percentage of housing units outside the 65 DNL will expend scarce AIP funds that are needed for other, more pressing airport needs.¹³ As FAA notes in response to a different comment, grants under the AIP come from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, which gets funding not

⁶ See Response to Comments 2.6, Final EIS Appendix P ("Runway use procedures that specifically address the reduction of noise impacts are the purview of a Part 150 Study that would be conducted by an airport sponsor.") It should be noted that approval of any operational noise abatement procedures as part of a Part 150 study are contingent on a determination by FAA that such procedures can be implemented without adversely affecting the efficient use and management of the Navigable Airspace and Air Traffic Control Systems. 14 C.F.R. § 150.350(i)(iii). ⁷ Final EIS at ES-33, 8-45. ⁸ Part 161 Analysis, Executive Summary at 5, citing Federal Aviation Admin., Order 5100-38C, sec. 810 b, P. 137 (June 28, 2005). ⁹ See FEIS, Table ES-2 at ES-34; Table 8-2 at 8-22 and Table 8-8 at 8-38 (Of the total 2,074 housing units potentially eligible for EIS noise mitigation measures under FAA's preferred alternative, 1,051 are within the 65 DNL while 1,023 are outside of the 65 DNL.) The Final EIS distinguishes this principle of establishing noise mitigation areas based on neighborhoods from the principle proposed by Broward County of providing noise mitigation in excess of minimum federal guidelines, which requires local officials to "clearly establish a local standard for compatible land use below the FAA DNL 65 dB guideline if they want to apply for FAA funding approval for mitigation projects to achieve their lower standards." Final EIS at 8-24, 8-26 to 8-27 (internal citations omitted). FAA did not recommend this principle, Final EIS at 8-45. ¹⁰ Final EIS, Table 8-9 at 8-38. ¹¹ Final EIS, Table 8-10 at 8-39. ¹² It is our understanding that FAA still would apply its numerical rating system, which requires that program implementation begin within the highest DNL noise contour band, to determine the priority phasing of noise mitigation. See Final EIS at 8-46, citing FAA Order 5100.39A, Appendix 6.

F-LC150

P 2.0

ROD 15.17

ROD 15.17

from general tax revenue but from user taxes and charges.¹⁴ While maintaining "neighborhood cohesion" sounds appealing, it is not a legitimate purpose for expenditure of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, which was created "to provide for the expansion and improvement of the Nation's airport and airway system."¹⁵

Thank you for providing us with an opportunity to review and comment on this final step in what has been a long and arduous process.

Sincerely,



Katherine Andrus
Assistant General Counsel
Air Transport Association of America, Inc.

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 this Runway Expansion is A Mistake. Further studies need to be done on the effects of noise to the surrounding area. wet lands, FAL should reevaluate the REAL growth of Fort Lauderdale Airport.

The expansion of this runway, as currently planned, will make the expansion of this runway impossible. The FAA should consider other alternatives; options with less impact, to an environmentally sensitive lands, NAME'S

John Wallace
577 W.E. Ave A, Davis Bldg, 33004
F-16151

puh
pus

pus

Red 15.17

¹⁴ Response to Comments 3.40, Final EIS Appendix P ("Funding comes from collections related to passenger tickets, passenger flight segments, international arrivals/departures, cargo waybills, aviation fuels, and frequent flyer mile awards from non-airline sources like credit cards.")
¹⁵ Airport and Airway Development and Revenue Acts of 1970 (P. L. 91-258, 84 Stat. 219).

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,

This runway is not needed. All airlines are cutting back on flights and some are even leaving FLL completely. We do not need the environmental damage nor the noise. This runway project is detrimental to thousands of residents.

p6.5
ROP 20.0

KC Gasport

4433 SW 37 Ave

Ft. Lauderdale, FL

33312

954 964 7097

F-4152

FROM : 104

FAK NO. : 9549859716 Jul. 26 2008 2:05PM P1

LOUIS FERRER, MBA
3448 S.W. 44th St.
Dania Beach, FL 33312-5523
ph/fax: 954 985 8716
email: Ferrer12@aol.com

7/25/08

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

re: FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane

I moved to Avon Isles in 1991. At the time Griffin Road was a relatively small country road (compared to the six lane highway it is today) with the main business entities being exclusive restaurants such as Tropical Acres, Spiced Apple and The Sea Chantry. Today Griffin Road is lined with strip malls, vacant buildings, neglected lots and walled in condos such as Oak Ridge and Maple Fidge. The wetlands along SW 29/30 Ave have become the I-95 industrial 'park' and the mile long commerce park. The Tiger tail lake and park are now Pro Bass. I guess this is what you call 'progress', but how much has our quality of life been sacrificed? The really sad part is that many of these buildings which have displaced our wetlands and woods now sit empty. Just this morning I mentioned to my roommates that I no longer see the wildlife - possums, rabbits, squirrels - that used to come in my yard. Even the Nova Cana (my backyard) now longer has the fish, ducks, sea turtles and even an occasional manatee it once had.

Now the FAA, the airlines, and some greedy politicians want to turn my front yard into an airport runway. **ENOUGH!** With American Airlines announcing that it will no longer be serving FLL and other airlines severly cutting back, I can't help but wonder if this extended south runway will be just a series of pot holes before it is even completed. This may be only a temporary situation until the economy turns around, but how much more 'progress' can our environment absorb? I feel this proposal, based on outdated projections and environmental studies, is unnecessary and ill-advised.

I bought my home in 1991 for \$125,000 and have since added another \$125,000 in improvements (pool, fish pond, central air, shatter proof windows, paved driveway, etc. etc.) I recently purchased a neighboring house for \$255,000 which in today's market I feel is about right. The idea of 'purchase assurance' whereby I would sell my home and my investment property at 'fair market value' is not economically feasible. Further, the FAA has apparently not even considered the price of such buy-outs in this proposal. Please, do not further reduce my quality of life and the environment for the purpose of greed.

Sincerely,

Louis Ferrer
Louis Ferrer

cc: Broward County Commissioner Rodstrom

F-4153

p3.0
ROP 20.0

p13.19

1410 Argonaut Isle
Dania Beach, Florida 33004
July 27, 2008

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

Re: FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane:

By now you are probably aware from my address that we will be immediately adversely affected by any expansion to the south runway. For many years my husband and I have joked that, by the time the airport destroys our neighborhood, we will be ready to move to an assisted living facility. That may well be the case, so I will avoid the personal in this letter.

I am afraid we will be living south of a white elephant. With fuel prices rising, several airlines have left Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood Airport. Others have reduced the number of flights. And, unfortunately, others have filed or will be filing for bankruptcy protection. Nothing I read or hear indicates that this trend will reverse itself for some years to come. I understand that FAA - like most governmental agencies and private businesses - seeks to expand its turf. But this just makes no practical or financial sense.

I don't know if you are familiar with our area but, like most of South Florida, we are in an area of much beauty, which we are rapidly losing to expansion. The thought of further damage to our wetlands and the degradation of our treasured John U Lloyd Beach State Park breaks my heart.

And, while I am not one who sees a terrorist behind every hibiscus, I am concerned that an elevated runway over U.S. 1, an international port, and a major railroad track will provide an attractive target. And it will certainly adversely impact the environment, to say nothing of the noise and pollution dropped on several parts of Dania Beach. The Green Belt - a lovely place to walk - currently shields us from some of the noise. But how can one be protected from an elevated runway? (Of course, there's also the question of safety on an uphill take-off and downhill landing, but fortunately we don't travel much so it won't be such an inconvenience for us to drive to Miami. Pity the poor folks who travel frequently!)

F-6655

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,

As a concerned resident of Dania Beach, I wish to state the following items regarding the South Runway expansion set for. First, in light of rising fuel costs, flight reductions by airlines and layoffs of employees by those airlines, I feel that any assumptions made by final EIS need to be readdressed. Second, the South Runways alternatives (B11 & B12) seem to have the most impact on parks, wetlands & nearby neighborhoods as opposed to a new north runway. Why are we set to destroy areas like John Lloyd State Park, West Lake Park & the neighbor hoods that surround fee when a north runway would pose the least noise & environmental impact on these areas? Finally, as a former resident of NYC, I moved to Florida to enjoy the magnificent weather here. All mitigation proposals do not address the fact that people do not want to be prisoners inside their homes. An airport expansion would destroy my ability to enjoy the outdoors around my home. Before the airport expands, and runways are reduced from 3 to 2 and peoples lives & property values are impacted, I feel it has an obligation to reconsider the final EIS to determine if those assumptions James M. Cooney 4470 SW 34 Ave. are indeed still valid. Respectfully,
Dania Beach, FL 33018
F-66154

POD 5/15
8.58
11/10
2013.7

26.6

POD 5/15

POD 3.0
POD 8.58
POD 4.4
POD 13.8



I am afraid the current Environmental Impact Statement has too many flaws for me to address in one letter - especially at this late date.

I can only hope that wiser heads will prevail.

Sincerely,

Sandra J. Mitzel

NEWS CLAREN PHOENIX

3361 sw 44 ct
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312
954 962 9837

July 26, 2008

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

Regarding FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

I want to start by thanking you for taking the time to listen to the concerns of the homeowners that are being greatly affected by the proposed South Runway Extension plans of the FAA. We are deeply concerned with the environmental impact that this will have in our area.

My husband and I are outdoor enthusiasts. We chose this area due to its variety of available activities. We can kayak or go boating from our backyard, go cycling or running from our front door, and frequent the wonderful state and county parks in our proximity. We bought our home three years ago, and at the time inquired about the effects of the airport to the quality of life. We were assured that it was only small private planes and that the disturbance would be minimal in comparison to the benefits of purchasing the home. Until now, it has proven to be true.

The implementation of any of the Runway Alternatives will impact the high quality wetlands, John U Lloyd State Park and West Lake Recreational Area. The city of Dania will have increased noise which will affect our quality of life and make it impossible to enjoy something as simple as sitting in our own backyard.

The FAA wants this expansion based on the benefits it projects through the year 2030 from having less delays. However, the environmental impacts disclosed are through the year 2020. What if the undisclosed 10 year difference voids the supposed economic gains. Recently in the local news there has been a lot of talk of several airlines, (ie. American, United, Spirit) reducing operations at Fort Lauderdale Airport. There have been steady declines in airport operations and demand of flights. It may be possible that the expansion is not necessary due to less demand than was assumed in the Final EIS. It is time to update the data!

P.6.1
P.8.58

P.6.0
R.O.D 3.0
R.O.D 3.10

F-16155

TOTAL P. 02

F-16156



The current economic forecast for the airport industry and the county are NEGATIVE. These are uncertain times, not just locally but for the entire country. At a time when property values are going down, (without the help of an increasingly noisy and polluted environment) and expenses are going up shouldn't we be allowed to feel POSITIVE about the things we do have. Let us at least enjoy the things we do not pay for... clean air, Florida weather, a good sweat, or a dip in a clean ocean.

Please help us by representing the people and delivering our concerns for the FINAL ENVIRONMENT STATEMENT and put a stop to the PROPOSED SOUTH RUNWAY EXPANSION PROJECT.

Sincerely,

JESUS and KAREN PEREZ

R0D 20.0

FROM : LETIZE.Pro

FRAX NO. : 954-924-9494

JUL 27 2008 11:41AM P1

FROM: Kevin Leize - 4321 SW 24th Lane, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33312 - email: leizepro@aol.com
TO: Ms. Virginia Lamm- FAA Orlando Airports District Office Fax: 407-512-6978

FEIS and the FLL EXPANSION - IS THE SOUTH RUNWAY REALLY THE BEST CHOICE ?

Hello, my name is Kevin Leize and I own 2 homes here in Dania Beach, Florida - I have a family of four, with two new children - We currently live directly under the s. runway flight path - However, I am NOT against airport expansion - but I am DEADLY against the south runway expansion We know from what happened in the early 80's that there is now a 3 mile wide area from 441 to 495 from the dania cut off canal to I-585 that was EMINENT DOMAINED and now provides no residential flyovers for the commercial jets -

My profession is construction: I am a general contractor here in the area and I also know the old construction motto : The MORE IT COSTS, the MORE WE MAKE !

I also know roughly what it costs to knock down 13 buildings on a runway area - relocate, and drop road rock and pave 8000 ft - in big business construction, NOT ALOT.

THAT VS. A 40 ft elevated runway then spans OVER us 1, with an elevated landing area, 2 tunnels, and bridges over the Dania Cut Off Canal. It truly is THE MOTHER OF ALL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS and it's clearly obvious which of the two options costs more to build - The estimated cost difference is : 370 million dollars !

It's also common knowledge that the airport is a CASH COW at 35 a head for all, the ridiculous airport markup on food, drinks, engineering etc; FLL's airport account is bloated - We also know that if the airport doesn't spend its reserves on itself the county will reallocate that profit somewhere else -

So how does the airport try to solve this problem ?

Lee Fisher & Associates: Is a airport aviation consultant assessment company - They create specific reports that gives the airport the justification it needs to build a grossly overdeveloped solution to solve its swollen airport account -

If the airport spends it's money on itself, the airport doesn't surrender it's profits to the county -

Orlen Kriebberg is the building development coordinator for the airport - Their building is on the N side of the runway - On the way the guys were building the building who owns the 13 buildings on the N, runway ?

Who do you think the HUNTS, MOSS, and Brown are ? ES study makers ? And where are they from ?

Who are Landrum and Brown ? ES study makers ? And where are they from ?

Mantoes and my children cant speak to you -

But who will speak when the ES study says now south runway "May affect but not likely to adversely affect" the mantoes and my kids ? It May affect ? Ok, it may affect, but how ? IS adversely affect even an option we can consider ?

What about all the jet fuel already on everything now ? And that's just from the small planes...

What about the entire DANIA CUT OFF canal being a NO MAKE, MANATEE ZONE area ?

What about the impact of the proposed runway on the wetlands and residents than N runway c1 ?

Does anyone really think IMPACT glasses will cut down the noise when we're all outside ?

Have we already gone too far and over extended ourselves ? We are already polluting the area ourselves at an alarming rate -

What about JOHN U LLOYD state park ? It's one of USA's top 4 parks recently featured on national television -

The proposed runway destroys atleast 12 acres of wetlands -

The South runway has more impact to parks, wetlands, and residents than N runway c1 -

What about the POWER PLANT that is directly under the S. Runway flight path ? (441/griffin)

What about the pipeline lines that run underground from here to port Everglades, down to MIA International and out 27 ?

Costs for the proposed runway are 1.5 billion dollars - The cost of the impact of electricity cut to that people for 100's of years would always ask, " HAD NO ONE EVER THOUGHT OF THAT ? "

TO OUR ELECTED LEADERS, REPRESENTATIVES, COMMISSIONERS and PEOPLE WHO CARE ABOUT OUR WELL BEING

All we want is the LEAST OBTRUSIVE, LEAST EXPENSIVE, LEAST DAMAGING AIRPORT EXPANSION possible -

It's Alternative C1 - 8,7,2,1,2,1 or grab them PARRALLEL RUNWAY -

So the I've haven't heard 1 explanation for the motivation behind why the most expensive, most damaging option of all choices, is the choice you support except for what I've found out so far -

WE THE PEOPLE ARE AWARE THAT THE AIRPORT HAS TO SPEND THE MONEY or LOSE IT TO THE COUNTY -

Hey, why not use some of that money and build a TRAIN or a peoplemover from the airport to the PORT for the tourists -

Airport delays are 6 minutes. I have waited longer at intersection lights here in town than that!

IS 6 minutes worth of time worth what we will do EVERYONE AND EVERYTHING affected ?

-To the BROWARD CO. BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, Shame on you for not protecting the people you are hired to represent

Please visit my website video : www.370e.com/airport.htm or on tube - keyword: FLL AIRPORT EXPANSION

R0D 20.0

R0D 20.0

F-LC156

F-LC157

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,

From Top (the air), to bottom, line-

THE AIRLINES! THE FAA'S DECISION SEEMS TO BE THE WORST ONE POSSIBLE! P3.37

WITH SO MANY UNANSWERED QUESTIONS (REAL COST OF RUNWAY?) I CAN ONLY ASSUME THAT THE ANSWERS WOULD BE IN CONFLICT WITH LOGIC AND WITH THE HEART + HONESTY OF COUNTLESS DISCARDED FAMILIES AS IS EACH DECISION MADE SO FAR. P02000

PLEASE TAKE ANOTHER CLEAR-HEADED, CLEAR-HEARD LOOK AT YOUR PLANS FOR THIS AIRPORT EXPANSION PROJECT. P02000

*Sincerely,
MIRAVAT TAOURASI
809 NW 8th AVE
MELLEWA GROS, DANIA I.F.L. 33004
F-LC158*

7/26/2008
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,

As a 36 year Broward county resident and as a 26 Dania beach home owner, I would like to express my concerns over the proposed FLL South Runway expansion.

As you know we are in tough economic times and I feel they are going to get worse. As the value of the dollar continues its decline and inflation continues it's upward spiral, there will be less fliers, less flights, hence NO need to expand now or the immediate future. P0310

It also amazes me what little consideration was given to the North Runway alternative C1 (Could the reason be ignorance, politics or corruption)? P6.6

I won't get into the impact on John U Lloyd State Park or the residents West and South of the proposed expansion or that the mitigation proposals are unacceptable. P8.58

With that being said I would like to propose a 5-10 year moratorium on this project as in my view there is NO rush for this expansion. P0020.0

I hope you will consider my concerns.

Regards,

Richard Anabedian
Richard & Carolee Garabedian
4618 SW 28 Way
FT Lauderdale, FL 33312
954-963-4235
diancra@gmail.com

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 VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE
 NO NEGOTIATIONS ON AIRWAYS BECAUSE FOR THE
 EXTENDED SOUTH RUNWAY, I LIVE ON 38TH TOWN AND
 IT WILL BE A LOT OF THE AIRWAYS. I HAVE A
 95 YEARS OLD MOM THAT LIVES WITH US AND SHE
 DOES NOT WANT TO MOVE AWAY FROM HER HOME. NOBODY
 CAN BE HELD BY THE AIRWAYS. WHAT WOULD YOU
 DO IF THIS WOULD BE HAPPENING OVER YOUR HOUSE?
 HELP US PLEASE!!!
 FAVIA R. G. JASPER
 4407 SW 38TH TOWN
 DANIA BEACH, FL 33312
 954 894 7142 H.
 954 683 6125 O.

F-LLC160

JUL 21 2008 03:43P JASPER

9549810819000

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

July 22, 2008

Ms. Lane, FEIS - FLL SOUTH RUNWAY EXTENSION

The environmental impact statement is flawed. This response relates to your latest acceptance of this study as developed by the Broward County Commissioners. The FAA has accepted recommendations of the BCC. Those recommendations are not in the best interests of Broward County residents nor the FAA!

The selection of the South Runway option impacts far more people than the reported 3000 homes. There are numerous homes and business developments directly under the proposed flight path that were not included in the study. I live in a 3 yr. old gated subdivision on the Dania Cut-Off Canal that was omitted from the study. The North Runway option affects only an estimated 60 households. Based on those numbers, I cannot understand how you could possibly accept the recommendation of the commission.

There is no environmental reason for FAA to accept the recommendation of BCC regarding south runway extension. Thousands more residents will be negatively impacted by noise, pollution and dramatically reduced home value. We live in South Florida for the outdoor lifestyle. All privately owned pools, spas and backyard barbeques will become unusable. Even boating on the Dania Cut-Off canal will be ruined with the sound of planes overhead. As a test, we've positioned ourselves north of our house in the path of the north runway. With the approaching airplanes at nighttime from west to east with head lights on, it feels like they are going to crash into us, and the noise and vibration is intolerable. Tell me how I'm going to be able to sell my new expensive home due to the need of getting away from the noise.

We have monitored noise levels of airplanes taking off to the west. These airplanes have frequently registered in excess of 100 decibels during early morning take-offs. We have reported excessive noise to no avail.

United, American and Spirit Airlines have announced dramatic reductions in service. Northwest Airlines has announced closing all flight operations! These are serious financial problems for the airline industry. How can you justify increasing the size of an airport under these conditions?

There is no logic in destroying the crosswind runway to build an extended south runway. The citizens of this county cannot afford this politically driven mistake. The demand for an extended runway is not plausible. Flight numbers are diminishing daily and projections show more of the same. Air traffic is decreasing every day due to many factors.

We need business driven decisions. We do not need politically driven decisions that do not benefit the citizens of Broward County.

Sincerely, Ron Bogue

Ron Bogue
3051 SW 44 ST.

DANIA BEACH, FL 33312

F-LLC161

POD 3.10

POD 15.15
POD 30

July 27, 2008

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

Re: Comments on the FLL FEIS

Dear Ms. Lane:

As we've discussed in the past, where does one begin on a project of this magnitude. I believe this is the third EIS and I believe it is once again flawed, as is the FAA's preliminary decisions and the sponsors underlying data and calculations. More importantly, the sponsors preferred alternative should have been eliminated as a choice by the FAA feasibility studies, even if the FAA relied on Broward's erroneous, inaccurate, and in some cases, totally false data/information for the project.

p 4, 110

For example, for years, BCAD represented publicly that the cost of the runway would be in the \$600-700 million dollar range. However, even while representing that publicly, in internal e-mails they admitted to the costs running somewhere north of the \$800 million and even into the billion-dollar mark (and this is without any mitigation.)

ROD 15.16

Another example includes the BCAD Director writing a memo to the FAA to discount the Tower Chief memo concerning the South Runway vs the North and/or any other choice of runway. He claims in the letter the cost to relocate the business on the North Side of the field would be costly and result in reduced area on the airport for future expansions. I am now hearing that the largest tenant on the North side of the airfield, Embreair may be moving away from FLL. Further, that BCAD may have known that when they extended their contract and agreed to fund expansion of their facility last year, as a means to further eliminate the North parallel runway as an option. It should also be noted that Mr. George's letter does NOT include the reduction of property taxes that will be collected by Broward County and the local municipalities when the South Runway is built due to lower values from noise impacts, nor does it believe account for relocation of non airport related tenants to other areas of the county, freeing up more acreage (i.e. Animal Care and Regulation as well as the bus depot to name a few. Please note, Animal Care and Regulation will eventually have to be relocated, as those poor dogs/cats can't possibly be expected to tolerate jet noise from both sides!! It is animal cruelty!!). The North parallel impacts fewer homes, resulting in almost no loss of property value, hence tax reductions. I believe this loss of residential and commercial property tax reductions of the affected properties off airport will more than set

p 4, 36
p 4, 58

p 13, 19

F-6616Z

of his alleged and inflated \$3 billion dollar impact. You have to admit though; he really pulls the big numbers out of this air when he is trying to scare you away!

Final example, all along BCAD has indicated that probably 1 - 12 homes may be affected by the sponsors preferred alternative. Now in the FEIS, the map shows gray areas over my neighborhood, Metaleuca Gardens as well as a HUGE area west of the airport from I-95 west to 441, just north of Griffin Road! Makes you wonder what this is all about. I think it is about next Tuesday's August 5th meeting to pick a new project/program manager for FLL. It is my understanding that many of Broward politically powerful and rich may have an actual financial interest in URS, one of the bidders. URS has been the project manager at FLL and has not handled the jobs too well, losing millions in grants for which the projects were never done, major faults in the projects including a baggage area with no walls, by which the luggage and employees get wet when it rains (about every day here in South Florida, May through to Sept), a runway resurfacing which was botched and has to be redone, parking garages which have had structural issues which required expensive repairs, just to name a few. I understand the FAA has instituted a COMPLIANCE AUDIT for FLL to start in November. I would strongly urge you to hold any decision regarding expansion until after that audit is completed! One thing we've learned from MIA, is that you don't keep giving money to people who are mishandling it!

p 10-21
ROD 15.14

This expansion should be placed on hold in light of the current economic conditions in the United States, let alone in South Florida. Florida, for I believe the first time in it's history has more people moving out than in, so the economic feasibility study needs to reflect this new trend as the demand for flights will decrease accordingly to population and demand. In addition, Florida continues to have severe water shortage issues. It is my understanding that it will take a great deal of water to compact the fill necessary for the sponsors preferred elevated/escalated runway project. We just don't have it! It will be very interesting if the sponsors' project actually starts construction and Broward's residents are advised, there is not enough water for their homes, but there is for construction of a elevated/escalated runway that will cost taxpayers, in local, state and federal taxes over \$2 billion dollars!

In addition, the cost of fuel and travel is now prohibitive for most Americans, let alone the airlines. The airlines have started reducing flight operations, as have the cruise lines at Port Everglades for which this expansion is supposedly necessary. The FEIS does not include updated data/couunts with respect to flight operations, so the baselines used in the feasibility studies as well as the projections all need to be recalibrated.

ROD 3.0
ROD 3.10
ROD 5.11

Issues with the FEIS include the following:

F-6616Z

- The FAA will not approved any operational restrictions, on which Broward County has "sold" their preferred alternative to all of the surrounding communities in public hearings. At the very least, BCAD should be required to notify all of the same property owners who were noticed for these meetings in the past, that if the South Runway is selected and constructed, there will be NO LIMITATIONS as to use, include time of day, type of aircraft, etc. P 2, 6
- The FEIS does not take into considering the latest economic conditions, including costs of fuel, airlines leaving FLL, operational changes at FLL and the local Cruise lines, and therefore the feasibility studies within the FEIS are flawed. Rather they are relying on the use of 2002 data, which we all know is drastically different from today's conditions. The feasibility studies need to be recalculated based on updated economic data as well as new baseline and projected flight operations information. It is my belief that the alleged six-minute delay by 2020 is no longer in existence. Furthermore, it should be noted that the expansion is based on economic and operational benefits to the year 2030, while the environmental review is only to 2020. Also it should be noted, many of the legacy airlines are now facing the prospects of bankruptcy. R0D 3, 0
R0D 3, 10
- The FEIS does not include the mitigation/acquisition costs of the various options, nor does it take into account the reduced value of affected residential and commercial properties with respect to tax dollars to the County coffers! There should be an offset of these dollars included in the feasibility analysis. R 13, 7
P 6, 0
- One of the more humorous points used to try and eliminate other alternatives included the conclusion that these alternatives will encroach on Interstate 95 and the CSX railroad track. Maybe I should break the news to you....but the Sponsors preferred South Runway not only encroaches on US 1 and the FEC track, but will actually be built on top of them! Doesn't get anymore encroaching than that! Furthermore, the traffic on US1 is a bottleneck at this location every evening as it goes from 8 lanes in front of FLL to 4 lanes into Dania Beach. Therefore, these will not be fast moving cars (targets) as on I-95, but rather parked cars under a tunnel ready to be creamed! R0D 15, 16
P 4, 4
- Although the FEIS does not include noise studies, it does rely on estimated costs from the Part 150 for the financial feasibility ratios. Fact of the matter is, the Part 150 has never been modeled to generate contours for the elevated configuration of the South Runway. That should be a requirement before any decisions are made as it may determine that hundreds of residents will be affected and thereby drastically affect the costs used for the feasibility study and decision on which alternative is the best! Now I understand that is what the BCAD and other rich and powerful individuals are depending on as many view this whole plan as a land grab, but the FAA has an obligation to have accurate feasibility studies and ratios on which to make a decision. R0D 8, 20

• Why not the South Runway?

F-LC162

1. It is WAY more expensive!
2. It has the most noise and environment impacts on the MOST homes and parks including the John U. Lloyd State Park, recently hailed by U.S. Representative Ron Klein on the floor of the House of Representative as a NATIONAL TREASURE!
3. The Tower Chiefs memo outlines operational delays on the tarmac and safety concerns!
4. Most pilots have indicated they won't use it.
5. It is ELEVATED AND ESCALATED over a MAJOR FEDERAL HIGHWAY and the FEC RAILWAY, which creates all kinds of operational and safety issues!
6. Firefighters have indicated it would be virtually impossible to manage an accident/fire on this runway configuration.
7. Other than to be used to GRAB LAND, it does not make any sense, unless URS is once again voted to manage the project, resulting in many of Broward County's political and powerful getting so much richer than they already are on the backs of the working class neighborhoods that surround the airport!

In the final analysis – the data really shows the professional, ethical, moral, economical, and wisest course is to delay any expansion at FLL until the economy recovers, which some say will take up to five years. In the alternative, if the FAA and BCAD really believe they need to expand, then everything points to the North Parallel runway as it is a safer configuration, costs less, has less noise and environmental impact and still allows for plenty of future growth of the airport up to four runways in the future and a great deal of space to the west and east for locating current and future tenants on the property!

Finally, my seven year old, who can't help to hear all of talk about this issue is terrified that a day will come that he can no longer ride his bike down our street, or worse, that will have to move from our home!

Again, let's do the right thing! It's a no brainer!! FLL does not need to be expanded at this time due to the economy, but if it does, the North Parallel is the obvious choice! Let's not give into the special interests and the wealthy and powerful few at the cost of so many middle class Americans who work hard every day and at the end of the day, just want to come home and enjoy their quiet slice of paradise with their kids, neighbors and friends!

Sincerely

Anne Castro
838 NW 10th Avenue
Dania Beach, FL 33004

F-LC162

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

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

The South Runway Alternatives will also increase the noise in Dania Beach and will negatively impact the quality of life to residents. I live in line with the present south runway, with the north runway being just to the north, and the present noise can be extremely loud and disruptive at times. The planes wake me up &/or keep me awake at night or in the morning. Many times we have to stop talking because we cannot hear each other or simply can not enjoy a movie, TV or music. As I looked at the contour lines for projected noise for the proposed South Runway Alternatives it shows the noise level far worse than we presently have and the EIS does not even address the greater noise level of a raised runway. The noise from a raised South Runway will be deafening and far worse than the contour charts show. The Greenbelt buffer will provide no relief to noise for us and will in no way shield the ugly image of the runway. FAA has not addressed the Resident's enjoyment of Florida's gorgeous weather being severely impacted by the South Runway Expansion. We live out-of-doors all year around here in South Florida and the question of "how do you soundproof it" has not been answered. The fact is, that the North Runway Alternative would have less impact in all of the above areas. Add to all of this the fact that FAA has failed to comply with its own environmental laws for years and there is no reason to believe that they will live up to their own mitigation assurances.

F-LC163

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Patricia Wright
4391 SW 34 Lane, FT. Lauderdale 33312

F-LC163

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

Regarding: FEIS - FLL South Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Lane,

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

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

The South Runway Alternatives will also increase the noise in Dania Beach and will negatively impact the quality of life to residents. I live in line with the present south runway, with the north runway being just to the north, and the present noise can be extremely loud and disruptive at times. The planes wake me up &/or keep me awake at night or in the morning. Many times we have to stop talking because we cannot hear each other or simply can not enjoy a movie, TV or music. As I looked at the contour lines for projected noise for the proposed South Runway Alternatives it shows the noise level far worse than we presently have and the EIS does not even address the greater noise level of a raised runway. The noise from a raised South Runway will be deafening and far worse than the contour charts show. The Greenbelt buffer will provide no relief to noise for us and will in no way shield the ugly image of the runway. FAA has not addressed the Resident's enjoyment of Florida's gorgeous weather being severely impacted by the South Runway Expansion. People live out-of-doors all year around here in South Florida and the question of "how do you soundproof it" has not been answered. The fact is, is that the North Runway Alternative would have less impact in all of the above areas. Add to all of this the fact that FAA has failed to comply with its own environmental laws for years and there is no reason to believe that they will live up to their own mitigation assurances.

F-L-1164

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

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

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

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

F-L-1164

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

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

The South Runway Alternatives will also increase the noise in Dania Beach and will negatively impact the quality of life to residents. I live in line with the present south runway, with the north runway being just to the north, and the present noise can be extremely loud and disruptive at times. The planes wake me up &/or keep me awake at night or in the morning. Many times we have to stop talking because we cannot hear each other or simply can not enjoy a movie, TV or music. As I looked at the contour lines for projected noise for the proposed South Runway Alternatives it shows the noise level far worse than we presently have and the EIS does not even address the greater noise level of a raised runway. The noise from a raised South Runway will be deafening and far worse than the contour charts show. The Greenbelt buffer will provide no relief to noise for us and will in no way shield the ugly image of the runway. FAA has not addressed the Resident's enjoyment of Florida's gorgeous weather being severely impacted by the South Runway Expansion. We live out-of-doors all year around here in South Florida and the question of "how do you soundproof it?" has not been answered. The fact is, is that the North Runway Alternative would have less impact in all of the above areas. Add to all of this the fact that FAA has failed to comply with its own environmental laws for years and there is no reason to believe that they will live up to their own mitigation assurances.

F-LL165

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Randy Wright
4391 SW 34 Lane, FT. Lauderdale 33312

F-LL165

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

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

The South Runway Alternatives will also increase the noise in Dania Beach and will negatively impact the quality of life to residents. I live in line with the present south runway, with the north runway being just to the north, and the present noise can be extremely loud and disruptive at times. The planes wake me up &/or keep me awake at night or in the morning. Many times we have to stop talking because we cannot hear each other or simply can not enjoy a movie, TV or music. As I looked at the contour lines for projected noise for the proposed South Runway Alternatives it shows the noise level far worse than we presently have and the EIS does not even address the greater noise level of a raised runway. The noise from a raised South Runway will be deafening and far worse than the contour charts show. The Greenbelt buffer will provide no relief to noise for us and will in no way shield the ugly image of the runway. FAA has not addressed the Resident's enjoyment of Florida's gorgeous weather being severely impacted by the South Runway Expansion. People live out-of-doors all year around here in South Florida and the question of "how do you soundproof it" has not been answered. The fact is, is that the North Runway Alternative would have less impact in all of the above areas. Add to all of this the fact that FAA has failed to comply with its own environmental laws for years and there is no reason to believe that they will live up to their own mitigation assurances.

F-LC166

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

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

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

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

F-LC166