

**National Park Service**  
**U.S. Department of the Interior**

Everglades National Park  
Florida



Acquisition of Florida Power and Light Company  
Lands in the East Everglades Expansion Area /  
Environmental Impact Statement

*Public Scoping Comment Summary Report*

October 2011





## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Everglades National Park has initiated the Environmental Impacts Statement (EIS) process through a Notice of Intent, published in the Federal Register, and issuance of a public scoping newsletter, for the plan to address the acquisition of Florida Power and Light Company land in the East Everglades Expansion Area.

On June 7, 2011, Everglades National Park requested public scoping comments on a public scoping newsletter that was distributed by mail and posted on the National Park Service website. Scoping comments were accepted through July 25, 2011. A public scoping meeting was held on June 22, 2011. During the public scoping period, the park received 10,120 correspondences containing 39,739 individual comments. There were 9,714 form letters received. The comments received were reflective of a public that is passionate about the future of the park's resources, their uses and management. The most common comment received expressed opposition to installation of any transmission lines in or adjacent to the park (code AL2000), representing 74 percent of all comments. The second most prevalent comment expressed opposition to Alternative 2 – Land Exchange (code AL1500), representing 25 percent of all comments. Thus, approximately 99 percent of all comments expressed opposition to all transmission line construction or completion of the land exchange for the purposes of constructing a transmission line.

This report summarizes the range of comments received, identifies substantive comments, provides concern statements reflecting these substantive comments, and provides a full listing of comments received.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Introduction.....	1
Public Comment Opportunities .....	1
The Comment Analysis Process.....	2
Definitions of Terms .....	3
Method for Analyzing Public Scoping Comments.....	3
Guide to this Document.....	4
Comment Summary Report .....	5
Public Concern Statement Report .....	8
Appendix 1: Meeting Sign-in.....	51
Appendix 2: Index by Code Report .....	57
Appendix 3: Non-Substantive Issues Report .....	65

[This page intentionally left blank]



## INTRODUCTION

Everglades National Park has initiated the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process for the plan to address the acquisition of Florida Power and Light (FPL) Company lands in the East Everglades Expansion Area (Expansion Area). The NPS published a Notice of Intent to proceed with the plan in the Federal Register on May 26, 2011, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and associated implementing regulations, and National Park Service (NPS) guidance on meeting NPS NEPA obligations.

### PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The public scoping newsletter was issued on June 7, 2011, and the public comment period was opened. The document was posted on the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) website, with a link from the park's website. A press release about the project and public scoping process was sent out on the park's media list on June 9, 2011 and information about the project and a link to the newsletter was emailed to several thousand individuals and organizations on the park's mailing list. The NPS provided several methods for the community to provide input on the proposed project, including directing comments to the NPS PEPC website at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/ever>. The public was encouraged to submit comments regarding the public scoping newsletter through the PEPC website, by emailing park staff, or by mailing a letter to the NPS Service Center located in Denver, Colorado. The public comment period was closed on July 25, 2011.

The NPS held a public scoping meeting to gather input on the proposed EIS on June 22, 2011 in Miami, Florida. The meeting was held at the Florida International University Stadium Club from 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm. One hundred and eight people attended. The meeting began with an open house, allowing the public to view display boards and other informational materials describing the project background and study area, the purpose and need for the acquisition of FPL lands, and possible alternatives to be analyzed in the EIS. NPS personnel were available to answer questions or concerns presented by the community. Everglades National Park Superintendent, Dan Kimball, gave a brief presentation to explain the project, including the project's purpose and concepts for preliminary alternatives.

This privately-owned parcel as well as several others must be acquired to facilitate restoration flows within the park – one of the primary objectives of the long-term Everglades ecosystem restoration plans. The FPL parcel is a linear north-south corridor of between 330 feet and 370 feet in width and approximately 7.4 miles in length. The parcel was purchased by FPL in the 1960s and early 1970s, prior to the expansion of the park, with the intention of supporting a future transmission lines from the Turkey Point power plant located south of Biscayne to locations north of metropolitan Miami. The draft EIS will address potential impacts to the natural and human environment that may result from the construction and operation of a transmission corridor associated with the options for land acquisition.

The current draft alternative concepts for FPL land acquisition include the following:

- **No Acquisition or Exchange.** This alternative would assume no change in ownership of the existing FPL parcel. Impacts analyses would assume subsequent construction of transmission lines through the interior of the expansion area.
- **Land Exchange with Conditions.** This alternative would include the land exchange authorized by the Omnibus Land Management Act of 2009 with appropriate conditions for

the exchange. Impacts analyses would address the effects of construction and maintenance of the transmission corridor on the exchange lands.

- **Acquisition/Condemnation.** This alternative would evaluate the option of NPS acquiring or condemning FPL's interest in the park, thereby removing the potential for transmission line construction within park boundaries. This alternative would ensure that the baseline of existing impacts is analyzed. It would also discuss the logistic and fiscal information related to the acquisition.

Following the presentation, the public provided formal oral comments. Attendees also had the options of 1) completing a comment form and submitting it at the meeting or mailing it to the park at any time during the public comment period, or 2) submitting their comment directly to the meeting's court reporter. The proceedings of the full public meeting were documented by a court reporter and a transcript was provided to the NPS. The meeting agenda, Superintendent's power point presentation and transcript can be found at the following link on the project PEPC site: <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/ever>.

Public comments received as a result of the public scoping period and meeting are detailed in the following sections of this report.

## THE COMMENT ANALYSIS PROCESS

Comment analysis is a process used to compile and correlate similar public scoping comments into a usable format for decision makers and the project interdisciplinary planning team and the public to better understand the project. Comment analysis assists the team in organizing, clarifying, and addressing technical information pursuant to NEPA regulations. It also aids in identifying the topics and issues to be evaluated and considered throughout the planning process.

The process includes five main components:

- developing a coding structure
- employing a comment database for comment management
- reading and coding of public scoping comments
- interpreting and analyzing the comments to identify issues and themes
- preparing a comment summary

A coding structure was developed to help sort comments into logical groups by topic and issue. The NPS derived the coding structure from an analysis of the range of topics discussed during internal scoping, past planning documents, and the comments themselves. The coding structure was designed to capture all the content of all comments rather than to restrict or exclude any ideas.

The project's NPS PEPC database was used to manage the comments. The database stores the full text of all correspondence and allows each comment to be coded by topic and issue. The database tallies the total number of pieces of correspondence and comments received, can sort and report comments by a particular topic or issue, and provides demographic information on the sources of each comment.

Analysis of the public comments involved assigning codes to statements made in public scoping letters, email messages, and written scoping comment forms, and at the public meeting. All comments were read and analyzed. Types of comments received included those of a technical nature including scientific data, resource management, legal and policy requirements, visitor opportunities and restoration goals, opinions, feelings, suggestions for alternative elements to be considered in the EIS, and comments of a personal or philosophical nature.

During coding, comments were also classified as substantive or non-substantive. A substantive comment is defined in the NPS Director's Order 12 Handbook as one that does one or more of the following (Director's Order 12, Section 4.6A):

- Questions, with a reasonable basis, the accuracy of information presented
- Questions, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of the environmental analysis
- Presents reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the EA
- Causes changes or revisions in the proposal

As further stated in Director's Order 12, substantive comments "raise, debate, or question a point of fact or policy. Comments in favor of or against the proposed action or alternatives, or comments that only agree or disagree with NPS policy, are not considered substantive." While all comments were read and considered, only those determined to be substantive were analyzed for creation of concern statements to be addressed in the EIS document, as described below.

Under each code, all substantive comments were grouped by similar themes, and those groups were summarized with a concern statement. Following each concern statement are one or more "representative quotes" which are comments taken from the correspondence to illustrate the issue, concern, or idea expressed by the comments grouped under that concern statement.

Although the analysis process attempts to capture the full range of public concerns, this content analysis report should be used with caution. Comments from people who chose to respond do not necessarily represent the sentiments of the entire public. Furthermore, the public scoping process is not a voting process and, therefore, the emphasis is on the content of the comments and not the number of times a comment is received.

## DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Primary terms used in the document include the following:

**Correspondence:** A piece of correspondence is the entire document received from a commenter. It can be in the form of a letter, email, written comment form, transcript, or petition.

**Comment:** A comment is a portion of the text within a piece of correspondence that addresses a single subject. It could include such information as an expression of support or opposition to the use of a potential management tool, additional data regarding the existing condition, or an opinion debating the adequacy of an analysis.

**Code:** A grouping centered on a common subject. Codes are developed during the scoping process and are used to track major subjects throughout the planning process.

## METHOD FOR ANALYZING PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENTS

During the comment period, 10,120 pieces of correspondence were received, containing a total of 10,120 signatures and a total of 39,739 individual comments. Two hundred and forty three pieces of correspondence were received through the PEPC system, 36 were submitted at the public meeting, 9,832 were submitted through letters mailed to the park, six were received through email and three were received through other means.

Once all correspondence was entered into PEPC, each was read, and specific comments were identified. Once the comments were identified, each comment was assigned a code. The coding structure was comprised of codes established in the NPS PEPC system, (referred to as national codes), and codes

developed specifically for this project. An example of a code developed for this project includes comments specific to impact topics that should be selected for analysis in the EIS. The codes were used to identify the general content of a comment. The content of some comments fall under more than one code; therefore, the total number of coded comments is 39,746, due to multiple codes being assigned to some comments.

## GUIDE TO THIS DOCUMENT

This report is organized as follows:

**Comment Summary Report:** A report produced from PEPC that provides information on the numbers and types of comments received, organized by code and by various demographics. The first section is a summary of the number of comments under each code or topic, and the percentage of comments under each code.

Data are then presented on the correspondence number received by state, organization type, and the distribution by correspondence type.

**Comment/Response Report:** A report summarizing the substantive comments received during the public scoping process. Comments are organized by code and further organized into concern statements. Below each concern statement are representative quotes which have been taken directly from the text of the public's comments and have not been edited: therefore some spelling and grammar errors were not corrected. Representative quotes further clarify the concern statement.

**Appendix 1 – Meeting Sign-in:** All open house meeting attendees were asked to sign in. The name, address, and email of each attendee are provided.

**Appendix 2 – Index by Code Report:** This appendix lists which commenters or authors (identified by organization type) commented on which topics, as identified by the codes used in this analysis. The report is listed by code, and under each code is a list of the authors who submitted comments that fell under that code, and their correspondence numbers. Correspondence identified as N/A represents unaffiliated individuals.

**Appendix 3 – Non-Substantive Issues Report:** This appendix lists all non-substantive comments by code and provides the correspondence number, the comment text, the comment number, and the name of the commenter who submitted the comment.



## COMMENT SUMMARY REPORT

Comment Distribution By Code			
Code	Description	Number of Comments	Percentage
AL1100	Alternatives: Support Alternative 1	2	0.01%
AL1200	Alternatives: Oppose Alternative 1	1	0.00%
AL1300	Alternatives: Alternative 1 (Substantive)	4	0.01%
AL1400	Alternatives: Support Alternative 2	3	0.01%
AL1500	Alternatives: Oppose Alternative 2	9,796*	24.65%
AL1600	Alternatives: Alternative 2 (Substantive)	26	0.06%
AL1700	Alternatives: Oppose Alternative 3	0	0.00%
AL1700	Alternatives: Support Alternative 3	178	0.45%
AL1800	Alternatives: Alternative 3 (Substantive)	23	0.06%
AL2000	Oppose Transmission Lines within Park	29,512*	74.25%
AL2100	Oppose Turkey Point Expansion	25	0.06%
AL2200	FPL Eastern Corridor Route	1	0.00%
AL4000	Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements	21	0.05%
CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments	4	0.01%
GA1000	Impact Analysis: Impact Analyses	5	0.01%
MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments	23	0.06%
ON1000	Other NEPA Issues: General Comments	1	0.00%
PN11000	Purpose And Need: Other Policies And Mandates	2	0.01%
PN2000	Purpose And Need: Park Purpose And Significance	8	0.02%
PN3000	Purpose And Need: Scope Of The Analysis	5	0.01%
PN4000	Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority	10	0.03%
PN5000	Purpose And Need: Regulatory Framework	0	0.00%
PN8000	Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action	2	0.01%
PN9000	Purpose And Need: Issues And Impact Topics Selected For Analyses	95	0.24%
<b>Total</b>		<b>39,747</b>	<b>100%</b>

*\*Note: Denotes code for which form letters were received, 1 in total*

<b>Correspondence Distribution by State</b>		
<b>State</b>	<b>Number of Pieces of Correspondence</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
AR	3	0.03%
AZ	2	0.02%
CA	17	0.17%
CO	9	0.09%
CT	3	0.03%
DC	2	0.02%
FL	247	2.44%
GA	2	.02%
ID	1	0.01%
IL	9	0.09%
IN	1	0.01%
KY	2	0.02%
MA	2	0.02%
MD	2	0.02%
ME	1	0.01%
MI	5	0.05%
MN	2	0.02%
MO	1	0.01%
MS	2	0.02%
MT	1	0.01%
NC	7	0.07%
NH	3	0.03%
NJ	3	0.03%
NM	2	0.02%
NV	1	0.01%
NY	6	0.06%
OH	1	0.01%
OK	2	0.02%
OR	5	0.05%
PA	3	0.03%
SC	3	0.03%
SD	1	0.01%
TX	3	0.03%
UT	1	0.01%
VA	3	0.03%
VT	1	0.01%
WA	7	0.07%
WI	1	0.01%
WY	2	0.02%
Unknown	37	0.37%
Form Letters (not broken down by state)	9,714	95.99%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,120</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Correspondence Distribution by Country</b>		
<b>Type</b>	<b>Number of Pieces of Correspondence</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
United Kingdom	2	0.02%
United States	10,098	99.98%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,120</b>	<b>100%</b>

*Note: Distribution by Country includes the 9,714 form letters that are classified as comments from the United States.*

<b>Correspondence Distribution by Organization</b>		
<b>Organization Type</b>	<b>Number of Pieces of Correspondence</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Town or City Government	1	0.01%
Business	3	0.03%
NPS Employee	1	0.01%
University/Professional Society	1	0.01%
State Government	3	0.03%
Tribal Government	1	0.01%
Conservation/Preservation	26	0.26%
Unaffiliated Individual	10,084	99.64%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,120</b>	<b>100%</b>

*Note: Table includes one form letter containing a total of 9,714 signatures, classified as unaffiliated individuals.*

*Note: Unaffiliated individual refers to a person representing no organization, society, business or government entity, but only themselves.*

<b>Correspondence Distribution by Correspondence Type</b>		
<b>Type</b>	<b>Number of Pieces of Correspondence</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Web Form	243	2.4%
Park Form	7	0.07%
Email	6	0.06%
Transcript	29	0.29%
Letter	9,832	97.15%
Other	3	0.03%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,120</b>	<b>100%</b>

*Note: Table includes one form letter containing a total of 9,714 signatures, classified as a letter.*

# Everglades National Park

## Acquisition of FPL Lands in the East Everglade Expansion Area / Environmental Impact Statement

### PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENT REPORT

#### AL1300 - Alternatives: Alternative 1 (Substantive)

**Concern ID:** 30231

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter was concerned that the No Action Alternative does not allow FPL to exercise their existing rights to develop the land and is predecisional.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 370 **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218696 **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** No Action Alternative Does Not Recognize FPL's Valid Existing Rights - The NOI considers two scenarios as part of the no action alternative, one in which FPL develops its existing transmission corridor and one where FPL is unable or unwilling to do so. But the NOI also includes prejudicial statements that do not adequately recognize FPL's valid existing property rights to the present 7.4 mile corridor. These statements appear to suggest that the NPS has predetermined that FPL's use of its property would be contrary to ENP plans and inconsistent with the purposes of the East Everglades Expansion Act. Taken together, these statements indicate that the EIS may improperly focus the no-action alternative on the "no development" scenario. Any a priori determinations purporting to strip FPL of its valid existing rights are arbitrary and capricious. Moreover, NPS cannot treat the taking of FPL's property as "no action." In order to take this private property by preventing the use of FPL's existing corridor (as indicated in the "FPL is unable to develop the corridor" aspect of this scenario), the agency would have to engage in a series of costly legal actions. This departure from the legal status quo does not qualify as a no action alternative.

**Corr. ID:** 371 **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218734 **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** FPL is concerned by the contradictory descriptions of the no action alternative presented in the Scoping Newsletter. The Newsletter considers two scenarios as part of the no action alternative, one in which FPL develops its existing transmission corridor and one where FPL is unable or unwilling to do so. However, it appears to suggest that ENP/NPS has predetermined that FPL's exercise of its valid existing property rights would be contrary to ENP land protection plans and inconsistent with the purposes of the East Everglades Expansion Act. These statements in the Newsletter indicate that the EIS may improperly focus the no-action alternative on the "no development" scenario. Any a priori determinations purporting to strip FPL of its valid existing rights would be improper.

The no action alternative must be clarified to eliminate any indications that FPL cannot exercise its valid existing property rights. When FPL acquired its rights in the corridor, the corridor was 10 miles removed from ENP and FPL had every reason to believe that the lands and interests it was acquiring and investing in for electric transmission purposes would be available for such use.

**Concern ID:** 30232

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter asked what would happen to the existing FPL corridor if it was unable to be developed.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 201319 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** And what is the purpose of this if the property is unable to be developed in its present state. Would it not just remain as is in its natural state?

**Concern ID:** 30233

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter felt that the No Action Alternative was not a viable alternative, stating that power lines within the park is an incompatible use and inconsistent with NPS mandates under the Expansion Act and the Organic Act.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 240 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 216574 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The "No Action Alternative" (Alternative 1) is not an option. The 1989 Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act requires that this land be acquired and be managed as "park". Utility lines have already been considered and rejected as an "incompatible use". This alternative - leaving in place a corridor which could lead to 150 foot high transmission towers inside a National Park - is also completely inconsistent with the mission of the National Park Service as stated in the Organic Act of 1916:

"...to promote and regulate the use of the...national parks...which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

#### **AL1600 - Alternatives: Alternative 2 (Substantive)**

**Concern ID:** 30234

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters stated that there was no way to mitigate negative impacts of transmission line construction in the existing corridor and requested a thorough analysis of the impacts from construction on the eastern edge of the park.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 57 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 211429 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** This should not be considered "swapping" lands for FPL b/c the new land can include putting in power lines. There are no existing power lines that will be taken down in the current lands so overall it is not considered an exchange to me, it is considered further degradation of the Everglades habitat. We as humans can come up with some environmental problems these power lines would pose from observation and experience. However, I don't think we fully know the impact. Bottom line is these preserved lands were meant to not alter "the behavior of native animals" and power lines will do just that. We have done enough damage already.

**Corr. ID:** 67 **Organization:** Western Lands Project

**Comment ID:** 209595      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** It does not appear that the impacts could truly be mitigated if FPL were to construct its project on the exchange lands, so we do not favor that alternative--however, the analysis of possible conditions should be useful for overall understanding of the project's impacts and the alternatives.

**Corr. ID:** 87      **Organization:** Sierra Club; Everglades Forever; Nature Conservancy

**Comment ID:** 210720      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I cannot think of any terms or conditions that could protect or mitigate the harm that would be incurred by the potential exchange.

**Corr. ID:** 105      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 210979      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** No. If fiscal constraints require that the government is unable to purchase the FPL land, then the land swap option 1 must be proven with extensive study that the FPL use of the eastern boundary lands would have no negative impacts beyond original construction. Anything less would be a very poor deal for the environment.

**Concern ID:** 30235

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Several commenters asked questions that they would like to see answered in the EIS analysis. Questions included what would happen if the property cannot be developed, how will acquiring the land protect park resources, and how often FPL would need to enter the property for maintenance.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 201320      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Is this piece of property a threat to the health of the park? Is acquiring it going to protect the park resources? If it is unable to be developed then why waste valuable time and efforts in this acquisition? How does this property now negatively affect the park?

**Corr. ID:** 81      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 210386      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** i do have concern in the exchange as the construction process will not be beneficial to wildlife using the proposed exchange areas. how often does FP&L need to enter these areas to service their structures? what is the environmental impact from this access?

**Concern ID:** 30236

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters provided additional suggestions for the land swap including an easement, lease with environmental impact fee and ideas for how to appraise the existing FPL property value.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 105      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 210980      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Worse comes to worse and the only way to obtain the new

land is to move with the option 1 land swap, then Dept of Interior should lease the land to FPL. FPL should be charged an environmental impact fee for every portion of construction and operations. In addition, these fees should include the impact of loss of water resources and increased risk of floods due to the development of land for continued use. Eventually, FPL will be motivated to minimize environmental impact until the day they may return the land to NPS.

**Corr. ID:** 107                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 211243            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** If the land swap is done- much as I hate that idea because it's potentially catastrophic or even more subtle long term affects on the wild life in the Everglades- that land should be leased for a sizable price top FP&L. This way if the effects on the ecosystem are bad the lease may be denied renewal but if the effects are measured and minimal the Everglades National Park Service can put that lease money towards helping the rest of the Everglade's recovery project.

**Corr. ID:** 317                      **Organization:** Miami-Dade County DERM

**Comment ID:** 218440            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** It is our understanding that under the current land exchange concept, the federally-owned land within ENP would be conveyed to FPL in fee simple ownership. The EIS should consider the benefit of including restrictions on FPL's use of the property and granting of an easement back to ENP as part of the transfer or an alternative to fee simple conveyance, in order to preserve the Park's interests. One potential advantage would be reduced risk and uncertainty to ENP if additional infrastructure and/or work were proposed by FPL within the corridor in the future, particularly any work that required additional impacts (either temporary or permanent) to wetlands within or adjacent to ENP. Another advantage would be to maintain some form of property interest in order to maintain flexibility in Everglades restoration if features or operational changes are later determined to be needed in or near this corridor.

**Corr. ID:** 405                      **Organization:** Clean Water Action

**Comment ID:** 218882            **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** In 1996 the FPL land had an appraisal value of \$109,300 (as stated in the NPS letter dated 10/7/96 to FP&L attached). The current appraisal should reflect an increase in value that reflects the percentage of property value increases that has occurred since 1996. Any appraisals should avoid placing emphasis on the value of the intended, but not yet approved, use by FPL of the land. At the moment, the highest and best use of the land FPL owns does not include the right to construct power lines. An appraisal value of FPL land that includes the cost FPL will incur from having to construct transmission lines in an alternative location wrongfully assumes that FPL will be granted the necessary permits to do such a project once the company has ownership over the exchanged land. In light of the fact that the land proposed for exchange is comprised of high quality wetlands and is in close proximity to nesting colonies of the federally endangered Wood Stork it is reasonably foreseeable that the construction of the transmission lines will have both direct and cumulative effects on the lands environment, and thus, will likely not be permitted.

Furthermore, it is unlikely that FPL will be a willing seller if NPS were to attempt to purchase the land in fee simple, therefore in conducting an appraisal of the FPL lands there must be an evaluation and determination of what would be considered just compensation for the land if NPS were to condemn the land. To calculate the condemnation cost the draft EIS should include an analysis of any and all existing

land use restrictions currently placed on or likely to be placed on the land prior to the exchange for both the land owned by FPL as well as the national park land to be used in the exchange. If the restriction is in good faith and not for the "principle purpose" of reducing the value of the land, land restrictions that are placed on a parcel of land will have an effect on the appraisal value of the property. We further request that all valuation appraisals are transparent.

**Concern ID:** 30237

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters felt that Alternative 2 is not a viable option and is authorized but not mandated.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 240 **Organization:** Not Specified

**Comment ID:** 218401 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The second option, the land swap option, is not an option either. While this option is authorized (but not mandated) by an inclusion buried deep in the massive Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Section 7107), enabling this option would mean that Everglades National Park would also gain a new industrial horizon visible to visitors throughout the area. Along with the necessary utility access road which would be constructed, the project would likely lead to severe impacts on wetlands, bird and animal populations (especially bird collisions and electrocutions), and facilitate the spread of invasive plant species throughout the area.

**Corr. ID:** 323 **Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Comment ID:** 218492 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Notably, Section 7107 gives the Secretary complete discretion as to whether or not to carry out the proposed land transfer with FPL. Given the weight of all previous legislation and NPS policies, the critical importance of all of these lands to hydrological and ecological restoration of the Park, and the severe ecological impacts the construction and operation of the proposed power lines at either location would produce, it is clearly in the best interest of the American public and the natural resources of the Park for the Secretary to choose not to exercise this option.

**Concern ID:** 30238

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter stated that FPL has conducted reviews and designs to minimize impacts from construction and that the relocation of the inholding will be a benefit and enable Mod Waters to move forward, providing a low cost option for both FPL and the NPS.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 229 **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 216420 **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** Over the course of the last four years, FPL has conducted a series of extensive reviews addressing concerns of various agencies, including the national park. We provided conceptual designs that minimize the impacts to wetlands to ensure surface water flow won't be disrupted. We've funded independent expert reviews of avian issues to conclude that there's no threats to the population of these species. We provided design options that minimize and discourage birds from perching on the lines and have developed some simulated photos you may want to look at that represent how the lines would look from key places within the park.



**Corr. ID:** 371                      **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218733           **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** Moreover, timely relocation of the FPL inholding will enable Mod Waters to proceed in 2013 to restore more natural water flows in the Northeast Shark River Slough within the East Everglades Expansion Area. Unless the FPL corridor is secured by ENP before then, the Company cannot allow its property to be "taken" via the flooding associated with Mod Waters, a foundation project for the broader environmentally beneficial Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Project (CERP) also approved by Congress (and the State of Florida). Timely realization of the environmental benefits associated with Mod Waters must be set forth clearly as the purpose and need of the proposed federal action (i.e., the land exchange).

The Congressionally authorized trade is also designed to serve other purposes which must be identified and disclosed plainly to the public in the EIS. A cooperative land exchange is the low cost option for acquisition of the FPL corridor since the ENP/NPS will avoid the substantial acquisition costs and damage claims that will otherwise arise. In fact, the only taxpayer costs arising from the exchange will be administrative costs associated with ENP/NPS approval of the authorized deal. The land exchange alternative helps the ENP/NPS avoid the substantial acquisition costs and severance damages that will arise from an involuntary taking of a portion of FPL's corridor. This purpose must be clearly and plainly explained in the EIS and to the public. Other legal and economic impediments regarding the acquisition via purchase alternative are addressed in the alternatives section of these comments.

**Concern ID:** 30246

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter provided management suggestions for the land swap, including ideas for vegetation management and the use of the existing FPL corridor as mitigation if it remains undeveloped. Additionally, one commenter supported the land swap if it benefits the NPS, and stated the NPS should support the right for FPL to construct on their property.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 317                      **Organization:** Miami-Dade County DERM

**Comment ID:** 218441           **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** By virtue of their location, the lands currently owned by FPL within ENP have unique value as preservation and enhancement lands due to ongoing Everglades restoration efforts. The highest and best value of these lands may be to offset FPL proposed impacts elsewhere if the lands continue to remain in private ownership. Therefore, the EIS should evaluate the suitability of these lands as mitigation if appropriate under the NEPA review. Under this scenario, a legal instrument such as a permanent flowage and/or conservation easement would be needed and the EIS should examine the potential benefits and risks of such an arrangement.

**Corr. ID:** 317                      **Organization:** Miami-Dade County DERM

**Comment ID:** 218442           **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** It is noted that in addition to the exchange corridor itself, an easement is proposed for control of vegetation to the west. However, it is not clear whether this refers to all vegetation or invasive exotic vegetation. Any vegetation management in the area should be consistent with the ecological restoration of native wetland plant communities. The EIS should address the

appropriate size of such easement, the types of vegetation to be addressed (including whether the removal or control of native species would be required), and methods anticipated for control of vegetation, including necessary phytosanitation procedures to prevent unintended spread of invasive exotic vegetation.

**Corr. ID:** 406

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 235282

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Transition lines are perfectly compatible with the Everglades and an important infrastructure that needs to be upgraded and expanded from time-to-time to provide the energy needed to keep our economy moving. Swap land if it aesthetically or otherwise benefits the National Park. Otherwise support FPL's need to build on their own land in the park

### *AL1800 - Alternatives: Alternative 3 (Substantive)*

**Concern ID:** 30239

**CONCERN  
STATEMENT:**

Commenters requested the NPS be given a discount on the purchase price or follow up on the purchase proposal from 1996 and that the EIS should explore the option of eminent domain.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 27

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 203181

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** A full purchase proposal had been sent to FPL back in 1996. It went nowhere. The Secretary could simply give follow up to that proposal and insist on the purchase or condemnation of the property in question.

**Corr. ID:** 105

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 210978

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I assume the preliminary alternative is to purchase the FPL land. I think this is a good solution. I only caution that the government be given a very generous discount for the land since I am betting FPL has this land because the government assisted them to obtain the land originally. I do not believe FPL should have any profit from any land sale since the citizens of South Florida likely funded FPL's original purchase through rate hikes or tax breaks.

**Corr. ID:** 202

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218372

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The EIS should consider the feasibility of obtaining federal funding for the purchase of the property through eminent domain. While those funds may not exist now, they could be available in the future if the NPS advocates for such funds.

**Concern ID:** 30240

**CONCERN  
STATEMENT:**

Commenters felt that alternative 3 best fulfils the 1989 Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act as well as the NPS Land Protection Plan.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 110

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 211934

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I think the power lines go completely against the purpose and charge of our National Parks. Alternative #3 is what the 1989 Everglades

National Park Protection and Expansion Act and the NPS's Land Protection Plan were written for. Please acquire the land, complete the park, and keep the power lines out.

**Corr. ID:** 118                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 213186      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** In regard to the FPL powerlines, in 1989 congress authorized to acquire the land by the Protection and Expansion Act. There is no reason whatsoever to deviate from this intent.

Alternative 3 was exactly what congress intended when this important piece of public land was acquired. It is fully spelled out in the 1989 Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act and the NPS's 1991 Land Protection Plan written to implement that Act. After over 20 years of delay, it's high time for the NPS to fulfill that promise to the American people.

**Corr. ID:** 240                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218402      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Alternative 3 is exactly what Congress intended when this important piece of public land was acquired and it's the alternative that must be pursued. It is fully supported by numerous local and national environmental organizations. It is also supported by the 1989 Act and the NPS's own 1991 Land Protection Plan written to implement that Act. The NPS should acquire the land as required by the 1989 Act. In 1996, NPS wrote a short letter to FPL telling the company that the "fair market value" of the property was determined to be \$109,300 (ironically, NPS now intends to spend over \$500,000 of the taxpayers money just to do a "study"). The company could do a voluntary sale or - if they refused - NPS would acquire the property by eminent domain in order to fulfill the purposes of the Act - the ecological and hydrological restoration of Everglades National Park. No powerlines or access road would be built.

As noted in my answer to #2 above, I think you should acquire the land as required by the 1989 Act. Everglades National Park contains remnants of a completely unique planetary ecosystem and we must do everything we can to preserve what is left. In addition to being the first "biological park" in our nation's history and by far the largest designated wilderness in the eastern United States, the park is also a World Heritage Site, an International Biosphere Reserve, and a Wetland of International Importance. Unfortunately, Everglades National Park also consistently ranks among "top travel destinations to see before they disappear" - and approximately one million visitors per year take that opportunity. (It's a national and state treasure and protecting it from the ravages of sightseers is important too!)

**Concern ID:** 30241

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Commenters requested that alternative 3 also include analysis for where the powerline segment could be relocated to outside of the park.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 65                      **Organization:** Coalition of NPS Retirees

**Comment ID:** 218347      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** We commend you for this effort and request that the EIS disclose this information and include maps and analyses of the potential alternate corridors that FPL could use to relocate the corridor to the East of the park. While it is ultimately FPL's responsibility to decide whether or where to seek a transmission corridor outside the park, the NPS should seek to avoid adverse impacts on park resources and values and inform the public and decision makers that there may be

other corridors FPL could select that would meet its transmission needs while avoiding the potentially significant adverse impacts on park resources and values.

**Corr. ID:** 268                      **Organization:** U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

**Comment ID:** 218414      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** However, for the third option, the NPS does not plan to include the impacts of building and operating any transmission lines. The NRC staff nonetheless understands that FPL anticipates a need for new transmission line capacity, and the NRC staff believes it reasonably foreseeable that, under the third option, FPL would propose to build and operate new transmission lines in an undetermined corridor to the east of the Everglades National Park. Accordingly, the third option should also include the impacts related to transmission lines in an undetermined corridor to the east of the Everglades National Park. The NRC staff recognizes that doing so will call for the NPS to make a number of assumptions about the location of the corridor. However, not including the impacts of new transmission lines in the analysis of the third alternative could be viewed as excluding a reasonably foreseeable impact and thereby unrealistically skewing the environmental balance toward the third alternative.

**Corr. ID:** 405                      **Organization:** Clean Water Action

**Comment ID:** 218879      **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** The Draft EIS Should Take a Hard Look at Alternative Transmission Line Corridors

A complete evaluation of the option to purchase FPL lands must analyze the feasibility of locating and permitting alternative transmission corridors outside of the park. Otherwise, the land exchange proposal may unfairly be determined to be the environmentally preferred alternative. In light of the fact that NPS will be drafting an EIS as part of a broader need for action initiated by the NRC, NPS has the responsibility to provide specific alternatives that not only satisfy NPS's need and purpose of protecting the Everglades, but also comport with the need for action initiated by the NRC. By only evaluating the purchase cost of the land and not alternative corridors, NPS's draft EIS will not provide the information needed in determining whether the option to purchase or condemn FPL's land is feasible. As a result, the draft EIS could preclude the equal treatment of an otherwise reasonable alternative.

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) has consistently warned against dismissing alternatives as unreasonable that are outside the scope of what congress has approved to fund, outside the legal jurisdiction of the park, undesirable to an outside applicant, but reasonable to the park, or in conflict with law, if the alternative is otherwise feasible. Given that the ultimate result of the land swap will be a net loss in park lands and a reduction in park size, it is of the utmost importance that the draft EIS broaden the scope of its evaluation to include a study on alternative transmission line corridors. By not providing a technical or cost analysis of alternative transmission line corridors outside of the park, the draft EIS evaluation of alternatives will not comply with the requisite scope of analysis the NEPA process intend to promote and it will appear as if the land exchange alternative was a solidified plan prior to the issuance of the draft EIS.

**Concern ID:**

30242

**CONCERN  
STATEMENT:**

One commenter felt that alternative 3 is not a viable alternative due to the cost of acquiring the land, which the commenter states NPS does not have, and would burden taxpayers. The commenter also states that FPL is not a willing seller and that

alternative 3 and reduces funds available for restoration.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 370 **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218698 **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** Acquisition via Purchase Alternative is Not Reasonable - This alternative is not spelled out with necessary clarity in the NOI, which may mislead the public into believing that this is a reasonable and practicable alternative. It is not. First, acquisition of the FPL corridor via purchase or condemnation will, in the best case for ENP/NPS, cost the taxpayers in excess of \$100 million. This is because FPL's 320 acre corridor through the East Everglades is an essential part of a larger 40 mile utility corridor painstakingly assembled and acquired over many years by FPL. If ENP/NPS were to insist on taking the 7.4 mile piece, FPL would be entitled to the fair market value of these lands, as a utility corridor, and the reduced value of the other reaches of the severed corridor and associated facilities.

Even if ENP/NPS were to attempt a "cure" by replacing the broken 40 mile corridor with a new corridor segment east of the exchange parcel (in theory ENP would "cure" the greater damage to the entire corridor by reconnecting the severed parts), taxpayers still face a huge economic burden. A recent governmental study for the acquisition of a transportation corridor in Miami-Dade County just east of the ENP estimated the cost of acquisition for a significantly narrower corridor than what FPL requires to be well over \$100 million dollars. See Miami-Dade Expressway Authority (MDX) Draft Report 83618 and Appendices for SR 836 Southwest Extension (Alternative Route 1), (May 2008 and August 2009). ENP/NPS does not have such funding and it is unlikely that Congress will provide it while cutting all federal agency land acquisition appropriations. These cost and funding issues, and the risk these issues present to taxpayers, must be explained in the EIS to allow a meaningful evaluation of alternatives. Consideration of this important factor is consistent with the intent of the land exchange as articulated in the legislative history. Remarks of Sen. Mel Martinez (FL), Cong. Record, Jan 13, 2009 at S332

**Corr. ID:** 371 **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218737 **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** The public also needs to understand that FPL will not willingly sell or surrender its utility corridor to ENP, absent being provided a feasible and practicable replacement corridor. This is because FPL has an obligation to its customers to make prudent and economical use of its existing resources. Without a north-south corridor for new electric transmission facilities, FPL's ability to discharge its obligations under Florida law to provide electric services to its south Florida customers will be hampered. The Congressionally authorized trade recognized this limitation by providing FPL an alternative corridor. However, if ENP seeks to force acquisition via condemnation of FPL's land, FPL will be obligated to resist and seek full compensation for the property rights taken from it. If ENP insists on action that would otherwise impose high costs on FPL and its ratepayers, FPL must necessarily look to ENP/NPS to bear these costs. As noted above, full compensation will include without limitation the corridor portion within ENP and the diminished value of the remaining 33 miles of severed utility corridor or the cost of acquiring a replacement segment to reconnect the severed corridor. With tightening federal and state budgets, and increasing costs for Everglades' restoration, we are convinced good public policy - and good environmental policy - is to direct finite public funding to restoration rather than high cost land acquisition when a low cost acquisition alternative (i.e., the exchange) is readily available.

**Corr. ID:** 371 **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218735    **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** The acquisition via purchase alternative should be spelled out sufficiently and with more clarity. Failure to disclose crucial details - legal and factual - mislead the public to believe that this is a reasonable and practical alternative. The alternative is not practicable for the reasons previously noted and explained in greater detail below. As a result, FPL is persuaded that acquisition via purchase/condemnation is an alternative that should be considered and rejected for subsequent consideration within the EIS.

Acquisition of the FPL corridor via purchase or condemnation will, in the best case for ENP/NPS, cost the taxpayers well in excess of 100 million dollars. The scoping documents do not explain that the FPL 7.4 mile corridor through the east Everglades is an essential part of a larger 40 mile utility corridor painstakingly assembled and acquired over many years ago by FPL. If ENP/NPS were to insist on buying the ENP Expansion Area inholding portion of the corridor, FPL would be entitled to the value of these lands, as a utility corridor, and the reduced value of the other reaches of the severed corridor and associated facilities.

**Corr. ID:** 371                      **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218736    **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** Even if ENP/NPS were to attempt a "cure" for the larger 40 mile corridor from Turkey Point to Levee in the event FPL's existing 7.4 mile segment within ENP is taken (i.e., acquired) by the NPS, taxpayers still face a huge economic burden. Replacing the broken 40 mile corridor with a new segment east of the exchange parcel and ENP would "cure" the greater damage to the entire corridor by reconnecting the severed parts. A recent governmental study estimates the cost of acquiring a transportation corridor (much narrower than the 330 feet required by FPL) in the area just east of ENP at over 100 million dollars.<sup>3</sup> (3 See Miami-Dade Expressway Authority (MDX) Draft Report 83618 and Appendices for SR 836 Southwest Extension (Alternative Route 1), (May 2008 and August 2009). MDX is a state sanctioned, locally administered, public agency enabled by the Legislature for the State of Florida and created and governed by the Board of County Commissioners of Miami-Dade County. The corridor cost estimate was prepared by an international engineering and consulting firm in consultation with MAI appraisers.)

Given the alignment of the route evaluated and its close proximity to the ENP, the study provides a meaningful comparison for estimating the cost of securing a replacement segment outside the ENP to reestablish its corridor after a taking.

FPL concurs with this study that the costs in damages associated with involuntary acquisition will be well in excess of 100 million dollars - money that ENP/NPS does not have and Congress is unlikely to appropriate.<sup>4</sup> (4 Congress has already compelled the federal agencies to substantially reduce the scale, and costs, of Mod Waters.

Yet the proposed EIS does not address these cost and valuation issues. Exclusion of this important factor will result in an incomplete EIS and may lead to an improper conclusion. A meaningful evaluation of the EIS alternatives cannot occur without disclosure of these issues and

**Concern ID:**

30243

**CONCERN**

One commenter stated that Everglades cannot purchase the land without a 20 percent

**STATEMENT:** contribution from the state, which Florida is unable to provide.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 370 **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218699 **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** Second, the law requires the State of Florida to contribute 20 percent to land acquisition in the East Everglades. 16 U.S.C. § 410r-6(f)(2). There is no indication that the State is willing or able to make its required contribution and the Constitution bars ENP from commandeering or committing Florida's financial resources. Again, the necessary financial involvement of the State of Florida in any land purchase must be disclosed and addressed within the EIS in order to allow for a meaningful evaluation of the purchase/condemnation alternative.

Third, consideration of the purchase alternative would need to include an assessment of the cumulative impacts of the development of a replacement corridor outside the Park. Establishing a new utility corridor farther to the east in heavily populated and highly developed Miami-Dade County may create other significant effects on the environment. These could include the impacts of private property acquisition, acquisition or condemnation of homes or businesses, and potential adverse public reaction to construction and operation of high voltage electric lines in a densely populated urban setting (compared to building and operating the line along the largely unoccupied ENP boundary and L-31 Canal).

**Corr. ID:** 371 **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218739 **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** Acquisition via purchase (i.e., condemnation) implicates other statutory and constitutional issues. The East Everglades Expansion Act prescribed "it is the express intent of Congress that acquisition within the boundaries of the addition shall be completed no later than five years after December 13, 1989," (emphasis added) 16 U.S.C. § 410r-6(c)(2). Congress has set forth a new, more specific, policy in the form of legislation to "facilitate" the land exchange. Cong. Record, Jan. 13, 2009 at S332. FPL insists that this newest iteration of Congressional policy and intent be incorporated clearly and plainly into any discussion in the EIS.

Without addressing the issue of Congressional authorization for an involuntary acquisition from FPL, Congress in 1989 prescribed too that "with respect to land acquisition within the [Expansion Area] . . . not less than 20 percent of such cost shall be provided by the State of Florida." Id. at § 410r-6(f)(2). Nowhere in the scoping documents is there any recognition of the State's obligation to contribute to acquisition via purchase. FPL also notes that ENP is constitutionally prohibited from commandeering State resources and taking action which obligates the State to contribute funds. Absent express State concurrence to contribute the mandatory 20 percent of \$100 million or more of acquisition/damage costs, ENP has no authority to pursue acquisition via purchase. These important legal limitations on ENP must be prominently disclosed in any EIS discussion on any acquisition via purchase alternative. In the event that ENP/NPS keeps the acquisition via purchase/condemnation alternative in the EIS, other foreseeable issues will then need to be considered.

#### ***AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements***

**Concern ID:** 30247

**CONCERN** Commenters requested that if the transmission lines are constructed, that land

**STATEMENT:** should be made available for trails and visitor use.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 13 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 202716 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I am most interested in seeing all parties get something from this effort. There will be need to maintain this facility once constructed. Require that the maintenance road be set to one side of the lines and be accessible for a hiking, biking, etc. trail.

**Corr. ID:** 13 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 202717 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The power company should be required to operate and maintain the road for use as a trail. Adequate crossings for water flow will need to be a part of the plan. The crossings could be low water fords, culverts or bridges dependent on the need.

**Concern ID:** 30248

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Several commenters suggested that the transmissions lines be built on existing equipment or along current right of ways.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 61 **Organization:** miami-dade NAACP

**Comment ID:** 208717 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Should be built beside current lines

**Corr. ID:** 129 **Organization:** sierra club

**Comment ID:** 214135 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** keep the old structures and reinforce the existing supports of the power-lines that are now in existence.

**Corr. ID:** 287 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 217789 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Consider using existing federal and state right-of-ways for the transmission lines, such as the median of the Florida Turnpike.

**Concern ID:** 30249

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters suggested that the transmission lines be placed underground, with one commenter suggesting Alligator Alley as a potential location.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 66 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 209286 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The alternatives that should be considered would be anything other than giant powerlines edging the Everglades. ANYTHING would be better. Preferably something underground.

**Corr. ID:** 223 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 216373 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual



**Representative Quote:** I understand the need for power. If power lines are absolutely necessary than the lines need to be buried under the ground close to Alligator alley. Do NOT disrupt pristine land to lay the lines. It is unfortunate that so much of the beauty of Broward, Dade and Palm Beach Counties is ruined by unsightly power lines. Adding insult to injury, why are power lines permitted to be installed in such a hurricane prone vicinity. THEY BELONG UNDER THE GROUND so they do not interfere with trees.

**Corr. ID:** 287                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 217787            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Because FPL owns title to the lands intended to be utilized, the Department should encourage subterranean lines where applicable and consider the use of eminent domain or co-location with other right-of-ways to place the proposed transmission lines in more developed areas.

**Concern ID:** 30250

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters suggested that FPL donate the land to NPS or sell to NPS for the original purchase price or exchange the lands for a tax credit.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 106                      **Organization:** Sierra Club

**Comment ID:** 211211            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I would look to move these power lines far away from the National Park. I would also suggest the FPL donate the existing easement back to the public or accept the original price of the lands.

**Corr. ID:** 238                      **Organization:** FNPS

**Comment ID:** 216512            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Exchange for tax credit.

**Concern ID:** 30251

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter suggested that the NPS look at the environmental reviews for similar on-going projects within the NPS.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 29                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 211958            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Please look to other environmental reviews that the National Park Service is currently conducting regarding transmission lines; i.e. Susquehanna to Roseland Transmission Line EIS for Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, Middle Delaware National Scenic and Recreational River, and Appalachian National Scenic Trail.

**Concern ID:** 30252

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter stated that private landowners lands have been acquired in the East Everglades Expansion Area and that FPL's lands should be acquired similarly.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 112                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 213192            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I do oppose to this Powerline Plan, and what is more for basic decency you must treat large corporations as you do treat individual investors, meaning FPL must have no right to build anything in the Everglades National Park borders. Moreover, any land possessions within the boundaries of the park must be expropriated as you have done to me and countless of other investors that owned land within the park extension boundaries.

**Concern ID:** 30253

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters questioned the western corridor, suggesting alternate locations along Krome Ave or Route 1 and requesting more detail for why the corridor is needed.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 278 **Organization:** Florida Wildlife Federation

**Comment ID:** 217766 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Due to the obvious environmental impacts that would be associated with construction of the FPL transmission corridor on either the western FPL preferred or eastern alternative, there needs to be consideration of another alternative. That alternative would be the possibility of FPL acquiring land to the east of US. 27, Krome Ave. on previously impacted and less environmentally important lands adjacent to Krome Ave. Obviously, that would entail more expense and negotiations with Dade County. But, it would facilitate the job of ultimately completing the longterm goals of CERP and MOD Waters.

**Corr. ID:** 279 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 217769 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** NORMALLY TRANSMISSION LINES ARE DESIGNED TO CONDUCT ELECTRICITY BETWEEN CONSUMING AREAS. THIS PROJECT HAS BOTH TWO 500KV LINES AND ONE 230KV LINE. A SEPARATE "EAST" TRANSMISSION CORRIDOR EXEMPLIFIES THE DUAL USE CORRIDOR. WHY IS THE "WEST" CORRIDOR BEING CONSTRUCTED AT THE BOUNDARY OF THE ENP RATHER THAN SAY NEAR THE KROME AVENUE LONGITUDE? THE FUNCTION OF THE "WEST" CORRIDOR NEEDS TO BE MUCH BETTER DESCRIBED IN THE DOCUMENTS.

**Corr. ID:** 373 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218778 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I understand FPL needs to get power downtown but at what cost? The U.S. 1 corridor seems like a good option (too bad Pinecrest, Coral Gables wealthy areas have the funds to get what they want.) in 2008-2009 meetings, the Park was not impacted.

### **CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: General Comments**

**Concern ID:** 30254

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter suggested that the NPS use Facebook and other social networking sites to obtain feedback.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 36 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 211407 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The public needs more concise and accurate information

that is being distributed on Facebook and other social networking tools. These sites are where you will get your most valuable feedback.

**Concern ID:** 30255

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters requested that the NPS coordinate with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as well as consulting parties such as local tribes and the Florida State Historic Preservation Office.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 316 **Organization:** Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

**Comment ID:** 218438 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** In addition to notification to the ACHP, NPS must also notify the Florida State Historic Preservation Officer and meet the standards in Section 800.8(c)(1)(i) through (v) for the following.

- identify consulting parties either pursuant to 800.3(f) or through the NEPA scoping process with results consistent with 800.3(f);

- identify historic properties and assess the effects of the undertaking on such properties in a manner consistent with the standards and criteria of 800.4 through 800.5;

- consult regarding the effects of the undertaking on the qualifying characteristics of historic properties with the SHPO/THPO, Indian Tribes, other consulting parties and the Council;

- involve the public and;

- develop in consultation with identified consulting parties alternatives and proposed measures that might avoid, minimize or mitigate any adverse effects of the undertaking on historic properties and describe them in the DEIS.

To meet the requirement to consult with the ACHP as appropriate, the NPS should notify the ACHP in the event NPS determines, in consultation with the SHPO/THPO and other consulting parties, that the proposed undertaking(s) may adversely affect properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places (historic properties).

**Corr. ID:** 323 **Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Comment ID:** 218491 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** In conducting the EIS, we encourage NPS to:

- Take a hard look at alternative transmission line corridors;

- Take a hard look at the consequences the proposed land exchange will have on the completion of CERP projects;

- Include a robust analysis of the impact each alternative has on historic properties;

- Review a true appraisal of the FPL land (do not assume permits will be granted); and

- Engage in formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the likely impacts of the proposed alternatives.

**Concern ID:** 30256

**CONCERN  
STATEMENT:**

One commenter suggested that the Department of Interior meet with FPL stockholders so that FPL can provide suggestions for how to best protect the park's resources.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 265 **Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Comment ID:** 217189 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The Secretary should meet with the stockholders of FPL and invite them to give suggestions as to how to protect the park's resources especially in FPL's attempts to invade the park with these type of projects.

**GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Impact Analyses**

**Concern ID:** 30282

**CONCERN  
STATEMENT:**

Commenters requested that the EIS analysis include both direct and indirect impacts as well as cumulative impacts from all of the alternatives. Additionally, one commenter requested that the NPS provide rationale for how the spatial area for analysis was selected.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 18 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 202957 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The EIS should consider all levels of impacts, both primary, secondary, and, if feasible, tertiary. Primary impacts being effects of construction, vehicle traffic, road construction/upkeep, line impacts, enjoyment impacts, etc. Secondary impacts include the effects of the structure on the surrounding area, from water flow issues to chemical leeching. Tertiary effects include the impacts of said issues on a wider area of the park land.

**Corr. ID:** 239 **Organization:** Palm Beach County Environmental Coalition

**Comment ID:** 216552 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Along with the immediate impacts to wildlife, ecosystem integrity and recreational value threatened by industrial infrastructure, NPS should also consider the secondary and cumulative impacts of the projects, including what impacts these proposed power lines would be accommodating, from the generation of the energy (including health and safety risks) to the amount of water required to create the energy for transmission. If there is no need for the power lines, as alternatives such as conservation and efficiency could render these threats to ENP and surrounding areas unnecessary, this too should be taken into consideration.

**Corr. ID:** 268 **Organization:** U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

**Comment ID:** 218415 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** It is unclear how NPS will set the areal boundaries for its review of the impacts of the transmission lines. It appears that more than one approach could be used and justified. For example, one approach would be to include the impacts of only those portions of the transmission lines that would be moved or differ among the alternatives. Whatever boundaries NPS chooses to set, it will be important to explain the logic behind its decision.

**ON1000 - Other NEPA Issues: General Comments**

**Concern ID:** 30257

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter questioned the use of an EIS to implement the 1989 Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act. Commenter also noted possible impacts of power lines to a number of natural features.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 267 **Organization:** Citizen of the USA

**Comment ID:** 217340 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** You shouldn't need an EIS to implement the 1989 Act and protect a world recognized ecosystem. Impacts from habitat fragmentation and disruption, water quality impacts, exotic plant invasion, vegetation clearing and maintenance, powerline obstruction of flight paths, hydrologic disruptions, and an unnatural intrusion into a unique ecosystem are unthinkable.

### ***PN11000 - Purpose And Need: Other Policies And Mandates***

**Concern ID:** 30258

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter cited the 2006 Management Policies for NPS and the application of the term "wilderness" stating that the Management Policies call for no new installation, extension or enlargement of utility lands in wilderness areas.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 323 **Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Comment ID:** 218489 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** According to the current (2006) Department of the Interior Management Policies for the NPS:

"For the purposes of applying these policies, the term "wilderness" will include the categories of eligible, study, proposed, recommended, and designated wilderness."

"The National Park Service will take no action that would diminish the wilderness eligibility of an area possessing wilderness characteristics until the legislative process of wilderness designation has been completed. Until that time, management decisions will be made in expectation of eventual wilderness designation."

"No new utility lines may be installed in wilderness, and existing utility lines may not be extended or enlarged."

**Concern ID:** 30259

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter stated the existing purpose and need statements were too limited in scope and ignored the Congressionally authorized land exchange and the Modified Water Deliveries Project, regarding FPL's north-south utility corridor. The commenter also suggested a purpose and need statement regarding a timely, cost effective alternate utility corridor outside of Everglades National Park.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 370 **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218694 **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** Purpose and Need - The purpose and need statements of the proposed EIS are focused on a limited subset of benefits and ignore other key purposes of the Congressionally authorized exchange. This portion of the EIS should be broadened and restated to incorporate those other key purposes of the transaction. When § 7107 was enacted to "facilitate" Mod Waters and the

exchange, the co-sponsor of the provision noted a key purpose was to "ensure that the exchange is executed so taxpayers are spared the multimillion dollar costs of purchasing the FPL corridor." Remarks of Sen. Mel Martinez (FL), Cong. Record, Jan 13, 2009 at S332. The purpose of the statutorily authorized land trade is to ensure that FPL's long established north-south utility corridor, which predates by decades the 1989 expansion of ENP, is removed promptly from inside the Park and relocated in a low cost, cooperative manner. Acquisition of these lands via exchange (i.e., removal of the FPL inholding) means that ENP resources and values will not be directly impacted by the construction and operation of electric transmission facilities on these existing privately held lands and property interests while maintaining a useable, cost effective corridor for FPL.

To this end, FPL suggests the following to serve as the statement of purpose and need: To examine the environmental effects of the Congressionally authorized land exchange between ENP and FPL for the purposes of facilitating timely hydrologic and ecologic restoration of the Park and Everglades ecosystem via the Modified Water Deliveries Project ("Mod Waters"), while providing for a practicable, cost effective alternative utility corridor not within ENP. This revised purpose and need statement more closely comports with Congressional intent.

***PN12000 - Purpose and Need: Relationship to other Projects and Plans***

**Concern ID:** 34242

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters disagreed with statements by Florida's Senators and FPL suggesting that acquisition of FPL's land would eliminate the last significant private inholding delaying implementation of improved water flows from the Modified Waters Deliveries Projects. Commenters requested that the EIS describe all projects or plans that must be completed before restoration flows can be implemented to avoid creating a perception that acquiring FPL's property is the last significant obstacle to implementing improved flows under the one-mile bridge.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 65 **Organization:** Coalition of NPS Retirees  
**Comment ID:** 234052 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The January 13, 2009 Congressional Record for the land exchange includes statements from Florida Senator Bill Nelson and former Senator Mel Martinez suggesting that acquisition of FPL's land "would eliminate the last significant private inholding delaying Mod Waters (Modified Water Deliveries project)." These statements are at odds with information in the scoping newsletter and the park's Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Tamiami Trail Modifications: Next Steps Project indicating there are multiple land acquisitions and projects that must be completed before restoration flows can be implemented.

The newsletter also indicates that the USACE must complete an Operational Plan for managing enhanced water flows in the project area. We recommend that the EIS describe all projects or plans that must be completed before restoration flows can be implemented under the Tamiami Trail One Mile Bridge. For each project, information should be provided on current status, implementation costs and anticipated date of completion. Inclusion of this information is important to put the FPL acquisition into an objective context and to avoid creating a perception that acquisition of FPL's property is the last significant obstacle to implementing restoration flows under the one mile bridge.

**Corr. ID:** 323 **Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association  
**Comment ID:** 234053 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Second, in their characterization of the current FPL corridor, both the Senators and Superintendent Kimball fail to acknowledge that the FPL corridor is not the only impediment standing in the way of the hydrological restoration of the Northeast Shark River Slough. In their statements before the Senate supporting Alternative 2 ("the land swap"), both Senators referred to the existing FPL corridor, in identical language, as "the last significant private inholding" standing in the way of the "Modified Waters Delivery Project" to be implemented by the Department of the Interior in conjunction with the Army Corps of Engineers. Superintendent Kimball made several references to the swap addressing the "urgent need to get water into the parched East Everglades" at the June public meeting.

Yet the NPS Scoping newsletter for this project and the Final Environmental Impact Statement ("FEIS") for the Tamiami Trail Modifications: Next Steps Project made reference to numerous properties still in need of acquisition. These include Coopertown, Gator Park and Everglades Safari airboat tour companies and the Lincoln Financial and Salem Communications radio towers. All of these properties are located south of Tamiami Trail, inside the borders of the Expansion Area, and are slated for NPS acquisition in accordance with the 1989 Act.

In addition to the above, two other steps are also in need of completion before "rehydration" can take place. Although the Airboat Association of Florida site is not intended for acquisition and will remain outside Park boundaries, the FEIS made clear that a flowage easement will still need to be obtained from the Association in order to complete "Mod Waters." In addition, the newsletter points out the necessity of the Army Corps completing an Operation Plan for managing the new and increased water flows throughout the entire project area.

As the public may have been led to believe that completing the land swap with FPL would quickly remove "the last obstacle" to restored water flow, the EIS should clearly lay out all steps and acquisitions which still need to take place to allow Mod Waters to move ahead. All steps should be fully described along with projected costs and "best guess" completion dates.

### ***PN2000 - Purpose And Need: Park Purpose And Significance***

**Concern ID:** 30261

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter disagreed that power lines should be constructed within the park due to its wilderness characteristics and accessibility for visitors to experience the natural area.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 7 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 202656 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Everglades National Park carries perhaps more prestigious designations than any other park in our nation. Not only does it contain the largest wilderness area in the eastern United States - the Marjory Stoneman Douglas Wilderness - but it is an International Biosphere Reserve, a Wetland of International Importance and a World Heritage Site (Endangered). It is also habitat for an enormous variety of plants and animals - some found nowhere else on earth. The east Everglades and Northeast Shark River Slough is by far the most accessible part of that natural area for the millions of Floridians and visitors who live in and visit Miami and other nearby communities. It is neither a vacant lot nor the right location for a major new power line across south Florida.

**Concern ID:** 30262

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters opposed power lines in the park based on their incompatibility with the park purpose, public mission, land use, conservation and rehabilitation efforts and viewsheds.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 18 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 212053 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Bottom line, FPL does not need to construct power lines through a national park for means of "getting from one place to another". Explicitly stated in the law for the park area described is that utility lines are incompatible uses for the land. That should end the discussion there.

**Corr. ID:** 20 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 203003 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** FPL's business objectives are fundamentally incompatible with the public mission to protect all aspects of Everglades National Park in perpetuity. The Park Service must not allow FPL's business interests to compromise the park, period.

**Corr. ID:** 47 **Organization:** sierra club

**Comment ID:** 204271 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I believe that any land used for power line construction within or directly abutting NPS property will be against the efforts to rehabilitate the Everglades ecosystem.

**Corr. ID:** 63 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 209247 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The use of national parks for private utilities is contrary to the purpose of conservation and wildlife refuge that the parks are designed for.

**Corr. ID:** 66 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 209285 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Regarding the proposed power lines along the Everglades boundary - this idea is an affront to the whole concept of preserving the River of Grass in the first place. We've preserved it because it is unique and mostly pristine. People visit here to observe our treasure, have fun and experience something very different from our everyday lives. This proposed action will mar the first and last view our residents and visitors will have of the Everglades.

**Corr. ID:** 166 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218353 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Powerlines through a National Park is totally contrary to the purpose of National Parks. The National Park Service should remain committed to protecting and preserving our precious natural resources for the enjoyment of future generations, take a hard look at the consequences of this action, and reject the proposal which would convey these public lands to Florida Power and Light.

**Corr. ID:** 183 **Organization:** *Not Specified*



**Comment ID:** 216072      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The proposed use is completely incompatible with the designated purpose of the Everglades National Park, and it is therefore necessary that FPL find an alternative route

**Corr. ID:** 337      **Organization:** National Parks Conservation Association

**Comment ID:** 234054      **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** We are a little concerned about the process. We are concerned about what the appraisals are going to show. It is not a foregone conclusion that FPL lines either inside or the swap lands are permissible. In fact, it is very likely that they are not. So we really hope that the appraisal process will be incredibly transparent. It is very difficult to sell a decision to the public who are the rightful owners of this land without knowing what the costs are going to be.

### *PN3000 - Purpose And Need: Scope Of The Analysis*

**Concern ID:** 30263

**CONCERN STATEMENT:**

One commenter requested that the EIS provide the best available information regarding potential costs of acquiring FPL's land within the park. Including completed appraisals for FPL's land and the potential exchange corridor, the amount of land acquisition funding available to the NPS, an estimate of additional funding that may be required to obtain all of FPL's land, the status of acquiring other funding and the estimated cost of a flowage easement on the Airboat Association of Florida property.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 65      **Organization:** Coalition of NPS Retirees

**Comment ID:** 218343      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The EIS should provide the best available information on the potential costs of acquiring FPL's lands within the park. We understand the DOI has recently completed appraisals of FPL's land and the potential exchange corridor. The results of these appraisals should be included in the EIS and are essential to support an informed acquisition decision. The EIS should also disclose the amount of land acquisition funding the NPS currently has for the Expansion Area, an estimate of additional funding that may be required to acquire all remaining tracts including FPL's land, the estimated cost of a flowage easement on the Airboat Association of Florida property, and the status of NPS efforts to acquire this funding.

**Concern ID:** 30264

**CONCERN STATEMENT:**

One commenter requested that the cumulative impacts analysis in the EIS include information on alternate transmission corridors outside the park, such as the likely locations and potential impacts on the human environment in those corridors.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 65      **Organization:** Coalition of NPS Retirees

**Comment ID:** 218346      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The newsletter describes scenarios under which FPL would not have a transmission corridor in the park (Alternative 3) or would be unable or unwilling to secure necessary permits to construct transmission lines and access roads on the exchange property or its current property (Alternatives 1 and 2).

Under these scenarios, it appears likely that FPL would seek a transmission corridor outside the park to meet its transmission requirements for the Turkey Point 6 & 7 Project. For these scenarios, we recommend that the cumulative impacts analysis identify, as best as can be determined with information developed in the EIS process, the likely location of such corridor(s) and the potential impacts on the human environment of the construction and operation of transmission lines in those corridors

**Concern ID:**

30265

**CONCERN  
STATEMENT:**

Commenters requested that the EIS include detailed information on significant impacts from the land exchange on the human environment, as well as detailed project background information describing past NPS efforts to acquire FPL's land, FPL's response and why the park shifted from fee acquisition to exchange. In addition, detailed descriptions on the rationale for executing the contingent agreement and related FPL agreements.

**Representative Quote(s):**

**Corr. ID:** 65

**Organization:** Coalition of NPS Retirees

**Comment ID:** 218341

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The scoping newsletter states that the NPS entered into an agreement to exchange lands with FPL in July 2008 ("contingent agreement"). We recommend that the EIS include a detailed project background that describes past NPS efforts to acquire FPL's lands, FPL's response to those efforts, and why the park shifted its approach from fee acquisition to exchange. The rationale for executing the contingent agreement should be described and the status of this agreement and related FPL agreements with the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the State of Florida should be detailed. We recommend that all of these agreements be included in an appendix to the EIS. This information is essential for the public and decision makers to understand the context for the current decision-making process and to avoid creating a perception of a pre-decisional bias by the NPS to implement the land exchange agreed to in 2008.

**Corr. ID:** 371

**Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218725

**Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** FPL has long maintained that an environmental assessment (EA) focused on the land exchange itself would be sufficient to enable the exchange to proceed, a position in line with the relevant legislative history. See Congressional Record at S332, Jan. 13, 2009 ("[An EA] needs to focus only on those factors arising from the land exchange itself [and] it is expected that the Park Service will move quickly to complete this assessment"). However, ENP and NPS now believe that the exchange has the potential for "significant impacts to the human environment" (74 FR at 30,740). FPL reiterates its previous position, but now that ENP/NPS has determined to perform an EIS that will address these impacts associated with potential transmission projects on the exchange parcel, it should perform that analysis in a comprehensive and balanced way, as discussed below.

**Corr. ID:** 371

**Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218732

**Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** The purpose and need of the proposed EIS should be broadened and restated to incorporate other key purposes of the statutorily authorized exchange. To that end, FPL suggests the following statement of purpose and need:

To examine the environmental effects of the Congressionally authorized land exchange between ENP and FPL for the purposes of facilitating timely hydrologic and ecologic restoration of the Park and Everglades ecosystem via the Modified Water Deliveries Project ("Mod Waters"), while providing for a practicable, cost effective alternative utility corridor not within ENP.

This statement is explained below.

This revised purpose and need more closely comports with Congressional intent. When § 7107 was enacted to "facilitate" Mod Waters and the exchange,<sup>2</sup> the co-sponsor of the provision noted a key purpose was to "ensure that the exchange is executed so taxpayers are spared the multimillion dollar costs of purchasing the FPL corridor." Remarks of Sen. Mel Martinez (FL), Cong. Record, Jan 13, 2009 at S332. The statutorily authorized land trade is to ensure that FPL's long established north-south utility corridor, which predates by decades expansion of ENP in 1989, is removed promptly from inside the Park and relocated in a low cost cooperative manner. Acquisition of these lands via exchange (i.e., removal of the FPL inholding) means that ENP resources and values will not be directly impacted by the construction and operation of electric transmission facilities on these existing privately held lands and property interests while maintaining a useable, cost effective corridor for FPL. The exchange also provides a net gain to ENP of 60 acres of valuable lands (ENP will acquire 320 acres from FPL not part of the Park or subject to Park control and ENP will transfer to FPL 260 acres). (2 Cong. Record, Jan. 13, 2009 at S 332.)

#### ***PN4000 - Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority***

**Concern ID:** 30266

**CONCERN  
STATEMENT:**

Commenters stated that the Organic Act, Wilderness Act, Endangered Species Act, East Everglades Expansion Act, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan and the Enabling Legislation of the park are mandates to protect and restore park land. Commenters felt that power lines within the park or on lands adjacent to the park were in conflict with these mandates. Commenters recommended that if acquisition of the FPL land was not possible, then the NPS should pay FPL fair market value for the land.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 29

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 211959

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Adhere to the Organic Act and the Enabling Legislation of the park.

**Corr. ID:** 47

**Organization:** sierra club

**Comment ID:** 211422

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Any powerline in this area would be contrary to the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, the 1991 East Everglades Land Protection Plan and many other studies and agreements.

**Corr. ID:** 114

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 212128

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The exchange would be illegal, representing dirty politics and a betrayal of the Secretary's responsibilities to uphold the Organic Act, the Wilderness Act, the Endangered Species Act and the East Everglades Expansion

Act.

**Corr. ID:** 114

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 212126

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Power lines on current FPL land or the proposed exchanged land are in direct violation of the Organic Act, the Wilderness Act the Endangered Species Act and the East Everglades Expansion Act. I'm shocked that the National Park Service has not shared cost estimates for acquisition of the FPL land, which the NPS has the authority to acquire and quite likely the acquisition funding already in-hand.

**Corr. ID:** 116

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218361

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Acquire the land as authorized by the 1989 Protection and Expansion Act. In

1996, you - NPS - wrote to FPL stating the "fair market value" of the property as \$109,300. Revise your estimate as you must, but either FPL does a voluntary sale or - if they refuse - you must acquire the property by eminent domain to fulfill the purposes of the Act - the ecological and hydrological restoration and protection of the East Everglades and Shark River Slough. Protect this source of water for Everglades National Park.

**Corr. ID:** 267

**Organization:** Citizen of the USA

**Comment ID:** 217337

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** You have a legislative mandate to protect and restore park land. Intrusion of a power line, even on the park land next to the park boundary, will have impacts to natural systems, plant and animal populations, hydrology, and the character and integrity of the park. Pay FPL the fair market value for the proposed path of the power line and get them out of the park!

**Corr. ID:** 337

**Organization:** National Parks Conservation Association

**Comment ID:** 218634

**Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** The Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act in 1989 expanded the park by 109,600 acres to include those lands. And in doing so, it directed the service to manage its resources, quote, to maintain the natural abundance, diversity and ecological integrity of native plants and animals as part of its ecosystem. NPC does not believe transmission corridors and sacrificing Everglades National Park land composed of high-quality wetlands is consistent with that directive. These lands should be owned by the American people in perpetuity as part of our heritage.

**Corr. ID:** 352

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218672

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Here is so much legislation that says this piece of land should be acquired. The Organic Act, the Everglades Protection Act, the Wilderness Act -- this land is wilderness, you can't put a power line in wilderness -- the Endangered Species Act. You've got all these acts on one side and you've got this strange critic called the Omnibus Act that says, well, you can change tract Band tract A if you want to.

**Corr. ID:** 382

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218799      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Any development along the eastern edge of Everglades National Park is 100% incompatible with the on going Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan authorized by Congress in 2000.

**Corr. ID:** 390                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218810      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Florida Power and Light should not be allowed to set up a power-transmission-lines corridor through Everglades National Park. This is not compatible with the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan authorized by Congress in 2000.

**Concern ID:** 34246

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters stated that an NPS decision to exchange park lands, purchased for restoration of Shark River slough, for FPL's lands would be legally challenged as inconsistent with the purposes of the Expansion Area.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 342                      **Organization:** Sierra Club

**Comment ID:** 234056      **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** Now this is what's going to happen: We know this is going to have terrible effects o~ the park, birds, water management, views, vistas, et cetera. In the meantime, the Sierra Club signed a letter opposing this in the EA. We are going to make sure the full weight of this organization nationally is opposing these lines. We are calling for the condemnation of FPL property in this park and we are going to make this a national issue because we are not going to let this stand.

Enough is enough. This is not the job of the National Park Service to put 15-story-tall power lines in the view of the park and claim that this is America's best idea.

**Corr. ID:** 352                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 234055      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Expansion clearly states the intent of congress to add these lands to Everglades National Park to be managed as park, not power line corridor. We are hearing a lot about the use of the flow way. It's not just a flow way and the land protection act written by the NPS says clearly, further, congress intended that the focus of management of the area to be conducted to the broadest extent possible to maintain natural abundance, diversity, ecological integrity of an entire ecosystem, not just water flowing through a section of the Shark River Slew.

So it has been acquired, now manage it as a park. If not, we will be adversaries. And I'm saying that right now, Sierra Club Member Jonathan Ullman said that. We will go to court on this and it will not end until it gets as far as it can go. You've got a strange piece of legal mumbo jumbo here with this Omnibus Act that throws out a 11 previous legislation and I'm stating on the record that South Florida Wildlands will join with other coalition members to go to court on this, however, we want to work harmoniously with the park service, manage this as a park, and let's all enjoy our park. Thank you.

**Concern ID:** 34247

**CONCERN** Commenters expressed concern about Congressional and NPS statements

**STATEMENT:**

emphasizing an urgent need to remove FPL's utility corridor from its current location to facilitate rehydrating the Park. Commenters noted that while rehydration is a worthy goal, Congress intended the management of the Expansion Area to focus on maintaining the natural abundance, diversity and ecological integrity of an entire ecosystem, not just a water flow way through the Shark River slough.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 323 **Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Comment ID:** 234057 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The language of Section 7107 of the 2009 Omnibus Public Land Management Act, which authorized the "land swap", contains no findings and no mention as to what purpose this transfer, if it took place, would serve for the Park or the American people. However, both Senators Mel Martinez and Bill Nelson of Florida attempted to provide justification for the proposed transfer in their statements before the Senate when the Bill was introduced. Both Senators emphasized the urgent need to rehydrate the Park and remove the FPL utility corridor from its current location in order to allow for the bridging of Tamiami Trail and the return of a semblance of the sheet flow that used to characterize this region. This same point was made by Superintendent Dan Kimball's in both his opening and closing remarks at the recent public meeting of June 22, 2011 held at Florida International University.

While rehydration is a worthy goal, there are other aspects to the issue that need to be examined as well. First, the 1991 Land Protection Plan emphasized that the purpose of the acquisition was to achieve not only the hydrological restoration of Northeast Shark River Slough, but also the ecological restoration of the East Everglades. The acquired land was intended to be far more than a "water flow way" - "Further, Congress intended that the focus of management of the area be conducted, to the broadest extent possible, to maintain natural abundance, diversity, and ecological integrity of an entire ecosystem, not just a water flow way through a section of the Shark River Slough."

**PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action**

**Concern ID:** 30267

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters noted that restoration and protection of the project area should be the guiding mandate of the project.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 7 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 202658 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Restoration of the project area as a whole should be the guiding mandate - no alternatives should be considered unless they accomplish that goal.

**Corr. ID:** 10 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 211053 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I am upset at the thought of transmission lines giving a "toe-hold" for more exotics incursion. This is antithetical to the mandate the NPS has to comply with ecological restoration, protection and the public's right to enjoy this area.

**PN9000 - Purpose And Need: Issues And Impact Topics Selected For Analyses**

**Concern ID:** 30270

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters provided a wide range of impact topics to be analyzed in the EIS. These impact topics included vegetation and control of invasive species, wilderness, wetlands, wildlife, avian species, health and safety, visitor use and experience, visual resources, and water resources.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 10 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 202706 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I am concerned about endangered and listed species, wetland destruction (EVEN ONE ACRE) land disturbance that allows exotics like melaluca, Brazillian pepper, Virgina creeper, air potato and the like to run like wildfire and natural water recharge.

**Corr. ID:** 27 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 203180 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Any new construction and infrastructure projects in Southern Florida should be planned with a minimum impact to an environment that is already suffering the effects of overpopulation, invasive species, and over use. FPL themselves asked residents of Miami-Dade their preferences, and here is what they said: minimize the proximity to residential neighborhoods and school properties and take advantage of opportunities to place these lines where other similar infrastructure already existed, such as electrical lines, railroads and major roads. Customers also preferred the lines to be placed in more commercial versus residential areas when possible and to utilize existing FPL rights-of-way.

**Corr. ID:** 47 **Organization:** sierra club

**Comment ID:** 204275 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The NPS should keep in mind that any power line presence within or on the border of the Everglades will cause further environmental degradation in this area. Wildlife (including many endangered species) will be further threatened if the powerlines are built in or bordering on the Everglades National Park. Any powerline in this area would be contrary to the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, the 1991 East Everglades Land Protection Plan and many other studies and agreements.

**Corr. ID:** 59 **Organization:** Sierra Club

**Comment ID:** 208336 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** One not so small issue: can you imagine the spread of exotics with the clearing of land to run power lines?

**Corr. ID:** 63 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 209251 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Bird deaths from high voltage lines, clearing of land required, erosion and runoff from the construction of lines. Increased water pollution and air pollution from coal emissions and radiation leaks. Heavy water use for cooling power plants, and the raising of water temperatures.

**Corr. ID:** 77 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 210251 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Impacts to birds and other species that would be affected by the power towers and electric lines. What would the disturbance of construction have

on nesting colonies of wood storks and other avian species in the East Everglades? Altered or blocked water flow and its effects on the ecosystem.

EMF (Electromagnetic Fields) and AMF (Alternating Magnetic Fields) pollution from the power lines and its effects on wildlife as well as people visiting the park.

**Corr. ID:** 87                      **Organization:** Sierra Club; Everglades Forever; Nature Conservancy

**Comment ID:** 210721            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** My concerns have to do with wilderness, of rather the lack thereof. Florida continues to be developed while newly constructed homes remain vacant and deteriorating. Except for a few state parks, parts of the Everglades are the only remaining land/wetlands in Florida. To open up a new corridor, rather than augmenting/enhancing the current one seems to be irresponsible and hide-bound thinking. A new corridor will upset the current natural balance, introduce erosive factors of roads and culverts, introduce and spread invasive plants, and disrupt and perhaps end the habitat and habits of wildlife including the fast disappearing Florida cougar. The possible dilaterious impact on migratory birds is too scary to even contemplate. Please leave well enough alone. We as a species have done enough damage. The Everglades is a last refuge for me, my fellow Floridians, and all citizens of the world who come to see and experience this special land.

**Corr. ID:** 114                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 212129            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** NPS peer-reviewed and USFWS studies have already determined that the proposed power lines would adversely impact wood storks and snail kites. Both are endangered species. Wood storks are the indicator species for Everglades restoration and power lines would be the equivalent of a mist net through the three most productive wood stork colonies in the park. This is in direct violation of the Endangered Species Act.

In addition to reducing the East Everglades Expansion Area (although the NPS has the authority and quite likely the funds to acquire all of it), construction of thirty-seven 15-story towers with bases longer than football fields will significantly impact the hydrology, vegetation and habitat that rightfully belongs to the only National Park established to protect biological diversity.

The massive structures and noise produced by the towers will contribute to a new industrial landscape of the Everglades, greatly diminishing visitor experience and wilderness character. This violates the Organic Act and the Wilderness Act.

Lastly, the Miami Dade Greenway will no longer offer cyclists and hikers pristine western views of the Everglades. Instead they will pass under towers taller than any building in Washington DC. They will experience the crackling of power lines instead of the hum of birds and insects.

**Corr. ID:** 175                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218368            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Power lines and towers and more maintenance roads have no place here. Their construction would have negative impacts on already endangered species like the snail kite, wood stork and Florida panther, introduce more exotic and invasive plants, and interfere with ongoing efforts to restore the Everglades. Visitors who come to look out across the sawgrass and wetlands do not want to see this eyesore.



Please have FPL find a more appropriate location for their transmission lines.

**Corr. ID:** 269                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 217376            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** First and foremost in considering the potential environmental impacts of the land acquisition alternatives should be protecting and preserving the one-of-a-kind Everglades, from its most microscopic bacteria and small lichen to its tallest cypress and largest panther. Protecting and preserving includes ensuring clean water, clean air, and adequate land for these living organisms. Studies have shown that manmade noises and structures can create stress that interferes with breeding and ultimately the survival of many creatures.

**Corr. ID:** 296                      **Organization:** Audubon, Native Plant Society

**Comment ID:** 217826            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Land swap would result in a net loss of approx. 260 acres for the Everglades National Park. Federally endangered Wood stork nest adjacent to the land swap area and should not be put in danger.

The aesthetic beauty of the historic area would be destroyed by towers and roads that would allow additional access plus provide barriers to the potential water flow for the restoration plan.

**Corr. ID:** 323                      **Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Comment ID:** 218490            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** In conducting the EIS, NPS must produce the most rigorous, comprehensive and objective analysis possible. This includes identifying and analyzing the full range of impacts the construction and operation these power lines could have on soils, wetlands, exotic plant species, listed wildlife, bird populations, and the public's ability to enjoy these lands with the addition of three massive power lines running across them. This includes identifying and analyzing a full range of alternatives (including predicted costs of acquiring the FPL property without transfer) - and the selection of the alternative at the end of the process which best protects the public interest in these lands and the natural and cultural resources of Everglades National Park.

**Corr. ID:** 323                      **Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Comment ID:** 218484            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The potential consequences of the proposed swap to the Park will likely result in:

- damage to sensitive wetlands due to construction of towers and maintenance roads;
- spread of exotic plant species on disturbed lands;
- impacts to federally listed endangered and threatened species including the Everglades snail kite, eastern indigo snake, wood stork, and Florida panther;
- likely increase in mortality of native and migratory birds due to collisions and electrocutions; and
- a significantly impacted viewscape and degradation of the public's ability to enjoy a unique area already declared "wilderness eligible" by the NPS.

**Concern ID:** 30271

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters expressed concern over potential impacts to threatened and endangered bird species including the snail kite and the woodstork, as well as migrating birds.

Commenters provided studies and statistics for consideration in the analysis.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 76

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 210188

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** From reading coverage of these topics in the Miami Herald, it seems to me that the EIS should consider and measure the impacts on the bird colonies described in the following:

According to Dave Hallac, chief biologist at the park, there are three productive wading bird colonies near the site FPL would receive in the land exchange. "These colonies are, in certain years, the most productive wood stork colonies in the central and southern Everglades," Hallac said. "It's fairly well-known that transmission lines have the potential to impact birds." According to Hallac, in just one colony in 2009 there were well over 7,000 wading bird nests which included great blue herons, egrets and white ibis in addition to the wood storks. The impact study will determine just how harmful the transmission lines might be to the birds' habit and well-being.

**Corr. ID:** 82

**Organization:** Concerned citizen of S. Florida

**Comment ID:** 210480

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** There are three productive wading-bird colonies near this site that would be affected. In 2009 alone, in just ONE colony, there were well over 7,000

wading bird nests, including great blue herons, egrets and white ibis, as well as wood storks. This is part of our FLORIDA HERITAGE, not to mention the reason why the National Parks were created in the first place!

In addition to that, and according to today's article in the Miami Herald, Florida Power and Light (FPL), if the swap were to occur, would then be installing 140-foot towers and lines buzzing with 500 kilowatts right at the entrance to the park.

This is a huge concern for the health and safety of the park wildlife and its human visitors!

**Corr. ID:** 213

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218396

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Documents prepared for the environmental impact statement examining the massive powerline project and whether the Park Service should acquire the land have said the towers could present risks to birds in the area. Although a report (attached) on the possible impacts to birds called for more study, it also said that the preferred location "would result in the loss of more than 100 acres of habitat used by more than 200 avian species, including loss of breeding habitat used by more than 50 avian species."

"This loss of habitat," the report continued, "would affect a diverse and abundant assemblage of avian species nesting, foraging, and migrating through habitats located within Everglades National Park."

**Corr. ID:** 213

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218398

**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** In addition to avian habitat loss due to the clearing required under above ground high voltage power lines, there is ample research indicating that up to several hundred birds are killed annually per kilometre of overhead high voltage lines and towers. Birds collide with overhead lines, shield wires and towers. Visible markers fastened to lines and shield wires may reduce bird mortality

somewhat, but not appreciably, and these visible markers add to the unsightliness of the already ugly towers and lines. As well, electromagnetic fields (EMFs) and pollutant-charged corona ions emitted by overhead high tension lines negatively affect avian health through reduced egg size, eggshell thinning, reduced egg laying and reduced hatching success. Several aspects of bird migration, mate selection, sleep and feeding patterns are also negatively affected by overhead high voltage power line EMFs. Burying these lines eliminates these negative impacts.

**Corr. ID:** 323                      **Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Comment ID:** 218488            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** In addition to the Plan restrictions, three of the most productive wading bird colonies in the central and southern Everglades are near the site FPL would receive in the land exchange. The construction and operation of power lines in that area are certain to have grave impacts to these bird populations. From the October 2010 NPS Avian Impact Report on the impacts of proposed FPL transmission lines:

**Corr. ID:** 324                      **Organization:** Audubon of Florida

**Comment ID:** 218715            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** We are grateful that the EIS will evaluate the impacts of the proposed transmission lines on nesting colonies of Wood Storks and foraging habitat for the Everglade Snail Kite. Each alternative should be analyzed for its specific impacts to these iconic species.

Peter Frederick's analysis in "Bird-Strike Mortality on the Everglades Section of the Levee-Midway Powerline" (Mar 1997) is a useful resource. While transmission lines pose increased risk, and likely do contribute to mortality, there are many factors that impact the severity of problems. For example, the differences could be significant when looking at impacts associated with transmission lines near breeding colonies (<5miles) verses those at great distances from breeding colonies (>10miles).

Another consideration is the proximity of foraging near transmission lines. Lines going through wetlands appear to be routinely mowed and free of woody vegetation and are often pocked with shallow depressions. This makes the area around the lines attractive foraging sites increasing the number of birds nearby. Foraging locations within a few hundred yards of a transmission line would similarly represent increased risk.

As these risks to bird species are analyzed, possible mitigating conditions should be discussed. Impacts could be partially mitigated with markers, flags or other tools to make the lines more visible. A condition should be reviewed that requires the creation or restoration of offsetting habitat in excess of the projected mortality. This would need to provide ecological lift from shallow wetlands (not other mitigation such as the removal of invasive exotic plants), which is so urgently needed to protect and create long-term sustainable habitat for the Wood Stork and other species populations.

**Corr. ID:** 324                      **Organization:** Audubon of Florida

**Comment ID:** 218717            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The ultimate and most important key to protecting and recovering the populations of wading birds and other endangered species in ENP is to restore natural habitat as soon as possible. The Everglades National Park website concludes that "[h]ydrologic conditions resulting from water-management activities in recent years often have been unfavorable to support Wood Stork feeding and

nesting requirements." According to the South Florida Wading Bird Report, during the 2010 nesting season Wood Stork nesting in the Everglades was reduced by 81% when compared with 2009 and most colonies eventually failed. The report also notes that Wood Stork nesting in the Everglades in 2010 was restricted only to colonies in ENP. Because recent fluctuations in nesting success from year to year are impacted by weather conditions and changes in water levels, restoring the natural system in ENP is critical to support resilient and stable populations that can withstand these challenges over the long term.

The lack of sustainable nesting in the Park is the greatest issue facing Wood Storks in this region, and should be a central part of the analysis in the EIS in addition to the loss of individuals that could be impacted by transmission lines. Therefore, we reiterate the need to focus on the long-term impacts of beneficial water management changes, and the consideration of restoration delays as a critical environmental impact of this process.

**Corr. ID:** 340                      **Organization:** Tropical Audubon

**Comment ID:** 218496            **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** And speaking on behalf of Tropical Audubon, of course this would have implications for migrating birds, for wildlife. I know you have all those issues already listed in your EIS. I'd like you to consider even further migratory birds and how that would affect and slice and dice this peninsula as a corridor, as an important bird area. Hopefully that's already in your EIS.

**Concern ID:** 30275

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters questioned how the alternatives would impact the overall restoration efforts of the Shark River Slough as well as potential impacts to wetlands from construction.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 198                      **Organization:** South Florida Audubon Society

**Comment ID:** 218392            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Whereas any construction of high-voltage power transmission lines anywhere within the boundary of the Park or the Add Lands would present serious obstacles to the improvement of sheet flow to Shark River Slough, the ENP, Florida Bay and eastward to Biscayne Bay, and Whereas the long term effects of magnetic fields and/or sound generated by high-voltage transmission lines on people and wildlife have yet to be determined, and Whereas there is evidence that suggests that the effects will be deleterious, and Whereas power lines are not aesthetically pleasing and will certainly detract from the natural beauty of the Park,

**Corr. ID:** 287                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 217791            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** It is possible that powerlines and earthworks necessary to construct them will create a hydraulic barrier and effectively dry out additional wetland habitats.

**Corr. ID:** 323                      **Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Comment ID:** 218487            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** However, if FPL keeps its current parcel and obtains the necessary permits, it would have to fill wetlands to build bases to anchor the towers

and construct access roads to maintain them. The construction and operation of the facility at this site would impede water flow from reaching the Park's interior and it would forever alter the natural landscape of the Park. Furthermore, the 1991 NPS Land Protection Plan specifically identifies power lines as an incompatible use: "Activities that would disturb the ecology, interfere with the restored hydrologic system, or prevent public enjoyment of the Addition would be incompatible?Major additions to existing developments or agricultural activities, as well as the construction of utility lines and roads, also would not be compatible."

**Corr. ID:** 324                      **Organization:** Audubon of Florida

**Comment ID:** 218711            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Ultimately, the scoping documents note that both the existing FPL corridor and the proposed exchange lands are important for accommodating ecosystem restoration flows into NESRS and substantial investigation should be allocated to this issue. While the proximity to NESRS of the 320 acres currently owned by FPL would make mitigation of the restoration impact extremely difficult, mitigation on the proposed exchange lands should be given consideration, especially if other alternatives are likely to have negative impacts caused by delaying restoration. The Secretary was given authority to impose conditions on the exchange alternative. Would the condition of a seepage management component funded or constructed by FPL allay impacts to restoring flows? Could such a condition be designed to in fact enable faster ecological benefits from other restoration projects?

**Corr. ID:** 336                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218627            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** This land is part of a national park and it should and rightfully be owned by the citizens.  
This proposed land swap would result in a loss of wetlands of over 260 acres, I believe I read, and this loss would undoubtedly disrupt the delicate Everglades ecosystem. And this would also be affected by the construction of over 70 access roads and tower pads which would take us filling wetlands. This is not compatible with SURP, which aims to restore and improve wetlands, not build upon them.

**Corr. ID:** 337                      **Organization:** National Parks Conservation Association

**Comment ID:** 218632            **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** So with that said, we will have some pretty specific comments and we'll send those in writing, but for today's purposes, I can't get them all in in three minutes, so I'll just hit on a few concerns. The first is that we think that a land swap deal would be completely incompatible with Everglades restoration. You are creating a linear barrier that would have permanent construction impacts and create permanent obstructions to areas that we are trying to move surface water flows to do other restoration. We are talking about an \$8 billion project and I just heard a \$109,000 appraisal, so we really need to take a hard look at what the impacts are in perpetuity, not just the construction period for the transition.

**Corr. ID:** 370                      **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218692            **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** Time is of the essence in order to facilitate Mod Waters, as it appears that the bridging portion of the project will be complete at the end of 2012 and ENP and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps") will then be ready to restore more natural surface water flows in the East Everglades/Shark River Slough area, including the 320 acres of FPL's property. However, these surface water flows cannot begin until the necessary property rights from FPL have been transferred to

ENP. FPL has been (and remains) committed to timely execution of the exchange to allow for relocation of its utility corridor so that Mod Waters can proceed in late 2012 or 2013. In fact, FPL has already acted to facilitate Mod Waters by voluntarily granting temporary easements to the Corps at no cost, where FPL's corridor crosses Tamiami Trail, to enable that federal agency to construct the one mile bridge that is the keystone feature of Mod Waters. Crucial to ensuring that a positive outcome can ultimately be achieved is the development of a comprehensive EIS that meaningfully evaluates the exchange and reasonable alternatives.

**Corr. ID:** 405                      **Organization:** Clean Water Action

**Comment ID:** 218880           **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** To establish the most environmentally preferable location for the transmission lines NPS should consider additional alternative corridors outside of the park, but at a minimum, must conduct a complete evaluation of how the currently proposed corridors will impact Everglades' restoration projects. A complete and thorough evaluation of the impacts the transmission lines will have on Everglades restoration projects, NPS must consider the following:

First, NPS must take a hard look at the impact the construction of additional access roads and increased traffic of both authorized and unauthorized vehicles will have on ecologically sensitive areas that are crucial to the goals of Everglades' restoration. Second, SFWMD has explained that future water management projects may necessitate the removal of the L31-N levees or modifications of the L31-N levee to accommodate for new water flow, therefore the draft EIS must evaluate the impact the construction of structure pads and access roads in L31-N will have on the hydrological restoration of the Everglades. Third, because the future plans for the Central Lake Belt Storage Area projects are uncertain, the NPS must evaluate whether it is possible to construct transmission lines in the currently proposed locations, without interfering with the water supply to the Shark River Slough. Lastly, NPS must evaluate the impact the construction, maintenance and management of the transmission lines will have on the wading bird populations that nest or have habitats in the area and conduct a comprehensive study on each species', flight behaviors and foraging habits.

**Concern ID:** 30280

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters provided information on previous archeological studies performed within the study area and requested that if construction was proposed outside of these previously studied areas, that additional archeology surveys be completed.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 89                      **Organization:** Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida

**Comment ID:** 211233           **Organization Type:** Tribal Government

**Representative Quote:** A full and comprehensive Phase I archeological investigation should be carried out on any and all lands prior to any land disturbance associated with implementation of the EIS land acquisition alternatives or subsequent actions on these lands.

**Corr. ID:** 318                      **Organization:** Florida Department of State - Division of Historical Resources

**Comment ID:** 218443           **Organization Type:** State Government

**Representative Quote:** This office reviewed the referenced scoping notice and our files to identify issues for possible impact to historic properties listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places, that should be addressed in the

forthcoming Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Our review was conducted in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended and with the National Environmental Policy Act and their implementing regulations.

A review of our records and data files indicates that in 2009 Florida Power and Light completed an archaeological survey (conducted by New South Associates) of the six-mile long potential exchange corridor. No archaeological resources were identified. If this is the entire corridor within the expansion area to be addressed in the referenced EIS, there should be no cultural resources of concern to be addressed. However, if the corridor is different in location of extent, or the proposed EIS includes alignment(s) outside the Everglades additional archaeological/cultural resource surveys may be warranted.

**Corr. ID:** 381                      **Organization:** Florida Department of Environmental Protection

**Comment ID:** 218792            **Organization Type:** State Government

**Representative Quote:** The Florida Department of State's (DOS) review of their records indicated that in 2009, Florida Power & Light completed an archaeological survey of the six-mile long potential exchange corridor, and no archaeological resources were identified. If this is the same corridor to be addressed in the Draft EIS, there should be no cultural resources of concern. If, however, the proposed corridor is different than that previously surveyed, additional archaeological/cultural resource surveys may be warranted.

**Corr. ID:** 405                      **Organization:** Clean Water Action

**Comment ID:** 218881            **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** The linear construction of three transmission lines atop 140 foot towers will adversely affect the visual and atmospheric appeal of the Shark River Slough Archeological District, a Federal Registered National Historic District. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), requires that a Federal agency take into account potential adverse effects a federal agency's action might have on historic properties. Additionally, the NHPA advises agencies to coordinate the steps of the Section 106 process with any other review required under NEPA, like a draft EIS.

Therefore, the draft EIS should include a thorough analysis on the adverse effects the initial construction of transmission lines will have in regards to the historic preservation, and restoration of resources within Shark River Slough Archeological District. Furthermore, to fully comply with the Section 106 process NPS should evaluate the reasonably foreseeable additive, continuing and cumulative impacts the transmission lines will have on the designated historic district. During the course of its review, NPS should consult with the State Historic Preservation Office or, if appropriate, communicate with any Tribal Historic Preservation Officer to properly determine the potential adverse effects the transmission lines might have on the historic preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation of the Shark River Slough Archeological District.

**Concern ID:** 30281

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [One commenter noted that this project could set a precedent for landowners with inholdings within the NPS system.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 341                      **Organization:** Everglades Committee for the Sierra Club

**Comment ID:** 218638      **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

**Representative Quote:** But the reality is, you know, Laura Reynolds talked about migratory birds and talked about water and all of these things are going to be impacted by even an exchange because basically what you are doing is you are setting a precedent which says that the National Park brand can be exchanged for somebody who has an inholding and that's a very dangerous precedent because, as we know, this might occur all over the place. Somebody might say, well, if you let me build a giant hotel or a movie theater on the border of the park, inside a national park, I'll exchange this, but that wasn't really the intent of congress when they passed the act.

**Concern ID:** 30284

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Commenters requested that the EIS analyze the impacts to visitor use and experience, including how access will be impacted as well as the visual impacts from any construction.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 166      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218354      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** American and international visitors don't want to see 140-foot towers and power lines surrounding this World Heritage Site. We must be sure that future generations can experience America's scenic wonders unspoiled.

**Corr. ID:** 278      **Organization:** Florida Wildlife Federation

**Comment ID:** 217768      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** High powered transmission lines would obviously destroy the viewshed in this area of ENP. Also, the need to raise the elevation of the transmission corridor in order to construct and maintain would have hydrological impacts on sheetflow. In addition, adverse impacts from towers and lines could negatively impact endangered woodstorks foraging and flying in the area.

**Corr. ID:** 317      **Organization:** Miami-Dade County DERM

**Comment ID:** 218439      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The EIS should include an assessment of the potential changes to public access to wetlands within and adjacent to ENP that could result from the land exchange and any subsequent roadway construction. This assessment should include an examination of all potential impacts from new access points and the extent to which access controls would be effective. This assessment should include areas both within and adjacent to ENP where proposed roadways or other linear features could exacerbate inappropriate access.

**Corr. ID:** 330      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218507      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Viewscape is a visual connection between a person and the spatial arrangement of landscape features. Viewscape is why so many Americans bring cameras to scenic vistas and is recognized by NPS as important to the park experience.

Most viewsapes (for example, a landmark, an urban space or a district) are visible from a variety of locations. However a significant view may only be visible from one or two vantage points. This view is often considered a panoramic view which is defined as a view that "requires an unobstructed but not empty foreground between the



viewer and the subject" (Du Toit Allsopp, Hillier, 1993, 15). Lise Burcher, Urban Character and Viewscape Assessment, ISoCaRP Congress 2005

**VIEWSCAPE-SWAMPSCAPE VALUES:**

Battles of Saratoga Viewshed Inventory and Analysis

[http://www.clemson.edu/caah/cedp/cudp/pubs/alliance/13\\_Jacour.pdf](http://www.clemson.edu/caah/cedp/cudp/pubs/alliance/13_Jacour.pdf)

NPS should adopt the following advice from the Saratoga "viewshed" which places nature's viewshed in terms of visible and not visible. "First the viewshed was displayed in the simplest terms of "visible" and "not visible." Any point of land that would be visible from any one of the observation points was considered visible; this was based on topography only, not accounting for buildings and vegetation."

**Corr. ID:** 336                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 218628            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** And also, this would affect ecotourism, which is a huge part of South Florida's economy. This swap would have a terrible aesthetic effect on the Everglades with power lines being visible almost 5 miles in the distance and you would also be able to hear these power lines while you are walking through, taking a hike. And therefore, I ask that NPS consider not swapping these lands and using the power that it has been given by congress to buy these lands or go through the condemnation process.

**Concern ID:** 30285

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [One commenter noted that under alternative 3, there would be impacts outside of the park that would need to be analyzed.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 371                      **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218869            **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** Establishing a new utility corridor farther to the east in heavily developed, heavily populated Miami-Dade County may create other significant effects on the human environment. These could include the impacts of private property acquisition, acquisition or condemnation of property, homes, or businesses, and potential adverse public reaction to construction and operation of high voltage electric transmission lines in a populated urban setting (compared to building and operating the line along the largely unoccupied ENP boundary and L-31 Canal). None of these issues are referenced in the scoping documents but will have to be part of the EIS if ENP/NPS proceeds to examine in depth the acquisition via purchase/condemnation alternative.

**Concern ID:** 30286

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Commenters requested that the adverse impact to the restoration efforts from any delay in flowing water to the area be analyzed.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 324                      **Organization:** Audubon of Florida

**Comment ID:** 218712            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Additionally, one of Audubon's primary environmental concerns in the Southern Everglades and Florida Bay is the continual loss of ecotones and marsh habitat, and in turn, ENP acreage in this most ecologically important zone. Will selecting an alternative that leads to delay in hydrating the southern wetlands cause further loss of land due to erosion and loss of habitats caused by transitions

from freshwater marsh to mangroves in this area?

**Corr. ID:** 324                      **Organization:** Audubon of Florida

**Comment ID:** 218704            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Timing of benefits to the Everglades is an indispensable issue that must be considered in each of the alternatives. When evaluating the impacts of each alternative on the environment, potential delays to operating the one-mile bridge and increasing flows into NESRS should be given serious consideration. Delaying restoration would have significant negative environmental impacts. The National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences stated in its 2008 report on the Progress of Everglades Restoration: "To do nothing is, in fact, to do harm." And it has long been noted that "delays are the worst enemy of the Everglades." Therefore, the question of whether selecting any of the alternatives is likely to cause delay and how significant of a delay, must be part of the analysis.

**Corr. ID:** 324                      **Organization:** Audubon of Florida

**Comment ID:** 218713            **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Related to this crucial issue of timing, we ask that an appraisal of the cost of the land be included in the analysis. This is unusually relevant to this particular EIS because the amount of money needed to pursue acquisition, and the amount of time needed to authorize and appropriate necessary funds, could determine the amount of time that the system will remain in a status quo of ecological decline. As discussed above, delaying the COP and the movement of freshwater flows to ENP has negative environmental impacts that must be considered as part of the analysis of the acquisition alternative.

**Concern ID:** 30287

**CONCERN  
STATEMENT:**

One commenter felt that the scoping newsletter misrepresented the potential impacts to restoration and avian species and requested the EIS alter these statements. The commenter also requested that NPS pay the difference in cost for implementing alternative 3 and any costs from the delay in land exchange.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 370                      **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218700            **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** In addition to the issues discussed above, FPL's attached comments raise a number of other issues identified by the scoping documents. For instance, the EIS should acknowledge that:

- the existing FPL corridor is more critical for restoration of natural surface water flows through Mod Waters than the lands along the L-31 Canal;
- the exchange and post-exchange use of the relocated corridor should not negatively impact agency efforts to engage in seepage control along the L-31 Canal;
- the proposed transmission lines along the L-31 Canal would not affect visitor experience within the Park and would be virtually invisible to visitors at current airboat locations and not visible from the Shark River visitor view points;
- the proposed exchange should not have any appreciable effect on the snail kite;
- there would be low to moderate risk of wood stork mortality due to collisions with the proposed transmission lines and no risk to the wood stork population; and
- as no wilderness eligibility determination has been made for the Everglades Expansion area, the wilderness issue has no bearing on the exchange.

**Corr. ID:** 371                      **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218740            **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** Environmental Effects of Exchange Alternative Overstated or Misrepresented - The NOI and Newsletter misrepresent the prospective environmental effects of the exchange. Both documents also reach conclusions that are untimely and inconsistent with the on-the-ground facts. We note that conclusions regarding environmental consequences and effects are to be presented in the EIS - not the scoping notice. 40 CFR 1502.16.

The Scoping Newsletter presents as an issue that "implementation of the land exchange would remove nearly 260 acres of high quality wetlands from NPS management and protection." Id. at 4. This misleads the public by failing to note that NPS (and ENP) will receive 320 acres of higher quality wetlands via the trade for a net gain of 60 acres of higher quality lands. The acquired acreage is also critical for Mod Waters' implementation (and Shark River Slough restoration) and more critical for this purpose than the exchange lands. In contrast, the 260 acres of exchange lands are along an existing degraded linear feature, the L-31 Canal, adjacent to developed portions of western Miami-Dade County.

The issues section also indicates that the "existing FPL corridor and the proposed exchange lands are important for accommodating ecosystem restoration flows into Northeast Shark River Slough" resulting from implementation of Mod Waters. This inaccurately implies that each corridor is of comparable value in terms of facilitating Mod Waters. The reason that FPL and ENP signed the contingent land exchange agreement in 2008 was to acquire the existing FPL corridor for Mod Waters and other environmental purposes since the FPL lands are of much greater importance for restoration purposes. In fact, that agreement states:

**Corr. ID:** 371                      **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218741        **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** The issues section also indicates that the "existing FPL corridor and the proposed exchange lands are important for accommodating ecosystem restoration flows into Northeast Shark River Slough" resulting from implementation of Mod Waters. This inaccurately implies that each corridor is of comparable value in terms of facilitating Mod Waters. The reason that FPL and ENP signed the contingent land exchange agreement in 2008 was to acquire the existing FPL corridor for Mod Waters and other environmental purposes since the FPL lands are of much greater importance for restoration purposes. In fact, that agreement states:

"The Parties have identified approximately 260 acres of property and interests at the eastern edge of the ENP Expansion Area that, if exchanged pursuant to the terms of this Agreement and approved for development for electrical transmission facilities, would have substantially less impact on the ENP, including the ENP Expansion Area, compared to use of the present FPL Property if used for the development of electrical transmission facilities."

That is also why Congress specifically authorized the trade spelled out in the 2008 agreement: the existing 45 year old FPL corridor is more critical for Mod Waters restoration flows than the lands along the L-31 Canal. But these key facts are not presented to the public and the failure to do so presents an inaccurate picture of the purposes and consequences of the land exchange.

**Corr. ID:** 371                      **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218742        **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** This problem is compounded by implications that the land exchange, and relocating the FPL corridor to the 260 acres along the L-31 Canal, will

negatively impact Mod Waters and restoration efforts by adversely effecting water seepage control along the eastern edge of ENP. See Newsletter at 4. FPL is not aware of any indications that the exchange and post-exchange use of the relocated corridor will negatively impact NPS (or Army Corps of Engineers or South Florida Water Management District) efforts to engage in seepage control along the L-31 Canal.

Seepage management for Mod Waters was thoroughly addressed in June, 1992 when the Corps of Engineers produced its General Design Memorandum ("GDM") for Mod Waters. The GDM, and related Final EIS, specifically outlined plans to control seepage along the east edge of ENP arising from Mod Waters. ENP was fully aware of these facts when it suggested the land trade years ago to FPL, signed the contingent exchange agreement in 2008, and supported the 2009 Congressional authorization of the ENP-FPL land exchange. During this period ENP/NPS did not indicate that the proposed trade would adversely impact seepage management plans and in fact discussed ways in which the proposed electric transmission facilities could potentially be constructed to support seepage management. Nonetheless, FPL supports objective evaluation of this non-issue in the EIS so this matter can be put to rest.

The Newsletter presents as an issue the conclusion that "visitors using the L-31 Canal corridor for recreation" will be impacted by electric lines that "would dominate the viewshed" if the exchange proceeds. *Id.* at 4. However, there is no comparable consideration of whether powerlines in the existing FPL corridor would similarly impact recreationists within the East Everglades Expansion Area. Presumably, impacts on visitors well inside the Park are of greater concern than visitors using the already developed lands along the L-31 Canal. FPL has also provided photo simulations that demonstrate that the lines will not affect visitor experience within the Park and will be virtually invisible to visitors at current airboat locations and not visible from the Shark River visitor viewpoints.

**Corr. ID:** 371                      **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218738           **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** The public (and ENP/NPS) should appreciate too that both the existing FPL corridor and the exchange corridor along L-31 can be used for transmission purposes in an efficient manner at reasonable cost. Agency action that prevents FPL from using its existing corridor will result in the acquisition costs and damages discussed above. To avoid passing these ENP/NPS created costs onto Florida taxpayers and ratepayers, FPL will look first to ENP/NPS to bear these costs which would arise from policy choices made by ENP/NPS. In the event that there is any shortfall between damages awarded to FPL and the ultimate cost of a replacement corridor, equitably ENP/NPS should bear those costs, too. Public taxpayers and Florida ratepayers should not be forced to pay higher costs to benefit ENP/NPS when a much lower cost option is readily available, environmentally acceptable, and permissible. We strongly urge ENP/NPS to press ahead with the statutorily authorized land exchange which avoids these cost obstacles during a period of continued economic distress.

**Corr. ID:** 371                      **Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Comment ID:** 218743           **Organization Type:** Business

**Representative Quote:** The Newsletter also concludes that the lands to be exchanged to FPL are "important forage habitat for the endangered Everglades snail kite" implying the birds will be adversely impacted by the exchange. This too is misleading, as State and federal agency control of water levels in the State's Water Conservation Areas (WCAs) is the crucial factor impacting the snail kite. FPL understands critical habitat for the snail kite is both within ENP and well to the north

of the Park in WCA-3, more than 10 miles from the proposed exchange lands. Additionally, other court orders to manipulate water flows well to the west for the benefit of the Cape Sable Seaside Sparrow are another primary factor adversely impacting the kite. In fact, the purpose of the trade is to ensure that there are no powerlines built in the middle of the Expansion Area by relocating the utility corridor to a peripheral, already developed area along the L-31 Canal and on the edge of heavily developed Miami-Dade County. Implications that the proposed exchange will have any appreciable effect on the snail kite are misleading.

The Newsletter states that wood storks are "highly susceptible to injury from power lines and support structures." This statement is misleading as it is not supported by the scientific literature regarding these birds. There are thousands of miles of transmission lines in Florida and collisions with transmission lines and their support structures have not been documented as causing significant mortality to wood storks. Additionally, FPL retained an avian expert with substantial experience with avian-power line interactions to prepare a qualitative risk assessment of potential wood stork mortality associated with transmission lines located within FPL's existing corridor in the Expansion Area and the exchange corridor along L-31. The assessment found there would be low to moderate risk of individual wood stork mortality due to collisions and no risk to the wood stork population.

[This page intentionally left blank]

# APPENDIX 1: MEETING SIGN-IN

[This page intentionally left blank]



**Everglades National Park**  
**Acquisition of FPL Lands in the East Everglade Expansion Area /**  
**Environmental Impact Statement**

**Public Scoping Meeting**

**Sign-In Sheet**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Street Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Zip Code</b>	<b>Email</b>
Adam Hines	365 Menores Ave	Miami	FL	33134	<a href="mailto:Hinesad78@gmail.com">Hinesad78@gmail.com</a>
Brigette Castro	7650 Corp Center Drive	Miami	FL	33134	<a href="mailto:Brigette-castro@urscorp.com">Brigette-castro@urscorp.com</a>
Christine Hemphill	500 Lake Ave	Lake Worth	FL	33460	
Kyle Krakow	1251 NW 13 <sup>th</sup> St, Apt #336	Boca Raton	FL	33486	<a href="mailto:Kylekrakow@aol.com">Kylekrakow@aol.com</a>
Don Finefrocioc	1380 S. Dixie, Apt #2203	Craig	FL	33146	<a href="http://Dfinefrocksantafloridaparks.org">Dfinefrocksantafloridaparks.org</a>
P. Garvoille		Miami	FL		<a href="mailto:rgarvoille@gmail.com">rgarvoille@gmail.com</a>
Sula Jacobs					
Laura Edwins	1 Herald Plaza				<a href="mailto:ledwins@miamiherald.com">ledwins@miamiherald.com</a>
Bob Skinner					
Gail Gelvan	16225 SW 88 <sup>th</sup> Ave Rd	Palmetto Bay	FL	33157	<a href="mailto:ganor@aol.com">ganor@aol.com</a>
Linda Benson	8202 SW 103 <sup>rd</sup> Ave	Miami	FL	33173	
Jacob Tisthammer		Miami	FL		
Bradley Stark	335 Palermo Way	Coral Gables	FL	33134	<a href="mailto:Bradley.stark@gmail.com">Bradley.stark@gmail.com</a>
Greg Hitz					<a href="mailto:gmhitz@lampl-herbert.com">gmhitz@lampl-herbert.com</a>
Andy Kugler					<a href="mailto:Andrew.kugler@nrc.gov">Andrew.kugler@nrc.gov</a>
Tom Duke					<a href="mailto:Tom.duke@fpl.com">Tom.duke@fpl.com</a>
Michele Francis					
Eloy Villasusu					<a href="mailto:Eloy_villasusu@fpl.com">Eloy_villasusu@fpl.com</a>
Rick Sanda					<a href="mailto:ricksanda@gmail.com">ricksanda@gmail.com</a>
Megan Clouser					<a href="mailto:Megan.l.clouser@usace.army.mil">Megan.l.clouser@usace.army.mil</a>
Malcolm Stein					<a href="mailto:malandil@aol.com">malandil@aol.com</a>
David Weda					<a href="mailto:David.k.weda@fpl.com">David.k.weda@fpl.com</a>
Katie Halloran					<a href="mailto:hallork@miamidade.gov">hallork@miamidade.gov</a>
Savannah Howington					<a href="mailto:Savannah_howington@nps.gov">Savannah_howington@nps.gov</a>
Jessica					<a href="mailto:jessicabernabei@yahoo.com">jessicabernabei@yahoo.com</a>

Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email
Bernabei					
Kaatje Bernabei					<a href="mailto:kaatjebnabei@bellsouth.net">kaatjebnabei@bellsouth.net</a>
Mercy Milcen					<a href="mailto:msanc@acfm-cpa.com">msanc@acfm-cpa.com</a>
Don Milcen					
Josh Roach					
Eileen Smith Carvos					
Debbie Matthews					<a href="mailto:treehuggerdeb@yahoo.com">treehuggerdeb@yahoo.com</a>
Laura Bustamante					<a href="mailto:Laurab399@aol.com">Laurab399@aol.com</a>
Christina Novaton					<a href="mailto:novaton@me.com">novaton@me.com</a>
Judith Foster	10115 SW 81 <sup>st</sup> St	Miami	FL	33123	
Daniel Ducassi					<a href="mailto:dducassi@bellsouth.net">dducassi@bellsouth.net</a>
Alejandro Almirola					<a href="mailto:Aalmi002@yahoo.com">Aalmi002@yahoo.com</a>
Luann Cardet					<a href="mailto:lscardet@aol.com">lscardet@aol.com</a>
Gary Serignese					<a href="mailto:railfront@gmail.com">railfront@gmail.com</a>
Jamie Higgins	61 Forsgta St NW	Atlanta	GA	30303	<a href="mailto:Higgins.jamie@epa.gov">Higgins.jamie@epa.gov</a>
Patricia Greene	10521 SW 54 <sup>th</sup> St	Miami	FL	33123	
Griselda Chavamia					<a href="mailto:Gchav002@fiu.edu">Gchav002@fiu.edu</a>
Leigh Ferrell					<a href="mailto:Leigh_ferrell@nps.gov">Leigh_ferrell@nps.gov</a>
Isaiah Fitzgerald					<a href="mailto:Isaiah.fitzgerald@nps.gov">Isaiah.fitzgerald@nps.gov</a>
Alfonso Fernandez-Fruya					<a href="mailto:afraga@initialengineers.com">afraga@initialengineers.com</a>
Rolando Chafe					
Brian F. Call	16480 SW 72 <sup>nd</sup> Ave	Palmetto Bay	FL	33157	<a href="mailto:briancallphoto@gmail.com">briancallphoto@gmail.com</a>
Valerie Robbin	730 Palermo Ave	Coral Gables	FL	33134	<a href="mailto:Flower8349@yahoo.com">Flower8349@yahoo.com</a>
Annette Masnik					
Mayco Villafana					<a href="mailto:Mayco_villafana@fpl.com">Mayco_villafana@fpl.com</a>
Cara Capp	7300 N. Federal Hwy #200	Boca Raton	FL	33487	<a href="mailto:ccapp@cleanwater.org">ccapp@cleanwater.org</a>
Austin Llewelly	11531 SW 34 <sup>th</sup> Lane	Miami	FL	33165	<a href="mailto:Allew00@fiu.edu">Allew00@fiu.edu</a>
Mark R. Woerner	111 NW 1 <sup>st</sup> St	Miami	FL	33128	<a href="mailto:mwoerner@miamidade.gov">mwoerner@miamidade.gov</a>
Aristedes I.	2911 SW	Miami	FL	33165	

Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email
Mandez-Insus	97 <sup>th</sup> Ave				
Laura Reynolds	5530 Sunset Drive	Miami	FL	33143	<a href="mailto:director@tropicalaudubon.org">director@tropicalaudubon.org</a>
Lisette Florez	8035 SW 102 <sup>nd</sup> Ave	Miami	FL	33173	<a href="mailto:Murphy_2000@live.com">Murphy_2000@live.com</a>
Drew Martin	500 Lake Ave #102	Lake Worth	FL	33460	<a href="mailto:dmandch@aol.com">dmandch@aol.com</a>
Jon Ullman	2600 SW 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ave	Miami	FL	33129	<a href="mailto:Jonathan.ullman@sierraclub.org">Jonathan.ullman@sierraclub.org</a>
Judy Kuchta	4232 W. Ocean Drive	Hollywood	FL	33019	<a href="mailto:judykuchta@yahoo.com">judykuchta@yahoo.com</a>
Manny J. Rodriguez	5955 SW 88 <sup>th</sup> Court	Miami	FL	33133	<a href="mailto:rodtec@bellsouth.net">rodtec@bellsouth.net</a>
Cindy Cerner	5901 Moss Ranch Rd	Pinecrest	FL	33156	<a href="mailto:mayorlerner@gmail.com">mayorlerner@gmail.com</a>
Norman Ganor	16225 SW 88 <sup>th</sup> Ave Road	Palmetto Bay	FL	33157	<a href="mailto:ganor@aol.com">ganor@aol.com</a>
Jesse Kenner					
Mary Rudisch					
David Rudisch					
Cueye Cauns					<a href="mailto:groye@cacrus-law.com">groye@cacrus-law.com</a>
Tara Blakey					<a href="mailto:tblakey@gmail.com">tblakey@gmail.com</a>
Stephanie McMillan					<a href="mailto:Steph_h_mcm@yahoo.com">Steph_h_mcm@yahoo.com</a>
Leslie Velarde					<a href="mailto:Leslie_t17@yahoo.com">Leslie_t17@yahoo.com</a>
Dana Brenner					<a href="mailto:Dmb525@bellsouth.net">Dmb525@bellsouth.net</a>
Paul Michel					
Diane Jacobs					<a href="mailto:Diane.jacobs@gmail.com">Diane.jacobs@gmail.com</a>
Richard Cabrera					<a href="mailto:christinelopez@hotmail.com">christinelopez@hotmail.com</a>
Marc Jaffee					<a href="mailto:m.jaffee@neu.edu">m.jaffee@neu.edu</a>
Ken Proctor					<a href="mailto:Kernard.proctorjr@fpl.com">Kernard.proctorjr@fpl.com</a>
Lillian Stein					<a href="mailto:malandlil@aol.com">malandlil@aol.com</a>
Daun Shirreffs					<a href="mailto:dsherreffs@npca.org">dsherreffs@npca.org</a>
Dean Whitman					<a href="mailto:whitmand@fiu.edu">whitmand@fiu.edu</a>
Rafael Tuburan					
Gisette Espinosa					<a href="mailto:gespino@micmidede.com">gespino@micmidede.com</a>
Elsa Alvear					<a href="mailto:Elsa_alvear@nps.gov">Elsa_alvear@nps.gov</a>
Jacquie Ayala					<a href="mailto:Jacqueline_ayala@nps.gov">Jacqueline_ayala@nps.gov</a>
Maittee Manoah					<a href="mailto:manoah@miamidade.gov">manoah@miamidade.gov</a>
Manuel Orbis					<a href="mailto:Manuel0@miamidade.gov">Manuel0@miamidade.gov</a>
David Denhavn					<a href="mailto:ddenham@consultant.com">ddenham@consultant.com</a>
Ailen Rivera					<a href="mailto:riveraailen@yahoo.com">riveraailen@yahoo.com</a>
Hope Viennan					
Cathy Culbea					<a href="mailto:Catgil2@gmail.com">Catgil2@gmail.com</a>

Name	Street Address	City	State	Zip Code	Email
Steve Showen					
Dayle Kennon					<a href="mailto:Dkennon28@yahoo.com">Dkennon28@yahoo.com</a>
Matt Schwartz					<a href="mailto:southfloridawild@yahoo.com">southfloridawild@yahoo.com</a>
Mike Powell					<a href="mailto:moroccomike@gmail.com">moroccomike@gmail.com</a>
Mara Shlackman					<a href="mailto:mara@shlackmanlaw.com">mara@shlackmanlaw.com</a>
Chris Haik					<a href="mailto:chhaik@gmail.com">chhaik@gmail.com</a>
Coky Michel					<a href="mailto:Wekayek2@gmail.com">Wekayek2@gmail.com</a>
Joe Nuprz					<a href="mailto:jow@tutorace.com">jow@tutorace.com</a>
Mike Masnik					<a href="mailto:Michael.masnik@nrc.gov">Michael.masnik@nrc.gov</a>
Fred Francis					<a href="mailto:ffrancis@nps.gov">ffrancis@nps.gov</a>
Steve Scroggs					<a href="mailto:Steven.scroggs@fpl.com">Steven.scroggs@fpl.com</a>
Ignacio Sarthiein					<a href="mailto:Ignacio.sarthiein@fpl.com">Ignacio.sarthiein@fpl.com</a>
Nnamdi Jackson					<a href="mailto:Njack004@fiu.edu">Njack004@fiu.edu</a>
Lauren McGurk					<a href="mailto:Lmcqu001@fiu.edu">Lmcqu001@fiu.edu</a>
Matt Raffenburg					
Steve Franzone					<a href="mailto:zonesteve@att.net">zonesteve@att.net</a>
Madeline Kraskia					<a href="mailto:madelinesophia@rocketmail.com">madelinesophia@rocketmail.com</a>
Swiezur Thul					<a href="mailto:Swl2@bellsouth.net">Swl2@bellsouth.net</a>
Rob Ragan					
F. Brawn					
Barrie F. Taylor					<a href="mailto:btaylor@rsmas.miami.edu">btaylor@rsmas.miami.edu</a>
Barb Yoger					<a href="mailto:barbyoger@aol.com">barbyoger@aol.com</a>

# APPENDIX 2: INDEX BY CODE REPORT

[This page intentionally left blank]

## Index By Code

### **AL1100 - Alternatives: Support Alternative 1**

Sierra Club - 217

Tropical Audubon - 340

### **AL1200 - Alternatives: Oppose Alternative 1**

Dade County Public Schools - 372

### **AL1300 - Alternatives: Alternative 1 (Substantive)**

Florida Power and Light - 370 , 371

N/A - 1 , 240

### **AL1400 - Alternatives: Support Alternative 2**

Florida Power and Light - 370

N/A - 13 , 225

### **AL1500 - Alternatives: Oppose Alternative 2**

Clean Water Action - 334

Dade County Public Schools - 372

Sierra Club - 75 , 106 , 299 , 301 , 306 , 307 , 327

Sierra Club - 313

Western Lands Project - 67

friends of fakahatchee - 35

retired citizen - 312

N/A - 11 , 15 , 41 , 70 , 79 , 84 , 107 , 117 , 131 , 133 , 183 , 205 , 234 , 270 , 288 , 304 , 319 , 321 , 336 , 373 , 377 , 388 , 394 , 395

### **AL1600 - Alternatives: Alternative 2 (Substantive)**

Clean Water Action - 405

Florida Power and Light - 229 , 371

Miami-Dade County DERM - 317

Sierra Club; Everglades Forever; Nature Conservancy - 87

South Florida Wildlands Association - 323

Western Lands Project - 67

N/A - 1 , 57 , 76 , 81 , 105 , 107 , 240

### **AL1700 - Alternatives: Support Alternative 3**

Audubon - 80

Broward Sierra Club - 314

CT Sierra Club - 297

Citizen of the USA - 267

Coalition of NPS Retirees - 65

Dade County Public Schools - 372

Desert Protective Council - 48

Everglades Committee for the Sierra Club - 341

Everglades National Park - 355

FNPS - 238

Florida Biodiversity Project - 332

Florida Trail Association - 349

Florida Wildlife Federation - 278

Great Old Broads for Wilderness - 274  
 Izaak Walton League - 71  
 Living Green Chiropractic & Wellness, LLC - 260  
 Miami-Dade Green Party - 258  
 Palm Beach County Environmental Coalition - 239  
 Regulus Consulting - 325  
 Sierra Club - 16 , 59 , 69 , 75 , 106 , 291 , 293 , 299 , 301 , 305 , 306 , 307 , 309 , 310 , 326 , 327 , 329 ,  
 357  
 Sierra Club Miami Group - 300  
 Sierra Club; Everglades Forever; Nature Conservancy - 87  
 Sierra; Audubon - 17  
 Sierra Club - 313  
 South Florida Audubon Society - 198  
 South Florida Wildlands Association - 265 , 323 , 333  
 U.S. Citizen, Taxpayer and Voter - 74  
 UNDER SEA ADVENTURERS INC. - 49  
 Western Lands Project - 67  
 retired citizen - 312  
 sierra club - 47  
 N/A - 2 , 7 , 10 , 15 , 18 , 20 , 22 , 25 , 26 , 32 , 36 , 51 , 52 , 53 , 56 , 57 , 68 , 70 , 76 , 77 , 78 , 79 , 81 ,  
 83 , 88 , 105 , 115 , 116 , 119 , 122 , 123 , 124 , 126 , 128 , 143 , 195 , 202 , 203 , 205 , 208 , 210 , 211 ,  
 213 , 215 , 218 , 221 , 226 , 228 , 230 , 232 , 233 , 235 , 236 , 241 , 244 , 245 , 250 , 251 , 256 , 269 , 270 ,  
 271 , 272 , 273 , 277 , 279 , 280 , 281 , 282 , 294 , 295 , 303 , 304 , 308 , 311 , 315 , 319 , 320 , 321 , 322 ,  
 330 , 331 , 339 , 344 , 346 , 352 , 354 , 356 , 374 , 375

**AL1800 - Alternatives: Alternative 3 (Substantive)**

Clean Water Action - 405  
 Coalition of NPS Retirees - 65  
 Florida Power and Light - 370 , 371  
 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission - 268  
 N/A - 27 , 105 , 110 , 118 , 202 , 240

**AL2000 - Oppose Transmission Lines within Park**

ALL ABOARD CRUISES, INC - 289  
 ARMF & FEI - 276  
 Audubon - 80  
 Audubon Society - 37 , 197  
 Audubon Society - Everglades Chapter - 125  
 Audubon, Native Plant Society - 296  
 Calusa Group Sierra CLUB - 247  
 Citizen of Florida - 253  
 Citizen of the USA - 243 , 267  
 Concerned Citizen - 109  
 Concerned citizen of S. Florida - 82  
 DEMOCRATIC PARTY - 222  
 Dade County Public Schools - 372  
 Environmental Defense - 127  
 FIU Student - 72  
 Fairchild Junior Naturalist - 90 , 91 , 92 , 93 , 94 , 95 , 96 , 97 , 98 , 99 , 100 , 101 , 103 , 104  
 Fairchild Junior Naturalists - 102  
 Florida Yes - 358



Floridan Aquifer Legal Defense Organization - 3 , 62  
 Green League - 302  
 Heifer International - 275  
 Int. Soc. for the Preservation of the Tropical Rainforest - 45  
 International Society for the Preservation of the Tropical Rainforest - 40  
 Issak Walton League - 348  
 Living Green Chiropractic & Wellness, LLC - 260  
 NATURE Coast Ramblers - 249  
 National Parks Conservation Association - 337  
 Nature Coast Coalition - 252  
 PB County Environmental Coalition - 257  
 Palm Beach County Environmental Coalition - 239  
 Parkland Enews & Commentary - 14  
 Progressive Democrats of America - 21  
 Save it Now Glades - 266  
 Sierra Club, Natl. Parks Cons. Assoc., Nat. Wildlife Foun., etc. - 121  
 Sierra Club - 34 , 58 , 69 , 106 , 113 , 220 , 242 , 298 , 327 , 342 , 357  
 Sierra Club And Responsible Growth Management Coalition - 237  
 Sierra Club Miami Group - 60  
 Sierra Club; Everglades Forever; Nature Conservancy - 87  
 Sierra; Audubon - 17  
 South Florida Audubon Society - 198  
 South Florida Wildlands Association - 199 , 265 , 323  
 TWS,NPCA,ED,Audubon,TNC,NRDC - 8  
 Tropical Audubon Society - 263  
 Tropical Audubon - 340  
 U.S. Citizen, Taxpayer and Voter - 74  
 UNDER SEA ADVENTURERS INC. - 49  
 Village of Pinecrest - 347  
 Wildlands Network - 206  
 environmental services - 231  
 environmentalrs@yahoo.com - 39  
 friends of fakahatchee - 35  
 k&K Development, Inc. - 286  
 sierra club - 12 , 129  
 N/A - 4 , 5 , 6 , 15 , 19 , 20 , 23 , 27 , 28 , 30 , 31 , 33 , 38 , 42 , 43 , 44 , 46 , 50 , 53 , 54 , 56 , 63 , 64 , 68 ,  
 73 , 77 , 85 , 86 , 107 , 108 , 111 , 115 , 117 , 120 , 131 , 151 , 172 , 175 , 176 , 177 , 178 , 179 , 180 ,  
 181 , 182 , 183 , 184 , 185 , 186 , 187 , 188 , 189 , 190 , 191 , 192 , 193 , 194 , 196 , 203 , 204 , 205 , 207 ,  
 208 , 209 , 210 , 211 , 212 , 214 , 215 , 216 , 219 , 221 , 223 , 224 , 227 , 230 , 233 , 234 , 235 , 248 , 251 ,  
 254 , 255 , 259 , 261 , 262 , 264 , 269 , 270 , 279 , 280 , 283 , 284 , 285 , 292 , 304 , 320 , 321 , 328 , 330 ,  
 335 , 338 , 343 , 344 , 345 , 346 , 350 , 353 , 354 , 356 , 359 , 360 , 362 , 363 , 364 , 365 , 367 , 368 , 376 ,  
 379 , 380 , 384 , 385 , 387 , 389 , 391 , 392 , 393 , 396 , 397 , 398 , 399 , 401 , 402 , 403 , 404

### **AL2100 - Oppose Turkey Point Expansion**

Dade County Public Schools - 372  
 Everglades National Park - 355  
 International Society for the Preservation of the Tropical Rainforest - 40  
 Sierra Club - 34 , 58  
 miami-dade NAACP - 61  
 N/A - 32 , 42 , 43 , 63 , 77 , 107 , 114 , 200 , 214 , 246 , 277 , 330 , 344

**AL2200 - FPL Eastern Corridor Route**

N/A - 27

**AL4000 - Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements**

FNPS - 238

Florida Wildlife Federation - 278

Sierra Club - 106

U.S. Citizen, Taxpayer and Voter - 74

miami-dade NAACP - 61

sierra club - 129

N/A - 13 , 29 , 66 , 111 , 112 , 219 , 223 , 279 , 287 , 351 , 373

**CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: General Comments**

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation - 316

South Florida Wildlands Association - 265 , 323

N/A - 36

**GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Impact Analyses**

Palm Beach County Environmental Coalition - 239

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission - 268

N/A - 18 , 374 , 375

**MT1000 - Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments**

Florida Power and Light - 229

Wildlands Network - 206

environmental services - 231

N/A - 9 , 27 , 30 , 50 , 77 , 86 , 130 , 146 , 194 , 200 , 210 , 279 , 320 , 330 , 378 , 400

**ON1000 - Other NEPA Issues: General Comments**

Citizen of the USA - 267

**PN11000 - Purpose And Need: Other Policies And Mandates**

Florida Power and Light - 370

South Florida Wildlands Association - 323

**PN12000 - Purpose and Need: Relationship to other Projects and Plans**

Coalition of NPS Retirees - 65

South Florida Wildlands Association - 323

**PN2000 - Purpose And Need: Park Purpose And Significance**

National Parks Conservation Association - 337

sierra club - 47

N/A - 7 , 18 , 20 , 63 , 66 , 166 , 183

**PN3000 - Purpose And Need: Scope Of The Analysis**

Coalition of NPS Retirees - 65

Florida Power and Light - 371

**PN4000 - Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority**

Citizen of the USA - 267

National Parks Conservation Association - 337

Sierra Club - 342  
South Florida Wildlands Association - 323  
sierra club - 47  
N/A - 29 , 114 , 116 , 352 , 382 , 390

**PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action**

N/A - 7 , 10

**PN9000 - Purpose And Need: Issues And Impact Topics Selected For Analyses**

Audubon of Florida - 324  
Audubon, Native Plant Society - 296  
Clean Water Action - 405  
Concerned citizen of S. Florida - 82  
Desert Protective Council - 48  
Everglades Committee for the Sierra Club - 341  
Florida Department of Environmental Protection - 381  
Florida Department of State - Division of Historical Resources - 318  
Florida Power and Light - 370 , 371  
Florida Wildlife Federation - 278  
Miami-Dade County DERM - 317  
Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida - 89  
National Parks Conservation Association - 337  
Sierra Club - 59 , 69 , 291  
Sierra Club; Everglades Forever; Nature Conservancy - 87  
South Florida Audubon Society - 198  
South Florida Wildlands Association - 323  
Tropical Audubon - 340  
sierra club - 47  
N/A - 7 , 10 , 11 , 18 , 22 , 23 , 24 , 26 , 27 , 32 , 33 , 55 , 63 , 76 , 77 , 114 , 115 , 166 , 172 , 175 , 213 ,  
215 , 241 , 256 , 269 , 270 , 280 , 287 , 294 , 330 , 336 , 352

[This page intentionally left blank]

# APPENDIX 3: NON-SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES REPORT

[This page intentionally left blank]

ACQUISITION OF FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY LANDS IN THE EAST EVERGLADES  
EXPANSION AREA**Non-Substantive Issues Report****(10/04/2011)****AL1100 Alternatives: Support Alternative 1 (Non-Substantive)****Correspondence Id:** 340 **Comment Id:** 218497

**Comment Text:** I don't think you should be afraid to pursue no alternative, and the reason I say that is because I know the money isn't there right now, and maybe it would affect other land acquisitions that you have. I would like to see you not be afraid to just say, you know what, we are not going to do it in the national park.

**Organization:** Tropical Audubon**Commenter:** Laura Reynolds **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 217 **Comment Id:** 218399

**Comment Text:** I favor the "No Action Alternative". Florida Power and Light (FPL) would retain their old corridor inside the park and it would be up to FPL to try and get their massive powerlines permitted.

**Organization:** Sierra Club**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**AL1200 Alternatives: Oppose Alternative 1 (Non-Substantive)****Correspondence Id:** 372 **Comment Id:** 218781

**Comment Text:** No - Do not allow Alternative one. No to alternative 2. Do not exchange lands - the eastern corridor is still to close to the Park. Alternative 3 - why buy from FPL? Do the condemnation process and prevent them from doing anything.

**Organization:** Dade County Public Schools**Commenter:** Judith Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**AL1400 Alternatives: Support Alternative 2 (Non-Substantive)****Correspondence Id:** 370 **Comment Id:** 218693

**Comment Text:** Accordingly, FPL's scoping comments on the EIS urge ENP/NPS to focus on the Congressionally authorized land exchange, recognize the multiple purposes (and benefits) associated with the exchange, and timely complete the EIS. Timely completion will enable the land exchange to be executed, FPL's corridor to be relocated at minimal cost to the taxpayers, and Everglades restoration ? in the form of the Mod Waters project ? to take a vital step forward.

**Organization:** Florida Power and Light**Commenter:** Dina Guenther **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 13 **Comment Id:** 202715

**Comment Text:** The need for energy transmission has increased to make this project worthy of consideration.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 225 **Comment Id:** 216386

**Comment Text:** I just think that it's more important to protect the people than animals. I'm a vegas and I am an animal lover, but if it comes down to protecting animals or people, I think it's more important to protect people, so I think we should put it if that's the only alternative we have, then we need to put it where there's no people.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Saul Wiezenthal **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**AL1500 Alternatives: Oppose Alternative 2 (Non-Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 395 **Comment Id:** 218815

**Comment Text:** DO NOT convey these public lands to Florida Power and Light.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Sherrill Futrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 11 **Comment Id:** 202711

**Comment Text:** No swapping. Fpl has other priorities that should be worked on prior to damaging our ecosystem. Lets reinforce the existing infrastructure on the East side so we can be prepared properly for hurricane season. Six yrs ago, i was out of power for 23 days. Absolutely ridiculous considering i wive less than 2 miles from downtown and beach area

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 15 **Comment Id:** 202813

**Comment Text:** I oppose a swap.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Andrew C Wojcicki **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 15 **Comment Id:** 202814

**Comment Text:** I oppose a swap or exchange of lands. The exchange is not necessary for the protection



of our natural lands. Instead it has a likely potential of degrading our public land as power lines could then be built which would disrupt the aesthetic beauty which is signature to this incredibly unique (specifically because it is open uninterupted natural land) property.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Andrew C Wojcicki **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 35 **Comment Id:** 203548

**Comment Text:** No exchanges...the environment never wins only the corporate entity.

**Organization:** friends of fakahatchee

**Commenter:** breeze ofarrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 41 **Comment Id:** 203891

**Comment Text:** Please reject FPL's application to swap rights of way for powerline construction. Certainly there are corridors available that are less environmentally sensitive. Let's preserve the Everglades for wildlife as intended.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Jonathan Gilbert **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 67 **Comment Id:** 209593

**Comment Text:** It appears that the land exchange would not be a desirable choice due to habitat value.

**Organization:** Western Lands Project

**Commenter:** Janine C Blaeloch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 70 **Comment Id:** 209635

**Comment Text:** Power lines on the edge of the everglades park is SUCH a bad idea. Aren't aesthetics part of the reason for the parks in the first place?

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 75 **Comment Id:** 209796

**Comment Text:** No powerlines on the edge of the Everglades National Park

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** thea surrey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 106 **Comment Id:** 211212

**Comment Text:** The Secretary needs to oppose any swap that degrades the park.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Drew Martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 79 **Comment Id:** 211220

**Comment Text:** The proposed land swap with FPL for 320 acres they own is harmful to the Everglades and, consequently, to those who live in Miami-Dade and Broward County. Not only Everglades National Park is one of our treasures but we get most of our drinking water from the various sections of the Everglades. The swap will affect the projected restoration of the Everglades, besides being an ugly eyesore in the Park

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Jose R Garrigo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 107 **Comment Id:** 211240

**Comment Text:** I'm not happy about the idea the land swap deal. It's not fair that FPL should use the Everglades to run those massive power lines. Stray voltage is a proven issue that deteriorates the quality of life and why no one wants them run on the Eastern route in populated areas. The Everglades is on tenuous ground in early recovery stages. Swapping out the land and just allowing FP&L to potential jeopardize that recovery is not fair to Floridians who are trying to protect the area and without a doubt a heinous and reckless disregard for the wild life that makes the Everglades their home, for many species, their only home.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Richard A Tucker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 84 **Comment Id:** 211942

**Comment Text:** The suggestion for land acquisition in our last standing natural reserve, OUR Florida Everglades, by FPL, is as preposterous as the once proposed sight to construct an airport West of the Palmetto Hwy/826.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** sandra kaplan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 117 **Comment Id:** 212177

**Comment Text:** We cannot exchange what was obtained in the NPS's 1991 Land Protection Plan. Implement this plan now. No trading of lands, you are destroying flora and fauna for a less desirable area. Say NO to FPL

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Barbara A Brodbeck **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 133 **Comment Id:** 215411

**Comment Text:** The National Park Service should remain committed to protecting and preserving our precious natural resources for the enjoyment of future generations, take a hard look at the consequences of this action, and reject the proposal which would convey these public lands to Florida Power and Light.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Ann Thornlow **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 131 **Comment Id:** 215726

**Comment Text:** The National Park Service should remain committed to protecting and preserving our precious natural resources for the enjoyment of future generations, take a hard look at the consequences of this action, and reject the proposal which would convey these public lands to Florida Power and Light.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Vasu Murti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 183 **Comment Id:** 216066

**Comment Text:** As you well know, Everglades National Park is one of America's iconic and treasured places. I believe the National Park Service should take a hard look at the consequences of this action, remain committed to protecting and preserving our precious natural resources for the enjoyment of future generations, and reject this proposal which would convey these public lands to Florida Power and Light.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Mike Strawn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 205 **Comment Id:** 216314

**Comment Text:** I am concerned about the possible alternatives to forfeit or exchange the protected, public everglades land to Florida Power and Light. Our public land is for the enjoyment of its citizens. It is a place respected and enjoyed by Floridians. I am interested to protect the land we have struggled to preserve. Do not allow a portion of that land to be exchanged with FPL.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 205 **Comment Id:** 216316

**Comment Text:** Do not allow a portion of that land to be exchanged with FPL.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 270 **Comment Id:** 217519

**Comment Text:** The exchange is not an alternative. Power lines do not belong in ENP. If this were Yellowstone, Yosemite, Rocky Mountains, or Smokey Mtns national parks we wouldn't be having this ridiculous argument.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Judy a Kuchta **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 299 **Comment Id:** 217872**Comment Text:** Strongly oppose exchange.**Organization:** Sierra Club**Commenter:** Philip Busey **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 301 **Comment Id:** 217900**Comment Text:** I support alternative 3 and appose 2**Organization:** Sierra Club**Commenter:** maksim tsionskiy **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 304 **Comment Id:** 217909**Comment Text:** I oppose Alternative 2, a swap of land owned by FPL deeper within Everglades National Park, for land owned by NPS on the eastern edge, where FPL wants to build 500,000 volt powerlines. FPL says Alternative 2 would save taxpayer money, but FPL is a private company whose interest is in making money, not saving taxpayers.**Organization:****Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 312 **Comment Id:** 217942**Comment Text:** Should not allow switch of property**Organization:** retired citizen**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 321 **Comment Id:** 218019**Comment Text:** I am in support of Alternative 3 I am adamantly opposed to Alternative 2.**Organization:****Commenter:** Harlan K Sandberg **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 321 **Comment Id:** 218020**Comment Text:** There should be no exchange-the NPS needs to acquire FPL land in the Park**Organization:****Commenter:** Harlan K Sandberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 327 **Comment Id:** 218032

**Comment Text:** No building anything on eastern tip of Everglades

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 327 **Comment Id:** 218033

**Comment Text:** I support Option 3. I am opposed to Option 2.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 234 **Comment Id:** 218344

**Comment Text:** Exchanging lands, just doesn't work.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 288 **Comment Id:** 218379

**Comment Text:** Please do not grant any corridor, even on the eastern edge of the NP. If transmission lines could be added to an existing eastern corridor with lines already on it of acceptable height, say like the ones along Krome Ave., well then, you may get less outcry. But to despoil our beloved national park, a world heritage site that brings in revenue from tourists the world over... Lets face it - this is about profit, not the good of the people. "The People" are asking that this not go forward.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** John Van Hise **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 306 **Comment Id:** 218429

**Comment Text:** I support Alternative 3, and oppose Alternative 2.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Ricardo N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 307 **Comment Id:** 218430

**Comment Text:** Regarding the FPL proposed land swap for Florida Everglades land, I oppose option 2 and support option 3. Preserving the undeveloped land we have left is essential for the future generations, and we cannot afford to keep giving up land to private companies. Please do not vote for option 2.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Robert L King **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 313 **Comment Id:** 218435

**Comment Text:** I support option #3 and oppose option #2, In my opinion too many times we select options that are important for everyone except the wilderness. Everglades National park is part of an eco-system which has been destroyed an altered enough already. There should be no powerlines in a national park (except the ones used to run anything needed in the park of course). But no even with the supposed tax dollars we would save I support option #3, I support The Sierra Club, I support the Everglades.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 319 **Comment Id:** 218444

**Comment Text:** I support Alternative#3 but not Alternative #2. Keep the power lines away from the Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 321 **Comment Id:** 218445

**Comment Text:** I am adamantly opposed to Alternative 2. There is no justification, financial or otherwise, which can justify(in my mind) degrading national park resources by allowing the building of powerlines across the Everglades National Park(or any other national park). I am in support of Alternative 3-the NPS should acquire the FPL land(by purchase and condemnation) and put to rest any idea of using Park lands by a private interest for their purposes. The purpose of the National Park System is to "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Alternative 3 will help to fulfill that stated purpose.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Harlan K Sandberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 334 **Comment Id:** 218451

**Comment Text:** Clean Water Action and its members urge the NPS not to consider the proposed land swap with FPL that would lead to the construction of power lines running within the entire eastern border of Everglades National Park -- western, I'm sorry. We feel that doing so will jeopardize the integrity of the park, our valuable water resources, native species habitats, and perhaps worst of all, set the dangerous precedent that America's national parks are open for business to industrial and commercial uses. Particularly, as our region faces the ongoing struggle of an extended drought season, we urge you to consider the value of our natural water storage areas and other environmental resources.

**Organization:** Clean Water Action

**Commenter:** Cara Capp **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 334 **Comment Id:** 218452

**Comment Text:** Allowing a land swap that will accommodate a utility corridor into the park will lead to the construction of towers up to 150 feet tall, as well as maintenance roads and numerous other ancillary operational needs. These projects will all have a negative impact on the very sensitive wetlands that make Everglades National Park such a unique and magnificent place that we have all come to love.

**Organization:** Clean Water Action

**Commenter:** Cara Capp **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 336 **Comment Id:** 218626

**Comment Text:** Hello, I'm Lauren McGirk again and I am a third-year law student here. I thank NPS for setting up this meeting and its interest in public concern. I feel, and a lot of citizens here feel, that exchanging public parks to private companies for building purposes is not an option and it should not be.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Lauren McGirk **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 373 **Comment Id:** 218779

**Comment Text:** There should not be an exchange. The Federal Government needs to buy the land. The park needs to be protected at all costs.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Barbara Cameron **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 372 **Comment Id:** 218781

**Comment Text:** No - Do not allow Alternative one. No to alternative 2. Do not exchange lands - the eastern corridor is still to close to the Park. Alternative 3 - why buy from FPL? Do the condemnation process and prevent them from doing anything.

**Organization:** Dade County Public Schools

**Commenter:** Judith Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 372 **Comment Id:** 218783

**Comment Text:** Do not even corridor an exchange. Are our parks protected or aren't they? Will condemnation to preserve our parks be successful? you act as though that is not an option. FPL should donate this land to the park!

**Organization:** Dade County Public Schools

**Commenter:** Judith Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 377 **Comment Id:** 218794

**Comment Text:** The treasure of Everglades National Park should never become the property of or be

allowed to be used by Florida Power and Light as a transmission corridor.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Leo King **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 388 **Comment Id:** 218805

**Comment Text:** Please reject the proposal which would convey public lands to Florida Power and Light.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Stephen Prine **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 394 **Comment Id:** 218814

**Comment Text:** Please do not allow purveyance of land to florida Power and Light to go forward.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Susan Waters **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**AL1700 Alternatives: Support Alternative 3 (Non-Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 372 **Comment Id:** 218782

**Comment Text:** I do not understand why you are even considering doing anything other than using the condemnation process to stop FPL. If you cannot stop them this way, then go ahead and acquire it.

**Organization:** Dade County Public Schools

**Commenter:** Judith Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 7 **Comment Id:** 202657

**Comment Text:** I prefer Alternative 3 - no land swap and acquisition of FPL's corridor by direct purchase or eminent domain.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Melissa Norman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 10 **Comment Id:** 202704

**Comment Text:** I want the area restored and protected.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 10 **Comment Id:** 202705

**Comment Text:** I strongly support Alternative # 3: Aquisition of the land in question



**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 15 **Comment Id:** 202812**Comment Text:** I support the acquisition.**Organization:****Commenter:** Andrew C Wojcicki **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 16 **Comment Id:** 202819**Comment Text:** I advocate ALTERNATIVE 3--AQUISITION**Organization:** Sierra Club**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 17 **Comment Id:** 202834**Comment Text:** I do not beleive that alternatives hae been eaxplored, but one sure alternative is no lines across the park. There are dead areas through BLM lands in the west and this should fol;ow the desisngation of ENP as a world class site and give protection for all time.**Organization:** Sierra; Audubon**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 18 **Comment Id:** 202955**Comment Text:** Alternative 3, the preservation of existing regulations and intents of the law is preferred.**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 20 **Comment Id:** 203002**Comment Text:** I support Alternative 3, acquisition of FPL's corridor by direct purchase or eminent domain with no land swap.**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 20 **Comment Id:** 203004**Comment Text:** I urge the Secretary of the Interior to hold out for a financial transaction that compensates FPL to leave the park. No terms will make land exchange within the park acceptable. I oppose construction and/or development of any additional utility corridors or maintenance roads through

Everglades National Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 22 **Comment Id:** 203045

**Comment Text:** Consider option #3: acquisition

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 25 **Comment Id:** 203132

**Comment Text:** Isn't it enough that we have almost destroyed the Florida Panther? Let us not be foolish and do the right thing, sustain habitat at all costs. The property, if FPL can prove that it is rightfully theirs, requires an appraisal, then negotiations. Raw land is at an all time low, I know because I can't sell my property by the KPSP.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** jon friedman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 26 **Comment Id:** 203169

**Comment Text:** Alternative 3 will have the least impact on the area under question (East Everglades Expansion Area)

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 32 **Comment Id:** 203390

**Comment Text:** I support alternative 3.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** sue lang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 36 **Comment Id:** 203562

**Comment Text:** I believe we should use eminent domain to take the property.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** breeze ofarrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 47 **Comment Id:** 204272

**Comment Text:** I believe that Alternative 3 - Acquisition is the proper and only acceptable alternative. By removing the FPL inholding NPS will have greater control over efforts to improve the ecosystem.

**Organization:** sierra club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 47 **Comment Id:** 204274

**Comment Text:** There shouldn't be any exchange, the land should be acquired at a reasonable price during this horrendous real estate cycle, by eminent domain if necessary.

**Organization:** sierra club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 49 **Comment Id:** 205356

**Comment Text:** If FPL wont accept the \$109,300.00 offer take it from them by eminent domain. My family owned acreage in Big Cypress Swamp and we were offered \$300.00 an acre which is what we paid for it and we accepted the offer.

**Organization:** UNDER SEA ADVENTURERS INC.

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 51 **Comment Id:** 205432

**Comment Text:** FPL property would be acquired by direct purchase or, as a last resort, by condemnation by the NPS. There would not be any construction of transmission lines and associated fill pads or access roads in the Expansion Area I support option #3 posited by Park Service

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** francis janeczek **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 52 **Comment Id:** 205458

**Comment Text:** acquisition, not exchange Acquisition is the only reasonable alternative. Powerlines in or alongside a national park of Everglades' sensitivity makes no sense whatsoever.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Ellen R Siegel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 53 **Comment Id:** 205493

**Comment Text:** I would like to advocate alternative 3, acquisition.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Alejandra Chamorro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 56 **Comment Id:** 206423

**Comment Text:** Please do not put electric lines across the Everglades Park. The park is under enough

outside pressures and its appearance already seriously impacted, so please don't do or allow anything more to be done that will further degrade the park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Lee Swerdlin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 57 **Comment Id:** 206461

**Comment Text:** Would most support alternative 3; aquisition.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 59 **Comment Id:** 208337

**Comment Text:** I favor Alternative 3: no land swap and aquire the FPL property by direct purchase or eminent domain. Get them out of MY Everglades!

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 67 **Comment Id:** 209594

**Comment Text:** We are happy to see the Park Service considering a purchase alternative, and even condemnation. If FPL continues to be an unwilling seller, we belive the NPS should not hesitate to acquire the land through eminent domain.

**Organization:** Western Lands Project

**Commenter:** Janine C Blaeloch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 68 **Comment Id:** 209609

**Comment Text:** Yes to the Acquisition of the FPL property.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Tracy J Barrack **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 69 **Comment Id:** 209632

**Comment Text:** I believe that the NPS should buy any FPL land to prevent construction of electric towers in the area of the National Park.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 70 **Comment Id:** 209636

**Comment Text:** Why not buy the FPL property?

**Organization:****Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 74 **Comment Id:** 209637**Comment Text:** Please purchase the FPL land and do not allow the powerline towers to deface this national treasure.**Organization:** U.S. Citizen, Taxpayer and Voter**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 75 **Comment Id:** 209797**Comment Text:** Acquisition/purchase of the FPL property to National Park Service**Organization:** Sierra Club**Commenter:** thea surrey **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 76 **Comment Id:** 210187**Comment Text:** Require FPL to sell, and move their transmission lines elsewhere.**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 77 **Comment Id:** 210248**Comment Text:** In this case, there should only be one option here: The NPS should either purchase the land or take it through eminent domain. Protect the Everglades. See comments in question 3.**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 77 **Comment Id:** 210250**Comment Text:** Eminent domain sounds like the perfect solution to protecting park resources and values.**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 78 **Comment Id:** 210359**Comment Text:** I urge the National Park Service to press on and buy the land that belongs to Florida Power and Light. The Everglades National Park is a treasure in need of constant care and watch. The way to disallow FPL from further harming the Everglades is to take back what should officially belong to the Nation.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 81 **Comment Id:** 210385**Comment Text:** i believe the best option is an outright purchase of the FP&L land. if that option is not possible, then the exchange of land appears to be the next best solution.**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 83 **Comment Id:** 210593**Comment Text:** I beleive that it is incumbent upon the public sector to acquire the 320 acres of land currently owned by FPL within the Expansion Area by any means available to the NPS including eminent domain. The property is currently undeveloped and is needed for ecosystem restoration and enhancement. The Everglades have suffered an onslaught of devastation from both man-made and natural causes in recent years and remains endangered from future encroachment and natural disaster.**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 83 **Comment Id:** 210594**Comment Text:** The NPS should consider that is a rare opportunity to aggregate such a significant addition to protected lands- and one that may not be duplicated. That is why the acquisition should be pursued with all due diligence and vigor.**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 87 **Comment Id:** 210718**Comment Text:** I support the third alternative as I understand it: "FPL property would be acquired by direct purchase or, as a last resort, by condemnation by the NPS. There would not be any construction of transmission lines and associated fill pads or access roads in the Expansion Area."**Organization:** Sierra Club; Everglades Forever; Nature Conservancy**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 87 **Comment Id:** 210719**Comment Text:** FPL should buy land outside of the Park.**Organization:** Sierra Club; Everglades Forever; Nature Conservancy**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 2 **Comment Id:** 210957

**Comment Text:** The NPS should continue to acquire land and expand the boundaries of the Everglades.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 105 **Comment Id:** 210977

**Comment Text:** Yes. Of the two choices 1. to exchange NPS lands for FPL's lands within the Park boundary or 2. to acquire FPL's lands by purchase, eminent domain, or by other means to be identified in the EIS. I see choice 2 as the best for the park, the environment and therefore in the end best for the people of South Florida. The Everglades National Park, while one of our largest parks, covers only a portion of the "River of Grass" watershed. Therefore any loss of current NPS lands for any use would further diminish the natural flow of waters from north to south and therefore harm the unique ecosystem of our national treasure.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 10 **Comment Id:** 211055

**Comment Text:** I cannot convey how strongly I feel that the NPS should proceed with Alternative #3. There has been enough damage done to our Everglades. Allowing power lines to traverse this area would be like pouring salt in an open wound. We should be moving forward on restoration of this international biosphere not discussing more cuts to which this wonderland has millions! The dilly dallying of various politicians, agencies, etc. is nauseating. This taxpayer wants action. That action is PROTECTION AND RESTORATION FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 88 **Comment Id:** 211202

**Comment Text:** The federal government should buy Florida Power and Light's land in the Everglades.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Margery Glickman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 106 **Comment Id:** 211209

**Comment Text:** I oppose the use of Park Lands for the purpose of Power Lines and support the purchase of this land from FPL.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Drew Martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 106 **Comment Id:** 211210

**Comment Text:** I support the alternative to purchase the easement rather than the land swap or the no action alternative.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Drew Martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 79 **Comment Id:** 211221

**Comment Text:** Hopefully the Park Service will buy the land at today's low price and continue its healthy administration of Everglades National Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Jose R Garrigo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 80 **Comment Id:** 211228

**Comment Text:** You have the money to buy (not swap) the tract and this is the best time in two decades to buy it. Land prices are at the lowest, due to the economic situation and that tract is "useless" to build homes, grow crops, etc. Buy it or force FPL to sell it now while the price is low.

**Organization:** Audubon

**Commenter:** Victoria F Garrigo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 71 **Comment Id:** 211503

**Comment Text:** Option 3, Buy Out FPL

**Organization:** Izaak Walton League

**Commenter:** Bob Skinner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 48 **Comment Id:** 211976

**Comment Text:** I therefore urge NPS to adopt Alternative 3, ROW acquisition and retirement from any future development.

**Organization:** Desert Protective Council

**Commenter:** Howard G Wilshire **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 115 **Comment Id:** 212150

**Comment Text:** I see only one acceptable alternative and that is No. 3.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Valerie Robbin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 115 **Comment Id:** 212151



**Comment Text:** No I don't have any suggestions because as I stated in Question 2, there is only one right way to protect the park resources and that is to not allow the power lines.C

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Valerie Robbin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 119 **Comment Id:** 212230

**Comment Text:** Write the most rigorous, comprehensive and objective analysis possible ? covering the full range of impacts these powerlines could have on soils, wetlands, exotic plant species, listed wildlife, bird populations, and the public's ability to enjoy these lands with the addition of 3 massive powerlines running across them (visible for miles) - choose the alternative at the end of the process which best protects the natural and cultural resources of Everglades National Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** David Mildrexler **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 126 **Comment Id:** 213178

**Comment Text:** Go for Alternative 3. Our national parks are our national treasures, and a very long-term investment in the health and quality of life of our nation and of the natural environment. Do not give up one inch of Park lands! Threats to these lands will never disappear. Constant vigilance and dedication are essential!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 124 **Comment Id:** 213179

**Comment Text:** As a frequent visitor and bird watcher to Everglades National Park I request that you choose Alternative 3: Acquire the land as authorized by the 1989 Protection and Expansion Act. In 1996, the NPS wrote a short letter to FPL telling the company that they had determined that the "fair market value" of the property was \$109,300. The company could do a voluntary sale or - if they refused - NPS would acquire the property by eminent domain in order to fulfill the purposes of the Act - the ecological and hydrological restoration of the East Everglades and Shark River Slough (the main source of water for Everglades National Park). Alternative 3 was exactly what congress intended when this important piece of public land was acquired. It is fully spelled out in the 1989 Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act and the NPS's 1991 Land Protection Plan written to implement that Act. After over 20 years of delay, it's high time for the NPS to fulfill that promise to the American people.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 123 **Comment Id:** 213180

**Comment Text:** Regarding NPS action on the FPL power line request, I favor acquisition of the land as authorized by the 1989 Protection and Expansion Act.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 122 **Comment Id:** 213181

**Comment Text:** I support alternative 3. NPS should purchase the land, if necessary via eminent domain in order to fully protect the ecosystem as mandated by previous legislation

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Daryle R Murphy **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 128 **Comment Id:** 214444

**Comment Text:** I favor Alternate 3, buy out FPL, do not let them in MY park

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Suzanne Valencia **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 203 **Comment Id:** 216309

**Comment Text:** Support Alternative 3 as it is true to the purposes of Everglades National Park. Absolutely do not do Alternative 2 which is completely antithetical to the purposes of Everglades.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Clayton Daughenbaugh **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 205 **Comment Id:** 216315

**Comment Text:** Acquire the land as designated by Congress. Fulfill the NPS 1991 Land Protection Plan. We are charged to continue the ecological and hydrological restoration of Everglades National Park so that this valuable resource will be available for continued future use.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 208 **Comment Id:** 216323

**Comment Text:** Alternative 3 is the path to follow.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 210 **Comment Id:** 216333

**Comment Text:** I support Alternative 3: NPS acquire the existing FPL corridor inside the Everglades National Park. No power lines should mar the beauty of the park or threaten wildlife

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 211 **Comment Id:** 216340

**Comment Text:** Acquire the land by eminent domain, if you have to.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Lesley Cox **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 211 **Comment Id:** 216341

**Comment Text:** This is public land set aside for wildlife habitat and wetland functions, not for constructing infrastructure. Acquire the land by eminent domain, if you have to.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Lesley Cox **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 215 **Comment Id:** 216346

**Comment Text:** Option 3 seems to me to be best. Power lines thru the park are not compatible and any addition to the size of ENP is a benefit.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Lee W Webber **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 218 **Comment Id:** 216353

**Comment Text:** OPTION 3 is the best option, do what you promised years ago

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 221 **Comment Id:** 216379

**Comment Text:** And throughout history, our national park system has built up their parks through acquiring private lands, so why can't we this with the Everglades? I don't see why the government can't act in part and outright buy this piece of property from FPL

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Jessica Bernabei **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 221 **Comment Id:** 216382

**Comment Text:** I would actually propose that -- I believe the government should use eminent domain to buy out the land and use the land for public use and so it can all be part of the national park because I know now it's privately owned by FPL. So that's what I propose and that's my comment on the situation.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Jessica Bernabei **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 226 **Comment Id:** 216393

**Comment Text:** I believe that we need to go with alternative 3 and acquire Everglades land under the 1989 Act.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Brian G Paradise **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 230 **Comment Id:** 216422

**Comment Text:** Purchase or eminent domain the FPL land if it is necessary to preserve the NP environment.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Jay Abramson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 233 **Comment Id:** 216449

**Comment Text:** The most logical solution to the FPL easement is to purchase it at appraised value. Considering the value of adjacent swats of land that are not useable for anything other than open land use, the value may be under one million dollars, a small price to pay for the preservation of our most precious resource, the Everglade.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Steve Welsch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 233 **Comment Id:** 216451

**Comment Text:** There should be no exchange, other than the purchase of the FPL easement.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Steve Welsch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 233 **Comment Id:** 216452

**Comment Text:** If I understand correctly, there are less than a handful of options. All options with any encroachment or visible blight would irreparably damage the Everglade. An outright purchase of the FPL easement, and an alternative route that would not impact the visual or physical assets of the Everglade can be the only option on the table.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Steve Welsch **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 235 **Comment Id:** 216469

**Comment Text:** Acquire the land as required by the 1989 Act.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 238 **Comment Id:** 216509**Comment Text:** Any opportunity to expand the Park should be seized.**Organization:** FNPS**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 238 **Comment Id:** 216510**Comment Text:** Acquire at fair market value**Organization:** FNPS**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 239 **Comment Id:** 216549

**Comment Text:** Alternative 3: Acquire the land as required by the 1989 Act. In 1996, NPS wrote a short letter to FPL telling the company that the "fair market value" of the property was determined to be \$109,300 (ironically, NPS now intends to spend over \$500,000 of the taxpayers money just to do a "study"). The company could do a voluntary sale or - if they refused - NPS would acquire the property by eminent domain in order to fulfill the purposes of the Act - the ecological and hydrological restoration of Everglades National Park. No powerlines or access road would be built.

**Organization:** Palm Beach County Environmental Coalition**Commenter:** Panagioti E Tsolkas **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 239 **Comment Id:** 216551

**Comment Text:** Alternative 3 was what congress intended when this important piece of public land was acquired. It is supported by the 1989 Act and the NPS's own 1991 Land Protection Plan written to implement that Act. It is also supported by the Palm Beach County Environmental Coalition, along with the South Florida Wildlands Association and numerous other local and national environmental organizations.

**Organization:** Palm Beach County Environmental Coalition**Commenter:** Panagioti E Tsolkas **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 241 **Comment Id:** 216582

**Comment Text:** The 1989 Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act required that this land be acquired and be managed as "park". Utility lines have already been considered and rejected as an "incompatible use". This alternative ? leaving in place a corridor which could lead to 150 foot high transmission towers inside a National Park - is also completely inconsistent with the mission of the National Park Service as stated in the Organic Act of 1916: "...to promote and regulate the use of

the...national parks...which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Everglades National Park contains remnants of a completely unique planetary ecosystem. In addition to being the first "biological park" in our nation's history and by far the largest designated wilderness in the eastern United States, the park is also a World Heritage Site, an International Biosphere Reserve, and a Wetland of International Importance. Unfortunately, Everglades National Park also consistently ranks among "top travel destinations to see before they disappear" ? and approximately one million visitors per year take that opportunity.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 241 **Comment Id:** 216583

**Comment Text:** Alternative 3: Acquire the land as required by the 1989 Act. In 1996, NPS wrote a short letter to FPL telling the company that the "fair market value" of the property was determined to be \$109,300 (ironically, NPS now intends to spend over \$500,000 of the taxpayers money just to do a "study"). The company could do a voluntary sale or - if they refused - NPS would acquire the property by eminent domain in order to fulfill the purposes of the Act - the ecological and hydrological restoration of Everglades National Park. No powerlines or access road would be built.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 241 **Comment Id:** 216584

**Comment Text:** Alternative 3 was what congress intended when this important piece of public land was acquired. It is supported by the 1989 Act and the NPS's own 1991 Land Protection Plan written to implement that Act. It is also supported by the Palm Beach County Environmental Coalition, along with the South Florida Wildlands Association and numerous other local and national environmental organizations.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 251 **Comment Id:** 216936

**Comment Text:** Installing power lines - a commonplace event in today's society - would be an monumentally bad idea when routed through Everglades National Park. Bad from an environmental standpoint - the initial construction, ongoing maintenance, and the surrounding support infrastructure that would also need to be built. Please, I beg of you, procure these lands before further destruction can be done to a fragile ecosystem that is unique in all the world.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Phillip R Penne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 256 **Comment Id:** 216946

**Comment Text:** Everglades National Park is a unique treasure of incalculable value for Americans, and other visitors from around the world. It is a rare treasure of biological diversity essential to preserving this planet's natural health and integrity. In these times, those few places left that still maintain a degree of wilderness quality, especially of such rare flora and fauna as the Everglades, need to be protected as completely as possible. There is no room for power lines and increased industrial development in this area. The NPS should do the right thing and choose alternative 3 - acquiring the corridor.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 256 **Comment Id:** 216947

**Comment Text:** Alternative 3 is the only alternative that serves the real interests of the generations of visitors who treasure this park, as well as the interests of the endangered wildlife that inhabit it. As well, it is the only option consistent with the 1989 Everglades Protection Act, and the 1991 Land Protection Plan of the NPS. Please implement it.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 258 **Comment Id:** 216976

**Comment Text:** Acquire the land as required by the 1989 Act. The company could do a voluntary sale or - if they refused - NPS would acquire the property by eminent domain in order to fulfill the purposes of the Act - the ecological and hydrological restoration of Everglades National Park.

**Organization:** Miami-Dade Green Party

**Commenter:** Paul S Lefrak **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 260 **Comment Id:** 216980

**Comment Text:** Acquire the land as required by the 1989 Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act. No powerlines!

**Organization:** Living Green Chiropractic & Wellness, LLC

**Commenter:** Lindsay Taylor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 265 **Comment Id:** 217187

**Comment Text:** The only alternative is the third one proposed. See my comments below

**Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 267 **Comment Id:** 217339

**Comment Text:** Implement the 1989 Act. Pay FPL the fair market value and get them out of the park.

**Organization:** Citizen of the USA

**Commenter:** Herbert H Zebuth **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 269 **Comment Id:** 217372

**Comment Text:** Acquiring Florida Power and Light lands within the Everglades National Park Expansion Area will help to restore the historic water flows and associated ecology of the unique Florida Everglades.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 269 **Comment Id:** 217373

**Comment Text:** Alternative 3, Acquisition of lands owned by Florida Power and Light within Everglades National Park, seems the best way to protect and preserve the unparalleled ecosystem of the Everglades.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 270 **Comment Id:** 217516

**Comment Text:** I feel alternative 3 will minimize impacts to the wildlife and the health of the already weakened Everglades National {Park

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Judy a Kuchta **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 274 **Comment Id:** 217757

**Comment Text:** Great Old Broads for Wilderness supports Alternative 3, which was exactly what congress intended when this important piece of public land was acquired. It is fully supported by South Florida Wildlands Association and numerous local and national environmental organizations. It is also supported by the 1989 Act and the NPS's own 1991 Land Protection Plan written to implement that Act.

**Organization:** Great Old Broads for Wilderness

**Commenter:** Veronica E Egan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 277 **Comment Id:** 217762

**Comment Text:** Please support ALTERNATIVE 3 ? "FPL property would be acquired by direct purchase or, as a last resort, by condemnation by the NPS. There would not be any construction of transmission lines and associated fill pads or access roads in the Expansion Area."

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes



**Correspondence Id: 278 Comment Id: 217765**

**Comment Text:** I support the acquisition of the FPL corridor lands by the NPS. While the eastern corridor would be somewhat preferable to the desired western FPL corridor, there are numerous environmental concerns that need to be considered as mentioned in NPS and public scoping comments.

**Organization:** Florida Wildlife Federation

**Commenter:** Franklin B Adams **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id: 279 Comment Id: 217772**

**Comment Text:** H.R. 146 (SUPERCEDED BY THE OMNIBUS ACT (2009)) AND ITS BACKUP CERTAINLY DEMONSTRATES THE POLITICAL PRESSURES OF THE APPLICANT (PROPOSER - FPL). IF NPS GOES FORWARD WITH THE EXCHANGE OR ANY GRANTING OF REAL ESTATE, THEN FULL RIGHT AND TITLE SHOULD BE OBTAINED WITHIN THE 1989 EXPANSION ACT LANDS. ANY GRANTS OF EASEMENT (WHETHER NPS OR CORPS OF ENGINEERS OR OTHER FEDERALLY RELATED LANDS) SHOULD NOT BE IN FEE, BUT, BY LIMITED EASEMENT. ALLOWING HIGH VISIBILITY STRUCTURES AT THE BOUNDARY OF ENP (WELL WEST OF ANY PRESENTED DOCUMENTATION OF A FURTHER EAST-WEST LOCATION) SEEMS TO CONFLICT WITH THE 1947 AND 1989 ACTS ESTABLISHING THE ENP. EASEMENT CONDITIONS MUST RECOGNIZE FULL DOI INVOLVMENT IN THE FUTURE FOR THE EASEMENT LANDS.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id: 280 Comment Id: 217775**

**Comment Text:** I support Alternative 3

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id: 280 Comment Id: 217776**

**Comment Text:** Alternative 3 should be adopted

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id: 297 Comment Id: 217838**

**Comment Text:** We support alternative 3

**Organization:** CT Sierra Club

**Commenter:** John D Calandrelli **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id: 299 Comment Id: 217870**

**Comment Text:** Strongly support Alternative 3. Strongly oppose Alternative 2.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Philip Busey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 299 **Comment Id:** 217873

**Comment Text:** Immediately acquire FPL lands within Everglades National Park.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Philip Busey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 301 **Comment Id:** 217900

**Comment Text:** I support alternative 3 and appose 2

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** maksim tsionskiy **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 304 **Comment Id:** 217908

**Comment Text:** I support Alternative 3 by which the National Park Service (NPS) will acquire by purchase, or as a last resort by condemnation, Florida Power and Light (FPL) owned lands within Everglades National Park Expansion Area.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 312 **Comment Id:** 217939

**Comment Text:** I want to support alternative 3

**Organization:** retired citizen

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 320 **Comment Id:** 218008

**Comment Text:** For the sake of our children and generations to come, Choose alternative 3.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 320 **Comment Id:** 218011

**Comment Text:** DON'T DO IT!!!!!! Our children are depending on you to choose alternative 3.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 321 **Comment Id:** 218019

**Comment Text:** I am in support of Alternative 3 I am adamantly opposed to Alternative 2.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Harlan K Sandberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 327 **Comment Id:** 218033

**Comment Text:** I support Option 3. I am opposed to Option 2.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 329 **Comment Id:** 218038

**Comment Text:** I am against the land swap. I support Alternative 3.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 330 **Comment Id:** 218040

**Comment Text:** Alternative 3 should be the only action alternative

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Roderick Tirrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 65 **Comment Id:** 218340

**Comment Text:** The Coalition supports the proposed NPS acquisition of FPL's lands in the Expansion Area which is needed to help facilitate the hydrologic and ecologic restoration of the Northeast Shark River Slough. The proposed objectives for land acquisition appear to be consistent with the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989 and the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009.

**Organization:** Coalition of NPS Retirees

**Commenter:** Richard B Smith **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 232 **Comment Id:** 218348

**Comment Text:** Acquire the land as required by the 1989 Act.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 232 **Comment Id:** 218349

**Comment Text:** The company could do a voluntary sale or - if they refused - NPS would acquire the property by eminent domain in order to fulfill the purposes of the Act - the ecological and hydrological restoration of Everglades National Park. No powerlines or access road would be built.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 228 **Comment Id:** 218350

**Comment Text:** Deny FPL their powerlines and have the NPS take the land back. No more carving up what's left of our environment, especially for rich corporate slimebags like FPL!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** nathan pim **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 236 **Comment Id:** 218351

**Comment Text:** please acquire the FPL corridor at fair market value to protect and preserve this national resource for generations to come.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 244 **Comment Id:** 218355

**Comment Text:** I support the third alternative to solving the issues with FP&L.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 116 **Comment Id:** 218362

**Comment Text:** Alternative 3 is what Congress intended in the 1989 Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act and the NPS's 1991 Land Protection Plan written to implement that Act. After a couple of decades' delay, it's overdue for the NPS to fulfill that promise to the American people and to our forebearers, furbearers, featherbearers, et al.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Edward M Dobson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 143 **Comment Id:** 218364

**Comment Text:** An ecosystem treasure like Everglades National Park, owned by the American public, is no place for granting a transmission corridor to a for-profit utility company like Florida Power and Light. A transmission corridor along the eastern park boundary would potentially devastate park restoration efforts by damaging water quality, wildlife habitat and corridors, and native plants. A World Heritage

site is hardly compatible with 140-foot towers and power lines.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Robert Stagman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 195 **Comment Id:** 218369

**Comment Text:** NPS should acquire the property by eminent domain in order to fulfill the purposes of the 1989 Act - the ecological and hydrological restoration of Everglades National Park. No powerlines or access road should be built.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 202 **Comment Id:** 218371

**Comment Text:** I am contacting you to express my support for Alternative 3. I believe that the NPS should acquire the FPL easement by eminent domain or encourage FPL to donate the strip of land to NPS as an act of goodwill.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** George Cavros **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 202 **Comment Id:** 218373

**Comment Text:** The current Everglades National Park staff is doing a great job of managing and protecting the park. The selection of Alternative 3 would be consistent with the current stewardship of Everglades National Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** George Cavros **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 273 **Comment Id:** 218375

**Comment Text:** As in alternative 3, please acquire the corridor land as required by the 1989 Everglades National Park and Expansion Act. No powerlines or access road should be built in Everglades National Park. Alternative 3 was exactly what Congress intended when this important piece of public land was acquired. It is also supported by the NPS's own 1991 Land Protection Plan written to implement that Act.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Norman C Sharp **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 271 **Comment Id:** 218376

**Comment Text:** Everglades National Park contains remnants of a completely unique planetary ecosystem. In addition to being the first "biological park" in your nation's history and by far the largest designated wilderness in the eastern United States, the park is also a World Heritage Site, an International Biosphere Reserve, and a Wetland of International Importance. Such an unique

environment must not be severely damaged further by such industrialised erections. Please Acquire the land as required by the 1989 Act.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Tom Tamplin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 291 **Comment Id:** 218378

**Comment Text:** I support Alertative 3: That FPL property would be acquired by direct purchase or, as a last resort, by condemnation by the NPS and that there would not be any construction of transmission lines and associated fill pads or access roads in the Expansion Area.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Silvia Hall **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 293 **Comment Id:** 218381

**Comment Text:** As a citizen of the United States and someone who volunteers to care for our environment I write in support of Alternative 3. I do not want to see Wetlands harmed or endangered species subject to development of their habitat.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Roberta A Paro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 282 **Comment Id:** 218382

**Comment Text:** I believe NPS should purchase the FPL property or take it by eminent domain. Transmission lines should not be built in the Expansion Area, nor should access roads be added there.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 295 **Comment Id:** 218383

**Comment Text:** I support Alternative 3. The Everglades restoration is of emmense importance not nly to our state but to the nation as a whole. Drinking water is irreplaceable and is closely affected by what is done with the lands under consideration. Do not sell out to FPL.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 303 **Comment Id:** 218385

**Comment Text:** I support Alternative 3

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 198 **Comment Id:** 218393

**Comment Text:** Be it then resolved that the South Florida Audubon Society stands opposed to the placement of power lines anywhere within the boundaries of the Everglades National Park or the Add Lands, and recommends return of the FPL corridor to the Everglades National Park by purchase at fair market value, or failing that, by invoking eminent domain.

**Organization:** South Florida Audubon Society

**Commenter:** Grant Campbell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 213 **Comment Id:** 218395

**Comment Text:** I believe you should follow alternative 3 for the following reasons:

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 213 **Comment Id:** 218397

**Comment Text:** Alternative 3 was exactly what congress intended when this important piece of public land was acquired. It is fully supported by South Florida Wildlands Association and numerous local and national environmental organizations. It is also supported by the 1989 Act and the NPS's own 1991 Land Protection Plan written to implement that Act.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 218 **Comment Id:** 218400

**Comment Text:** Please move ahead with Option 3, the original intent of Congress. It is supported by your own 1991 Land Protection Act written to implement the 1989 act of Congress Please move ahead and protect this incredible habitat, one of the worlds biosphere reserves, the largest wlderness designated in the Eastern US. It is an incredible piece of land that draws milions to south Florida every year. Please dont degrade this park with power lines but continue to acquire land to protect its wild and scenic values. it is strange that you are now spending more on the "STUDY" than on the original projected purchase price of acquiring additional lands. What are you waiting for???

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 245 **Comment Id:** 218403

**Comment Text:** I am a strong supporter of Alternative #3.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kim F Floyd **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 250 **Comment Id:** 218405

**Comment Text:** I believe the 3rd alternative is the one to chose. The Park need to remain a Park with no intrusions or damage. A private company has no business interferring in the Public's land. I believe they should remove their equipment from the Park lands.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 272 **Comment Id:** 218416

**Comment Text:** Alternative 3 - NPS acquisition of the FPL tract - is the only alternative consistent with the Expansion Act of 1989 and the 1991 Land Protection Plan. In 16 USC 410r-7, the Expansion Act provides that the "Secretary shall manage the park in order to maintain the natural abundance, diversity, and ecological integrity of native plants and animals, as well as the behavior of native animals, as a part of their ecosystem." The Land Protection Plan provides that construction of utility lines would be an incompatible use at odds with the purpose of the Expansion Act. Transmission lines and support structures would be a danger to the wood stork, the Everglades snail kite, and a variety of wading birds for whom Everglades National Park is habitat. Furthermore, the construction of 70 transmission tower pads and access roads would lead to an increase in exotic vegetation, harming the ecological integrity of the area.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Mara Shlackman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 277 **Comment Id:** 218418

**Comment Text:** I support ALTERNATIVE 3 ? "FPL property would be acquired by direct purchase or, as a last resort, by condemnation by the NPS. There would not be any construction of transmission lines and associated fill pads or access roads in the Expansion Area." I am against turning over an important part of south Florida's iconic national park to a private company.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 280 **Comment Id:** 218421

**Comment Text:** Please adopt Alternative 3, and acquire the current FPL lands by direct purchase or condemnation by the NPS if FLP refuses to accept a reasonable offer. Transmission lines and associated roads and other development should not be allowed in the Expansion Area.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 281 **Comment Id:** 218422

**Comment Text:** I fully support Alternative 3. The loss of more of the Everglades ecosystem is completely unacceptable. The Everglades are a natural treasure to the United States, and I will never forget the time I spent there in 2007. The Everglades are one of the defining attributes of South Florida,



and the restoration of the East Everglades through the Shark River Slough is essential for the region. With the current threat of global climate change, we must strengthen our ecosystems in order to prepare them for the coming changes and allow them to perform their important services for the urban areas connected to them. Please protect the Everglades to ensure their future health along with the continued prosperity of the Miami area. Thank you

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 294 **Comment Id:** 218425

**Comment Text:** Please support Alternative 3 and buy the land from FPL. Ask them to put up these power lines somewhere else. It is important to preserve the everglades wild and our National Park free. Thank you.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 300 **Comment Id:** 218426

**Comment Text:** Please go w/ Alternate 3, this is the only Sane and Safe thing to do.

**Organization:** Sierra Club Miami Group

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 305 **Comment Id:** 218428

**Comment Text:** Please purchase the land on the eastern edge of the Everglades rather than swap it for FPL-owned land deeper within the Everglades.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 306 **Comment Id:** 218429

**Comment Text:** I support Alternative 3, and oppose Alternative 2.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Ricardo N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 307 **Comment Id:** 218430

**Comment Text:** Regarding the FPL proposed land swap for Florida Everglades land, I oppose option 2 and support option 3. Preserving the undeveloped land we have left is essential for the future generations, and we cannot afford to keep giving up land to private companies. Please do not vote for option 2.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Robert L King **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 308 **Comment Id:** 218431

**Comment Text:** I am a member of the Sierra Club and support Alternative 3.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 309 **Comment Id:** 218432

**Comment Text:** I support National Parks Option 3

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 310 **Comment Id:** 218433

**Comment Text:** I support Alternative 3 by which the National Park Service (NPS) will acquire by purchase, or as a last resort by condemnation, Florida Power and Light (FPL) owned lands within Everglades National Park Expansion Area.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 311 **Comment Id:** 218434

**Comment Text:** support alternative 3

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 313 **Comment Id:** 218435

**Comment Text:** I support option #3 and oppose option #2, In my opinion too many times we select options that are important for everyone except the wilderness. Everglades National park is part of an eco-system which has been destroyed an altered enough already. There should be no powerlines in a national park (except the ones used to run anything needed in the park of course). But no even with the supposed tax dollars we would save I support option #3, I support The Sierra Club, I support the Everglades.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 314 **Comment Id:** 218436

**Comment Text:** I support Alternative 3.

**Organization:** Broward Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Barbara B Ruge **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 315 **Comment Id:** 218437

**Comment Text:** PLEASE SUPPORT ALTERNATIVE THREE! PLEASE!!!!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 319 **Comment Id:** 218444

**Comment Text:** I support Alternative#3 but not Alternative #2. Keep the power lines away from the Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 321 **Comment Id:** 218445

**Comment Text:** I am adamantly opposed to Alternative 2. There is no justification, financial or otherwise, which can justify(in my mind) degrading national park resources by allowing the building of powerlines across the Everglades National Park(or any other national park). I am in support of Alternative 3-the NPS should acquire the FPL land(by purchase and condemnation) and put to rest any idea of using Park lands by a private interest for their purposes. The purpose of the National Park System is to "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Alternative 3 will help to fulfill that stated purpose.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Harlan K Sandberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 322 **Comment Id:** 218446

**Comment Text:** I support the Everglades National Park taking FPL's property as long as animals will be allowed to live PROTECTED on this property.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Cindy McDaniel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 325 **Comment Id:** 218447

**Comment Text:** I support Alternate 3. Please keep your greedy mitts off our National Parks ! I will reinforce this position at election time.

**Organization:** Regulus Consulting

**Commenter:** David Lord **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 326 **Comment Id:** 218448

**Comment Text:** I support alternative #3

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 331 **Comment Id:** 218450

**Comment Text:** I support Alternative 3

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Ira Brinn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 323 **Comment Id:** 218485

**Comment Text:** Because of these impacts, South Florida Wildlands Association, Center for Biological Diversity, and Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility recommend NPS fully vet and select ALTERNATIVE 3: ACQUISITION, whereby the "FPL property would be acquired by direct purchase or, as a last resort, by condemnation by the NPS. There would not be any construction of transmission lines and associated fill pads or access roads in the Expansion Area."

**Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Commenter:** Matthew Schwartz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 323 **Comment Id:** 218493

**Comment Text:** The Secretary and NPS should instead move as expeditiously as possible to Alternative 3 - full acquisition of the FPL corridor with no land transfer and no construction of transmission lines, fill pads, or access roads.

**Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Commenter:** Matthew Schwartz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 330 **Comment Id:** 218502

**Comment Text:** Does not the months long burning in East Everglades, loss of habitat, lack of seasonal flows, loss of periphyton, sprawl up and down Krome Avenue, and exotic predators present enough human interference? A few word synopsis seems to describe a cumulative invasion and human war on Everglades National Park. Now, do the edges have to go? Can NPS reject corporate infrastructure from a wealthy private company that will degrade America's view? Can't we afford to be patriotic and respect the historic and scenic values of Everglades NP? Must we surrender the current border and sell off the current view of a panoramic Everglades to "corporate patriots" who lobbied Tallahassee to conscript solar research and development market in Florida for themselves? What will happen a decade from now when FPL petitions NPS to add more power lines, or place advertising billboards on new towers? Will the courts deny the owners a right to free speech on their own property? Please stand up to FPL and require acquisition or condemnation of their property. FPL owns a huge profitable wetland bank in Dade County and can well afford to pay the extra cost of running new lines like all other companies do in the "industrial corridor." You can protect a National Park and FPL will still make lots of money. With

Krome Avenue sprawl exploding near ENP boundaries FPL's mitigation business will remain profitable.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Roderick Tirrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 330 **Comment Id:** 218503

**Comment Text:** Please enforce NPS policy so ENP is managed to maintain the natural abundance, diversity, and ecological integrity for native plants and animals. The "purpose and need" of protecting those species reflects the value of their role in their ecosystem. Large structures will impact wildlife and avian species detrimentally. A Land Protection Plan written by NPS in 1991 in order to implement the act cited power lines as a non-compatible use. Creating marsh disturbance to build service roads next to ENP is not compatible use. Congress mandated: "maintain natural abundance, diversity, and ecological integrity of an entire ecosystem in the 1989 Act. Twenty years too late NPS is now seeking to know what should be covered in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). We ask NPS to please draft and formulate a complete, comprehensive and objective analysis that covers any and all direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts upon every species including construction, tower maintenance, and habitual changes to wildlife and birds as well as soils and plants.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Roderick Tirrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 330 **Comment Id:** 218506

**Comment Text:** NPS should choose Alternative 3, the option that most supports the public benefit for taxpayers and most facilitates CERP. It also aids the natural and cultural resources of Everglades National Park. I support only Alternative 3 and hope NPS will too. Please reject any land swap schemes and pursue fee simple acquisition of FPL's corridor by direct purchase or a "taking" and appropriate compensation to FPL. Alternative 3 - no land swap and "full" acquisition of FPL's corridor by direct purchase

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Roderick Tirrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 332 **Comment Id:** 218510

**Comment Text:** The Florida Biodiversity Project (FBP) supports Alternative 3 for the following reasons: 1) The powerline corridor represents an incompatible use of the Park. 2) The powerline corridor conflicts with the mandate of NPS Organic Act. 3) The powerline corridor conflicts with the mandate of the 1989 Everglades National Park Expansion and Protection Act. 4) The powerline corridor would degrade the natural beauty of the Park and would significantly lessen aesthetic values for park visitors. 5) The powerline corridor would cause significant loss of sensitive wetlands. 6) The powerline corridor could cause significant injury or death to low flying birds in the Park. 7) The powerline corridor would fragment the natural landscape and limit the natural movement of wetland species. The FBP therefore urges the NPS to select Alternative 3.

**Organization:** Florida Biodiversity Project

**Commenter:** Brian Scherf **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 333 **Comment Id:** 218511

**Comment Text:** I support alternative 3 of the EIS.

**Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Commenter:** Leigh K Buckner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 349 **Comment Id:** 218512

**Comment Text:** So personally, in my group, I think we could only support alternative three, which is buy the land, condemn the land, whatever it takes. I would love to see alternative four that Laura mentioned, build this transmission line on Krome Avenue, just get it as far away from the park as we can.

**Organization:** Florida Trail Association

**Commenter:** David Denham **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 357 **Comment Id:** 218572

**Comment Text:** Hello, my name is Diane Jacobs, and as Jonathan Ullman stated earlier, I remember fighting to try to protect the Everglades from loud noises and planes flying over because whenever I go into the park -- I hope they don't have that park land development -- but just coming through the road, I start to just calm down when I see I'm approaching the entrance to the park because, to me, it just means tranquility and nature and a real renewal from the city life and I couldn't bear the thought of having planes fly over when I camp and go biking and hiking in the park. And I can't bear the thought of approaching these huge power lines that are going to make this just you know, to me, it's just a no-go situation. I just can't even imagine it and I can't believe that anybody is even considering it. And I strongly would recommend option three and I think that Florida Power & Light should donate the land or we should condemn it. We don't need to spend the money. I hope that you are really listening to what everybody has to say tonight because we are just a small amount of representation of many, many people that feel as we do. And I'm also a Sierra Club member and I've done a lot of camping in the park and I really would hate to see this visually and sound wise and just for the wildlife and for the nesting to see this happen.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Diane Jacobs **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 355 **Comment Id:** 218580

**Comment Text:** I'm recommending alternative three through donation of the land or non-contested condemnation.

**Organization:** Everglades National Park

**Commenter:** Savannah Howington **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 339 **Comment Id:** 218625

**Comment Text:** So I really support for the national park plan three, a l ternative three, to buy it out. I wish personally I had a friend who is a billionaire who could just do this for me. It means so much to me,

to the people I know. You have to think what counts.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Catharina Bernabei **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 341 **Comment Id:** 218637

**Comment Text:** Alternative three is the best of the alternatives we have here. This l and needs to be purchased. And I noticed the lady said, well, why doesn't FPL just donate it? And I think that's a great idea. FPL can just give you the land maybe for a dollar or something, you know, and you could have a nice ceremony. I would be glad to come and attend that. It would be a wonderful opportunity for everybody.

**Organization:** Everglades Committee for the Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Drew Martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 341 **Comment Id:** 218639

**Comment Text:** So it seems to me that this is a reasonable alternative . I don't think you want people to have to see giant power lines as they approach the park. And as you know, those sort of power lines can be very disruptive to animals. Any sort of bare land is basically a barrier. Also you are going to see, of course, invasive species entering into those areas. So we really need to protect the park. The park needs to be what it is today and that is a habitat for wild animals and not power lines for

**Organization:** Everglades Committee for the Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Drew Martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 344 **Comment Id:** 218655

**Comment Text:** This project will be damaging aesthetically, ecological y, economically. It just should not be all owed. It's just a ridiculous idea and alternative three should not be the last alternative.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Daniel Ducassi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 346 **Comment Id:** 218656

**Comment Text:** I am shocked that the National Park Servicemanaging this park on my behalf and on behalf of my fellow citizens is even considering such an action. This is totally against anything that makes sense for a national park of this kind, which is unique in the world . There is no Everglades anywhere else on the planet and if you are considering further degradation by allowing the power lines either within the park boundaries or along the edge, I'm completely opposed to it. My home is off the grid, I have solar panels. I don't get any electricity from FPL. But nonetheless, I live in South Florida and every time I step out the door, there it is. But for the record, I am opposed to this. Alternative three is the only one to consider and I want to know for the record why in the last 15 years the National Park Service hasn't sought to condemn the land and put an end to this issue.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Madeline Kraskin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 352 **Comment Id:** 218671

**Comment Text:** Expansion clearly states the intent of congress to add these lands to Everglades National Park to be managed as park, not power line corridor. We are hearing a lot about the use of the flow way. It's not just a flow way and the land protection act written by the NPS says clearly, further, congress intended that the focus of management of the area to be conducted to the broadest extent possible to maintain natural abundance, diversity, ecological integrity of an entire ecosystem, not just water flowing through a section of the Shark River Slew.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Matthew Schwartz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 352 **Comment Id:** 218673

**Comment Text:** First of all, I want to be on the record that South Florida Wildlands does support alternative three, I didn't say that, buyout the corridor and do not build power lines in this piece of land.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Matthew Schwartz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 354 **Comment Id:** 218680

**Comment Text:** Hi. My name is Mara Shlackman. I'm a lifelong South Floridian and resident of Fort Lauderdale and an attorney. I come here to speak in favor of alternative three and that's NPS acquisition of the FPL property.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Mara Shlackman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 356 **Comment Id:** 218683

**Comment Text:** I really support and I think Steven would support option three where the land belonging to the Everglades stays in the Everglades. If we put these transmission lines up, there are sound issues, there are wildlife issues, and certainly there are aesthetic issues.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Eileen Smith-Cavros **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 375 **Comment Id:** 218772

**Comment Text:** I strongly support alternative 3: acquisition of FPL Property.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** James McGrath **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 375 **Comment Id:** 218773



**Comment Text:** Alternative 3 is the only one to consider.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** James McGrath **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 374 **Comment Id:** 218775

**Comment Text:** Yes, I urge NPS to strongly support Alternative 3 acquisition of FPL property.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Marcela McGrath **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 374 **Comment Id:** 218776

**Comment Text:** Yes alternative 3 is the only one I support.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Marcela McGrath **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

#### **AL2000 Oppose Transmission Lines within Park (Non-Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 402 **Comment Id:** 218826

**Comment Text:** This is not acceptable. Our natural areas usually come out on the short end of the stick whenever it comes to projects such as this. It's time that our public lands - this is a national park you know, are given the protection they deserve.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Peter Weckesser **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 3 **Comment Id:** 202586

**Comment Text:** This is a very bad idea. Stay out of the Everglades. Period.

**Organization:** Floridan Aquifer Legal Defense Organization

**Commenter:** Susan Woods **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 4 **Comment Id:** 202614

**Comment Text:** Please no power lines across the Everglades.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Fosdick f Harrison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 5 **Comment Id:** 202618

**Comment Text:** Preservation of the natural lands contained in the Everglades is of paramount

importance and should rise above the need for additional corporate profits for FP&L. The need for conservation should also outweigh the need for excessive use of electric power.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 6 **Comment Id:** 202650

**Comment Text:** i believe the everglades should be free of power lines, which are unsightly and which are unhealthy to surrounding life.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 8 **Comment Id:** 202673

**Comment Text:** I can't believe you would even consider letting FPL put those huge towers any where near ENP. With all the damage that would occur with the installation. Roads built, habitat destroyed, exotic plants brought in on heavy equipment tires. Not even considering the UGLINESS of those towers. Why are we Floridians working so hard to restore our precious Everglades if all that destruction will be allowed to happen?? Just say NO

**Organization:** TWS,NPCA,ED,Audubon,TNC,NRDC

**Commenter:** Linda Headley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 8 **Comment Id:** 202676

**Comment Text:** Everything that is wrong for the environment, wildlife, plants and US enjoying the beauty and solitude of ENP would be ruined I have fought for years against Snowmobiles and ATVs ruining our Parks and Wilderness areas, but it always seems that they WIN and we loose. Please, Please do the right thing and don't allow this to happen. Thank You

**Organization:** TWS,NPCA,ED,Audubon,TNC,NRDC

**Commenter:** Linda Headley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 14 **Comment Id:** 202746

**Comment Text:** Electricity if for people to use yet people don't want to see the infrastructure. They want to push it on Everglades National Park and the habitat we're trying to save to preserve species. Please keep the power lines OUT of the Park and let them take the shortest route which I'm sure will save money. People want more electricity and they must accept the infrastructure.

**Organization:** Parkland Enews & Commentary

**Commenter:** Stuart H Krantz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 14 **Comment Id:** 202748

**Comment Text:** Preserve species which are under much more threat than people and their increasing

population. Go the shortest, cheapest route - not the one where people give FPL the littlest flack.

**Organization:** Parkland Enews & Commentary

**Commenter:** Stuart H Krantz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 14 **Comment Id:** 202749

**Comment Text:** Preserve species at ALL costs. They are undergoing their greatest extinction EVER of the six great extinctions and all efforts must be made to preserve them. Increasing cost to humankind is of no significance in comparison to the loss of ANY priceless species.

**Organization:** Parkland Enews & Commentary

**Commenter:** Stuart H Krantz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 15 **Comment Id:** 202815

**Comment Text:** I visit the Everglades every year for it "true wilderness"! This is very hard to find in our continental United States. And there is no other true wilderness in Florida. This is absolutely no place for power lines. We owe it to ourselves and to our decedents to maintain one piece of intact wilderness in Florida.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Andrew C Wojcicki **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 17 **Comment Id:** 202833

**Comment Text:** I am very concerned to know that there is a proposal to cross Everglades National Park with power lines, thereby stressing another fragile ecosystem with electric frequency issues in addition to the construction practices to site transmission lines. This should not be allowed to go any further

**Organization:** Sierra; Audubon

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 19 **Comment Id:** 202975

**Comment Text:** As a frequent visitor, I am very opposed to the idea of high voltage power lines within the park boundaries.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 20 **Comment Id:** 203001

**Comment Text:** I oppose construction and/or development of any additional utility corridors or maintenance roads through Everglades National Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 21 **Comment Id:** 203015

**Comment Text:** Our National Parks are sacrosanct. Please do not permit Florida Power & Light to build power transmission lines across Everglades National Park. This should be simply unthinkable.

**Organization:** Progressive Democrats of America

**Commenter:** Nicolas Davies **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 23 **Comment Id:** 203058

**Comment Text:** I believe there are other ways to achieve the purpose that FPL wants to achieve WITHOUT further damage to the Everglades. It might mean taking a different approach, but I know for certain that FPL's profits would be well used to explore other methods for installing the power lines in question without submitting our fragile Everglade ecosystem to further assault in the name of "progress."

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 27 **Comment Id:** 203182

**Comment Text:** As mentioned above, the Everglades is already suffering from a myriad of issues. The rich natural diversity of the area is threatened by overpopulation, invasive species and over use. Even recreational activities like allowing noisy vehicles can seriously affect an already fragile environment. The Everglades needs lots of "fixing", and building this West corridor will only make things worse.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Patricia Tricorache **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 28 **Comment Id:** 203183

**Comment Text:** Leave the Everglades alone. We have done enough damage.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Stephanie k Nagel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 30 **Comment Id:** 203226

**Comment Text:** I enjoy biking Shark Valley and realize how fragile the land and the wildlife is there. I was there last Sunday. It was a beautiful day. It is our responsibility to keep it safe from all the damage that would be done with the installation of power lines. Leave the land alone!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 31 **Comment Id:** 203375

**Comment Text:** I think FPL power lines posts have no place in Everglades Nat'l Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A mckniff **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 33 **Comment Id:** 203411

**Comment Text:** Putting power lines thru the Everglades National Park is absurd..what are you people thinking... Majorie Stoneman Douglas must be spinning madly in her grave at the mere thought of such a beautiful and pristine piece of our national heritage to be use thusly.... as a taxpayer I am deeply oposed to this action and have said so and shared via myFB page... NO POWER LINES IN THE EVERGLADES!!!!!!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** anne price **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 33 **Comment Id:** 203412

**Comment Text:** NO POWER LINES IN THE EVERGLADES

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** anne price **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 33 **Comment Id:** 203413

**Comment Text:** YEAH.. NO POWER LINES IN THE EVERGLADES

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** anne price **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 34 **Comment Id:** 203494

**Comment Text:** DON'T DO IT! WE DON'T NEED EITHER THE LOSS OF WETLANDS OR THE THREAT OF NUCLEAR MELTDOWN. FLORIDA HAS ENOUGH PROBLEMS ALREADY!

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 35 **Comment Id:** 203545

**Comment Text:** Absolutely not. Haven't we harmed the Evergades enough? The machinery, people, etc in a fragile environment loaded with endangered and listed plants and wildlife and for what? if people choose to live out there they have made the choice to do without FP and L. If it is for the straighten and cheapest line possible...shame on FP and L.

**Organization:** friends of fakahatchee

**Commenter:** breeze ofarrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 35 **Comment Id:** 203549

**Comment Text:** NPS should stand firm and not allow this project in any way...we will all lose.

**Organization:** friends of fakahatchee

**Commenter:** breeze ofarrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 37 **Comment Id:** 203628

**Comment Text:** It strikes me as insane that the idea of erecting power-lines trough an unique national park is even being considered.

**Organization:** Audubon Society

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 37 **Comment Id:** 203629

**Comment Text:** It may be inconvenient or more expensive to build the power lines along a different route but building power-lines in a national park in an unique ecosystem that is already endangered is beyond insane. Preserving what is left of the Everglades is far more important than the short term goal of saving money.

**Organization:** Audubon Society

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 38 **Comment Id:** 203765

**Comment Text:** Consider our LAST frontier and it's preservation above anything else. Do not disturb it!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 39 **Comment Id:** 203802

**Comment Text:** we have been trying to keep the park natural,its hard enough to keep it in check with natural diasters

**Organization:** environmentalsrs@yahoo.com

**Commenter:** stephen d anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 40 **Comment Id:** 203853

**Comment Text:** This should not be happening, electrical lines is very dangerous for the environment & the inhabitants of the Everglades. We have worked in the Amazon Basin for over 28 yrs now & when they installed electrical lines in the Amazon, some people died from it getting into the water ways.

**Organization:** International Society for the Preservation of the Tropical Rainforest

**Commenter:** Roxanne O Kremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 43 **Comment Id:** 203960

**Comment Text:** No power lines in everglades.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Mario Papalia **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 49 **Comment Id:** 205354

**Comment Text:** The Everglades does not need any more access roads and private development. They are now raising the Tamiami Trail in the area that FPL wants to put power lines. It is the first area of fully restoring the water flow to Everglades National Park. FPL should not be putting roads and power lines in the park because of the pollution of the equipment used to build and maintain the power lines. Also I have seen the power lines going to Key Largo and all the exotic vegetation that grows in the cleared area around the power poles. I have help remove exotic vegetation that spread from the FPL cleared pole areas.

**Organization:** UNDER SEA ADVENTURERS INC.

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 49 **Comment Id:** 205355

**Comment Text:** The final choice should not be in the Everglades.

**Organization:** UNDER SEA ADVENTURERS INC.

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 50 **Comment Id:** 205400

**Comment Text:** I think that power lines across the Everglades would result in damage to the ecosystem and further infringe on the wildlife in the area.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 53 **Comment Id:** 205492

**Comment Text:** I have grave concerns about this project. Our national parks have already been harshly treated by many factors, the last thing they need is to be butchered up by power lines. The environmental impact would be devastating to the delicate eco system in the everglades. An ecosystem that is already under stress . It is precious and unique and deserves our protection.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Alejandra Chamorro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 54 **Comment Id:** 205536

**Comment Text:** Please don't do this.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 56 **Comment Id:** 206423

**Comment Text:** Please do not put electric lines across the Everglades Park. The park is under enough outside pressures and its appearance already seriously impacted, so please don't do or allow anything more to be done that will further degrade the park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Lee Swerdlin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 58 **Comment Id:** 207734

**Comment Text:** Just say no to power lines through the Everglades.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 58 **Comment Id:** 207736

**Comment Text:** Stand firm for the environment - not enrichment of developers.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 60 **Comment Id:** 208430

**Comment Text:** I am opposed to constructing power lines through the Everglades. The Everglades is a national park and one of the few untouched, natural areas in Florida. It is sorely needed for those of us who are living in the city. Power lines are a disruption visually as well as a disruption to the wildlife that lives there. It is also a tourist draw and one that we cannot afford to tamper with.

**Organization:** Sierra Club Miami Group

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 62 **Comment Id:** 209246

**Comment Text:** It's a REALLY bad idea.

**Organization:** Floridan Aquifer Legal Defense Organization

**Commenter:** Susan Woods **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 63 **Comment Id:** 209250

**Comment Text:** The construction and maintenance of high voltage power lines as well as the lines



themselves adversely impacts the environment and human and animal populations. The heavy use of water and the degradation of water supplies from nuclear and coal power cannot be sustained when water supplies are already in short supply.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 68 **Comment Id:** 209608

**Comment Text:** Absolutely no to 15-story powerlines on the edge of Everglades National Park. This is just insane. I am trying to save the River of Grass or what is left of it. FP&L have no business there. Bad idea.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Tracy J Barrack **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 69 **Comment Id:** 209631

**Comment Text:** I wanted to write a quick letter to express my opposition to the FPL development of electric towers in the Everglades. I was surprised that the NPS would even consider a proposal to place large and obtrusive towers across a low-lying national park. I think these towers would be as tall as most of the trees I've seen in the Everglades. I hope the NPS continues to place park preservation above all else and rejects any proposal for development of electric towers in the Everglades. Regards, Daniel Perlmutter

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 74 **Comment Id:** 209641

**Comment Text:** No towers. No fill. No electro-magnetic radiation. No compromise.

**Organization:** U.S. Citizen, Taxpayer and Voter

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 77 **Comment Id:** 210247

**Comment Text:** I really don't see a need for FPL to threaten the whole Everglades ecosystem here in South Florida. It's not necessary because there are better alternatives to their constructing power towers. See comments in question 3.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 82 **Comment Id:** 210481

**Comment Text:** Let FPL take their plans to invade the Everglades elsewhere. They propose yearly rate hikes, refuse to divulge what their top executives earn in bonuses and now want to prey on the most

sensitive environment in South Florida because - THEY "CAN'T AFFORD" OR ARE UNWILLING TO GET OFF THEIR LAZY BUTTS and look to put their power-line corridor in a different place! Please!

**Organization:** Concerned citizen of S. Florida

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 85 **Comment Id:** 210607

**Comment Text:** Living in Homestead I've heard a dozen stories of things FP n L planned that would make service better an cut cost. I'm a single man that has to keep all AC off in all non main areas of my house. Cutting back on temp in the Frig an every other area I can cut back. Now you want to destroy more Florida land an the only gain is for FP n L? Did Someone step on a live wire?

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Paul J Headley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 86 **Comment Id:** 210617

**Comment Text:** Please don't allow FPL to build those towers and bring those lines across the entrance to Everglades National Park. How much more of our natural heritage has to be destroyed before the entire environment collapses?

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Linda M Meyerholz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 87 **Comment Id:** 210717

**Comment Text:** I understand what FPL wants to do; I do not want to see the project implemented. It is a short term energy goal with long term harmful and irreparable environmental consequences.

**Organization:** Sierra Club; Everglades Forever; Nature Conservancy

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 104 **Comment Id:** 211018

**Comment Text:** We think you shouldn't open the Everglades for houses because I have a friend who hates it when the Everglades are harmed. Also its a bad idea because the Ibis is the Miami Hurricanes (my favorite football team) symbol. Please use another place to put houses but never harm habitats.

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist

**Commenter:** Zelda NA **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 103 **Comment Id:** 211019

**Comment Text:** Today there are approximately 80 total Florida Panthers. They need at least 200 sq acres to survive. By running powerlines thru the Everglades, if will reduce the amount of space in the Everglades that has already been reduced by urban development. Please defend the Everglades because they cannot defend themselves.

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist  
**Commenter:** Corcen Morris **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 12 **Comment Id:** 211057

**Comment Text:** I am 100% opposed to this project because it would degrade the natural areas on which it would be built. These towers should not be built in the park.

**Organization:** sierra club  
**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 93 **Comment Id:** 211098

**Comment Text:** I think it is very important to save the everglades because our water source comes out of the everglades and animals need a space to live so you can't go and put the lightning poles without thinkign what you are doing to a lot of things.

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist  
**Commenter:** Zoe NA **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 91 **Comment Id:** 211099

**Comment Text:** I think it is important to save the Everglades because the Everglades are on of the only wild places. It is home to many animals who can't go anywhere else. If we destroy if, what will our future generations see? Smoke, cares and yucky old factories. Humans have destroyed enough places. Do we really have to destroy this one too?

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist  
**Commenter:** Emi Teh **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 94 **Comment Id:** 211100

**Comment Text:** I care about the Everglades a lot. Please don't put any roads or electrical cords (powerlines) in the Everglades. It is the home of many plants and animals. If you build things there, then the animals could get runover or killed and it would also cut back more of the space that plants and animals live in.

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist  
**Commenter:** Elena M. **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 99 **Comment Id:** 211101

**Comment Text:** I really don't want power lines in the Everglades because the Everglades is one of the only places I can relax. so DON'T put power lines in the Everglades!

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist  
**Commenter:** Alexander Yagoda **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 98 **Comment Id:** 211103

**Comment Text:** I have loved and admired the Everglades. Please do not destroy the gorgeous sight of it by building a housing development! Please think of all the homes you will be destroying and lifes you may be killing!

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist

**Commenter:** Anna Bauer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 97 **Comment Id:** 211104

**Comment Text:** The Everglades is a wonderful place so....SAVE IT. I care about the Everglades a lot! So please leave it the way it is and please do not put any roads or powerlines.

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist

**Commenter:** Daya B **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 100 **Comment Id:** 211105

**Comment Text:** These powerlines may hurt of harm plants and animals. Save the Everglades! No more powerlines!

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist

**Commenter:** Chloe NA **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 102 **Comment Id:** 211106

**Comment Text:** I have been to the Everglades and its a beautiful place to visit. It has become home to exotic plants and even more exotic animals. If powerlines were to be added to the park, it would drastically change the lives of the animals. By adding powerlines, the homes of these animals will become smaller and smaller. Its important that we help save the wildlife and preserve the plants. It is this generation's duty to save the ecosystem. If everyone were to help out, we could save the Everglades. With this small step, we can help save the world.

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalists

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 96 **Comment Id:** 211175

**Comment Text:** You get water and nature loves from the everglades. Please help us save it. It was here first.

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 64 **Comment Id:** 211176

**Comment Text:** To hear that a power company is being allowed to encroach into this amazingly special,

unique place - words cannot describe how sad that makes me feel. If this plan goes ahead then I think I will prefer to keep the beautiful images I have in my head and visit elsewhere. There are ever fewer places of outstanding natural beauty, we have to safeguard what we still have, not reduce it further! I am used to reading about such extravagances in certain parts of the world but, frankly, I expect better of the US. I expect the US, whose National Parks are talked about and revered worldwide, to have more sense!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 73 **Comment Id:** 211204

**Comment Text:** . I do not support any expansion/acquisition either in so-called environmentally sensitive areas or any other area. Nonhumans have a moral right to their own habitat; free from the destructive intrusion of human tyranny and industrialization.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** NA NA **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 106 **Comment Id:** 211213

**Comment Text:** I oppose putting power lines in the swap area or the National Park. Power lines could harm migratory birds and destroy the look of the park.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Drew Martin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 72 **Comment Id:** 211219

**Comment Text:** I would not like having FPL in the National Park because it will obstruct water flow and it is also visual pollution!

**Organization:** FIU Student

**Commenter:** Ginselda Chavaria **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 80 **Comment Id:** 211229

**Comment Text:** How could you consider having those towers and power lines which will have a significant impact on the environment and other issues. FPL's construction will impede the flow of water in the area, which is necessary to restore the Park's long parched headwaters

**Organization:** Audubon

**Commenter:** Victoria F Garrigo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 44 **Comment Id:** 211232

**Comment Text:** i don't think power lines should be run through the everglades. we just need to leave some areas alone!!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** cyndi hoxie **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 107 **Comment Id:** 211241

**Comment Text:** Selfish expansion of the power lines should be borne on the people who swear they need it and not on wild life. If people aren't willing to accept the risks of stray voltage then it should not be moved to a place that's just another out-of-sight, out-of-mind excuse for a solution.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Richard A Tucker **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 108 **Comment Id:** 211251

**Comment Text:** FPL should give the land to the National Park System and no FPL towers on the land! Thank you.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Helen Colby **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 109 **Comment Id:** 211406

**Comment Text:** FPL should be encouraging conservation so that new projects like this would not be necessary.

**Organization:** Concerned Citizen

**Commenter:** John W Cunningham **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 111 **Comment Id:** 211423

**Comment Text:** As a resident of South Florida and an annual visitor to the Everglades I am abhorred about the prospect of high tension power lines being constructed along the edge or anywhere in sight from the Everglades Park. What can the park service have been thinking to even consider such a proposal? People from all over the world come to the Everglades to get away from the sight of industrial blight and you are considering bringing it to one of the most precious natural sites in the world? I urge you to reject the plan to place 15 story-tall power lines along the edge of Everglades National Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 42 **Comment Id:** 211428

**Comment Text:** Putting additional powerlines through the National Park is a desecration of the South Florida Environment and an unwarranted endeavor.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id: 90    Comment Id: 211913**

**Comment Text:** Along with this letter you find at least 20 letters and/drawings of campers from 5 to 10 years of age that come to the junior naturalist camp every year, asking you to help keep the everglades safe and pristine for us and the world, and I think that 20 aware, invested and interested children are a great reason to make this effort

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist

**Commenter:** Diana Pena    **Page:**    **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id: 92    Comment Id: 211914**

**Comment Text:** do NOT let them destroy the Everglades what will happen to the animals that live there? What if that was you?

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist

**Commenter:** Olivia Hernandez    **Page:**    **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id: 95    Comment Id: 211920**

**Comment Text:** Please save the Everglades. What would happen to the animals?

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist

**Commenter:** Olivia Hernandez    **Page:**    **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id: 101    Comment Id: 211921**

**Comment Text:** Although we have done a great job preserving is, we must continue to be proactive in our attempts to continue to keep the River of Grass safe from ruin. The recent idea of FPL to put up powerlines throughout the Everglades important land which must be protected at all costs, is a grave danger to this one-of-a-kind ecosystem and must be prevented at all costs.

**Organization:** Fairchild Junior Naturalist

**Commenter:** Aaron Schwartz    **Page:**    **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id: 45    Comment Id: 212030**

**Comment Text:** It is an "inconvenient truth" that power lines strung across Everglades National Park desecrates the wilderness that is the essence of the unspoiled Everglades. The National Park - the very highest level of protection afforded protected wilderness - should be sacrosanct from such intrusions we suffer in the city and suburbs, and the main reason we retreat to national parks to recharge our souls and commune with nature and God.

**Organization:** Int. Soc. for the Preservation of the Tropical Rainforest

**Commenter:** Arnold Newman    **Page:**    **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id: 46    Comment Id: 212032**

**Comment Text:** lease don't further degrade the environment of the Everglades with power lines. "Legal

persons" are destroying the environment that supports us all. Make them responsible for their destruction.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 115 **Comment Id:** 212149

**Comment Text:** I'm concerned about the damage that will be done to wildlife if FPL is allowed to put up these huge power lines in the park. And the damage that will be done to the land in the process of installing the lines and servicing the lines.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Valerie Robbin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 117 **Comment Id:** 212175

**Comment Text:** FPL has plenty of other lands, let them place utility poles, roads, and bldgs.there. Also, they should use green energy.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Barbara A Brodbeck **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 117 **Comment Id:** 212178

**Comment Text:** Really, aren't we being silly, just say "No" to FPL. Ethics is needed here badly, poor judgment will punish all the citizens of Florida.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Barbara A Brodbeck **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 120 **Comment Id:** 212247

**Comment Text:** I do not agree with FPL Powerline Expansion into the Florida Everglades that may affect wildlife and plants in the park. I pay taxes to have lands set aside to be protected- this land should NEVER be for the benefit of corporations. National Parks are this nation's treasures not to be despoiled by FPL. Keep corporate America out of our parks!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 125 **Comment Id:** 212270

**Comment Text:** I wanted to make a statement against the proposal by FPL to build powerlines through either corridor in Everglades National Park.

**Organization:** Audubon Society - Everglades Chapter

**Commenter:** Katie Hoffmaster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No



**Correspondence Id:** 121 **Comment Id:** 213182

**Comment Text:** I am strongly opposed to FPL's proposal to construct powerlines in any part of our park. The Everglades is a precious gift of Mother Nature. We must restore it and safeguard the park from any further disruptions. This is not just for us to enjoy but for the many generations to come. To permit FPL to proceed with its plans would be contrary to what Congress intended when it agreed to partially fund the restoration of The Everglades. I urge you to say no to FPL.

**Organization:** Siera Club, Natl. Parks Cons. Assoc., Nat. Wildlife Foun., etc.

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 113 **Comment Id:** 213191

**Comment Text:** I am opposed to this project based simply on the fact that wild lands should be kept as wild as they were created. The Everglades are a fragile ecosystem which have been chipped away over the years by development and industry. What little of this amazing wild land remains should be guarded and protected, not continually eroded.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 129 **Comment Id:** 214133

**Comment Text:** yes, i would like to to see the the everglades are not disturbed at all. there would have to be another way for fpl to by pass this national park !

**Organization:** sierra club

**Commenter:** robert l taylor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 129 **Comment Id:** 214134

**Comment Text:** there is a way to lay these new powerlines without disturbing the ecological surrounding areas. we need to stay away from the main part of the area and only use the eastern side.

**Organization:** sierra club

**Commenter:** robert l taylor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 129 **Comment Id:** 214136

**Comment Text:** i do believe that we would disturb the existing ecology if we went in there with a lot of earth moving machines and roads to the proposed power-lines and this is like virgin pristine wilderness, and this would be forever lost to the almight florida power and light magnants that demand a profit for their share holders. more profit at the expense of our future enjoyment of just such a place. LEAVE IT ALONE ! and let flp find a better solution even if it does not please them monetarily!

**Organization:** sierra club

**Commenter:** robert l taylor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 131 **Comment Id:** 215727

**Comment Text:** Conveying Everglades National Park land to a for-profit utility company for a transmission corridor along the eastern park boundary would significantly interfere with ongoing restoration efforts.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Vasu Murti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 131 **Comment Id:** 215728

**Comment Text:** American and international visitors don't want to see 140-foot towers and power lines surrounding this World Heritage Site.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Vasu Murti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 131 **Comment Id:** 215731

**Comment Text:** New power lines should avoid national parks and not put at risk water quality, wildlife habitat and corridors, and native plants.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Vasu Murti **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 176 **Comment Id:** 215998

**Comment Text:** I opposed this proposal as strongly as possible. It will be sold to the public as essential to America's economy, which I think is nonsense. There are always lots of alternatives.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Norman Kopecky **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 177 **Comment Id:** 216003

**Comment Text:** I have experienced Everglades National Park for several years and urge you to use your utmost efforts to prevent the construction of the proposed power lines and infrastructure. It would be a travesty to have this intrusion into the precious resource that is Everglades National Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Richard Hoffman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 178 **Comment Id:** 216012

**Comment Text:** There are so many reasons not to put power lines and towers in any National Park. First, it is not a part of our God given nature, it is manmade and not beautiful. Second of all there is health risks to all the animals of the area. Third, it is time that we as Americans stop giving higher priority to profit seeking companies over that of our God given natural resources.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Corine Louwsma **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 179 **Comment Id:** 216024

**Comment Text:** Please keep this national park natural and unspoiled. When President Roosevelt created the park system, I believe he had the intention of keeping wild spaces safe from man's clutter. Please honor his legacy by preserving this beautiful place as it is.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Justin Mears **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 180 **Comment Id:** 216028

**Comment Text:** While I am a winter resident of Florida and could possibly somehow benefit from this project, I find it highly objectionable and unconscionable that consideration could ever be given to allowing FPL or any private entity to benefit/profit from such use of any National Park. DON'T ALLOW IT!!!!

**Organization:****Commenter:** Robert Doles **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 181 **Comment Id:** 216036

**Comment Text:** America's National Parks don't need power lines running through them that Parks have survived with the help of corporate help.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Connie Brady **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 182 **Comment Id:** 216040

**Comment Text:** The National Parks ought to be left pristine and unmolested by corporate fascist pigs whose only interest is the bottom line. Hydro-fracking has led to a toxic America and the culpable scoundrels are exporting the excess gas, while raising prices here in America! Enough is Enough!

**Organization:****Commenter:** Norma Madison **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 183 **Comment Id:** 216070

**Comment Text:** New power lines should avoid national parks and not put at risk water quality, wildlife habitat and corridors, and native plants. Conveying Everglades National Park land to a for-profit utility company for a transmission corridor along the eastern park boundary would significantly interfere with ongoing park ecosystem restoration efforts

**Organization:****Commenter:** Mike Strawn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 183 **Comment Id:** 216073

**Comment Text:** Conveying a slice of Everglades National Park to a for-profit utility for a transmission line corridor poses a threat to the Everglades ecosystem and conflicts with long-term restoration efforts.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Mike Strawn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 183 **Comment Id:** 216075

**Comment Text:** We should ensure that future generations can experience America's scenic wonder unspoiled. In short, American and international visitors don't want to see 140-foot towers and power lines surrounding this World Heritage Site.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Mike Strawn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 184 **Comment Id:** 216078

**Comment Text:** Please reject any attempt to allow transmission lines into the Everglades National Park. This is one of America's unique and great places. There are other ways to transmit this power. Please keep the National Parks free from such intrusions.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Herbert Salmon **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 185 **Comment Id:** 216083

**Comment Text:** Please use all your powers to prevent the Florida Power and Light from building lines through Everglades National Park. We have so very few wild unspoiled places left in this country. How can we not do our utmost to preserve them as they are? This kind of development brings with its threats to the ecosystem. No matter how small they may seem, they CHANGE this wonderful place.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Cynthia Hill **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 186 **Comment Id:** 216095

**Comment Text:** Everglades National Park is one of America's iconic and treasured places. The National Park Service should remain committed to protecting and preserving our precious natural resources for the enjoyment of future generations, take a hard look at the consequences of this action, and reject the proposal which would convey these public lands to Florida Power and Light.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Mark Meeks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 187 **Comment Id:** 216114

**Comment Text:** I have experienced Everglades National Park for several years and urge you to use your utmost efforts to prevent the construction of the proposed power lines and infrastructure. It would be a travesty to have this intrusion into the precious resource that is Everglades National Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Richard Hoffman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 188 **Comment Id:** 216121

**Comment Text:** Please do not permit FPL to build on Everglades National Park land.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kathryn McCormick **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 189 **Comment Id:** 216122

**Comment Text:** The national parks ought to be left pristine and unmolested by corporate fascist pigs whose only interest is the bottom line. Hydro-fracking has lead to a toxic America and the culpable scoundrels are exporting the excess gas, while raising prices here in America! Enough is Enough!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Norma Madison **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 190 **Comment Id:** 216123

**Comment Text:** Please keep this national park natural and unspoiled. When President Roosevelt created the park system, I believe he had the intention of keeping wild spaces safe from man's clutter. Please honor his legacy by preserving this beautiful place as it is.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Justin Mears **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 191 **Comment Id:** 216126

**Comment Text:** Putting a power line through Everglades National Park or any national park is just a dumb idea. Who wants to see a power line in an area that's supposed to be pristine and unique piece of nature? And i'm sure there would be environmental damage caused by the construction and just the existence (especially to birds) of a transmission line. They need to come up with a better idea.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Cary Crosby **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 192 **Comment Id:** 216130

**Comment Text:** The Everglades is home to many threatened and endangered species. Their survival depends on a very delicate ecosystem which could be destroyed by the building of huge power line towers.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Joe Paschal **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 193 **Comment Id:** 216132

**Comment Text:** I will keep this short and simple. The purpose of National Parks is to preserve large pristine areas of wilderness. The Everglades have been attacked time and again by federal and state agencies to point it is having to be restored. Power lines do not belong in any National Park. It is that simple.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Lora Lehner **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 194 **Comment Id:** 216292

**Comment Text:** I do not believe that FPL should be allowed to run powerlines through the Everglades National Park or the Big Cypress National Preserve. This should also be the case for any of the National Parks. It might be that along a human use roadway buried cables can be used for a minimum impact to the wildlife and recreational enjoyment

**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 197 **Comment Id:** 216294

**Comment Text:** We need to keep new power lines out of Everglades National Park. This is our precious natural resource.

**Organization:** Audubon Society**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 199 **Comment Id:** 216295

**Comment Text:** I do not want any changes to what exists now. The Everglades in a treasure and should be preserved in its absolute natural state.

**Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association**Commenter:** Fosdick Harrison **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 203 **Comment Id:** 216310

**Comment Text:** Don't do it, that would be the best thing to protect park resources and values.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Clayton Daughenbaugh **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 203 **Comment Id:** 216311

**Comment Text:** The park service should place its priority on habitat protection and enjoyment of the same by people. A power line is exactly the opposite of that purpose and has no business being in view of the park or its contiguous lands.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Clayton Daughenbaugh **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 205 **Comment Id:** 216317

**Comment Text:** Failing to preserve the park's land will likely result in the expansion of the FPL's developed property. This includes construction of more high voltage transmission towers, larger towers, and more access roads constructed. It could also result in industrialization on the outskirts of the park in order to support new high voltage transmission towers through the park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 206 **Comment Id:** 216318

**Comment Text:** There is too much fragmented land in Florida now. This fragmentation due to habitat destruction for development has created irreparable damage to our fragile ecosystems in Florida. Please stop the MADNESS!

**Organization:** Wildlands Network

**Commenter:** Lise Meinke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 206 **Comment Id:** 216320

**Comment Text:** At all costs protect wild places and the native species that live in them.

**Organization:** Wildlands Network

**Commenter:** Lise Meinke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 208 **Comment Id:** 216326

**Comment Text:** There is no other Everglades in the world. This is a unique and wondrous land that must be conserved for future generations. It has already lost so much of its size and character that we must not allow further endangerment and alteration.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 209 **Comment Id:** 216327

**Comment Text:** Do not allow FPL access to the National Parks!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 210 **Comment Id:** 216332  
**Comment Text:** Keep the Everglades free of powerlines  
**Organization:**  
**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 211 **Comment Id:** 216337  
**Comment Text:** Acquire the land. Do not build power-lines in the Everglades National Park.  
**Organization:**  
**Commenter:** Lesley Cox **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 211 **Comment Id:** 216338  
**Comment Text:** This should have been done years ago. Acquire the land. Do not build power-lines in the Everglades National Park.  
**Organization:**  
**Commenter:** Lesley Cox **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 211 **Comment Id:** 216339  
**Comment Text:** 1989 Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act required that this land be acquired and be managed as "park". Utility lines have already been considered and rejected as an "incompatible use". What are you waiting for? Acquire the land and manage it as required.  
**Organization:**  
**Commenter:** Lesley Cox **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 212 **Comment Id:** 216342  
**Comment Text:** The Everglades should be left alone  
**Organization:**  
**Commenter:** Andrew m N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 214 **Comment Id:** 216343  
**Comment Text:** Roads and powerlines should not be built in this manner.  
**Organization:**  
**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** Yes



**Correspondence Id:** 215 **Comment Id:** 216345

**Comment Text:** The 1st priority should be the protection of this National Treasure .

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Lee W Webber **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 216 **Comment Id:** 216350

**Comment Text:** Do not allow any more powerlines and any maintained utility corridors in the ENP or historic Everglades lands

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 216 **Comment Id:** 216352

**Comment Text:** Do not allow any more powerlines and any maintained utility corridors in the ENP or historic Everglades lands; visual viewshed quality; bird flyways protection; damage to the aquatic habitat; cultural integrity relative to settler and Native Americans.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 219 **Comment Id:** 216355

**Comment Text:** No power lines should be ran through the park. It will ruin the natural look of the environment.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Alan Levenson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 220 **Comment Id:** 216357

**Comment Text:** The project causes destruction of a pristine natural resource.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Barbara B Ruge **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 220 **Comment Id:** 216358

**Comment Text:** Keep FPL out! The future of humanity depends on clean air and water.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Barbara B Ruge **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 220 **Comment Id:** 216359

**Comment Text:** Power lines are unsightly and destroy natural habitats for native wildlife. We don't need more oil, gas or nuclear power. Promote the development of clean energy alternatives without destroying our precious Everglades.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Barbara B Ruge **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 221 **Comment Id:** 216363

**Comment Text:** I would like to comment about FPL's proposed -- I guess the power lines. I'm against it because it's a national park, and it would be unheard of in other national parks like Yosemite and Yellowstone, but because it's the Everglades people assume they can just put up power lines or do anything and no one would notice, but it's actually a national park and it should be a treasured piece of land.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Jessica Bernabei **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 222 **Comment Id:** 216364

**Comment Text:** KEEP THE EVERGLADES AS IS. IT IS RUINED ENOUGH BY GROWTH AND ENCROACHMENT ALREADY. are power lines as matter of life aand death? i think not!!!!!!

**Organization:** DEMOCRATIC PARTY

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 223 **Comment Id:** 216377

**Comment Text:** Unsightly lines that already spoil much of the Southeast Florida coastline, lines always impact trees and cause more hassles in the long run with high winds and tropical storms. They belong under the ground!!!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Jared Stein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 227 **Comment Id:** 216406

**Comment Text:** We need to leave this alone. Once gone we will never get this precious land back. Not everything should be about money and this is one of them. The Everglades are not suppose to be for sale.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 230 **Comment Id:** 216421

**Comment Text:** Understanding a need for power, there are other pathways to its delivery besides cutting through this pristine, natural sanctuary.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Jay Abramson **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 230 **Comment Id:** 216425**Comment Text:** It is long past time to preserve and protect the Everglades from development, no matter how beneficial it may seem or even actually be. It's powerlines. Run them some other route.**Organization:****Commenter:** Jay Abramson **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 231 **Comment Id:** 216428**Comment Text:** we have enough problems with fire in the glades due to lighting, this just helps the problem more.**Organization:** environmental services**Commenter:** stephen anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 231 **Comment Id:** 216432**Comment Text:** shouldn't even have any talks at all.**Organization:** environmental services**Commenter:** stephen anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 233 **Comment Id:** 216450**Comment Text:** Find an alternative route for the lines.**Organization:****Commenter:** Steve Welsch **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 235 **Comment Id:** 216468**Comment Text:** I do not think any option that involves any additional stress on the park should be on the table.**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 237 **Comment Id:** 216494**Comment Text:** The Everglades need to be preserved and protected rather than another attack. The power company should put their power lines along with the existing ones or just a out of the Everglades.**Organization:** Sierra Club And Responsible Growth Management Coalition

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 239 **Comment Id:** 216548

**Comment Text:** The 1989 Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act required that this land be acquired and be managed as "park". Utility lines have already been considered and rejected as an "incompatible use". This alternative ? leaving in place a corridor which could lead to 150 foot high transmission towers inside a National Park - is also completely inconsistent with the mission of the National Park Service as stated in the Organic Act of 1916: "...to promote and regulate the use of the...national parks...which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Everglades National Park contains remnants of a completely unique planetary ecosystem. In addition to being the first "biological park" in our nation's history and by far the largest designated wilderness in the eastern United States, the park is also a World Heritage Site, an International Biosphere Reserve, and a Wetland of International Importance. Unfortunately, Everglades National Park also consistently ranks among "top travel destinations to see before they disappear" ? and approximately one million visitors per year take that opportunity.

**Organization:** Palm Beach County Environmental Coalition

**Commenter:** Panagioti E Tsolkas **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 242 **Comment Id:** 216658

**Comment Text:** Please- you know very well the site of powerlines is not natural or park like. Please keep our parks clear of foreign non native non invasive HUMAN technology. No Power Lines in the Everglades National Park!!

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Wick Beavers **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 242 **Comment Id:** 216662

**Comment Text:** Even if the power lines, or any other permanent/semi permanent human intrusion, are not seen, we know they are there. That is an infraction against the constitutionality of our national parks. No high line wires. Make the park like the Mogollon Wilderness area- no motorized vehicles anywhere except designated access roads.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Wick Beavers **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 243 **Comment Id:** 216682

**Comment Text:** FPL keep your lines out of the Everglades

**Organization:** Citizen of the USA

**Commenter:** Joseph E Krois **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 247 **Comment Id:** 216883

**Comment Text:** This defacing of our national park ..one of international renown would be a national disaster.. Unecessary and unthinkable.

**Organization:** Calusa Group Sierr CLUB

**Commenter:** Ellen W Peterson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 247 **Comment Id:** 216885

**Comment Text:** No defacement of the Everglades should ever be considered..Especially this un necessary traversity

**Organization:** Calusa Group Sierr CLUB

**Commenter:** Ellen W Peterson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 248 **Comment Id:** 216894

**Comment Text:** Please leave what is left of the Everglades alone. Once this is destroyed.....that's it! We have something so unique.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Gayle Edelman-Tolchin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 251 **Comment Id:** 216934

**Comment Text:** Yes - don't install the extra power lines. Extra power lines means population growth; the rich will grow richer, the poor will not benefit, and the environment will suffer.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Phillip R Penne **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 252 **Comment Id:** 216937

**Comment Text:** There is no need to increase the footprint of transmission lines or any other manmade objects within the Everglades.

**Organization:** Nature Coast Coalition

**Commenter:** Emily Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 253 **Comment Id:** 216942

**Comment Text:** to the National Park Service.... please protect our lands, our beautiful mysterious and unique Everglades.... please protect our parks. I am 100% against cutting through the everglades.

**Organization:** Citizen of Florida

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 255 **Comment Id:** 216945

**Comment Text:** no powerline

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 257 **Comment Id:** 216972

**Comment Text:** Any alternative to invading the Everglades is preferable.

**Organization:** PB County Environmental Coalition

**Commenter:** Barry M Silver **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 257 **Comment Id:** 216974

**Comment Text:** There are no terms or conditions that can mitigate the risk of harm to the Everglades

**Organization:** PB County Environmental Coalition

**Commenter:** Barry M Silver **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 257 **Comment Id:** 216975

**Comment Text:** No invasion of the Everglades should be permitted. Any alternative which allows this invasion, even if minimized, is still too much. The Everglades is a national treasure, and an international unique ecological site, and should not be destroyed.

**Organization:** PB County Environmental Coalition

**Commenter:** Barry M Silver **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 260 **Comment Id:** 216982

**Comment Text:** The mission of the National Park Service as stated in the Organic Act of 1916: "...to promote and regulate the use of the...national parks...which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." No powerlines!

**Organization:** Living Green Chiropractic & Wellness, LLC

**Commenter:** Lindsay Taylor **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 263 **Comment Id:** 217132

**Comment Text:** FPL must be prevented at all costs from cutting into or around the Everglades and destroying the fragile ecosystem.

**Organization:** Tropical Audubon Society

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 263 **Comment Id:** 217135

**Comment Text:** No Glades land should be sacrificed in any way whatsoever for FPS's convenience.

**Organization:** Torpical Audubon Society

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 264 **Comment Id:** 217148

**Comment Text:** keep the park pristime...it is all we have left

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** george l eisman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 265 **Comment Id:** 217186

**Comment Text:** The project needs to be moved OUT of the Everglades National Park! It needs to be totally changed to a GREEN alternative such as solar, wind or hydro electric power.

**Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 265 **Comment Id:** 217188

**Comment Text:** As for any projects proposed to invade the Everglades National Park, they should be shut down and the NPS needs to focus on keeping the park pristine and the wonderful wildlife habitat it is meant to be.

**Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 266 **Comment Id:** 217333

**Comment Text:** Absolutely - Why further disturb the Everglades to allow FPL to build new power lines that will soon be obsolete when we convert to renewable distributed rooftop solar - new nuclear, fracked gas and dirty coal and oil will soon be a thing of the polluted past.

**Organization:** Save it Now Glades

**Commenter:** Deb Arnason **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 267 **Comment Id:** 217336

**Comment Text:** Keep the power lines in developed areas that create the need for them.

**Organization:** Citizen of the USA

**Commenter:** Herbert H Zebuth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 269 **Comment Id:** 217375

**Comment Text:** Allowing for the possibility of the construction of electric power transmission lines and their associated roads and structures on the very eastern boundary of the Everglades will cause negative impacts to this fragile habitat. Not only will the structures and roadways themselves eliminate plants and animals, but the power poles will also create obstructions in the landscape that will imperil many organisms.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 270 **Comment Id:** 217517

**Comment Text:** Yes as above . FPL should not be putting powerline in the park period. It belongs to the US citizens and not private industry.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Judy a Kuchta **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 275 **Comment Id:** 217759

**Comment Text:** No, I only know that the everglades should be left alone.

**Organization:** Heifer International

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 279 **Comment Id:** 217773

**Comment Text:** A MERE LOOK AT HISTORY, SAYS ELECTRICAL TRANSMISSION HAS CHANGED RADICALLY IN ONLY A CENTURY. THE PROPOSERS EARLY CORPORATE ENTITIES WERE QUITE WILLING, EVEN A LITTLE MORE THAN A HALF CENTURY AGO, TO TRANSMIT ELECTRICITY OVER (OR UNDER) LANDS FOR WHICH THEY DID NOT TAKE FEE. LOOKING AT ALTERNATIVE ROUTES (REGARDLESS OF THE FDEP TRANSMISSION LINE SITING PROCESS) FURTHER EAST COULD RESULT IN "GREEN" CORRIDORS WITH SIMPLE REDESIGN (BUT MORE EXPENSIVE HIGHER) OF THE TRANSMISSION WORKS. MAJOR LAND USE BENEFITS, COST BENIFITS OF DISTRIBUTION TO THE CONSUMER, IMPROVED TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS, ACCOMODATION OF OTHER UTILITIES WITHIN THE SAME CORRIDOR, ETC. COULD BE ACHIEVED WITH A MORE EASTERLY ALIGNMENT.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 280 **Comment Id:** 217777

**Comment Text:** I am opposed to the potential exchange

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**



**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 286 **Comment Id:** 217784

**Comment Text:** Please figure out another way to get power to these locations, power lines are not acceptable/

**Organization:** k&K Development, Inc.

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 289 **Comment Id:** 217799

**Comment Text:** Please do not build anymore Power Plants in or near our Everglades, Respect mother nature and our wildlife.

**Organization:** ALL ABOARD CRUISES, INC

**Commenter:** Rachel Kriegert **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 296 **Comment Id:** 217825

**Comment Text:** Find an alternative corridor.

**Organization:** Audubon, Native Plant Society

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 298 **Comment Id:** 217846

**Comment Text:** Keep FPL out of the EIS.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 304 **Comment Id:** 217910

**Comment Text:** There should be no construction of FPL power lines along the eastern edge of and within Everglades National Park, or anywhere else in this or any National Park. The purpose of National Parks is to "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 320 **Comment Id:** 218012

**Comment Text:** This will have massive impacts on the environment. The Everglades are unique to this world it will be destroyed.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 321 **Comment Id:** 218018  
**Comment Text:** Powerlines have no place in Everglades National Park.  
**Organization:**  
**Commenter:** Harlan K Sandberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 327 **Comment Id:** 218031  
**Comment Text:** Environment must come first, there's no one to save w/ the world in a grave  
**Organization:** Sierra Club  
**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 327 **Comment Id:** 218032  
**Comment Text:** No building anything on eastern tip of Everglades  
**Organization:** Sierra Club  
**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 196 **Comment Id:** 218242  
**Comment Text:** The Everglades should be protected from the industrial presence of power lines. More should be done to return the Everglades to a natural state, rather than to add industrial artifacts. The natural state is not merely to be enjoyed by charmed visitors -- which is fine, in itself -- but in fact is the sought-after healthy state of the environment that we need for the future. I urge you to turn back any proposal that runs power lines through national park land.  
**Organization:**  
**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 127 **Comment Id:** 218243  
**Comment Text:** I'd like to record my support for recommendations of the Environmental Defense Fund without having to express detailed comments of my own, which are bound to be superficial.  
**Organization:** Environmental Defense  
**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 204 **Comment Id:** 218317  
**Comment Text:** There should not be any electrical poles and wires throughout the Everglades. This is protected lands. FPL power lines will change the landscape forever and the possibility of an electrical accident would be catastrophic.

**Organization:****Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 224 **Comment Id:** 218332**Comment Text:** Please don't do it!**Organization:****Commenter:** Scott N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 234 **Comment Id:** 218342**Comment Text:** FPL should NOT have power lines cutting through the Everglades ANYWHERE.**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 234 **Comment Id:** 218345**Comment Text:** The only consideration is to tell FPL, NO. You don't even have to say sorry, just a flat out NO.**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 230 **Comment Id:** 218359**Comment Text:** Realizing that conserving the Everglades is a very emotional subject, it must be taken into consideration that it is the only such environment in the United States, and therefore said preservation is essential. Powerlines are more than just an eyesore. The necessary preparation of the area for their installation by its very nature transforms the area destructively, and history has shown when such efforts are made, they are ultimately negative to that environment.**Organization:****Commenter:** Jay Abramson **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 266 **Comment Id:** 218360**Comment Text:** Block new power lines across Everglades national park!**Organization:** Save it Now Glades**Commenter:** Deb Arnason **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 151 **Comment Id:** 218365**Comment Text:** It is my understanding that you are considering allowing a private company to place power lines in the Everglade National Park. I am writing to request that you do not do so.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Elaine Warshell **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 172 **Comment Id:** 218366

**Comment Text:** Everglades National Park is one of America's iconic and treasured places. The National Park Service should remain committed to protecting and preserving our precious natural resources for the enjoyment of future generations, take a hard look at the consequences of this action, and reject the proposal which would convey these public lands to Florida Power and Light.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Michael McGuire **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 175 **Comment Id:** 218368

**Comment Text:** Power lines and towers and more maintenance roads have no place here. Their construction would have negative impacts on already endangered species like the snail kite, wood stork and Florida panther, introduce more exotic and invasive plants, and interfere with ongoing efforts to restore the Everglades. Visitors who come to look out across the sawgrass and wetlands do not want to see this eyesore. Please have FPL find a more appropriate location for their transmission lines.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Elinor Williams **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 261 **Comment Id:** 218374

**Comment Text:** As a nature guide in Everglades National Park I am against powerlines within the park.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 285 **Comment Id:** 218384

**Comment Text:** I support the position of the South Florida Wildlands Association. Please do not allow powerlines across the Everglades.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 283 **Comment Id:** 218386

**Comment Text:** Can not imagine any federal agency even considering changing or damaging the uniqueness of this park, especially the very group that is charged with protecting it. I ask that the National Park Service do its job and not allow powerlines to cut across the park. You have the future of The Everglades in your hands. Take charge and do only what is in the best interest of this glorious park.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 198 **Comment Id:** 218391

**Comment Text:** Resolution opposing power lines in the Everglades National Park

**Organization:** South Florida Audubon Society

**Commenter:** Grant Campbell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 207 **Comment Id:** 218394

**Comment Text:** I am thinking there is conflict in this project of running power lines within the Everglades with the very real and expected reclamation of the Everglades and the ecosystem that is a very real and necessary system to Florida and the entire planet.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 249 **Comment Id:** 218404

**Comment Text:** The Everglades must not be disturbed--it must be kept for perpetuity without encroachment by intrusions like a power line.

**Organization:** NATURE Coast Ramblers

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 254 **Comment Id:** 218406

**Comment Text:** don't believe this is a good idea and it should be changed we should see the power lines the park is supposed to be a wild area.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 259 **Comment Id:** 218409

**Comment Text:** New utility lines are not a current permitted or allowable use in Everglades National Park. Please do not allow this usage to puncture the beautiful and unique environment currently available nowhere else in the world.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Elisabeth p Fennell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 262 **Comment Id:** 218410

**Comment Text:** I oppose the power lines through the Everglades NP. That would defy the very purpose of the National Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Miguel hernandez **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 284 **Comment Id:** 218413

**Comment Text:** Keep FPL out of Everglades National Park. This park was set aside for the citizens of the US to enjoy and to preserve nature, including plants and animals. I am against any utility using MY national park for its own purpose and destroying MY national park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 276 **Comment Id:** 218417

**Comment Text:** In my expert opinion there are no possible mitigations that would make power-lines allowable on Park Service land. Nor are any additional studies needed for The Department of Interior to reject siting of Florida Power and Light utilities corridors of any kind on Park Service land or land projected to be included.

**Organization:** ARMF & FEI

**Commenter:** Thomas L Poulson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 292 **Comment Id:** 218423

**Comment Text:** I am writing to you about the towers that may be built inside Everglades National Park. I'm worried about the effect of these towers on the wildlife that live there. I remember how beautiful and wild the everglades were, with no human development for miles around! My Dad showed me some before and after pictures of everglades that had the towers constructed in them. It looked as though the magnificent park had been fenced in. I cannot believe that anyone would want to destroy such a beautiful view and make it look so unnatural!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 302 **Comment Id:** 218427

**Comment Text:** The Everglades needs to be kept to as pristine a condition as it can. The best alternative would be that FPL remove the powerlines and the park service get the land back. Having giant towers going through the park looks ridiculous and flies in the face of the basic purpose of having a national park.

**Organization:** Green League

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 328 **Comment Id:** 218449

**Comment Text:** Please don't let FPL invade our precious Everglades. Let it stay as natural as possible for our friends,the animals. Thank you!

**Organization:****Commenter:** Eileen Howard **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 363 **Comment Id:** 218453**Comment Text:** Please do not allow transmission lines to mar one of America's greatest treasures.**Organization:****Commenter:** Sylvia B Flowers **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 348 **Comment Id:** 218482**Comment Text:** In conclusion, I want to just show you a picture. Is this the way you want Everglades National Park's borders to look? Is this what you want a person from Germany, in Japan to see in front of our national treasure? This is the purpose of this meeting right here. Just look at it, please. Thank you for your time.**Organization:** Issak Walton League**Commenter:** Bob Skinner **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 323 **Comment Id:** 218483**Comment Text:** The National Park Service's ("NPS") proposal to swap Florida Power and Light's ("FPL") utility corridor in the East Everglades Expansion Area for a new corridor on the east side of Everglades National Park ("Park") is contrary to the mission of the NPS, the purpose of the Park, and the public interest. If permitted to take place, one of our nation's most unique natural areas will gain a new industrial horizon consisting of three sets of power lines carrying up to 500,000 volts of electricity across towers as high as 150 feet. Valuable habitat for some of Florida's most imperiled and iconic species will be lost or irreparably altered.**Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association**Commenter:** Matthew Schwartz **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 323 **Comment Id:** 218486**Comment Text:** Everglades National Park carries perhaps more prestigious designations than any other park in our nation. The Superintendent's Annual Narrative Report, Fiscal Year 2005, noted the Park's significance; Everglades National Park is the: - Largest continuous stand of sawgrass prairie in North America. - Predominant water recharge area for all of South Florida through the Biscayne - aquifer. - A World Heritage Site, a Biosphere Reserve, a Wetland of International Importance, and an Outstanding Florida Water. - Home of 14 Federally listed endangered species. - Largest mangrove ecosystem in the western hemisphere. - Largest designated wilderness in the southeastern U.S. - Site of invaluable breeding grounds for tropical wading birds in North America. - Site of significant ethnographic resources. - Site of a nationally significant estuarine complex in Florida Bay. - The largest remaining subtropical reserve in the United States. - Major "edge" area of the northern and southern limits for many species creating a unique mingling of diverse temperate and subtropical species. Moreover, with frontage on Tamiami Trail and close proximity to developed areas, the East Everglades and Northeast Shark River Slough is by far the most accessible part of the Park for the millions of Floridians and visitors who live in

and visit Miami and other nearby communities. For these reasons and many more (e.g. disruption of the eastern viewscape from the highly popular Shark River Observation Tower), the proposed project site - inside the current borders of the Park - is not the right location for a major new power line across south Florida.

**Organization:** South Florida Wildlands Association

**Commenter:** Matthew Schwartz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 338 **Comment Id:** 218494

**Comment Text:** And with the exchange land, the construction of the transmission lines would amount to a literal fencing in of that boundary of the park and seriously impact the visitors' experiences when they come to the park . So I urge NPS to reject any proposal that proposes to construct transmission lines on existing land within the boundaries of Everglades National Park and exercise their power under the 1991 protection plan and either purchase or condemn the land and preserve the ecosystem of the Everglades.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Austin Llewellyn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 340 **Comment Id:** 218495

**Comment Text:** I'm representing Tropical Audubon, but I'd like to just take one minute to say the first time I drove into the park, the thing that you see first is that line of trees, you know, and I think this has implications beyond what any of us here can imagine what that would look like. And I know that part of the reason we have these little stickers is because look at these huge power lines, what would that mean for tourism and also the first experience of those school children. I think she's right.

**Organization:** Tropical Audubon

**Commenter:** Laura Reynolds **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 340 **Comment Id:** 218497

**Comment Text:** I don't think you should be afraid to pursue no alternative, and the reason I say that is because I know the money isn't there right now, and maybe it would affect other land acquisitions that you have. I would like to see you not be afraid to just say, you know what, we are not going to do it in the national park.

**Organization:** Tropical Audubon

**Commenter:** Laura Reynolds **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 330 **Comment Id:** 218501

**Comment Text:** Why is FPL seeking a special deal from NPS, a deal denied thousands of homeowners who were not in the nuclear expansion business? Must the Everglades be sacrificed yet again so a private monopoly can make even more money? My wife Debra, daughter Megan, and son Zachary (who you were so kind to) hope you will find the fortitude to confront the imperious growth of a not so green monopoly. FPL chooses to profit from nuclear expansion rather than invest in renewable green technologies that could challenge control of the grid and pave the way for America's future and green jobs for our children.



**Organization:****Commenter:** Roderick Tirrell **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 335 **Comment Id:** 218513

**Comment Text:** Yes, I go to school here and I'm just concerned that beyond the 200 acres that FPL might build on, it will be felt around Everglades Park. I'm concerned that beyond the 200 acres that FPL plans to build on, it's going to be felt throughout the Everglades basically because when Pensuco County had -- when someone tried to build near Pensuco wetlands, water left the wetlands, and as a result, the mameluco plant grew throughout the wetlands and it actually destroyed a good portion of it. So I'm concerned that building near the Everglades, the same thing might happen. And as the Army Corps of Engineers has already said, once you go south of 8th Street, water leaves the wetlands much easier when you build near it. So 20 plus acres being built on is going to be felt by more than 400 acres of the Everglades Park. So I would just ask that they not be allowed to build on it. There's no reasoning for it.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Nnamdi Jackson **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 357 **Comment Id:** 218572

**Comment Text:** Hello, my name is Diane Jacobs, and as Jonathan Ullman stated earlier, I remember fighting to try to protect the Everglades from loud noises and planes flying over because whenever I go into the park -- I hope they don't have that park land development -- but just coming through the road, I start to just calm down when I see I'm approaching the entrance to the park because, to me, it just means tranquility and nature and a real renewal from the city life and I couldn't bear the thought of having planes fly over when I camp and go biking and hiking in the park. And I can't bear the thought of approaching these huge power lines that are going to make this just you know, to me, it's just a no-go situation. I just can't even imagine it and I can't believe that anybody is even considering it. And I strongly would recommend option three and I think that Florida Power & Light should donate the land or we should condemn it. We don't need to spend the money. I hope that you are really listening to what everybody has to say tonight because we are just a small amount of representation of many, many people that feel as we do. And I'm also a Sierra Club member and I've done a lot of camping in the park and I really would hate to see this visually and sound wise and just for the wildlife and for the nesting to see this happen.

**Organization:** Sierra Club**Commenter:** Diane Jacobs **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 358 **Comment Id:** 218573

**Comment Text:** I agree with everybody else here. I think that these power lines should not be built. I've always grown up here and I've always wondered why I'm surrounded by a concrete jungle and it bothers me to see the Everglades being affected every year. I have two children and I can't take them camping because they are worried that it's not going to be there when they get older and they told me don't waste my time to take me camping if it's not going to be here in the next ten years.

**Organization:** Florida Yes**Commenter:** Christina Novaton **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 364 **Comment Id:** 218574

**Comment Text:** No, no, no, no, no to the massive transmission lines through the Everglades. This is not what I want, it is not what I want for my children's future, and it is not good stewardship of one of our great national treasures. If I have not been clear, NO POWER LINES. NO.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Hallie Rookey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 359 **Comment Id:** 218575

**Comment Text:** My name is Joe Dimerand and I just want to say I've lived in Blumberg, Germany for eight years where they are implementing right now with the help of the government solar panels on all the houses. Now, they don't have that much sunlight relative to South Florida, and one of the reasons I suspect that what FPL is trying to do is get control over the production of electricity, because in 20 years, which would be about the time that it would take to get the plant, the two nuclear power plants up, they could have solar panels on all the houses in South Florida and that would mean that the people would have control over the electric production rather than FPL. So it's just simply a power grab. That's all.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Joe Dimerand **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 343 **Comment Id:** 218576

**Comment Text:** My stand on this issue is simply keep the Everglades pristine, the way they were created. Don't put any concrete in them, don't put any pollution in them, don't add anything to them. Let them be what they are, such as they are.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Rafael Tuburan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 368 **Comment Id:** 218577

**Comment Text:** "They won't be happy until the entire glades is paved over." I remember when that new sports arena went up in north county and they didn't use tiered parking but spread the parking lot out flat as though we had all the room in the world. Anyway what I am saying is the "park" should be enlarged so that it is really what is left of the entire "glades." We have enough development down there and on the Naples side already. We are so blessed to have our own panther and their habitat has been so reduced that it does no good to add new western cats to help the gene pool. They don't have enough room.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Tracy Ferguson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 353 **Comment Id:** 218578

**Comment Text:** And this is being done for money. We don't need that electricity. We don't want that electricity. There's already too much crap here as it is. I think that instead, this land belongs to the creatures who live on it, the animals, the insects, the birds the grasses, the plants. It doesn't belong to us

and it certainly doesn't belong to FPL. They might think that it's worth trading for money, but I don't think so and I don't think anybody who lives on that land thinks so, and they are all species.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Stephanie McMillan **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 360 **Comment Id:** 218598

**Comment Text:** I am deeply concerned about the proposal to allow FPL to put power lines in a for profit transmission corridor. New power lines really should avoid national parks. I really do not want to see huge power lines when i revisit the Everglades. If I do, we will not come back as it will be ruined.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kirk Mayes **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 345 **Comment Id:** 218599

**Comment Text:** Recently, the interior secretary said no more, that he's against uranium mining in the Grand Canyon because it will destroy the water supply in the Grand Canyon and the same problem will occur in Florida as well. The Everglades is our water source and we can't be polluting it with the electricity. And I really doubt that FPL needs to build these transmission lines. There are two nuclear bombs they want to build in Turkey Point. If they want electricity, just give us money to build solar panels. That's much more efficient and works much better.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Alejandro Altmirola **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 337 **Comment Id:** 218633

**Comment Text:** Lining our parks with 140-foot power lines are not the welcome mat for the international visitors. Is this the best America has to offer? We can do better, we must do better, Americans deserve better.

**Organization:** National Parks Conservation Association

**Commenter:** Dawn Shirreffs **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 342 **Comment Id:** 218652

**Comment Text:** Enough is enough. This is not the job of the National Park Service to put 15-story-tall power lines in the view of the park and claim that this is America's best idea.

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Jonathan Ullman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 344 **Comment Id:** 218653

**Comment Text:** Hi, my name is Daniel. I'd like to begin by just reminding everybody that the land we are standing on right now used to be part of the Everglades. It used to be part of that ecosystem. Why are

we allowing -- why would the National Park be encouraging or facilitating in any way further encroachment on National Park land? Why? It just doesn't seem to make any sense to me considering that, historically, we've just been building and building and building and extending further into the Everglades. Why are we allowing ISO-foot towers right on the edge, right in the park?

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Daniel Ducassi **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 346 **Comment Id:** 218656

**Comment Text:** I am shocked that the National Park Servicemanaging this park on my behalf and on behalf of my fellow citizens is even considering such an action. This is totally against anything that makes sense for a national park of this kind, which is unique in the world . There is no Everglades anywhere else on the planet and if you are considering further degradation by allowing the power lines either within the park boundaries or along the edge, I'm completely opposed to it. My home is off the grid, I have solar panels. I don't get any electricity from FPL. But nonetheless, I live in South Florida and every time I step out the door, there it is. But for the record, I am opposed to this. Alternative three is the only one to consider and I want to know for the record why in the last 15 years the National Park Service hasn't sought to condemn the land and put an end to this issue.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Madeline Kraskin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 347 **Comment Id:** 218658

**Comment Text:** The coalition that we are building to oppose the prospective power lines along u.s. 1 is an embracing and broad enough coalition that I would like to invite everybody to join us. The fast tracking of transmission lines long before there is any approval for new nuclear power plants and the unlikelihood of that approval ever happening is really so offensive because we are all paying for it. Although somebody from FPL just stood up here and said that no taxpayer dollars are going into this, it's our utility dollars. They are receiving early cost recovery right now. And, in fact, a reporter from Sun Sentinel told me yesterday by the end of this year, they will have already accrued over \$300 million in early cost recovery for the building and hardening of a system when they may not even ever be developing or building or getting approval for new nuclear power pants.

**Organization:** Village of Pinecrest

**Commenter:** Cindy Lerner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 350 **Comment Id:** 218665

**Comment Text:** You are going to go to the Everglades. You save up your money, you put together \$10,000 because that's what it costs to fly from Europe. You rent hotel rooms, you set up an airboat ride, you are going to go to Shark River Slew, you are going to go to Anhinga Trail. You are going to go to Pahokey Overlook and you are all psyched up about it, the kids are psyched up about it. You've read your books about the Everglades. You fly in, get into the hotel. The next day, bright-eyed and bushy-tailed, you eat breakfast and head out to the park. Power lines. Every damn day, you are seeing power lines. So they are not just seeing them, but you can hear them. You are waiting to hear that nature sound you hear the buzz. Maybe they even see some people coming out to repair them. They have a miserable vacation. They go back to Europe and they say to their friends in Europe, it's a zoo. It's not a wilderness, it's not a

park, it's a zoo. Everything in the United States is for sale, money rules there. These people are crazy. They sell an engaged world heritage site. Everything is for sale.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Bradley Stark **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 354 **Comment Id:** 218681

**Comment Text:** The land exchange would take away 260 acres of high-quality wetlands from NPS management protection and the 70 transmission tower pads along with access roads would result in long-term wetlands disturbance exceeding 100 acres. And as others have said, the power lines would adversely affect the aesthetic experience of visitors to the most accessible area of the park, even though that area of the park hasn't been well highlighted for potential visitors. You drive west on Tamiami Trail west of Krome now, there's just a post, a small post that if you approach, you see it says it's the park boundary. No entranceway to lure people that you are entering the Everglades National Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Mara Shlackman **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 356 **Comment Id:** 218684

**Comment Text:** I don't have to remind you, I know that people in the National Park Service love the national parks and you already know that your mission is to save national parks and keep them unimpaired for future generations. And, you know, even a baby, I think, would look at these power lines and say there's no way that they fit the definition of unimpaired. So I really hope that you will keep that in mind, support option three, and hopefully when Steven grows up, he is going to see a park just as beautiful as it is today. Thanks.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Eileen Smith-Cavros **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 362 **Comment Id:** 218685

**Comment Text:** There is no place for massive utility lines in a national park. The National Park Service is responsible for the integrity of our national parks. If you don't do it there is no one else who will? Please do not allow power lines to go through Everglades National Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Ken Spalding **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 365 **Comment Id:** 218686

**Comment Text:** Please keep the Everglades from being used by the power companies. The eco system is fragile enough. The purpose of wilderness parks is to have some unspoiled virgin land to protect wild life. We must keep our boundaries firm to protect certain areas for future generations.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Thmoas Scaglione **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 367 **Comment Id:** 218690

**Comment Text:** In my lifetime so much as been done and then tried to be undone which has hurt this park that I sincerely hope that any action taken will include a longterm view of its impact ! This is a precious and unique place. Everything and everyone in this ecosystem is counting on your good stewardship !!!!! Please act wisely !

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Ann Jacobson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 376 **Comment Id:** 218771

**Comment Text:** The attempt by Florida Power and Light (FPL) to erect major powerlines and extensive support structures in close proximity (or in the park??) of the ENP boundary is absurd. The continuous expansion of development west of Krome avenue towards the Park Boundary impacts the Park's plant- and animal species already, unpermitted hunting adds to problems.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Renate H Skinner **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 372 **Comment Id:** 218780

**Comment Text:** We need to prevent FPL from building power lines anywhere near the Everglades. I also object to future building of nuclear power plants (after Japan).

**Organization:** Dade County Public Schools

**Commenter:** Judith Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 404 **Comment Id:** 218793

**Comment Text:** Please keep power lines out of Everglades National Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Michelle Turco **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 379 **Comment Id:** 218796

**Comment Text:** I am sure that American international visitors don't want to see 140 foot towers and power lines surrounding this World Heritage Site.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Cynthia Fischer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 380 **Comment Id:** 218797

**Comment Text:** Granting Florida Power and Light the right to put power lines in the Everglades is a terrible idea. Please to not allow it.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Elaine Warshell **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 384 **Comment Id:** 218798**Comment Text:** I urge you to ban power lines in Everglades National Park.**Organization:****Commenter:** Alexandra Hopkins **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 387 **Comment Id:** 218802**Comment Text:** Please keep power lines out of Everglades National Park.**Organization:****Commenter:** Steven Lowen **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 385 **Comment Id:** 218803**Comment Text:** Please, keep massive power line developments out of the everglades.**Organization:****Commenter:** Andrew Hamilton **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 397 **Comment Id:** 218804**Comment Text:** Please protect this unique ecosystem and don't spoil it with power lines..**Organization:****Commenter:** Mary Lucas **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 389 **Comment Id:** 218806**Comment Text:** Not power lines!**Organization:****Commenter:** Cliff Lawson **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 391 **Comment Id:** 218811**Comment Text:** Power lines should not be allowed in any national park, including Everglades.**Organization:****Commenter:** Pete Aniello **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 392 **Comment Id:** 218812

**Comment Text:** No; No; and NO!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Nye Ffarrabas **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 393 **Comment Id:** 218813

**Comment Text:** The National Park Service must reject the proposal for a transmission corridor affecting the park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Daniel Hawley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 398 **Comment Id:** 218818

**Comment Text:** Please reject alternatives that allow FP and L power lines within the expansion area of Everglades National Park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Tom Poulson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 399 **Comment Id:** 218819

**Comment Text:** New power lines should avoid national parks.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Linda Yow **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 401 **Comment Id:** 218821

**Comment Text:** Transmission lines have no right to blight it for the rest of us.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Bruce Berger **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 403 **Comment Id:** 218822

**Comment Text:** No Power Lines in Everglades National Park --- it is a World Heritage Site!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Dale Ramsey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 396 **Comment Id:** 218824

**Comment Text:** Please work to ensure that future generations can experience America's scenic wonders unspoiled and let your legacy be seen as a leader in this regard.

**Organization:**



**Commenter:** Deidre Moderacki **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**AL2100 Oppose Turkey Point Expansion (Non-Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 372 **Comment Id:** 218780

**Comment Text:** We need to prevent FPL from building power lines anywhere near the Everglades. I also object to future building of nuclear power plants (after Japan).

**Organization:** Dade County Public Schools

**Commenter:** Judith Foster **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 32 **Comment Id:** 203391

**Comment Text:** Put the money into solar, wind and wave technology and installations.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** sue lang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 32 **Comment Id:** 203393

**Comment Text:** See above. Look at Japan. Florida is crazy to add another nuclear power plant in this area! Not to mention its impact on the everglades. Funds should be invested in solar, wind and wave technology and installations. If the US government and major power companies spent half the money it has spent on nuclear power, on solar, wind and wave technology, we would not need nuclear power...

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** sue lang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 34 **Comment Id:** 203494

**Comment Text:** DON'T DO IT! WE DON'T NEED EITHER THE LOSS OF WETLANDS OR THE THREAT OF NUCLEAR MELTDOWN. FLORIDA HAS ENOUGH PROBLEMS ALREADY!

**Organization:** Sierra Club

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 40 **Comment Id:** 203854

**Comment Text:** Better to have generators witch can generate electricity

**Organization:** International Society for the Preservation of the Tropical Rainforest

**Commenter:** Roxanne O Kremer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 42 **Comment Id:** 203949

**Comment Text:** Expanding the FPL nuclear power facility at Turkey Point is a grave mistake.

**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 43 **Comment Id:** 203959**Comment Text:** We need to go with clean energy, solar, wind, instead of nuclear.**Organization:****Commenter:** Mario Papalia **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 43 **Comment Id:** 203961**Comment Text:** Solar power & wind mills. We don't need an accident like Japan is going through.**Organization:****Commenter:** Mario Papalia **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 58 **Comment Id:** 207733**Comment Text:** I have great concern about additional nuclear reactors in our area that are going to damage the local environment with lines to distant consumers. No thank you.**Organization:** Sierra Club**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 58 **Comment Id:** 207735**Comment Text:** Solar, wind, conservation, putting a lid on mindless wasteful expansion would be a few ideas.**Organization:** Sierra Club**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 61 **Comment Id:** 208716**Comment Text:** The project is linked to another nuclear power plant which will not likely ever be built it is a scam to recover upfront costs**Organization:** miami-dade NAACP**Commenter:** Bradford E Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 63 **Comment Id:** 209248**Comment Text:** The installation of nuclear and coal power is degrading to public health.**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 63 **Comment Id:** 209249

**Comment Text:** Clean renewable energy systems provide less CO2, less adverse health impacts and create more jobs for citizens, as well as save money on fuel and cleanup costs.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 77 **Comment Id:** 210249

**Comment Text:** Yes. In all seriousness, another alternative that should be added to the list is for FPL to sell or donate the land to the NPS and be required by law to invest the millions of dollars they have already collected from their customers for their obsolete and wasteful power tower project and invest that money in purchasing solar panels for every one of their South Florida customers to get off the grid. This could be done and would totally eliminate the need for their invasive, environment damaging and obsolete power towers. It would also eliminate the need for more nuclear reactors. With climate change and sea level rise expected to occur in South Florida, I am shocked at FPL's desire to increase the amount of reactors they have at Turkey Point - especially after the growing nuclear disaster in Japan. That disaster is negatively affecting the whole world. I guess FPL wants to contribute to what is now unfolding in Japan.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 107 **Comment Id:** 211242

**Comment Text:** Limiting growth needs to be considered. With real estate at an all time low and demand not helping in the recovery of home values it would be nice to see a moratorium on building. There are legions of empty homes and storefronts and until they are near full occupancy there is no need for newer subdivisions and commercial real estate. This will keep electrical demands low and would likely create demand as the economy recovers for home and commercial properties that are currently empty. This has never been tried in small or large scale efforts. Shrinking surplus creates demand where expanding building will only keep those prices below healthy levels forcing people to sell homes at a loss in last ditch efforts to get out of deteriorating neighborhoods. This has been a problem with Florida's all consuming boom bust cycles and we need to put an end to it.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Richard A Tucker **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 32 **Comment Id:** 212040

**Comment Text:** Florida should also rethink any additional nuclear plants or expansions of nuclear facilities, especially anywhere near an area prone to flooding, hurricanes, etc. We need to reduce our dependence on nuclear as well as fossil fuels. Put the money into solar, wind and wave technology and installations.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** sue lang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 114 **Comment Id:** 212125

**Comment Text:** The project need is based on obsolete population projections for South Florida's population which is not growing anywhere near the rate predicted. Additionally, until FPL receives approval for the Turkey Point expansion, jeopardizing the only Everglades in the world to potentially transmit new power from the anticipated expansion would be ludicrous. Florida should be a leader in solar power and at least be exploring renewable energy sources.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 200 **Comment Id:** 216303

**Comment Text:** We should look toward true renewables, not nuclear.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 214 **Comment Id:** 216344

**Comment Text:** I think the government should acquire the land as per the 1989 Act which requires that it be used for the restoration of Everglades National Park. No powerlines or access road should be built. It is what Congress intended when the land was acquired.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 246 **Comment Id:** 216845

**Comment Text:** Yes, The power expansion is not really needed if the demand projection schemes are carefully exposed as false economies. This landuse overbuild speculation has crashed the economy and ruined many lives, except for those millionaires and billionaires who hardly winch at their percentage losses, but continue to overbuild Florida.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 277 **Comment Id:** 218419

**Comment Text:** I am also against any and all nuclear energy, given the tremendous risk associated with contaminated waste and the risk of accidents due to human error and natural or unnatural disasters, as shown in these images: <http://tinyurl.com/43mzk4z> Do not do this to the United States. We will still see the fallout of Fukushima in coming years. People will rise up against nuclear energy as dangerous and destructive, not clean energy. Better to not build in the first place, than the build and have to abandon when public opinion turns, as the deformities and disease turn up in Japan's disaster as they turned up after Chernobyl.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 330 **Comment Id:** 218500

**Comment Text:** FPL is a wealthy power monopoly that advertises its commitment to invest in green energy. As a shareholder for the last decade I am not convinced of their green commitment. Seven years ago FPL touted its "largest wind towers" in the world. But in Florida FPL has chosen to expand Turkey Point nuclear plant and build two more reactors at sea level. This non-green future for South Florida hardly seems like "greening" to compromise ENP's current border. If FPL is denied a nuclear permit for expansion at Turkey Point a recent purchase of land by FPL in Hendry County will insure more non-green, non-renewable power from FPL. FPL chose a swath of panther habitat, five miles from Big Cypress "Addition Lands" border, to build the largest natural gas plant nationwide. Burning gas can't compete with green energies in reducing FPL's carbon footprint.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Roderick Tirrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 330 **Comment Id:** 218501

**Comment Text:** Why is FPL seeking a special deal from NPS, a deal denied thousands of homeowners who were not in the nuclear expansion business? Must the Everglades be sacrificed yet again so a private monopoly can make even more money? My wife Debra, daughter Megan, and son Zachary (who you were so kind to) hope you will find the fortitude to confront the imperious growth of a not so green monopoly. FPL chooses to profit from nuclear expansion rather than invest in renewable green technologies that could challenge control of the grid and pave the way for America's future and green jobs for our children.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Roderick Tirrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 355 **Comment Id:** 218579

**Comment Text:** FPL can develop alternatives to achieve approval for their new nuclear reactors that can help the National Park Service achieve their goal of restoring the natural environment and increasing public interest in the aesthetic values of Everglades National Park. I do not know any other alternatives in the NRC, EIS or FPL's new reactors. I am reasonably confident that FPL might get approval without constructing any towers on any piece of park land by working with the State of Florida to acquire land for the tower powerlines on the east side of Krome Avenue. This alternative will still likely be of interest to the Everglades National Park, but in my opinion, the chances of restoring northeast Shark Slew will be greater.

**Organization:** Everglades National Park

**Commenter:** Savannah Howington **Page:** **Paragraph:**  
**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 344 **Comment Id:** 218654

**Comment Text:** So if a deal were to be made, surely the park should be compensated handsomely with millions. I mean, FPL, how much power can be created by two new nuclear reactors? How much money



**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 320 **Comment Id:** 218010

**Comment Text:** Yes consider solar on the homes and businesses of So. FL

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 320 **Comment Id:** 218009

**Comment Text:** The purpose of National Parks is to "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 279 **Comment Id:** 217771

**Comment Text:** LOCATION OF THE "WEST" COORIDOR SEEMS TO BE RELATED TO THE PROPOSER'S PROPOSALS RATHER THAN A TRUE ANALYSIS OF NEEDS AND OBJECTIVES. NPS NEEDS TO BACK UP AND LOOK AT THE BASICS, FIRST OF "LOCATION". RE-READ THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 279 **Comment Id:** 217770

**Comment Text:** QUESTION 1 "NEEDS & OBJECTIVES", THEN TRANSLATES INTO NEED FOR ANALYSIS OF A BETTER ALTERNATIVE LOCATION!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 231 **Comment Id:** 216430

**Comment Text:** use solar or wind or wind power.

**Organization:** environmental services

**Commenter:** stephen anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 229 **Comment Id:** 216418

**Comment Text:** In our effort to support the project in full, we went ahead and signed up for those temporary flowage easements so the Tamiami Bridge project could go ahead and start. That was a good faith effort on our part to a temporary solution. We believe that the proposed land exchange is the long-

term solution.

**Organization:** Florida Power and Light

**Commenter:** Steve Scroggs **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 210 **Comment Id:** 216335

**Comment Text:** Don't let FPL push you around. They do not represent the citizens. If they were at all serious about alternative energy, then the new power lines would not be necessary. Distributed rooftop solar installations would provide peak power and take pressure off the grid.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 206 **Comment Id:** 216321

**Comment Text:** Habitat fragmentation, loss of diversity, destruction of precious ecosystems and quality of life for all.

**Organization:** Wildlands Network

**Commenter:** Lise Meinke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 206 **Comment Id:** 216319

**Comment Text:** Programs to teach people how to be more energy efficient. Incentives to become so and alternative eco-friendly forms of energy.

**Organization:** Wildlands Network

**Commenter:** Lise Meinke **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 200 **Comment Id:** 216302

**Comment Text:** And what would we exchange for the integrity of these waters which are crucial to the planet, not just to Florida? Do they have a 2nd earth to trade us?

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 200 **Comment Id:** 216300

**Comment Text:** We need to look at renewables and at distributed generation for these S. FL areas.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 194 **Comment Id:** 216293

**Comment Text:** These exchanges harm other lands. However, in the case of South Florida, if a corridor





**Correspondence Id:** 30 **Comment Id:** 203227

**Comment Text:** Solar energy.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 27 **Comment Id:** 203178

**Comment Text:** I recognize the need of providing reliable energy solutions, but I question the need of two corridors, especially the West corridor which, according to FPL, "was filed by the Miami-Dade Limestone Products Association, representing the interests of the limestone mining and processing companies in the northwest portion of Miami-Dade County in an area commonly referred to as the Lake Belt Area." Evidently this sounds more like a business venture than a community effort.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Patricia Tricorache **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 9 **Comment Id:** 202689

**Comment Text:** It is important The Everglades be preserved in as much of their natural state as possible. We have unique and sensitive ecosystem in the Glades that is home to several endangered or rare species of animals. Their natural habitat must be protected in order for them to recover and flourish for the future.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**XX1000 Duplicate Comment (Non-Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 382 **Comment Id:** 218801

**Comment Text:** Any development along the eastern edge of Everglades National Park is 100% incompatible with the on going Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan authorized by Congress in 2000.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Al Laurent **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 366 **Comment Id:** 218412

**Comment Text:** I am writing to you about the towers that may be built inside Everglades National Park. I'm worried about the effect of these towers on the wildlife that live there. I remember how beautiful and wild the everglades were, with no human development for miles around! My Dad showed me some before and after pictures of everglades that had the towers constructed in them. It looked as though the magnificent park had been fenced in. I cannot believe that anyone would want to destroy such a beautiful view and make it look so unnatural! I'm also concerned that the wires from these towers will kill the songbirds that fly so quickly throughout the everglades. At night the little birds won't be able to see the wires as they fly and if they get too close? It makes me shiver just to even think about all of those

innocent and unsuspecting birds. I enjoyed our visit to you and Everglades National Park last year and hopefully the next time I come it will be as beautiful as I remember it was. Thank you!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Megan Tirrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 369 **Comment Id:** 218411

**Comment Text:** Dear Dan, Below are my comments to NPS regarding the FPL land swap. Sorry I haven't called; therapy is difficult right now. This deal should never have come on your watch. I recall debating this issue with Dick Ring more than a decade ago when he could have forced the issue with FPL. My comments are strong and direct and aimed upstairs at those will make the decision. This issue has had me consumed and we appreciate your concerns.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Roderick Tirrell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 288 **Comment Id:** 218380

**Comment Text:** Please do not grant any corridor, even on the eastern edge of the NP. If transmission lines could be added to an existing eastern corridor with lines already on it of acceptable height, say like the ones along Krome Ave., well then, you may get less outcry. But to despoil our beloved national park, a world heritage site that brings in revenue from tourists the world over... Lets face it - this is about profit, not the good of the people. "The People" are asking that this not go forward.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** John Van Hise **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 194 **Comment Id:** 218356

**Comment Text:** I do not believe that FPL should be allowed to run powerlines through the Everglades National Park or the Big Cypress National Preserve. This should also be the case for any of the National Parks. It might be that along a human use roadway buried cables can be used for a minimum impact to the wildlife and recreational enjoyment

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 331 **Comment Id:** 218041

**Comment Text:** I support Alternative 3

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Ira Brinn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 11 **Comment Id:** 211058

**Comment Text:** No swapping. Fpl has other priorities that should be worked on prior to damaging our

ecosystem. Lets reinforce the existing infrastructure on the East side so we can be prepared properly for hurricane season. Six yrs ago, i was out of power for 23 days. Absolutely ridiculous considering i wive less than 2 miles from downtown and beach area

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 51 **Comment Id:** 205436

**Comment Text:** FPL property would be acquired by direct purchase or, as a last resort, by condemnation by the NPS. There would not be any construction of transmission lines and associated fill pads or access roads in the Expansion Area I support option #3 posited by Park Service

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** francis janeczek **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 51 **Comment Id:** 205435

**Comment Text:** FPL property would be acquired by direct purchase or, as a last resort, by condemnation by the NPS. There would not be any construction of transmission lines and associated fill pads or access roads in the Expansion Area I support option #3 posited by Park Service

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** francis janeczek **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 51 **Comment Id:** 205434

**Comment Text:** FPL property would be acquired by direct purchase or, as a last resort, by condemnation by the NPS. There would not be any construction of transmission lines and associated fill pads or access roads in the Expansion Area I support option #3 posited by Park Service

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** francis janeczek **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 51 **Comment Id:** 205433

**Comment Text:** FPL property would be acquired by direct purchase or, as a last resort, by condemnation by the NPS. There would not be any construction of transmission lines and associated fill pads or access roads in the Expansion Area I support option #3 posited by Park Service

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** francis janeczek **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 32 **Comment Id:** 203392

**Comment Text:** I suggest telling NPS to write the most rigorous, comprehensive and objective analysis possible ? covering the full range of impacts these powerlines could have on soils, wetlands, exotic plant species, listed wildlife, bird populations, and the public's ability to enjoy these lands with the addition of

3 massive powerlines running across them (visible for miles) - and to choose the alternative at the end of the process which best protects the natural and cultural resources of Everglades National Park. I am confident that that process will result in the selection of Alternative 3 ? no land swap and acquisition of FPL's corridor by direct purchase or eminent domain.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** sue lang **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 29 **Comment Id:** 203217

**Comment Text:** Adhere to the Organic Act and the Enabling Legislation of the park.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 29 **Comment Id:** 203216

**Comment Text:** Please look to other environmental reviews that the National Park Service is currently conducting regarding transmission lines; i.e. Susquehanna to Roseland Transmission Line EIS for Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, Middle Delaware National Scenic and Recreational River, and Appalachian National Scenic Trail.

<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/projectHome.cfm?projectID=25147>

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**Correspondence Id:** 14 **Comment Id:** 202750

**Comment Text:** Preserve species at ALL costs. They are undergoing their greatest extinction EVER of the six great extinctions and all efforts must be made to preserve them. Increasing cost to humankind is of no significance in comparison to the loss of ANY priceless species.

**Organization:** Parkland Enews & Commentary

**Commenter:** Stuart H Krantz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**Correspondence Id:** 14 **Comment Id:** 202747

**Comment Text:** Electricity if for people to use yet people don't want to see the infrastructure. They want to push it on Everglades National Park and the habitat we're trying to save to preserve species. Please keep the power lines OUT of the Park and let them take the shortest route which I'm sure will save money. People want more electricity and they must accept the infrastructure.

**Organization:** Parkland Enews & Commentary

**Commenter:** Stuart H Krantz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No