

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Focus Group Meeting #2 Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Palm Beach International Airport Environmental Impact Statement for Airport Improvement Program

Group A November 14, 2007

The purpose of the Focus Group Meeting was to provide neighborhood and community representatives an overview of the preliminary evaluation of alternatives for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The Focus Groups are comprised of forty-four citizens representing neighborhoods in the EIS study area. To facilitate discussion, two Focus Group meetings were scheduled to discuss FAA's preliminary evaluation of alternatives. The same alternatives evaluation information was presented at both Focus Group meetings. Twenty-two Focus Group members were invited to the meeting on November 14. Focus Group Members in attendance at the meeting were:

Nancy Pullum, El Cid Historic Neighborhood Association
Linda Cullen, Flamingo Park Neighborhood Association
Rick Rose, Grandview Heights Neighborhood Association
Gail Meade, Citizen's Committee on Aircraft Noise
Joyce Vaughn, Palm Beach

The points and issues discussed at the meeting are summarized below by topic. Additional clarification and response by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is also provided as necessary.

1. **ALTERNATIVES OVERVIEW PRESENTATION** - FAA and URS began the meeting with a presentation summarizing the preliminary evaluation of alternatives conducted for the EIS. Copies of the presentation material were provided to each Focus Group member attending the meeting. After the second nights meeting, the presentation material was made available to the public through the FAA's PBIA EIS web site.
2. **FUNDING** - It was noted by one Focus Group member [Rick Rose] that 65 percent of traffic at PBIA is general aviation (GA) and that the Proposed Action to provide additional capacity at PBIA is unfairly being funded by commercial passengers and local taxes. During the discussion, FAA noted that operational delays at PBIA equally affect all users – commercial and private GA. With regard to funding, FAA noted that airport improvements of this nature are typically funded with a combination of federal, state and local funds. These funds are derived from aviation-based user fees such as aviation fuel taxes, Passenger Facility Charges (PFC's), and airport revenues, and not local taxes.

3. **USE OF OTHER AIRPORTS** - Several of the Focus Group members [Rick Rose, Tom Conboy, Nancy Pullum] strongly questioned why the alternative concept that would use other airports in the area to supplement PBI, thereby increasing capacity and reducing delay at PBI, was eliminated from further consideration. It was requested by Rick Rose that FAA fully explore relocating PBI based GA traffic to other area airports as a means to reduce delay at PBI; that FAA disclose in the EIS the impact of moving GA operations on the justification for the need for the Proposed Action at PBI; and that FAA acknowledge that the purpose of the Proposed Action was really for the benefit of GA users. FAA was also asked by Nancy Pullum what studies and/or surveys have been conducted that lead FAA to the conclusion that other airports could not be used to alleviate congestion and delay at PBI.

During the discussion of this alternative and the points listed above, FAA responded with the following:

- FAA does not have the authority to tell either airlines or private pilots which airport they can and cannot use. Public airports are, by law, open to everyone.
 - FAA considered ten commercial and GA airports in the Palm Beach area for possible use to alleviate congestion and reduce delay at PBI. The three GA airports in Palm Beach County that are under the operational jurisdiction of the Airport Sponsor would all require substantial improvements, such as runway extensions and GA support facility development in order to accommodate GA and/or commercial operations currently taking place at PBI. FAA noted that the County manages its airport system to serve large GA aircraft and commercial service aircraft at PBI and smaller GA operations at its other airports. Airport Sponsors outside of the County's jurisdiction have not approached the FAA with a request to use their airports to relieve traffic at PBI, or to construct suitable support facilities and runway improvements that would be needed to attract larger GA operations from PBI.
 - FAA does not sponsor, build or operate airports. If a new airport was proposed to increase capacity and reduce delay at PBI, a government body, authority or private entity ("willing sponsor") would need to approach the FAA with a request to establish a new airport. To-date, no such request had been made to the FAA.
4. **HISTORICAL AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS** – A timeline plot chart depicting recorded historical (1976 – 2006) and FAA-projected (2007-2025) totals of PBI annual aircraft operations was prepared and circulated by Tom Conboy. An aircraft operation is classified as either a take-off or a landing. As presented, it was stated that the annualized aircraft operational data was obtained through FAA sources. Although it was assumed that the aircraft operational data reflected the FAA's Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) developed specifically for PBI, the documented source of the aircraft operational data was not provided at the Focus Group meeting. Without having the actual data used to develop the time series plot, a subsequent review by URS verified that that the depicted data and timeline presented was within one percent of the historical and projected total annual operations as listed within the FAA's latest TAF published for PBI.

As part of the presentation of the historical operational levels, it was noted that since 1976, the total number of aircraft operations occurring at PBI have continuously decreased. It was further noted that in 1980, the airport experienced almost 267,800 annual operations, far higher the 194,100 reported for 2006. Through the use of exponential smoothing of historical operational levels, a negatively-sloping generalized trend line was incorporated into the plotted time series graph that clearly demonstrated this trend.

Based on this finding, the question of the need for additional airfield capacity to accommodate existing and projected levels of aircraft operational demand at PBI was raised. Based on the argument that the airport has experienced higher levels of aircraft operations in the past without incurred associated levels of aircraft operational delay, the question of current need for the proposed runway improvement at this time was asked of the FAA.

In an effort to offer a reasonable and simplified explanation of why existing levels of aircraft operational delay necessitate the proposed runway improvements it was noted by FAA that the relative mix of aircraft generating aviation activity at PBI has changed substantially over the last few decades. For instance, production of and activity by light general aviation aircraft peaked in the 1980's, generating the highest levels of historical aircraft activity. As the general aviation industry experienced its highest number of entry-level pilots, the associated levels of training and practiced operations in the form of "touch-and-go's" and low-level approaches served to increase the overall number of recorded aircraft operations. For reasons of increased cost of operations and aircraft manufacturer liability, the level of recreational flight activity by these smaller general aviation aircraft have decreased markedly since that time, throughout the nation.

This shift in operations was subsequently verified by FAA/URS utilizing the same referenced historical FAA TAF data. During the five-year period from 1976 through the end of 1980, "local" general aviation aircraft operations at PBI represented as much as 33 percent of all general aviation operations and as much as 27 percent of all aircraft operations. To accommodate these increased levels of training operations at the airport, the majority of such training operations were conducted on the shorter parallel runway (Runway 9R-27L). By design, the use of the shorter parallel runway served to offer acceptable levels of capacity and levels of aircraft operational delay for all other users.

In direct response to past growth trends of general aviation activity at PBI, the County developed the North Palm Beach County Airport in 1996 to accommodate the anticipated continued growth of general aviation activity. Serving as a designated "Reliever Airport" to PBI, the North Palm Beach County Airport accommodated almost 70,000 annual operations in 2004. Combined with the County's second general aviation Reliever Airport, Palm Beach County Park Airport, the overall number of general aviation aircraft operations at PBI has steadily decreased over time to approximately 93,000 operations (2006), down considerably from the high of over 215,000 experienced in 1979.

Today, local general aviation operations at PBI represent only 3 percent of all general aviation operations and 2 percent of all operations. The FAA's TAF indicates that the projected relative percentage of local general aviation activity operations at PBI will remain unchanged throughout the remainder of the forecast period (2026).

From these findings, it can be inferred that the remaining mix of general aviation aircraft operating at PBI represent the larger "cabin-class" genre of general aviation aircraft.

While these operations account for approximately 65 percent of all aircraft operations at PBI, the increased need for air traffic control and aircraft in-flight separation, avoidance of wake turbulence and the adherence to the safe and efficient use of the runways and airspace, all serve to produce the increasing need to more efficiently accommodate both general aviation and air carrier operations at PBI.

Based on current conditions and planning efforts, there is a need to increase capacity at PBI and projections indicate that average annual delays at PBI would become unacceptable within the next ten years.

5. **JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT** – A Focus Group member [Tom Conboy] questioned the validity of the FAA's *Future Airport Capacity Task 2 Study* (FACT 2) that identified PBI as having the need for capacity improvements to reduce delay. As designed and executed, the FACT 2 study addressed the need for additional capacity at a number of the nation's air carrier airports for the period 2015-2025. The FACT 2 Study employed unique data and information review and validation techniques that are not typically employed within the FAA's Terminal Area Forecast (TAF). Although the FACT 2 Study utilized airport- and locale-specific considerations, it serves as a useful investigative, forecasting and planning tool and also serves to compliment and further validates the need for airfield improvements at PBI that were previously identified within the FAA's TAF. The EIS is utilizing the published and accepted projections of aviation activity levels contained in the FAA's TAF for PBI. Although used for comparative and validation purposes, the findings of the FACT 2 Study are not specifically being used as supporting data for the Sponsor's Proposed Action.

At the meeting, the FAA could not comment as to the details of the FACT 2 input assumption and computer models since the study was completed by a different part of the FAA organization. FAA (Airports) said it would look into the FACT 2 methodology. However, FAA did note that the basis for the Proposed Action was substantiated solely by the use of the FAA's TAF projections for PBI as well as other detailed planning studies, airfield simulations, and activity forecasts conducted by the County.

6. **CONSIDERATION OF ECONOMIC FACTORS** – FAA was asked by Rick Rose if economic factors were considered in the alternatives evaluation. FAA responded that Level 2 of the alternatives screening evaluation considered economic factors in terms of costs associated with construction and relocations. FAA noted that

other potential socio-economic impacts associated with each of the retained alternatives will be documented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

7. **SHIFTING TRAFFIC TO OTHER AIRPORTS** – A second discussion of shifting aircraft operations to surrounding area airports focused on what measures were available by the FAA or the County to make GA pilots use other area airports. It was suggested by several Focus Group members [Rick Rose, Tom Conboy, and Nancy Pullum] that the County should implement landing fees or other fees such as peak-period pricing on GA users at PBIA. The intent of this would be to make operating at PBIA less attractive, and thereby induce some GA operations to move from PBIA to the other area airports. LaGuardia and JFK airports in New York were cited as examples of an Airport Sponsor shifting operations within a multiple airport system in order to maximize capacity at all of the airports. As an alternate strategy, it was suggested by a Focus Group member [Nancy Pullum] that the County could also provide incentives, such as reduced user fees, at its other airports to promote the use of those airports as an alternative to PBIA.

In response, FAA noted that an Airport Sponsor cannot charge discriminatory fees or treat different airport users unfairly. Although the FAA does not have the authority to impose measures to divert activity from one airport to another, FAA noted that an owner of an airport system, such as the County, can manage its airports to achieve its goals for the airport system. Case in point, the County has developed two reliever airports for PBIA that have been effective at shifting smaller-sized GA traffic from PBIA to its other airports. It was also noted by FAA that the County manages its airport system to serve the needs of large GA aircraft and commercial service aircraft at PBIA, and the needs of the smaller-sized GA fleet at its other airports. Implementing high user fees or incentives may have some effect on airport utilization within the system; however, FAA does not consider this approach a viable alternative that would provide the needed airfield capacity and reduce delays at PBIA.

8. **USE OF ST. LUCIE COUNTY AIRPORT** – A Focus Group member [Rick Rose] asked if the FAA had approached St. Lucie County and asked the county to develop their airport to accommodate operations that might be shifted from PBIA. FAA responded that they have not approached St. Lucie County, nor has anyone from St. Lucie County approached the FAA in regard to shifting traffic from PBIA to St. Lucie County International Airport. FAA noted that the agency does not solicit proposals from airports for airport development projects, or to build new airports (see Item 3 above).
9. **RUNWAY NORTH OF BELVEDERE BLVD** – A Focus Group member [Rick Rose] asked about an alternative that he had seen that placed a new parallel runway on the north side of Belvedere Boulevard. FAA stated that such an alternative may have been developed at one time in a study prepared by the Airport Sponsor, but that particular alternative is not being considered by FAA in the DEIS.
10. **RUNWAY CONFIGURATION AND USE** – Responding to several technical questions, the FAA explained the operational characteristics of a parallel runway system when compared to an intersecting runway configuration. FAA noted that

the Proposed Action's parallel runway system would improve airfield capacity and reduce delay when compared to the existing PBI runway layout. This would be achieved under the Proposed Action by allowing one runway to be used primarily for arrivals and the other runway primarily for departures. FAA clarified that the close spacing of the parallel air carrier runways (800 feet) would allow for dependent operations, but not independent simultaneous operations. The current airfield configuration is operationally constrained by its intersecting runway configuration. Arrivals and departures are essentially conducted on a single runway during most operating conditions. The County's Proposed Action would use the 8,000-foot southern parallel runway (Runway 9R) for arrivals and the 10,000-foot northern runway (Runway 9L) for departures. This operational scenario would also provide the most optimum configuration for handling taxiing aircraft on the ground.

11. **USE OF CROSSWIND RUNWAY FOR HURRICANES** – A Focus Group member [Nancy Pullum] commented that the crosswind runway (Runway 13/31) is necessary for hurricane evacuations and relief efforts. FAA responded that the County's Proposed Action retains Runway 13/31, but with a shorter runway length (4,000 feet). Alternative 2 would eliminate the crosswind runway. At PBI, the smaller-sized GA aircraft (i.e., single-engine props) are typically more susceptible to wind conditions and have more of a need for a crosswind runway than the larger GA and commercial aircraft. FAA explained that it anticipates that in a hurricane situation, all aircraft would have sufficient warning to either depart the airport or shelter the aircraft in a hangar. Likewise, arriving aircraft would be diverted to another airport. During post-disaster relief efforts, the runway configuration under the Proposed Action, which retains a crosswind runway, would provide sufficient wind coverage for most aircraft to operate safely. FAA noted that it does not have design or safety requirements that an airport maintain a crosswind runway for emergency relief situations.
12. **AIRPORT CAPACITY AND DELAY SIMULATION** – In response to questions on airfield capacity and delay calculations, FAA responded that a combination of methods, including detailed computer modeling (SIMMOD), were used to calculate and evaluate the potential operational benefits of each alternative. One Focus Group member [Tom Conboy] requested a copy of the calculations that determined the anticipated average annual delay for the 2018 No-Action Alternative. FAA replied that the technical appendices to the DEIS will contain the capacity/delay modeling assumptions and the results of the modeling. Since this information is still being evaluated by the FAA, it is not available for release to the public at this time.
13. **CHANGE IN MEETING VENUE/FORMAT** – It was requested that the FAA consider a new meeting location that did not impose a time constraint due to building closure requirements (end meeting by 8 p.m.). FAA acknowledged that the alternatives topic was very detailed and time consuming and agreed to consider a location for the next meeting that would allow more time, if needed.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Focus Group Meeting #2 Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Palm Beach International Airport Environmental Impact Statement for Airport Improvement Program

Group B November 15, 2007

The purpose of the Focus Group Meeting was to provide neighborhood and community representatives an overview of the preliminary evaluation of alternatives for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The Focus Groups are comprised of forty-four citizens representing neighborhoods in the EIS study area. To facilitate discussion, two Focus Group meetings were scheduled to discuss FAA's preliminary evaluation of alternatives. The same alternatives evaluation information was presented at both Focus Group meetings. Twenty-two Focus Group members were invited to the meeting on November 15. Focus Group members in attendance were:

Al Vasquez, Parker Ridge Neighborhood Association
Nina Blakeman, Prospect Heights Neighborhood Association
Jose Rodriquez, Vedado Park Neighborhood Association
Brenda Warren, Royal Palm Estates
Paul Agnew, Citizens Committee on Noise
Michael Smith, Town of Cloud Lake
Kevin Wellman, Town of Glen Ridge

The points and issues discussed at the meeting are summarized below by topic. Additional clarification and response by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is also provided as necessary.

1. **ALTERNATIVES OVERVIEW PRESENTATION** - FAA and URS began the meeting with a presentation summarizing the preliminary evaluation of alternatives conducted for the EIS. Copies of the presentation material were provided to each Focus Group member attending the meeting. After the second nights meeting, the presentation material was made available to the public through the FAA's PBI A EIS web site.
2. **MEETING NOTICES** – One Focus Group member [Paul Agnew] stated that he did not receive the invitation letter to the Focus Group meeting and had only learned about the meeting that morning. FAA responded that invitation letters to each Focus Group member were mailed via first class mail approximately thirty days in advance of the meeting. FAA apologized that the letter was not received and stated that future meeting notices and invitations will be sent via registered mail and e-mail. FAA will also place follow-up phones calls prior to the meeting to ensure meeting notices were received.

3. **NOISE** – One Focus Group member [Michael Smith] stated that he was concerned about noise impacts to his community. He requested that a noise monitor be placed in the Town of Cloud Lake and noted that the nearest monitor was two miles south of the town. He questioned how the noise analysis would be conducted on the alternatives and stated that the noise analysis information needed to be made available to the public. He also asked how the FAA would know what the noise levels would be if they did not monitor and measure noise levels in the town. [Note: The need for noise monitoring to establish a baseline noise condition and to verify the Integrated Noise Model (INM) results was also noted in a subsequent discussion by Al Vasquez.]

In response, FAA explained that the Palm Beach County Department of Airports (PBC DOA) has a noise monitoring system in place, although no monitors are located in Cloud Lake. FAA indicated that data from these monitors would be looked at for the noise analysis included in the DEIS. FAA explained the applicability and use of the INM to analyze potential noise impacts associated with the Proposed Action and the alternatives carried forward for detailed study in the EIS. FAA explained that the noise analysis in the DEIS will document the existing noise conditions in the EIS study area, but that the evaluation of alternatives in the DEIS will be based on a comparison of the future year No-Action noise levels and the future year “Build” alternatives. In addition, FAA stated that based on public comments and concerns received during the Scoping process, the scope of work for the Phase 2 noise analysis was greatly expanded to include noise metrics and operational conditions that are not normally evaluated by FAA. FAA indicated that a detailed discussion of the EIS noise analysis will be the topic of a subsequent Focus Group meeting.

4. **STUDY BASIS AND ASSUMPTIONS** – Two Focus Group members [Paul Agnew and Al Vasquez] separately stated that the forecast of operations at PBIA, which justifies the need for the Proposed Action, is based on flawed economic growth models/assumptions, and that the need for additional capacity at PBIA is unfounded. Both Focus Group members cited a recent study titled “*Future Airport Capacity Task 2*” (FACT 2), and noted that PBIA was specifically mentioned in the study as an airport that needed capacity enhancement improvements. In response, FAA briefly discussed the FACT 2 study and provided an overview of how aviation forecasts are developed. FAA noted that the FACT 2 study was developed independently of the forecasts prepared by the PBC DOA and the branch of the FAA that develops the annual Terminal Area Forecast (TAF). FAA stated that the forecast being used in the EIS is the FAA’s TAF, which actually shows slightly fewer operations than the PBC DOA Master Plan forecasts. Finally, FAA pointed out that although the TAF and FACT 2 results were derived using different methodologies and assumptions, they both support the justification for the Proposed Action.
5. **INTERSECTING RUNWAYS** – A Focus Group member [Paul Agnew] asked whether the Level 1 alternatives screening criteria of enhancing safety by eliminating intersecting runways at PBIA was based on a FAA or National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) national directive, and whether FAA would try to eliminate all intersecting runways at airports across the country. FAA responded that removing runway intersections was not a national agency policy,

but is preferred when able to do so to improve airfield capacity and enhance safety (e.g., reduce runway incursions).

6. **LAND AND HOLD SHORT OPERATIONS** – It was asked by Paul Agnew whether the FAA considered Land and Hold Short Operations (LAHSO) on any of the other alternatives evaluated and if a variation of the “Scoping Alternative” (change the proposed operational flow) was considered. FAA responded that the Scoping Alternative was evaluated as it was submitted to FAA. As of the time of the Focus Group meetings, FAA had not modified the Scoping Alternative to consider a changed operational flow. However, a variation of the Scoping Alternative to consider LAHSO using a different operational flow suggested by the Focus Group member will be evaluated by FAA and included in the DEIS. FAA did not evaluate other alternatives using the LAHSO concept.
7. **“WILLING SPONSOR” FOR OTHER AIRPORT(S)** – With regard to the alternative concepts of developing a new airport or using an existing airport to supplement PBIA, one Focus Group member [Kevin Wellman] commented that the FAA’s statement that no “willing sponsor” has come forward to-date is a misrepresentation, and that what needs to happen is that FAA should be approaching potential airport owners/operators to start the process. FAA responded that the agency does not build and operate airports. If a new airport was proposed to increase capacity and reduce delay at PBIA, a government, authority or other private entity (“willing sponsor”) would need to approach the FAA with a request to establish a new airport. To-date, no such request has been made to the FAA.

A related comment by Al Vasquez questioned how the FAA could come up with other alternatives (e.g., Alternatives 1 and 2) if there was not a “willing sponsor”? FAA replied that the agency can work with an airport sponsor (in this case the County) on the subject airport, but can not go to other public or private entities to initiate plans for airport improvements or a new airport. FAA mentioned that it did consider other County-owned airports and the ability of each airport to address the capacity and delay issues at PBIA. A Focus Group member [Jose Rodriguez] asked if the concept of sending GA traffic to the North Palm Beach County Airport could be included in the EIS for further study. FAA responded that this alternative concept had already been considered and that it was not retained for additional study.

8. **GENERAL AVIATION USER FEES** – The need for the Proposed Action at PBIA was questioned in light of the fact that approximately 65 percent of the traffic at PBIA is associated with GA aircraft. A Focus Group member [Kevin Wellman] commented that the capacity and delay problem at PBIA could be solved if the GA users would be charged fees that would help shift GA traffic to other airports. FAA responded that an airport owner cannot charge discriminatory fees or treat different airport users unfairly. FAA described that the County manages its airport system to serve large GA aircraft and commercial service aircraft at PBIA and not its other airports, which are managed for the smaller-sized GA fleet. FAA discussed the use of supplemental airports, GA operations, and the role of and expansion capabilities of the County’s other airports. In summary, FAA stated that charging fees or promoting incentives to GA users may have some effect on airport utilization; however, the FAA does not consider this approach a

- viable alternative that would provide the needed airfield capacity and reduce delays at PBI.
9. **MINIMIZE IMPACTS** – A Focus Group member [Nina Blakeman] stated that she agreed with the prior Focus Group member comments and discussion. She stated that neighborhoods should not be impacted negatively (no noise, no soot, etc.) and that FAA has a duty to minimize impacts on people already living in the community. FAA responded that the purpose of the EIS process was to disclose the potential impacts associated with the Proposed Action and reasonable alternatives, and for those impacts that are unavoidable, develop a mitigation program that minimizes and compensates for the impacts.
 10. **NOISE CONTOURS** – A Focus Group member [Brenda Warren] asked if the noise contours for each of the alternatives could be provided to the Focus Group members. FAA replied that the agency will generate noise contours for the three alternatives retained for detailed analysis in the DEIS, but not for each of the alternatives evaluated in the three level screening process. This is because the other alternatives were not considered to be reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action and because of the time and expense involved in developing the noise contours. FAA noted that the alternatives screening process was employed to identify alternatives for which detailed environmental study would be conducted. In response to a question as to when the contours would be made available to the public, FAA replied that the noise contours will be made available in the Draft EIS, which is scheduled to be published in the fall of 2008.
 11. **TIMELINESS OF INFORMATION** – Several Focus Group members shared a concern about having to quickly review and understand the information provided at the meeting. Brenda Warren and Jose Rodriguez commented that having the information in advance of the meeting would help the members be better prepared with questions and better prepared to share the meeting's information with their respective communities. It was also noted that the Alternatives Public Workshop was in two weeks and that some communities did not have regularly scheduled meetings within that time period at which the Focus Group member(s) could disseminate the information to their communities. FAA acknowledged this concern and discussed the process of conducting the EIS studies, preparing information, and scheduling meetings. In some cases, it is difficult to provide advance meeting materials; however, this will be considered for the future meetings. In regard to local dissemination of information, FAA noted the preliminary alternatives evaluation information provided to each Focus Group member would also be posted on the project's web site for public review after the Focus Group meetings and in advance of the Alternatives Public Workshop.
 12. **EIS SCHEDULE** – It was noted by one Focus Group member [Kevin Wellman] that the Ft. Lauderdale EIS is taking twelve years to complete, and they asked why the PBI EIS is "being rushed" to complete it in two years. FAA replied that most EIS's are completed in approximately three years and that the Ft. Lauderdale EIS has taken so long because the Proposed Action changed numerous times during the development of the EIS and each time the project changed, it had to be re-evaluated. FAA also explained the need to have a reasonable project schedule, and the agency's commitment to keep the project on schedule.

13. **SPANISH DOCUMENTS** – Al Vasquez said he had not received a Spanish language version of the DEIS document. FAA replied that the DEIS Executive Summary will be published in Spanish, but that it had not been prepared yet. It will be available with the DEIS, which is scheduled for publication in the fall of 2008.
14. **PEAK HOUR vs. ENTIRE DAY PLANNING** – One Focus Group member [Al Vasquez] commented that the County and FAA are doing the proposed project to accommodate the capacity and delay needs of the busiest hour of the day (peak hour) at PBI, and that the project would not be needed if airport operations were better spread out over the entire day. FAA replied that it is the accepted industry standard and practice for airport planning to evaluate annual and peak-hour activity at airports. FAA noted that as a special consideration for the unique operational characteristics at PBI, the noise analysis for the DEIS would consider the average annual day, peak month-average day and busy day operational scenarios. Normally, only the average annual day operational scenario is considered in an EIS document.
15. **COST V. BENEFIT** – A Focus Group member [Brenda Warren] questioned spending \$400 million to provide capacity for only a three year period. FAA explained that the Proposed Action would provide an airfield that is operating at approximately 62 percent of its capacity in 2018. The operational benefit of the project and the capacity enhancement/delay reduction would extend beyond 2018.
16. **HANGAR RELOCATIONS** – It was asked by Kevin Wellman why some GA hangars on the south side of the airfield would be relocated and others would not. FAA explained that the hangars on the southeast corner of the airport would be located too close to the proposed runway and its approach, and they would not be in conformance with FAA's safety requirements. The other hangars and GA support facilities on the south side of the airport would be a safe distance from the relocated runway and therefore would not have to be moved. FAA stated that the cost of relocating the GA facilities was taken into account in the development of the cost estimate for the Proposed Action.
17. **REQUEST TO RESCHEDULE WORKSHOP** – A suggestion was made to reschedule the Alternatives Public Workshop on November 27 to allow more time for the Focus Group members to pass on the information provided by the FAA to their communities, to avoid a conflict with the scheduled Historic Commission meeting, and avoid holiday conflicts. FAA acknowledged and apologized for the potential conflicts, but a decision was made to conduct the Public Workshop as scheduled.
18. **EXAMPLE EIS/RECORD OF DECISION** – Paul Agnew asked if the agency could provide an example of an EIS and/or a Record of Decision to a member of the Focus Group. FAA replied that several of the agency's EIS studies and all of its Record of Decisions (ROD's) are posted on the internet. ROD examples posted on the internet can be found at the following address: http://www.faa.gov/airports_airtraffic/airports/environmental/records_decision/

19. **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS** – It was noted by a Focus Group member [Paul Agnew] that assuming that the County’s project would be selected, the communities should focus on the environmental impacts of that alternative. FAA replied that no decisions had been made yet concerning the approval of the Proposed Action or the other reasonable alternative.
20. **OTHER ISSUES** – One Focus Group member [Jose Rodriguez] cited several issues he felt has led to a feeling of mistrust on the project. The issues included: 1) FAA only provided a two week notice for Scoping Meeting; 2) FAA was “antagonistic”; 3) FAA’s control of meetings; and 4) there is no trust. FAA noted that there was a 30-day notice for the Scoping Meeting, and that the agency will explore means of conducting more meaningful and productive meetings.