

Appendix 8.5-B3

DEIS Comments, Form Letters

AAF Form Letter Inventory

First Line	Topic	Form Letter #
Table S-2 of the EIS Draft claims “no adverse effects on Communities and Demographics”	Communities	2
I have many concerns about the veracity of All Aboard Florida’s recently submitted DEIS, especially in reference to cultural resources	Cultural Resources	3
The All Aboard Florida EIS analysis of the negative effects on various minority and low-income communities.. is neither complete nor accurate	Environmental Justice	4
Your EIS analysis of the negative effects on various minority and low-income communities on the treasure coast is neither complete nor accurate	Environmental Justice	5
All Aboard Florida does not qualify for a taxpayer loan – RIFF loans are for a different purpose	Funding	6
Having looked over the 522-page report by consultants	Funding	7
I can’t think of any project in the history of the United States... All Aboard Florida is all about freight and real estate	Funding	8
I protest the Draft EIS for All Aboard Florida and request denial of the RRIF loan	Funding	9
Let’s do a comparison between the known facts of these two start-up organizations	Funding	10
RIDERSHIP AND REVENUE REPORTS ON EIS	Funding	11
The Draft EIS does not justify allowing All Aboard Florida to proceed with their planned passenger service	funding	12
AAF’s primary goal of providing sustainable intercity rail service as a private commercial enterprise	General	13
Lots of Information Missing from the EIS Draft	General	14
I have many concerns about the scope, methodology and supporting details	General Opposition	15
AAF’s proposed project is bad in execution and location	General Opposition	16
All Aboard is about freight, not people	General Opposition	17
Any support of this train lacks SOUND reasoning	General Opposition	18
As a concerned resident of Palm Beach Gardens	General Opposition	19
As a longtime resident in this area I object to All Aboard! I am totally opposed	General Opposition	20
As a unit owner and resident of Vista Royale	General Opposition	21
As per the study conducted by the Jupiter Town Council	General Opposition	22
I am a resident of Stuart, Florida and the Harborage Yacht Club	General Opposition	23
I am writing to ask that the Administration withhold funding for the West Palm Beach-Orlando leg	General Opposition	24
I am writing you to comment on the draft environmental impact statement on All Aboard Florida. I oppose your findings.	General Opposition	25

I have reviewed portions of the Environmental Impact Statement .. and offer some of my thoughts/fears/opinions	General Opposition	26
I vehemently oppose the development... for the following reasons	General Opposition	27
I wish to express my concerns about the effects of All Aboard Florida Passenger Trains and FEC freight trains	General Opposition	28
Many people would agree a coastal passenger rail line is suboptimal	General Opposition	29
On behalf of hundreds of citizens of Vero Beach	General Opposition	30
On behalf of hundreds of citizens of Vero Beach	General Opposition	31
Please consider, review and address these concerns in the final EIS document	General Opposition	32
The Environmental Impact Statement for All Aboard Florida Does Not Adequately Address Environmental issues – the permit should be denied	General Opposition	33
The most shocking exposition in the EIS is the flippant projection	General Opposition	34
The residents and business people in our communities DO NOT WANT	General Opposition	35
We are strongly opposed to the proposed “All Aboard Florida” passenger train service from Miami to Orlando	General Opposition	36
Who is watching out for the communitys’ interest!	General Opposition	37
All Aboard Florida will shut down the Okeechobee Waterway	Navigation	38
The East Coast of Florida has topography unique to the United States	Navigation	39
Your agency should object to All Aboard Florida because of the navigation, water quality and economy negative impacts	Navigation	40
EIS meetings are merely “show and tell for All Aboard Florida”	Public Involvement	41
Please conduct a public hearing	Public Involvement	42
Please extend the deadline for comments to this report	Public Involvement	43
The “ridership” promises for All Aboard Florida in the EIS look overly optimistic	Ridership	44
CSX Transportation is one of only five Class One railroads in the United States	Safety	45
Emergency vehicle access needs to be addressed much more fully in the EIS	Safety	46
Grade Separation: the DEIS indicates that the East-West Corridor would be entirely grade separated at roadways.	Safety	47
Page S-23, Table S-2 of the EIS Draft regarding All Aboard Florida states that there will be “no effect on public health and safety”	Safety	48
The “Public Health and Safety” section of the EIS does not adequately address some important negative aspects	Safety	49
Support Card for All Aboard Florida	Support	1
Table S-2 claims “beneficial effects by increased freight traffic efficiencies”	Transportation, ridership	50



Support Card for All Aboard Florida

Date: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

All Aboard Florida is the intercity passenger rail service that will connect Miami to Orlando with intermediate stops in Fort Lauderdale and West Palm Beach. The project will create 10,000+ jobs; generate \$653 million in federal, state, and local tax revenue; reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and eliminate up to 3 million vehicles from Florida's congested roadways.

Which of the following, resulting from the All Aboard Florida project, would be most beneficial for Floridians? (check all that apply)

- Minimal environmental impact with significant benefit to Florida
- Reduction of up to 3 Million cars from Florida's roadways
- Millions of dollars generated in tax revenues for Florida
- Connecting Central and South Florida
- Air quality improvement by reducing greenhouse gas emissions
- Creation of thousands of jobs

List Additional comments for consideration: _____

Submit this comment card to the appropriate personnel or mail to:

Mr. John Winkle
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

Table S-2 of the EIS Draft claims "*no adverse effects on Communities and Demographics.*" Those of us who live here disagree. Here in South Florida, we have to wonder if government officials hundreds of miles away in Washington realize how much we look to them to protect us from abuses. By living with the rumble of freight cars, waiting at crossings and bridges, and witnessing the situations where too many freight cars can ruin a beautiful downtown, we are constantly weighing the impact of All Aboard Florida.

Few people lived along Florida's largely pristine east coast when pioneer Henry Flagler bankrolled the first hotels and passenger rail service to serve them. Today, more than 7 million residents live in the coastal counties where a revival of passenger service is proposed along 195 miles of existing railroad right of way by hedge fund All Aboard Florida, a venture of Fortress Investment Group-owned Florida East Coast Industries.

Pretend you are a 21st century Henry Flagler looking at Florida from space, planning to colonize this beautiful peninsula with its 1,200 miles of coastline. Would you use up valuable real estate within a few miles of some of the best beaches and most attractive communities anywhere to move freight? Using expensive noisy outdated technology?

Flagler was a visionary. If he were alive, he would not expand a 19th century railroad with crumbling infrastructure and rusting bridges. That would be investing in buggy-whips.

Now home to businesses and millions of year-round residents, the coastal route of the proposed passenger rail service using a right of way that has served Florida East Coast freight trains since the 19th century, is also packed with growing opposition.

30,000 Petitions Against The Train Have Been Signed With More Each Day

This project is not just deleterious to Florida, but to all taxpayers. If the project is publicly funded, the RRIF loan could require a public bailout if All Aboard defaults.

Without highly populated cities such as Tokyo and Osaka, historically HSR projects have failed to meet profitable expectation. The unique topography of Florida coastal will be negatively impacted by trains traveling through. While AAF boasts fantastical and unsubstantiated claims of increase in tourism and business, it also will delay emergency vehicles, create traffic jams, raise noise pollution, and block waterways along hundreds of miles of tracks.

Further concerns are aging railroad bridges, noise pollution, increased deterioration of buildings due to train vibration, safety concerns of high speed trains being retrofitted to aging rail beds and grade level crossings, and decreased property values of homes in close proximity to train routes.

Taxpayers will experience increased costs to upgrade railroad crossings maintained by local governments. The maintenance costs - that's taxpayer money. Martin County alone maintains 18 train crossings at an average cost of about \$60,000 each. All to the benefit of an alleged "private venture" of a junk bond hedge fund.

It's not that we hate trains, just unprofitable and unsafe trains retrofitted to old tracks funded by taxpayer dollars that irrevocably harm communities.

Sincerely,

Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311,
Washington, DC 20590

November 10, 2014

Dear Mr. John Winkle of the Federal Railroad Administration, and concerned parties--

I have many concerns about the veracity of All Aboard Florida's (AAF) recently submitted Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), especially in reference to the cultural resources and historical resources along the 128-mile North -South corridor from Cocoa south to West Palm Beach. Please review the following points and kindly address as revisions to the final EIS document:

To begin with the DEIS does not "include an analysis of *various* alternative solutions and a *complete* analysis of potential environmental impacts, including any impacts to historical resources," as required by the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing (RRIF) Program Guide for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) http://www.tcrpc.org/special_projects/AAF/AAF4914.html

Many historic districts and properties along this corridor are within the project's Area of Potential Effect and are already listed on the National Register of Historical Places, eligible for NRHP, and listed by the State Historic Preservation Office in the State Master File. These cultural and historical resources will be adversely impacted by the project. Specifically, please address the following for the Town of St. Lucie Village:

RE: Section 5.4.5, Cultural Resources,

Other than the Listing of Fort Capron as an archaeological site in **Table 4.4.5-14**, there is no mention in the DEIS of the incorporated (1961) Town of St. Lucie Village (the Village), nor is there mention of other significant historic resources, Pre-Columbian and pre-historic Ais Indian middens and burial mounds within the Village boundaries. Additionally, the St. Lucie Village Historic District was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1989 and is comprised of 34 contributing structures. Many of the residential lots on which these historic homes and structures stand abut the FECR right-of-way. Many of these homes have been occupied by 6 and 7 generations of the same family.

The Town of St. Lucie Village's 51 historic resources previously documented by Janus Research in 2003 for St. Lucie County, Fort Capron, the historic Paine cemetery, and the Village's National Register Historic District structures will be degraded by the AAF project as a result of the detrimental impacts described in the DEIS. **Historic Resources (Section 5.4.5)** states "*The Project would have no direct or indirect effects (noise, vibration or change in setting) to the historic resources located adjacent to the N-S Corridor.*" However, in a May 30, 2014, personal e-mail with Ginny Jones of the State Historic preservation Office, Ms. Jones states "**Fort Capron does fall within the APE and is NRHP eligible and the impacts of the proposed project on the site have not yet been assessed**"

Furthermore, under **Noise and Vibration... 5.2.2 page 5-39 the DEIS states** "The Project would result in long-term noise and vibration adverse impacts to residents and properties, primarily along the N-S Corridor." Also, on **page 5-51 under North-South Corridor, the DEIS states** "Ground-borne vibration levels already exceed the FRA criteria along the N-S Corridor due to the frequency and nature of current freight operations. FRA guidance for assessing project impacts along such "heavily used rail corridors" (more than 12 trains per day) states that additional impact would occur if the project approximately doubled the number of trains (FRA 2012a)." The number of trains proposed for the project will most definitely more than double as will vibrations.

Map 52 and 53 of appendix 4.4.5 B3 cultural resources do not accurately depict the Third Seminole War U.S. Army Fort Capron's (1850-1859) total site area and historic trails, which were bisected in 1894 by the placement of FECR railroad tracks.

According to Methodology 4-37 Affected Environment---" *The Project Study Area for noise extends approximately 2,500 feet from the rail corridor and the Project Study Area for vibration extends approximately 600 feet. These study areas include all land uses that are sensitive to noise or vibration ("sensitive receptors").* This Noise and Vibration will most definitely adversely impact St. Lucie Village's historic resources. The vibrations may cause foundation and structural damage as well as window and flooring damage to St. Lucie Village's historic structures and historic district. Furthermore, the impact on this noise-sensitive, vibration sensitive historic district, historic forts and archeological sites was not addressed and needs to be addressed in the DEIS.

5.4.5.1 (page 421) Methodology states " *The methodology for the balance of the N-S Corridor was consistent with that used in the 2012 EA.*" Yet the cultural resources and historic resources of St. Lucie Village vary greatly from those of south Florida and should not be compared as such.

Page 10 of 3.3B4 AlternativeA N-S Corridor Track Chart shows 30% plans for triple tracks with a center siding which would extend about $\frac{3}{4}$ of the length of St. Lucie Village. Because our only ingress and egress to most of our homes and the NRHP historic district is over the FEC tracks, this additional track/siding will place a great safety burden on the Village in case of medical or fire emergencies. I ask that you consider another alternative for the triple track which doesn't extend over the Village's seven at-grade crossings.

In conclusion, the impact of center siding, noise, vibration and change of setting created by the project and its proposed sealed corridors must be properly assessed, addressed and mitigated in order to protect and preserve our cultural and historical resources.

Signed _____ printed name _____

Address _____

e-mail or telephone _____

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

The All Aboard Florida EIS analysis of the negative effects on various minority and low-income communities on the Treasure Coast is neither complete nor accurate. The All Aboard Florida Project disproportionately impacts the safety of Martin County's low income and minority populations, for example at grade crossings in East Stuart, Golden Gate and Port Salerno. All three of these communities are in Community Redevelopment Areas and have significant minority, low income and include limited English proficiency populations.

The draft states on pages S-17 and S-17 that "Neither the E-W Corridor nor the N-S Corridor would result in residential displacement, job loss, or neighborhood fragmentation." In the Hobe Sound and Stuart area there are several businesses adjacent to the tracks that will suffer lost business and may even have to close entirely as a result of the dramatically increased rail traffic and its effects on the environment.

Further, the draft says there will be no "residential displacement" because of eminent domain. However, unlike some communities, residents of low income and minority neighborhood homes may not leave because they can't afford to move. In effect, they are not displaced, they are held hostage in an undesirable location and cannot escape the negative impacts of the All Aboard train service even if they want to.

The EIS also states on page S-17 that "mitigation would limit any changes in vibration along the N-S Corridor." This presumably refers to the "wheel and rail maintenance" that will diminish the expected doubling of vibration along the N-S Corridor. For minority and low-income people living close to the tracks your promise to alleviate this problem is not enough to justify All Aboard going forward.

FEC Crossings

Twenty-eight grade crossings within Martin County alone. Less than half (ten) of the crossings have pedestrian facilities. A sealed corridor (necessary due to the 110 mph train speed) would direct pedestrians to grade crossings that are unsafe for walking. Many CRA residents do not own cars, forcing them to walk or bike as their primary mode of transportation.

Title I Schools

Title I was established by the Federal Government to provide funding to local school districts to improve the academic achievement of disadvantaged students. "Disadvantaged" students are defined by this legislation as students who come from low-income families. Located within the vicinity of the AAF project, there are four Title I Schools. The two largest percentages of free and reduced lunch recipients are from JDP (75.56%) and PSE (62.27%).

The Florida All Aboard project should be denied.

Sincerely,

Environmental Justice

Mr. John Winkle
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue
SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Mr. Winkle,

Your EIS analysis of the negative effects on various minority and low income communities on the Treasure Coast is neither complete nor accurate.

You state on pages S-17 and S-17 that "Neither the E-W Corridor nor the N-S Corridor would result in residential displacement, job loss, or neighborhood fragmentation.." In the Hobe Sound and Stuart area there are several businesses adjacent to your tracks that will suffer lost business and may even have to close entirely as a result of the dramatically increased rail traffic and its effects on the environment.

Further, you may be correct in saying there will be no "residential displacement" because of eminent domain. However, unlike some communities, residents of low income and minority neighborhood homes may not leave because they can't afford to move. In effect, they are not displaced, they are held hostage in an undesirable location and cannot escape the negative impacts of your train service even if they want to.

Your EIS also states on page S-17 that "mitigation would limit any changes in vibration along the N-S Corridor." This presumably refers to the "wheel and rail maintenance" that will diminish the expected doubling of vibration along the N-S Corridor. For minority and low income people living close to the tracks your promise to alleviate this problem is not enough to justify your going forward.

Minority and low income residents near your proposed rail line will be disproportionately impacted by your trains. The project should be dropped.

Sincerely,

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM: [REDACTED]

All Aboard Florida does not qualify for a taxpayer loan - RIFF loans are for a different purpose by law. AAF claims it is privately funded with a secret business plan yet over 50% of the cost will be provided by public money. There is no transparency in examining the AAF ridership study. It is hidden behind a false claim of trade secrets and is off limits to taxpayer inquiry, understanding or review. Citizens deserve to know the truth. What is the need for secrecy? AAF is not competing against anyone.

By law, the FRA must determine if this loan can be repaid by passenger ridership ticket sales. This is the only type of revenue that can be considered in your financial evaluation. Revenue from real estate leases or other types of income cannot be considered. Yet rail ridership history and current facts show that it will not be a viable railroad. All Aboard Florida has yet to prove its unencumbered assets will provide collateral. **The true beneficiary of the loan would be an unwanted freight line, with trains up to two miles long - this is NOT a public benefit.**

Nor are we in favor of the alternative, corporate welfare in the form of Private Activity bonds for a Junk Bond investment company. The BONDS ARE A FORM OF TAXPAYER SUBSIDY and are intended for projects that have public benefit, and AAF negatively impacts ALL of the route from West Palm Beach to Orlando. All Aboard Florida has filed an additional application with the Florida Development Finance Corporation (FDPC) for an allocation to sell tax-exempt bonds to finance their rail project. In this bond application to the FDPC, All Aboard is asking that its interest payments be exempt from Federal taxes. Income from these bonds would be tax free to the bondholder. Normally, these types of bonds are issued from a clear, transparent and **definable public benefit- freight and real estate investments do not qualify as a public benefit.** Recently, select companies are enjoying tax breaks normally reserved for public work that now come at the expense of taxpayers. PAB bonds amount to a concession in the form of a government subsidy by reducing tax revenues. When these programs are taken as a whole nationwide, lost revenues to our government run into the billions. If All Aboard Florida were to issue taxable bonds instead, then the Federal government would receive tax revenues on these bonds. The PAB is a concession to project promoters and a disservice to Florida citizens.

The AAF ridership demand is based on a concept of foreign visitors flying to Miami or Orlando with a strong desire to visit the other city. **This concept is a fantasy.** In addition, All Aboard Florida will operate in the same market as Tri-Rail and Amtrak, both of which lose tens of millions of dollars a year. A third system is redundant. Please deny both the RIFF and the PAB's!

Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

November 5, 2014

John Winkle
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, S.E. Room W38-31
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Sirs:

Having looked over the 522-page report by consultants commissioned by the Florida East Coast Railroad, I am compelled to weigh in on All Aboard Florida's (AAF) plan, which provides more questions than answers.

The first of dozens of reasons against the AAF proposal is the Federal Government should not finance a private venture that will not succeed and leave tax payers paying the bill. No one will ride this train between Orlando and Miami when you can rent a car and get there cheaper and faster. We already have the cheap train Amtrak offers from Orlando to Miami for \$43 and it takes five hours with a nice view of central Florida – probably in a rail car all to yourself.

If it costs \$100 per person, what family of four is going to spend \$400 to take the train from Maim to Orlando when they can rent a car, get there quicker at a fraction of the cost?

It makes perfect sense for you to finance a real bullet train – like the ones they use in China – in the Turnpike right of way as originally proposed. The Treasure Coast Chapter of the American Institute of Architects unanimously agreed that no high speed rail should run through the downtowns of all the cities from Sebastian to Tequesta. The western route is the only possibility to spare the destruction of the communities affected by the current proposal. A real bullet train makes sense, and it would be much faster than 110 mph. People will ride it. It might not initially pay for itself, but it would be infrastructure in place for years to come. That was the original plan for the bullet train when voters approved it by constitutional amendment.

Sad to say, but AAF is little more than an attempt to scam the Federal Railroad Administration into subsidizing expansion of FEC Railway lines to accommodate cargo coming through the Panama Canal for the newer, deeper South Florida ports. Let them find private investors to pay for their additional tracks and improvements. If the numbers are there, investors will come. Please don't allow AAF to sucker the Federal Government into financing a project that has no chance of success. We have yet to see a feasible ridership study to justify this \$1.6 billion in tax payer money.

Before the Federal Railroad Administration approves any financing of All Aboard Florida as currently proposed, you must consider the devastating impacts to property values 4,711 waterfront property owners west of the Stuart FEC Crossing at the St. Lucie River. They live along the North and South Forks of the St. Lucie River and their property values are a direct function of their ocean access. If the railroad bridge is only open for boats less than 20 minutes per hour – based on current freight trains and the 32 proposed passenger trains during daylight

hours – then the traffic jam of boaters trying to go boating will be a serious danger to navigation to and from the St. Lucie Canal, which connects to Fort Myers and the Gulf of Mexico. There are also thousands of St. Lucie County boaters who won't be able to go to the Gulf or enjoy the South and North Forks of the St. Lucie River. There are plenty of tales of 40-minute waits in heavy currents for the Stuart railroad bridge to go back up and again allow boater traffic to go east or west.

The same is true for thousands of waterfront property owners west of the much lower railroad bridge in Tequesta. For unknown reasons, this ill-advised proposal does not include an additional rail crossing at the St. Lucie, Loxahatchee or Miami Rivers. These are obvious choke points for rail and boating traffic. The choke point in Stuart is just minutes away from the St. Lucie Inlet where boaters can reach the Atlantic Ocean after crossing the state from the Gulf of Mexico in Fort Myers.

The last argument against any federal money for AAF is the damage that will be done to the small towns in the wake of this shameful attempt to push this through against the opposition of virtually every citizen from Sebastian to Tequesta.

Officials from Indian River, St. Lucie and Martin counties are extremely concerned about the negative impact on emergency vehicles in life threatening situations. And they will tell you people will die if this project is approved.

This is not the route for "allegedly" high speed rail as proposed and please don't give them money to wreck our way of life and destroy our property values.

Sincerely,

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

I can't think of any project in the history of the United States that has negatively effected so many people for the profits for so few. In a normal society our lawmakers protect the welfare of their constituents. Apparently, not now. **All Aboard Florida is all about freight and real estate - so a RIFF loan does not apply and neither do the Private Activity Bonds - a freight train is not a public benefit.**

1. THERE IS A COST TO TAXPAYERS FOR THE RIFF LOAN APPLICATION THAT IS STILL PENDING. This approach is deeply inappropriate, as it would force taxpayers to pay huge subsidies to support AAF's \$1.6 billion request. This RIFF loan, if granted, would be a direct payment of taxpayer's dollars by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to AAF. If this loan goes into default, United States taxpayers assume all liability.

2. PRIVATE ACTIVE BONDS (PAB) ARE A FORM OF TAXPAYER SUBSIDY. All Aboard Florida has filed an additional application with the Florida Development Finance Corporation (FDFC) for an allocation to sell tax-exempt bonds to finance their rail project. AAF IS PUSHING BREVARD FOR AN IMMEDIATE VOTE. So what is the hurry? AAF is afraid of the impending election next month and with it the possibility that election results may reduce state and local support. In this bond application to the FDFC, All Aboard is asking that its interest payments be exempt from Federal taxes. Income from these bonds would be tax free to the bondholder. Normally, these types of bonds are issued from a clear, transparent and definable public benefit such as hospitals, schools, municipal buildings, roads and similar projects. Recently, select companies are enjoying tax breaks normally reserved for public works. These unusual projects come at the expense of taxpayers. Budget analysts quoted by The New York Times state that these PAB bonds amount to a concession in the form of a government subsidy by reducing tax revenues. When these programs are taken as a whole nationwide, lost revenues to our government run into the billions. For example, if All Aboard Florida were to issue taxable bonds instead, then the Federal government would receive tax revenues on these bonds. The PAB approach is a concession to project promoters, a disservice to Florida citizens, and represents a cost to all taxpayers.

3. THERE IS NO TRANSPARENCY. Taxpayers (Florida and U.S.) have not been presented with complete information detailing how much PAB funding would cost in terms of lost tax revenue, which is the natural byproduct of any tax-exempt bond. Nor it is clear how taxpayers would be impacted if AAF defaults on the PAB and fails to repay – and given that passenger trains, historically, don't make money that is a very real possibility. IN ADDITION, it is common for these select companies to ask for a waiver of sales taxes on any activities or products they buy. In some instances, they have also asked to be exempt from real estate taxes. It is not known if All Aboard Florida has asked the FDFC for either of these two

additional concessions or additional subsidies in it's loan application.

According to Steve Ryan of CARE FL, *"The PAB financing bid is just another example of AAF trying to manipulate the public. The same applies to the RRIF loan. Both are financial rip-offs cloaked in slick marketing doubletalk."*

4. The key to receiving a tax-exempt bond allocation is in DEFINING ITS PUBLIC PURPOSE OR BENEFIT.

That definition is left up to the state hosting the project. In this case, Governor Rick Scott and his administration will make that decision, if he is reelected. There IS NO BENEFIT TO THE COMMUNITIES ON THE TREASURE COAST. Most labor for the project will come from out of state workers, and they will leave at completion taking their paychecks with them.

5. THE ALL ABOARD FLORIDA PROJECT TAKEN AS A WHOLE WILL PROVIDE SIGNIFICANT PROFITS ONLY FOR ITS SHAREHOLDERS.

In addition, AAF freight business, with new and improved tracks, will be able to ramp up it's freight trains to speeds up to 79 mph as compared to their current average speed of 37 mph and EXTEND THE LENGTH OF TRAINS UP TO 11,000 FEET (more than 2 miles). Of course, those residents within hearing distance of the tracks will experience a significant increase in noise levels, destructive vibration levels, and safety risks at these higher speeds. Additionally, the AMOUNT OF FREIGHT TRAFFIC WILL BE SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED, creating more traffic congestion.

6. History and demographics clearly demonstrate there will not be sufficient passenger ridership to justify these loans, however raised. Therefore, complete, **detailed ridership information should be released** by Florida DOT and the Governors' office BEFORE ANY DECISION IS MADE BY THE BREVARD COUNTY COMMISSION. THE PUBLIC HAS EVERY RIGHT TO BE FULLY INFORMED. This ridership information should be made available for an objective, professional review. Additionally, the public benefits and detriments must be carefully weighed and debated. Many, many lives would be impacted.

Sincerely,

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

I protest the Draft EIS for All Aboard Florida and request denial of the RRIF loan since every bit of evidence points to failure, profound safety and environmental issues and lack of any discernible benefit to local communities.

Taxpayer dollars are being loaned to a private enterprise and this proposed loan will incur significant risks of default. As our custodians of these funds, you are responsible to your constituents to be certain that taxpayer monies are being properly and prudently spent and invested. It is your duty to be totally informed on matters as large as a \$1.8 billion dollar loan. Nor are we in favor of the alternative, corporate welfare in the form of Private Activity bonds for a Junk Bond investment company.

The Federal Railroad Administration should not sign off on this ill-advised high-speed passenger rail project. History dictates that it is unlikely ever to be financially independent of major taxpayer obligation, and it is clear the benefits are not worthy of the burden on taxpayers.

This train project is unsafely retrofitted to old rail beds, does not stop to serve passengers in the communities it is passing through, is funded with almost 2 BILLION dollars of taxpayers money, and carries the unsubstantiated claim that its service will remove 3,000,000 cars from the road.

Florida does not have conditions that would support All Aboard Florida success. According to The Federal Train Policy report, "The Development of High Speed Rail in the United States: Issues and Recent Events," published in December 30, 2013 about factors supporting HSR, "Compared to the United States, countries with HSR have higher population densities, smaller land areas, lower per capita levels of car ownership, higher gasoline prices, lower levels of car use (measured both by number of trips per day and average distance per trip), and higher levels of public transportation availability and use" are more successful with HSR projects.*

The population of AAF's cities are too small to provide the level of ridership necessary for HSR profitability. Tokyo and Osaka have over 17 billion residents, By comparison, Orlando's population is 255 thousand and Miami's is 418 thousand.

I request that the federal Government Accountability Office review the project's costs and risks of *default, as well as the interest rate that would be assessed to their \$1.875 billion loan. Why* should a "privately funded" project be the on the shoulders of the taxpayers?

We, the tax-payers, look forward to your accountability and response to our concerns.

Sincerely,

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

Let's do a comparison between the known facts of these two start-up organizations, Solyndra and All Aboard Florida.

- Solyndra owners were well politically connected in Washington and were key political players.
- Tulsa billionaire George Kaiser was a major political donor and frequent visitor to Washington D.C. and state capitals.
- They hired lobbyists, lawyers, consultants, contractors and public relations firms seeking financial favors from our government.
- They were successful. Our government gave them \$535,000,000 in loan guarantees. Within fifteen months, they were out of cash and nine months later they shut down their plant and laid off nearly all their employees.

American taxpayers lost all their money.

- Fortress, Inc. a New York based hedge fund's Chairman and principals are politically well connected in Washington and Florida.
- Their principals have met with Governor Scott several times and their representatives with key Washington Congressional officials.
- A former Fortress employee is now Governor Scott's chief of staff.
- Like George Kaiser, some senior Fortress executives are billionaires. They too have hired lobbyists, consultants, contractors, advertising and public relations firms in Washington and Florida to THE TUNE OF 3.5 MILLION TO advance their scheme.

The first federal loan request is identical to Solyndra's.

- It is a request for the Office of Budget and Management to grant loan guarantees to All Aboard Florida \$1.6 billion. The second request, for approximately \$1.6 billion, is for a federal loan allocation and authority to sell tax exempt bonds in the market place. This right, if granted by Washington to AAF/Fortress, is a subsidy by tax payers to a private company.
- The All Aboard Florida business plan which would show the sources and uses of funds, income statement, cash flow and balance sheet projections are hidden from view.
- An attempt to obtain them from Florida DOT under the Freedom of Information Act, resulted in an All Aboard Florida law suit against the state, blocking them from being released.

Revealing their ridership study between Orlando and Miami has also been blocked from view by their law suit.

In sum, the only difference between Solyndra and All Aboard Florida is their relative size. All Aboard Florida's loan requests are at least three times larger.

Fortress/AAF financial usual strategy is to pay off higher cost financing with lower cost financing using taxpayer money. In this case, using undocumented ridership studies on a destructive path through coastal towns without a stop.

STEP ONE

About nine months ago Fortress raised \$405 million from new investors to fund their train project. They had to pay investors 12.35% to attract the money. That is an equity rate. These are equity investors investing in this Florida rail scheme.

STEP TWO

In the private activity bond (PAB) request to Treasury, Federal DOT and Wall Street underwriters, their Prospectus states, according to Bond Trader, that THE FIRST MONIES FROM THE LOAN WILL GO TO PAY OFF PRIOR EQUITY OWNERS.

So out of a \$1.6 billion tax-exempt loan proceeds, if they receive authority from the Feds, 25% OF EVERY DOLLAR will go to prior Fortress/AAF equity owners.

The balance will go to other general project expenses, which will include lobbyists, consultants, contractors, lawyers, advertising and public relation firms.

STEP THREE

While these financial schemes are afoot, the direct loan request to the Federal Railroad Administration for the RIFF loan is still live and well. This direct loan or loan guarantee from OMB carries the full faith and credit of the United States government. Therefore, the loan rate will fall between 3% to 4% for a 35-year term.

So the \$405 million in equity is cashed out by the \$1.6 billion loan at 8% to 9%. That loan is then cashed out with 3% to 4% money.

So what we see in this financial sequencing is raising money \$405 million at 12.35%, replacing it with \$1.6 billion tax-exempt private activity bonds (PAB) at 8% to 9% then replacing that loan with 3% to 4% money.

The financial plan is to pay off higher priced loans with lower priced loans and always using some type of taxpayer money or taxpayer privilege to do so.

Cool for them. Not so cool for the taxpayer.

This is a public subsidy for an unsafe train that history shows will have insufficient ridership, retrofitted to old tracks dangerously running over 340 AT GRADE CROSSINGS through coastal towns without a stop in the communities that it will destroy. What is wrong with this picture?

Sincerely,

cc: Recipients: Commissioner Chuck Nelson District 2, Commissioner Mary Bolin Lewis District 4, Ananth Prasad Florida Department of Transportation; Governor Rick Scott

All Aboard Florida Public Comment
November 5, 2014 - Indian River College

RIDERSHIP AND REVENUE REPORTS ON EIS – Request FRA to DENY RIFF Loan & DENY EIS Draft

The DEIS is incomplete, faulty and misleading data, ticket prices hidden, AAF sued to have ridership/ticket prices hidden to prevent company profitability projections, Lack of Viable and valid Business Plan, Unrealistic ridership data on Pages 2-4 and Table 1 below.

AAF RIDERSHIP AND REVENUE STUDY - Summary Report: Different Numbers Reveal Extremely Contradictory Numbers and Shows Failure to Achieve Financial Success
Refer to: EIS Study Pages 2-4, Table 1: Ridership and Profitable Revenue for 2019

ANALYSIS PER EIS REPORT – Low Ridership Numbers of 37% to 2019

Table 1, Pg 4 Below chart says: “4.01 Million in 2019, volume of riders 11,000 per day.”

Misleading as Only Numbers to Use are Base Case, Long Distance (Orlando/Miami)

Ridership = 1,526,300 Passengers Annually Compare with their claim of 4.1 Million Annual

Ridership = Very Low Ridership in 2019 of = 37% HUGE OPERATIONAL LOSS

Note Analysis Points: Only “Long Distance” Applies here for Orlando to Miami and short term trains are already in service and not part of AAF HSR Long Distance Analysis. “Business Plan Case” on chart can’t be used as that pertains to future expansion.

“Base Case” ridership numbers are only ones to consider ridership to 2019 – **1,526,300.**

ANALYSIS AAF CAPACITY CLAIMS PER EIS REPORT: Only 3.25% ridership by 2019

Rusty Roberts of AFF repeatedly verified: 10 trains, 400 passengers each, 32 times per day = 128,000 = 47 million Annual Seat Capacity

Contradiction: EIS Table 1, Page 4 Shows 1,526,300 “Long Haul” Riders Annually (separated from city) compared to AAF Train Capacity per Rusty Roberts of 47 Million = 3.25% tickets per capacity

Both Above Scenarios Create Huge Ridership Discrepancy and Operational Losses

Chart Numbers Show 37% Passengers to Capacity, AAF Claim’s show 3.25% Passengers to Capacity –

BOTH HUGE OPERATIN LOSSES – RIFF Loans and Bond Issues won’t be pack back!

25-50% Time Savings in EIS is not accurate compared to Mr. Roberts 30 Minutes HSR Time Savings!

TIME SAVINGS LIES: Ridership and Revenue Study Summary

Page Two: AAF says “No Comparable Service” “AAF can provide travel time savings of 25% to 50% when compared to existing surface modes (auto) ... Mr. Roberts has presented train to car savings of half-an hour since day one! (Verify on MapQuest Orlando/Miami Car Trip 3 Hours and 35 minutes)

DEIS “Time Savings” of 25-50% Aren’t Possible and False!

Mr. John Winkle
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Mr. Winkle,

The Draft EIS does not justify allowing All Aboard Florida to proceed with their planned passenger service.

The vast majority of justifications for moving ahead and granting a federal loan are based on promises, not actions. Time and again an environmental impact is deemed acceptable on the basis of AAF promising or committing to "mitigate" the situation.

To date, these people have attempted to trick us into accepting their plan with misleading facts or partial truths. They imply they are not going to use taxpayer money when they've asked for a \$1.6 billion government loan. They talk about lowering emissions by taking 3 million cars trips off I95, but they ignore the vastly increased amount of exhaust fumes created by cars idling at crossings further east 32 times every day.

Promises from All Aboard Florida are not enough. They've been anything but transparent up to now and in the EIS they have hidden behind "mitigation" claims rather than openly addressing potential negative impacts with clear action steps. Their loan request should be denied.

Sincerely,

TO: USDOT Federal Railway Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington, DC 20590

Proponent: All Aboard Florida

Subject: Public Commentary on Draft Environmental Impact Statement & Section 4(f)
Evaluation

AAF's primary goal of providing sustainable intercity rail service as a private commercial enterprise as described in the DEIS is not justified. It fails to take into account existing, competing commercial airline service between Orlando and Miami. Airline service is not only much faster (approximately one hour flight time versus three hour rail time) but also likely to be cheaper. Regular round trip flight prices are available for under \$300, whereas AAF will need to charge over \$400 roundtrip to break even, based on its ridership estimates.

AAF estimates 1.5 million riders per year between Orlando and SE Florida. This translates into 4110 passengers per day (365 day year) and 128 passengers per train (32 trains per day). 128 passengers per train will require a minimum of six passenger cars with attendant operational costs. The AAF estimate of ridership lacks supporting facts or statistics and appears to be based on blue sky estimates by AAF.

The Air Quality appears to fail to take into account the increase in miles traveled by the passenger train which should be an offset against the calculated annual VMT reduction. It also fails to take into account the annual emissions created by 32 train trips everyday. The diesel engines will emit carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxide, volatile organic compounds and particulate matter in measurable quantities. These train emission quantities need to be offset against the vehicle emission quantities and may create increases in emissions. Also, noise impact appears to be understated, considering an increase of 32 times a day of at least 90db for up to a minute or more.

The economic impact of State and Local Taxes fails to take into account that real estate properties adjacent to and near the railroad tracks, will have a reduction in value due to significantly increased noise, air and vibration pollution. I have read estimates of a 25 to 30 percent reduction in property values associated with AAF, due to fewer buyers wanting to live near a high speed train passing by every half hour. This loss of value will have to be reflected in assessed tax values and will significantly reduce the \$21 million increased tax income and may ultimately have a negative tax effect.

Finally, the USDOT must answer to the American taxpayer on its' use and or misuse of public funds. It is generally recognized that Passenger Rail Service, whether publicly or privately operated, is a money losing proposition. In light of this general knowledge, any approval by the USDOT of the AAF passenger rail project, may constitute, a deliberate and knowing misuse of taxpayer moneys' for which the approving authorities may be held legally accountable by taxpayer's and or their representatives. Simply put, how does the USDOT expect a money losing passenger rail service to repay its' loans? When the rail service defaults, then the USDOT must use taxpayers dollars to pay off the loan default.

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

Lots of Information Missing From the EIS Draft For All Aboard Florida. For example:

Missing Information from the Draft EIS

In Section 4.4.1 Communities and Demographics and 4.4.1.2 Affected Environment (Table 4.4.1-1)

- Describes and lists incorporated municipalities crossed by the project
- Includes Orange, Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie and Palm Beach County
- incorporated municipalities Martin County and City of Stuart are excluded from the analysis

In Section 4.4.5-2 Designated Cultural Resources

- Martin County was not consulted regarding its historic resources
- Martin County General Services Department tracks properties on the Local and National Historic Registers

Regarding the St. Lucie Bridge

- Effect of bridge opening on automobile traffic delays are not addressed in Draft EIS --- the Report only evaluated traffic at two intersections Monterey and Dixie Highway (at Indian Street)

Regarding Air Quality (page S-10)

- A detailed hot-spot modeling evaluation of intersections was not conducted as part of the air quality because traffic volumes and congestion at grade crossings
- Emissions increase when a car idles while a Freight train is stopped on tracks, awaiting Passenger trains to pass

Information (paid for and written by All Aboard Florida) is incomplete - AFF RIFF loans and PAB's should be denied.

Sincerely,

Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311,
Washington, DC 20590

November 12, 2014

Dear Mr. Winkle, of the Federal Railroad Administration,

I have many concerns about the scope, methodology, and supporting details of the All Aboard Florida (AAF) project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) submitted to your office in September, 2014. I am most concerned with the North-South Corridor from Cocoa to West Palm Beach.

Please consider, review, and address these concerns as revisions to the final EIS document:

To begin with, the DEIS fails to adequately address many significant negative aspects of the proposed All Aboard Florida project, and does not clarify or address the extent to which the project will enhance safety (49 CFR 260.7(a)). The AAF DEIS does not adequately demonstrate how AAF will enhance public safety as a RRIF (260.7) priority consideration.

For instance, in **3.3-C_Grade-Crossings** Rail line relocation and the building of overpasses and underpasses for the 340+ at-grade crossings along the N-S corridor are not sufficiently addressed in the DEIS, even as Alternatives. This greatly conflicts with Federal Railroad Administrator Joseph C. Szabo's remarks as prepared for delivery to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials Committee on Rail Transportation (SCORT) in Denver, Colorado on September 7, 2014. Mr. Szabo stated then that "*On the safety side, and to improve the quality of life in communities, our vision (Grow America) would support rail-line relocation efforts, and grade-crossing improvements, and projects that seal off corridors by building over-passes and underpasses.*"

Furthermore, according to Frank A. Frey, (Gen. Engineer-HSR of Federal Railroad Administration | U.S. DOT 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE) ON-SITE ENGINEERING FIELD REPORT – Part 1 All Aboard Florida from March 20, 2014--- "*In my professional opinion, I respectfully disagree with the Project's approach in that they are not exercising appropriate safety practices and reasonable care when designing for High Speed Passenger Rail service. I explained to the entire diagnostic team how important it was to adopt the principles of the Sealed Corridor approach. However, it was clearly evident that the Project was not pursuing such concept.*"

In St. Lucie County where I live there are 20 railroad crossings along the 22 mile length of the county. In the Town of St. Lucie Village (Incorporated in 1961 but first settled in 1843) where I reside ^{West of} there are six at-grade crossings in the Village's 2.5 miles length. These crossings are the only ingress or egress to most of the Village's residences. Sealed corridor mitigation is unclear and unrealistic. Yet appropriate safety guidelines and safety practices are most necessary. Public safety must take precedence.

Next, the AAF project will endanger human life not only due to the dangerous at-grade crossings but also due to the great likelihood of increased delays for emergency vehicles, ambulances, fire department, and police vehicles needing immediate access over the at-grade tracks in St. Lucie Village. Furthermore, **Page 10 of 3.3B4 AlternativeA N-S Corridor Track Chart** shows 30% plans for triple tracks with a center siding which would extend about $\frac{3}{4}$ of the length of St. Lucie Village. Because our only ingress and egress to most of our homes and the National Register of Historic Places 34-structure historic district in the Village is also only accessed over the FEC tracks, this additional track/siding will place a great safety burden on the Village, especially in case of medical or fire emergencies. I ask that you consider another alternative construction site for the triple track which doesn't extend over the Village's six at-grade crossings.

Moreover, the DEIS does not address the time trains might wait on the additional siding and how these standing trains might further impact railway crossings while they block these crossings during their wait and further exacerbate the safety concerns for increased trains and faster speeds of the AAF project. According to the **DEIS: S-9, page 13, paragraph 5**: "Typical at-grade crossings (intersections of local roads with the FECR corridor) would be closed an average of 54 times per day (3 times per hour), with closure times ranging from 1.7 minutes (passenger) to 2.8 minutes (freight)." The potential for catastrophic consequences created at the at-grade crossings is most frightening. I am also greatly concerned that malfunction of the safety equipment, electrical/mechanical errors, human error in operations, or trespassers' "challenges" to higher speed rail will result in a much higher risk of accidents at the Village's crossings.

Also evident is that the DEIS does not address the safe passage of pedestrian and bicycle traffic through the Village's six at-grade crossings. These crossings are at Old Dixie Highway (SR 605) and are used as school bus stops, where school children of all ages are picked up and dropped off daily throughout the school year.

One last safety concern for the project is noise and vibration. **According to page Methodology 4-37 Affected Environment**---" The Project Study Area for noise extends approximately 2,500 feet from the rail corridor and the Project Study Area for vibration extends approximately 600 feet. These study areas include all land uses that are sensitive to noise or vibration ("sensitive receptors"). This would most definitely included the Village's historic district structures, and the 1875 oldest house in the St. Lucie County located here.. Furthermore, under **Noise and Vibration... 5.2.2 page 5-39 the DEIS states** "The Project would result in long-term noise and vibration adverse impacts to residents and properties, primarily along the N-S Corridor." **Also, on page 5-51 under North-South Corridor about ground-borne vibration levels exceed FRA criteria.. North-South Corridor, the DEIS states** Ground-borne vibration levels already exceed the FRA criteria along the N-S Corridor due to the frequency and nature of current freight operations. FRA guidance for assessing project impacts along such "heavily used rail corridors" (more than 12 trains per day) states that additional impact would occur if the project approximately doubled the number of trains (FRA 2012a).

Thank you for addressing these important safety concerns as revisions to the final EIS document.

Signed _____ printed name _____

Address _____

Email / telephone number _____

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
 Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

AAF's proposed project is bad in execution and location.

1. First and foremost we live in a democracy and **citizens rights are being ignored** - this is offensive and unacceptable. All Aboard Florida should not have the right to use century old rules to destroy communities and cultures. How many trains a day are too many? AAF and FECCI say they can do whatever they want on the rail lines they own. But what mechanism is in place to protect the public from 32 trains increasing to who knows how many, 100, 200 passenger and 2 mile freight trains running through the county?

2. All Aboard Florida is a private enterprise using public money to benefit itself - another Solyndra in the making. Solyndra owners were well politically connected in Washington and were key political players. They hired lobbyists, lawyers, consultants, contractors and public relations firms seeking financial favors from our government. They were successful. Our government gave them \$535,000,000 in loan guarantees. Within fifteen months, they were out of cash and nine months later they shut down their plant and laid off nearly all their employees. **American taxpayers lost all their money.**

By comparison, Fortress, Inc. a New York based hedge fund's Chairman and principals are politically well connected in Washington and Florida. Their principals have met with Governor Scott several times and their representatives with key Washington Congressional officials. A former Fortress employee is now Governor Scott's chief of staff. They too have hired lobbyists, consultants, contractors, advertising and public relations firms in Washington and Florida to THE TUNE OF 3.5 MILLION TO advance their scheme. In sum, the only difference between Solyndra and All Aboard Florida is their relative size. **All Aboard Florida's loan requests are at least THREE TIMES LARGER.**

3. All Aboard Florida does not qualify for a taxpayer loan or the Private Equity Bonds - RIFF loans are for a different purpose by law. AAF claims it is privately funded with a secret business plan yet over 50% of the cost will be provided by public money. This RIFF loan, if granted, would be a direct payment of taxpayer's dollars by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to AAF. If this loan goes into default, United States taxpayers assume all liability. PAB'S are for a public benefit, and dangerous, at grade high speed trains that do not stop in the communities they pass through are not a benefit.

4. All Aboard Florida's EIS claims are unsubstantiated. There is no transparency in examining the AAF ridership study. It is hidden behind a false claim of trade secrets and is off limits to taxpayer inquiry, understanding or review. Citizens deserve to know the truth. What is the need for secrecy? AAF is not competing against anyone. The All Aboard Florida business plan which would show the sources and uses of funds, income statement, cash flow and balance sheet projections are hidden from view. An attempt to obtain them from Florida DOT under the Freedom of Information Act, resulted in an All Aboard Florida law suit against the state, blocking them from being released. Revealing their ridership study between Orlando and Miami has also been blocked from view by their law suit.

5. **At grade crossings are a recipe for death.** Add 32 high speed trains, existing freight, increased freight, and the acknowledge possibility of 74 more Amtrack commuter trains, Sout East Florida's coastal communities will be changed forever. Good railroads use below grade or above grade tracks- most stations are under the ground. Ride the train from Boston to New York. Ride the Marta in Atlanta. Ride the Metro Link in St.Louis. Ride the trains in Europe to find examples of railway done right.

6. The East coast of Florida has a unique topography and a fragile marine ecosystem. The St. Lucie River is not just another Florida river. It stands apart from the New River and Loxahatchee River and Miami River because it is not merely a vessel thoroughfare through some county roads. It is the equivalent of the Panama Canal for vessels transiting via the Okeechobee Waterway from the Atlantic Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico. Just as the Panama Canal is the only way to get from the Atlantic to the Pacific without going around notorious Cape Horn, the Okeechobee Waterway is the only way for vessels to transit from the Gulf of Mexico to the Atlantic Ocean without going south around the Florida Keys (for shallow-draft vessels) or Key West (for deep-draft vessels).

7. These rail tracks bisect communities with elderly demographics - emergency response time will be severely hindered - remember - all crossings are at grade. This activity could virtually cut off the east from the west parts of town, **impede emergency services and reduce commerce due to the relentless flow of trains.** And will the rail cars move from passenger to the more lucrative and consistent freight when revenue falls short of expectations?

8. **Noise and vibration will be horrendous, and disproportionately harm the safety low income and minority populations,** for example at grade crossings in East Stuart, Golden Gate and Port Salerno. All three of these communities are in Community Redevelopment Areas and have significant minority, low income and include limited English proficiency populations. They won't be able to relocate.

9. Florida already has a train that goes from Miami to Orlando - no one rides it - we don't need another one funded by taxpayer expense.

10. Last, is anyone paying attention to the fact that this country is in debt up to its ears? Will the government allow more debt for an absurd project to benefit private enterprise at the expense of taxpayers?

Sincerely,

cc: Recipients: Designated Comments Email as Provided In EIS Draft, Governor Rick Scott, EPA's Environmental Hotline, EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy, Senator Marco Rubio, Ananth Prasad Florida Department of Transportation, Congressman Patrick Murphy

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM: [REDACTED]

All Aboard is about freight, not people. Mimi Whitefield of The Miami Herald had an excellent piece reprinted in The Post's Business section Sept. 29 ("Miami's port bets big on Panama Canal expansion"). It was a good overview of the opportunities presented to East Coast ports resulting from the Panama Canal's expansion. When the canal first announced its intention several years ago, it got the attention of all ports along the East Coast. Most ports can't accommodate the megaships that the canal expansion envisions. The Port of Miami was one of those. However, they were one of the first to not only plan on how to accommodate these ships, but also how to finance the needed infrastructure.

One short sentence in the middle of the article piqued my interest: "**As part of its (Port-Miami) three-pronged strategy to boast cargo ... a rail link to the FEC rail yard ... has been added.**" You don't read much about this except in industry publications. The journal Progressive Railroading had an article in April 2013 on the canal expansion and railroads. It stated: "Among railroads anticipating a bump in intermodal traffic (large containers) ..., Florida East Coast Railway ... FEC is working with Port-Miami and Port Everglades to build on-dock facilities ... FEC execs view a big part of the railway's strategy to grow intermodal traffic." Quoted in the article was FEC President and CEO James Hertwig, who said, "We're prepared to handle the cargo and we've got plenty of capacity."

Concerning the on-dock rail facility, Port of Miami Director Bill Johnson said, "It will allow us to double-stack containers directly to Jacksonville in under nine hours, and connect to Norfolk Southern Railway and CSX directly to the heartland of America." Hertwig's final comment: "I think it's going to be great for the railroad." **It should be noted that FEC owns and operates All Aboard Florida.**

So, the individuals who recently wrote letters to the editor – Jackie Cassidy and Robert Smykal – stating that All Aboard was everything to do with moving freight and not people, hit the nail on the head. They are unloading freight ships, not passenger ships. Hertwig wants to use the right of way he already has up the East Coast to lay a new set of tracks. I understand the business need, as it would be costly to get new rights of way through the central part of the state. What I can't understand is the total disregard for the people who live in the communities on the East Coast.

It will be stunning to see a 150-car train loaded with gigantic containers pushing its way north from Miami each day, again and again.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

cc: Recipients: Designated Comments Email as Provided In EIS Draft, Governor Rick Scott, Senator Marco Rubio, Senator Bill Nelson, Ananth Prasad Florida Department of Transportation, Andrew Philips - US Army, David Keys, Evelyn Smart - Coast Guard, Congressman Paul Ryan

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

Any support of this train lacks SOUND reasoning. **From 5.2.2-A3 of the draft – vibration noise will double.** The noise and vibration impacts are substantial and widespread throughout SE Florida. Citizens can attest to the lack of sleep from freights in the middle of the night and from the cracks in our walls from the vibrations. Doubling noise vibrations will double the damage.

With new tracks, existing freight and 32 additional passenger trains will run double the speed. Noise will increase dramatically. Unlike modern well-built railways that are below grade or elevated, all of the SE crossings are AT GRADE, spreading the noise at grade at 78 locations on the Treasure coast.

The already existing 18 trains of freight traffic now increasingly double-stacked and with considerably intensified noise and vibration already an issue. This number is projected to multiply substantially with the expansion of canal and Miami shipping. **A substantial increase of slow moving, burdensome freight traffic with the addition of 32 high speed passenger trains will paralyze South East Florida Coastal towns.** Even with so-called "quiet zones", the horns still sound. Train horns produce a sound level of 110 decibels (human conversation is about 60 decibels, with the sound level doubling at 10 decibel intervals)

European residents claim the noise of the HSR train engines is horrific, something that All Aboard Florida declines to comment on. Former Swiss resident Sebastian Schmid of Vero Beach had this to say about his experiences of living near a high speed train: "The noise of a high speed train approaching and passing at more than 110 miles per hour wakes up everybody sleeping and frightens children, elderly people and animals. In a way, it sounds like a jet plane passing at low altitude."

Further, All Aboard Florida will negatively impact those who have no recourse to move. The draft states on pages S-17 and S-17 that "Neither the E-W Corridor nor the N-S Corridor would result in residential displacement, job loss, or neighborhood fragmentation." In the Hobe Sound and Stuart area there are several businesses adjacent to the tracks that will suffer lost business and may even have to close entirely as a result of the dramatically increased rail traffic and its effects on the environment.

Further, the draft says there will be no "residential displacement" because of eminent domain. However, unlike some communities, residents of low income and minority neighborhood homes may not leave because they can't afford to move. In effect, they are not displaced, they are held hostage in an undesirable location and cannot escape the negative impacts of the All Aboard train service even if they want to.

The EIS also states on page S-17 that "mitigation would limit any changes in vibration along the N-S Corridor." This presumably refers to the "wheel and rail maintenance" that will diminish the expected doubling of vibration along the N-S Corridor. For minority and low-income people living close to the tracks your promise to alleviate this problem is not enough to justify All Aboard going forward.

Nothing is right about this project.

Sincerely,

cc: Recipients: Designated Comments Email as Provided In EIS Draft, Governor Rick Scott, Office of Rail Road Policy and Development, Senator Marco Rubio, Senator Bill Nelson, Ananth Prasad Florida Department of Transportation, Congressman Patrick Murphy, Congressman Paul Ryan

11/24/14

Mr. John Winkle
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Ave SE, Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Mr. Winkle:

As a concerned resident of Palm Beach Gardens, Florida I am writing to express my total disapproval of the ill-conceived "All Aboard Florida" railroad project that is being thrust upon us.

As you know, this project proposes to run high speed trains through our residential areas causing major disruption to traffic, fire and emergency personnel and our way of life here. In August of 2012 when my mother needed emergency medical assistance at 2:30 AM and the paramedics arrived at our home from their station located on the other side of the tracks and were transporting her to Palm Beach Gardens Medical Center Emergency Room, I rode up front in the rescue vehicle and asked the driver as we made our way to the hospital, *also on the other side of the tracks* – "what if a train were coming"? He said "**WE WAIT**". That thought gives me great concern. In an emergency there is not a minute to lose. And the thought of 32 additional trains per day plus additional and longer freight trains is by no means a minor impact to our community – but rather a major disruption in our daily lives.

The subsequent increase in freight traffic will compound our problems – with more noise from longer and heavier freight trains, more whistles and more traffic delays. This proposal seems to be more about getting the approval to install a second track under the *auspices* of running passenger service and thus obtaining government funding. The second FEC track will certainly allow significantly more freight service and it appears to me that is what this project is really all about. The distance from Orlando to Miami is 236 miles and the drive time is approximately 3 Hours and 45 Minutes – taking the bus costs as low as \$25.

Florida already has train service from Miami to Orlando! It's called AMTRACK! And it operates at a deficit using government funding – Why would this new All Aboard Florida service be any different? And further, I cannot understand why the proposed new high speed train wouldn't run on the same tracks as AMTRACK?? After West Palm Beach going north, Amtrack trains turn inland and pass through rural agricultural areas in the middle of the state which causes minimal impact – let All Aboard Florida run their new high speed trains on the existing Amtrack tracks. I am certain the cows wouldn't care if more trains passed by! The impact on our shoreline communities and the problem of the aging FEC drawbridges and subsequent disruption of marine traffic would thus be eliminated.

But the proposal to run these additional trains through some of the highest valued real estate in Florida is sure to drive those values downward. And **would YOU allow your family** to travel on these trains *knowing* that they will pass over the Loxahatchee River and St. Lucie River drawbridges both built in the **1920's** and **both in need of repair – at 110 miles per hour!** *I would think not!* These bridges were not designed for high speed trains and already take approximately 20 minutes to open and close causing significant delays to boat traffic. Imagine the fear of boaters when a severe thunderstorm warning is issued by the National Weather Service urging boaters to seek safe harbor immediately (very common in our summer months) – only to find that their access to safe harbor is blocked by the railroad bridge. It is estimated that these bridges will be in the down position for close to 8 hours a day! This is a tragedy waiting to happen... Boater's cannot "park" their boats but are subject to shifting river currents and winds causing a dangerous situation as they wait for the bridge to open.

This whole ill-conceived plan is simply unacceptable and if Amtrack and other long distance trains in the US are subsidized by the government why would this ill-conceived All Aboard Florida project be any different? **You MUST put the brakes on this plan right now!!** Perhaps improve the existing Amtrack Miami Orlando train service instead.

Respectfully,

October 30, 2014

As a longtime resident in this area I object to All Aboard! I am totally opposed to All Aboard because of the extreme negative impact that these trains would create in our community. The trains going through our towns would have a terribly destructive impact on our economy, navigation, quality of life, water quality, and our safety. **The DEIS has serious flaws, major deficiencies.** Martin County and the Treasure Coast and More Residents are virtually unanimous in their Opposition to All Aboard. *All Aboard has serious negative impacts to...*

our safety - the speed and frequency of trains creates serious issues for emergency services, evacuation, blocked crossings dangerous traffic light issues, crossings of young & senior citizens

- **our economy -- tourism and older downtowns are highly impacted, SMALL Businesses disproportionately impacted**
- **our older neighborhoods - many are cut by RR tracks with double tracking & speeds negatively impacting**
- **consider the blocked crossings of downtown Stuart when the RR bridge breaks down our traffic - traffic snarls, traffic signals problematic**
- **water navigation - OLD RR bridge NOT to be replaced, RR water crossing NOT to be double-tracked**
- **-- so long delays, evacuation issues during such as hurricanes, effectively eliminates Gulf to Intracoastal/Ocean**
- **environmental justice - All Aboard disproportionately impacts the safety of low income and minority populations**
- **our taxes - costs of roads/traffic signals, lower property values**
- **our air quality - cars idling waiting for 32 high speed + 20 freight**
- **our water quality - boats idling waiting for RR bridge openings, collisions**
- **our property values - affect our taxes**
- **our wildlife - adding a 2nd set of RR tracks, 32 high speeds trips on multiple-tracked create frequency and speed problems for wildlife.**

Claimed "mitigation" being for small areas of Miami-Dade and Orlando, & some roads of Miami-Dade and of Orlando.

The DEIS is seriously flawed, using inaccurate including outdated data and analysis. Even these "public hearings" are flawed by a set-up that limits residents comments being recorded, and residents hearing from, learning from, and supporting other residents. Martin County has prepared excellent analysis. Please listen and Object to the All Aboard EIS: it fails to address serious problems regarding the public interest your agency is intended to protect.

John Winkle
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Ave. S.E. Room W38-31
Washington, D.C. 20590
E-Mail, AAF_comments@vhb.com

Subject: All Aboard Florida

As a unit owner and resident of Vista Royale, which is directly effected by the increased in rail traffic, and will be subject to the full brunt of the noise pollution, and the separation from emergency services, located west of the RR tracks, I and many of the 2200 residents and voters in this community ask the commission reconsider the request from AAF, and denies all applications..We are in full support of our Board of Directors resolution.

RESOLUTION

Be It Resolved That the Vista Royale Board of Directors, representing a senior community of 1512 condos in Indian River County, bordering Route 1 and the current railroad tracks, is overwhelmingly against the All Aboard Florida proposal to add tracks allowing up to 32 passenger trains a day, travelling at high speeds, very close to our community. There are presently 3 railroad crossings (Oslo Road, 1st Street and 4th Street) that will be directly affected by the planned tracks and trains, limiting our access to emergency services, shopping and daily travel throughout Indian River County, as well as the safety issues associated with the additional trains.

Residents of Vista Royale are presently disturbed by the existing train noise throughout the day and night, and any additional trains and noise associated with them will only exacerbate this level of disturbance and severely limit our peaceful use of the many outdoor activities we currently enjoy. We are also concerned that Vista Royale's properties will decline in value because of the diminished access to our community and the increased noise generated by the high speed trains.

We request you utilize all of your efforts to STOP THIS TRAIN PROJECT FROM GOING FORWARD.

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM: 

As per the study conducted by the Jupiter Town Council, although the DEIS focused on passenger rail, the assumptions in the analysis include a growth in freight that need to be considered given the combined impacts on transportation.

Baseline Data for Freight: The DEIS discusses expected increased freight train trips using 2013 as a baseline. This section should be updated to cite 2014 figures and projections for 2015 and beyond. The section also states that a doubling of the number of expected freight trains along the line is expected within two years. The basis for this anticipated doubling should be provided.

Per the DEIS, there is a 30% increase in average freight train speeds in the No-Action Alternative over the average currently being experienced. An explanation of this increase is important to ensure that there is a clear understanding of the basis for the assumed change in speed. The information requested above will provide more certainty regarding the baseline impacts of increased freight without the proposed passenger rail service.

ASSUMED TRAIN SPEEDS AND TRAFFIC IMPACTS The methodology for analyzing traffic impacts confirms that the AADT for only the two largest arterials have been included for each county. Using only two roads per county (10 total, or 6% of the total number of crossings) provides an incorrect calculation of the total average daily volume being impacted by the proposed project. The transportation study needs to be vastly expanded to study the impact on all major local roads with grade level crossings.

The assumed operation speed for freight trains as 54.3 mph in the DEIS is questionable for the Center Street, Indiantown Road and Toney Penna Drive crossings due to the Loxahatchee River bridge and curvature of the rail. Based upon the Town's internal review of the rail system in Jupiter, a 30 mph operation speed seems to be a more appropriate assumption for freight trains. The corresponding total closure time, based upon the Town's calculations, will be extended from 2.5 minutes to almost 4 minutes, which significantly impacts the traffic on Indiantown Road. Additionally, the assumed operation speed for passenger train in the DEIS is 89.2 mph, which is

November 19, 2014

Mr. John Winkle
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Mr. Winkle:

I am a resident of Stuart, Florida and the Harborage Yacht Club & Condominiums. The Harborage Yacht Club and Condominiums are situated on the east side of the Florida East Coast Railroad (RR) Tracks between two crossings 3,000 feet apart between Fern Street and Alice Avenue. Our condominium buildings are a scant 79 feet from the tracks. We will be irreparably harmed by the All Aboard Florida (AAF) Intercity Passenger Rail Project unless current plans are amended to require realignment of the rail tracks west of I-95. If, as most Treasure Coast residents suspect, this proposal has already been rejected, the Federal Railroad Administration should require AAF to make all crossings within the City of Stuart safe and quiet.

I have examined the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) prepared for AAF and believe it falls far short in its analysis of Martin County and the City of Stuart.

I do not believe the DEIS adequately addresses our community's concerns with respect to crossing safety, noise pollution, train vibrations, emergency response times and disruption of marine navigation by the change in operations of a bascule bridge almost 100 years old. I believe DEIS understates the navigational use of the St. Lucie River under the RR bridge. Marine Traffic, exiting marinas, yacht builders, repair facilities, brokerages, and private docks were under counted.

The Stuart RR Bridge was built in 1920's. The track segment through downtown Stuart is the only segment within the project limits that will remain single tracked. The more than threefold increase in train whistle noise pollution and vibrations will adversely impact neighborhoods on each side of downtown Stuart. I believe the effect of increased bridge openings on automobile traffic delays are not fully addressed in DEIS — the Report only evaluated traffic at two intersections, SE Monterey Road and Colorado/SE Dixie Highway. Fern Street, Alice Avenue and other crossings to the south of the City were not evaluated. On a recent Saturday morning, a freight train stopped across both the Fern Street and Alice Avenue crossings blocked access for over an hour.

Mr. John Winkle
November 19, 2014
Page 2

The Harborage has 129 two and three bedroom condos and three offices, with residents of all ages. Delays in securing emergency services as both entrances are closed for trains measurably undermine our emergency response times; increased train whistles and vibrations will degrade our quality of life and make our property virtually unsaleable. AAF should move to and share the existing right of way that already offers passenger service to Orlando. At the very least, safety and quiet zones should be required for Fern Street and Alice Avenue. Federal highway sound barriers would be required for far less densely populated areas.

Last, there is no justification for a Federal loan guarantee for a project that will ultimately degrade this community and the Treasure Coast. If it is going to happen, let it be private money and private guarantees.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

IT IS NOT TOO LATE TO STOP THE BULLET TRAIN

*****All Aboard Florida Railroad has NOT received the 1.6 BILLION dollar loan from the Federal Railroad Administration it needs to complete the leg between West Palm and Orlando.**

Please write to: Federal Railroad Administration

Attn: John Winkle, Room W 38-31

2100 New Jersey Ave. SE

Washington, DC 20590

Letters must be received by December 3rd. Feel free to write your own or sign and mail the letter below.

Federal Railroad Administration

Attn: John Winkle, Room 38-31

2100 New Jersey Avenue SE

Washington, DC 20509

Dear Sir:

I am writing to ask that the Administration withhold funding for the West Palm Beach-Orlando leg of the proposed high-speed train service intended to connect Miami and Orlando for the following reasons:

1—The trains will be travelling thru our small town at speeds in excess of 100 MPH on tracks which divide our community into distinct East-West sections with the bulk of the businesses West and the Hospital and Medical Facilities East.

2—People with life-threatening conditions may not be able to reach the hospital. First responders will be gravely hampered in carrying out their urgent duties.

3—We have no train station in Vero Beach so no one can take advantage of any passenger trains that might run on these tracks.

4—We do have a large population living and working very close to the tracks. Our Historically Landmarked Heritage and Community Centers are next to the tracks and won't fare well from all the vibration.

5—An increase is expected in both the number and size of freight trains using these tracks causing even more noise and disruption to our community.

There exists a parallel set of tracks West of I 95. I feel that since we have no passenger terminal, money would be better spent shifting train traffic to that set of more westerly tracks.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

NAME (print)

October 28, 2014

Address:

John Winkle
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Ave. S.E.
Room W38-31, Washington D.C. 20590

Dear Mr. Winkle:

I am writing you to comment on the draft environmental impact statement on All Aboard Florida.

I oppose your findings. This is not a project that is good for the populated coastline communities of Florida. We are being led to believe this is about passenger service from Miami to Orlando. We know this isn't the truth. This is "All About RAIL."

I believe an objective independent third party should have been selected to write this report, not one SELECTED by All Aboard Florida.

What bothers me the most about your report is your lack of understanding of the SAFETY concerns from the residents of the populated coastal communities of Florida.

Florida first developed along the coastline not the interior. When cities were chartered they soon established their infrastructure for roads, government, hospitals, safety and education institutions etc. Many small communities have the trains passing through their downtowns, like Stuart in Martin County. That is how our towns evolved.

My main concern is the fact that you do not recognize or understand that many...many...many Florida hospitals are EAST of the FEC Rail Road tracks, and not concerned that the at-risk neighborhoods to the WEST of the FEC Rail Roads track will be compromised. First responders value TIME in saving lives. You would be limiting and denying the first responders their ability to save the lives of Florida residents while their emergency vehicles wait for an unreasonable number of multitude passenger and rail trains to pass through their communities to reach their residents and hospitals. I didn't see a reference or visual map of the FEC Rail Road tracks in relationship to Florida hospitals. I suggest you include that.

What's good for you is not good for us.

For the record....I do not recognize the validity of this report or the assumption that this is a plan that protects or seves the best interests of the citizens of Florida coastline communities.

Sincerely,

October 23, 2014

Re: All Aboard Florida Environmental Impact Statement

To Whom It May Concern:

I have reviewed portions of the Environmental Impact Statement prepared on behalf of the application of All Aboard Florida, a subsidiary of Florida East Coast Railroad and offer some of my thoughts/fears/opinions.

First, the location of the existing tracks which AAF proposes to use run along the coastal area of the Treasure Coast (Martin, St. Lucie and Indian River Counties). The addition of thirty-two trips per day will cause untold damage to our area in the form of traffic delays to motorists, police, fire and ambulance vehicles. These delays could result in loss of life in getting an injured/ill patient to the nearest hospital; the unnecessary burning of fossil fuel by vehicles waiting at the crossing gates; loss of property values of owners within one/quarter mile of the railroad tracks due to vibration and noise pollution: in short, the loss of our peace and tranquility – our quality of life!

Second, Stuart has one of three (I believe) railroad drawbridges along the proposed route: the Miami River, the Loxahatchee River and the St. Lucie River. I am not familiar with the first two bridges, but I am with the St Lucie River railroad bridge. Has an independent engineering firm been hired to assess the safety of this bridge with the proposed 32 additional crossings? Is the bridge strong enough for this additional load? Is the draw mechanism going to fail with all this additional stress put on it in raising and lowering this ‘dinosaur’?

Third, these additional 32 closings of the railroad drawbridge will have a detrimental effect on navigation to both commercial and recreational boaters. Has anyone looked at Universal Commercial Code (UCC), specifically Title 33, Sec. 494 and 502 regarding alterations to bridges over navigable rivers? These sections contain the following wording: “unreasonable obstruction to free navigation of such waters on account of insufficient height, width of span, *or otherwise....*” (emphasis provided by the writer). It is the “or otherwise” portion of these Sections which must be looked at. As proposed, AAF is definitely proposing an “unreasonable obstruction to free navigations” as prohibited under the UCC. (Just an aside here: what is the total time it takes to raise then lower this drawbridge and how much time in advance of an oncoming train must it be in

the down position? Do the math, multiply by thirty-two trains per day, and you cannot contend that these closings will not unreasonably obstruct free navigation of our waterways.

For these reasons, I am in opposition to the approval of the proposed All Aboard Florida, and I believe I represent a growing number of residents along the Treasure Coast, ALL OF WHOM will be effected by this abomination and we are certainly Not All Aboard Florida!

Please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,



November 7, 2014

Mr. John Winkle
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Ave, SE, Room W38-311
Washington, D.C. 20590

RE: All Aboard Florida Intercity Passenger Rail, DEIS

Dear Mr. Winkle:

I vehemently oppose the development of the All Aboard Florida Intercity Passenger Rail Project for the following reasons:

1. **Safety:** Just from my limited knowledge, there are 4 hospitals that will be cut off from emergency vehicles by the 49 trains that will be traveling these rails each Day - Jupiter Hospital, Jupiter, FL; Martin Memorial Hospital, Stuart, FL; Cape Canaveral Hospital, Cape Canaveral, FL; and Weusthoff Hospital, Rockledge, FL. The trains will impede traffic by 7.8 hours just on the weekend, considerably more during the week, as pointed out at the environmental impact meeting I attended Nov. 6 in Port St. Lucie, FL.

This does not even take into account the amount of time that will be curtailed for marine emergency services with 49 trains passing over bridge openings that cater to vast marine traffic. Who is going to take responsibility for the number of lives that are lost due to inability of emergency vehicles to reach hospitals because AAF needs to get tourists to one of the limited passengers stops they propose.

2. There are 24 existing bridges between Miami and Rte 528 in Brevard County with 4 additional bridges to be built on the Rte 528 corridor to Orlando. While the All Aboard Florida operation could lease track from CSX in the central part of the state that would have limited affect on commercial & recreational marine activity and limit the safety issues related to hospitals that are cut off by the large increase in rail traffic, they have chosen to take this passenger train through a heavily trafficked residential, commercial and popular tourist areas.
3. **Economic:** The substantial cost to meet federal regulations for Quiet Zones must be met by local governments while, at the same time, these passenger rails traveling through these areas have the potential to decrease the economic activity of those traveling by car through our areas. This would adversely affect restaurants, hotels, rental cars, service stations, historic venues, recreational sites and retail in general. Florida businesses are suffering enough without compounding it.

4. At the meeting last night, AAF was unable to share what they believed to be an approximation of the cost of this passenger rail service from Miami to Orlando International Airport. The response was "we don't have that information but it will not be as much as a plane ticket and we hope to be approximately the cost of driving." By my calculation, based on a 2-week advance ticket purchase on a plane ticket from MIA to MCO, the cost would be \$305.20 roundtrip. For a family of 4, the cost would be \$1,220 and would take approximately 3.5 hrs. with airport wait time. Transportation at either end must now be considered.

With a rental car, which provides multiple economic benefit to a vast audience of businesses along the way, the approximate cost of renting a mid-size car is \$127 for a week plus \$70 for gas and you have the car for one week and you have transported the family of 4 for a total of \$196. The time involved with a direct drive MIA to MCO is 3hr 27 min.

In an attempt to compare to an Amtrak route and typical cost, I used the Charlotte to Raleigh route. Keeping in mind that Amtrak is subsidized by the federal government, this route takes approximate 3 hr 22 min. at a cost of \$47.50 one way and \$95 roundtrip for a total cost to a family of 4 of \$380. Now, you do not have transportation at either end of the trip.

There is not one thing about this passenger rail service that makes sense to a large majority of residents of Martin, St. Lucie, Indian River or Brevard Counties and, most likely, Palm Beach County. This creates no economic advantage to our area, creates significant safety issues and creates substantial costs to local governments of all counties impacted wherein we have no say in the matter. This appears on all levels to be an ill-conceived project with benefit not befitting the return.

If Amtrak must be subsidized by the government, I have seen nothing from AAF to indicate or assure that they will not be the next railroad that will have their hand out to the taxpayers. They say they have the \$1.6 B loan request from the federal government on hold but the people of southern Florida are not convinced that the loan will not go back on the table if this is approved. I see AAF as another Amtrak or Solyndra.

Page 3, AAF

We just cannot afford this poorly developed model which benefits few and creates multiple adverse affects on many. Does it not seem suspect that AAF has completed all the engineering projects, environmental studies have been completed and AAF says they don't know the approximate cost of a train ticket from Miami to Orlando. No wonder there is so much opposition. They provide only the information they deem beneficial and avoid all answers to pointed questions.

Sincerelv.

Dear Mr. Winkle:

I wish express my concerns about the effects of All Aboard Florida passenger trains and FEC freight trains to the quality of life in Fort Lauderdale, FL.

Traffic Congestion: 32 passenger trains and 20 freight trains a day traveling through Fort Lauderdale will impact traffic, police, fire, school buses & ambulances from moving through our cities? The FEC tracks in Fort Lauderdale are very close to the main hospital, Broward General. How will emergency services be able to reach/deliver people to the hospital if the track is closed over 50 times each day?

When the FEC train bridge over the New River is up, permitting boats to pass, the street bridges will also be up, stopping vehicular traffic. The marine traffic on the river will be forced into specific time slots, causing traffic jams both on the river and the streets.

The DEIS does not address the time trains might stand in queue waiting for the drawbridges to open and close and how these standing trains might further impact railway crossings while they block these crossings during their wait, further impacting all of the above problems caused by increased train traffic.

Damage to property values on or near the tracks or the New River. Properties above the FEC Rail Bridge will have limited ocean access due to AAF's proposed frequent closings of the FEC Rail Bridge. One of the best selling/owning points of the properties in this area is that they have unlimited ocean access. AAF passenger trains and FEC freight trains will close the bridge 6.5 hours each day. This will negatively affect property values, property taxes will drop which will deplete the city's revenues. Emergency services, libraries and education will suffer. Noise and vibration from the trains will pose a problem for properties/businesses close to the tracks.

Quiet Zones and Jobs: Fort Lauderdale has 68 crossings which must be maintained by the city. It is estimated that a normal-sized railroad crossing with a quiet zone could cost \$200,000, while a wide crossing could cost \$600,000. Cities and their tax payers will pick up this tab. AAF suggest that the construction of the project will provide jobs and improve the economy. They are also likely aware that job creation for track construction is a transient thing and would only increase burden on infrastructure and taxpayers without any long term benefits. Additionally the marine industries located on St. Rd 84 will suffer significant business losses because the boats will have difficulty getting to their marinas due to frequent closings of an old, unreliable bridge. Jobs in this industry will be in jeopardy. Job loss in our area affects every person living in Fort Lauderdale.

Need for Another Passenger Train: TriRail services South Florida and AMTRAK has an existing line from Miami to Orlando which runs at a deficit due to lack of riders. Why do we need AAF when there are two existing services? According to the Congressional Research Service a passenger train's ridership must have between 6 and 9 million riders the first year to be profitable. According to the DEIS, the train's ridership is projected to be 3.5 million in 2019.

What We Need: If the FRA decide to grant AAF a federal loan, the most immediate mitigation needed in Fort Lauderdale is a new, dependable fast opening rail bridge over the New River with an onsite bridge tender in order to ensure that some the above problems are reduced.

Additional Comments:

Sincerely, _____

Please Print Your Name:

Date

TO: Mr. Joseph Szabo Administrator Federal Rail Road Administration
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

Many people would agree a coastal passenger rail line is suboptimal for a number of reasons. Let's look at Florida's demographics. Significant population growth is projected throughout the state. Since our coastal areas are already highly developed, population growth must, therefore, press inland. If we proceed with AAF's coastal passenger rail interconnectivity, this will further disadvantage our future population by keeping them much more isolated than they would be if a future transit system were to be located nearer to the new growth areas instead.

With this as backdrop, our observations come down to two things: First, AAF rail service will preclude timely transportation infrastructure planning for the future population of inland Florida; and second, it compromises the financial viability and sustainability of a future better-placed rail line to accommodate said population by dividing the market share.

1. If AAF proceeds, it is far less likely that state or (any) county officials, including planning groups like our multi-county MPO, will start long-range planning for better, alternative passenger rail lines. Consequently, they won't plan for rights of way and land acquisition, nor related development planning that would facilitate a future preferred rail line. We will be doomed to a poor-planning model, and (future) leaders won't even see this until many, many years in the future when effective planning will be all the more expensive and convoluted. So, an adverse effect of EIS is its deleterious impact on the effectiveness of future transportation infrastructure planning. Building AAF as an intercity passenger rail transportation model for "old Florida" is not going to be consistent with building an intercity transportation model for the "new Florida" to come.

2. Next consider the likelihood that even if AAF goes forward, it will have continuously underperforming passenger ridership—not just in terms of passenger numbers, but also in terms of weak financial performance. As a former corporate financial planner and analyst, this suggests to me future plans for a new and improved passenger line will be handicapped by these previously existing, poorly planned coastal tracks. The reason is that the line would have to share the ridership "pie" with AAF, thereby dragging down prospective ridership and attendant financial performance.

Who will want to finance a future rail line in a better location if its market share is weakened by

another line already running through coastal regions? This may create a situation where AAF crowds out potential development of a better line because it would need the whole "pie" to sustain itself. So, another adverse effect of EIS is its significant negative impact on the financial viability of otherwise superior future transportation infrastructure planning.

We won't be the only ones "paying the price" for AAF in terms of its quality-of-life wreckage. Future generations, even our new residents, will also pay the price of moving to a state whose passenger rail service was antiquated from the outset. We no longer live in the age of Mr. Flagler.

Both the RIFF loans and PAB bonds for this project should be denied.

Sincerely,

cc: Recipients: Designated Comments Email as Provided In EIS Draft, Governor Rick Scott, EPA's Environmental Hotline, EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy, Senator Marco Rubio, Ananth Prasad Florida Department of Transportation, Congressman Patrick Murphy, Congressman Paul Ryan

November 5, 2014

Federal Railroad Administration
c/o John Winkle, FRA,
1200 New Jersey Ave, Room W 38-311,
Washington DC 20590.

Dear Mr. Winkle:

On behalf of hundreds of citizens of Vero Beach, Florida and thousands of petitioners of Florida Not All Aboard I want to register strong objections to the high-speed passenger rail project All Aboard Florida and the DOT's loan to same. Simply stated, the project is not viable and will cost taxpayers well more than \$2 Billion.

If this is not the case, why did DOT refuse a \$ 5.6 Billion grant to Xpress West a similar passenger rail project from California to Las Vegas just last year? AAF is all about Crony Capitalism with taxpayer funds used to benefit a large publicly owned hedge fund - The Fortress Group - which has major real estate and freight handling/shipping interest in south Florida, especially Miami.....

Beyond this very basic point, the process for public hearing of the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Palm Beach to Orlando leg of the project is deeply flawed. Important considerations of safety, emergency access, costs to upgrade hundreds of grade-level crossings as well as impact on local businesses and property values should NOT be in the hands of a consulting firm retained and paid by the petitioner, AAF. This is DOT's basic job.....

The silence in Washington re AAF on the part of elected officials is deafening and, indeed, scandalous.....Please see that this letter is made part of the public record on this hearing process.

Sincerely,

Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311,
Washington, DC 20590

November 17, 2014

Dear Mr. Winkle, of the Federal Railroad Administration,

Please consider, review, and address these concerns as revisions to the final EIS document:

I have many concerns about the scope, methodology, and supporting details of the All Aboard Florida (AAF) project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) submitted to your office in September, 2014. I am most concerned with the North-South Corridor from Cocoa to West Palm Beach.

To begin with, the DEIS fails to adequately address many significant negative aspects of the proposed All Aboard Florida project, and does not clarify or address the extent to which the project will enhance safety (49 CFR 260.7(a)). **The AAF DEIS does not adequately demonstrate how AAF will enhance public safety as a RRIF (260.7) priority consideration.**

For instance, in **3.3-C_Grade-Crossings** Rail line relocation and the building of overpasses and underpasses for the 340+ at-grade crossings, and grade separation along the N-S corridor are not sufficiently addressed in the DEIS, even as Alternatives. This greatly conflicts with Federal Railroad Administrator Joseph C. Szabo's remarks as prepared for delivery to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials Committee on Rail Transportation (SCORT) in Denver, Colorado on September 7, 2014. Mr. Szabo stated then that "*On the safety side, and to improve the quality of life in communities, our vision (Grow America) would support rail-line relocation efforts, and grade-crossing improvements, and projects that seal off corridors by building over-passes and underpasses.*"

Furthermore, according to Frank A. Frey, (Gen. Engineer-HSR of Federal Railroad Administration | U.S. DOT 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE) ON-SITE ENGINEERING FIELD REPORT – Part 1 All Aboard Florida from March 20, 2014--- "*In my professional opinion, I respectfully disagree with the Project's approach in that they are not exercising appropriate safety practices and reasonable care when designing for High Speed Passenger Rail service. I explained to the entire diagnostic team how important it was to adopt the principles of the Sealed Corridor approach. However, it was clearly evident that the Project was not pursuing such concept.*"

In St. Lucie County where I live there are 20 railroad crossings along the 22 mile length of the county. Eighteen of these are at-grade crossings. In the Town of St. Lucie Village, where I reside (Incorporated in 1961, but first settled in 1843 under the Armed Occupation Act of 1842), all of our six crossings are at-grade crossings. The proposed project's sealed corridor mitigation is unclear and unrealistic. Yet appropriate safety guidelines and safety practices are most necessary. Public safety must be a priority.

Next, the AAF project will endanger human life not only due to the dangerous at-grade crossings but also due to the great likelihood of increased delays for emergency vehicles, ambulances, fire department, and police vehicles needing immediate access over the at-grade tracks which provide access to St. Lucie Village. Furthermore, **Page 10 of 3.3B4 AlternativeA N-S Corridor Track Chart** shows 30% plans for triple tracks with a center siding which would extend about $\frac{3}{4}$ of the length of St. Lucie Village. Because St. Lucie Village's only ingress and egress to most of its residences and the National Register of Historic Places 34-structure historic district in the Village is also only accessed over the FEC tracks, this additional track/siding will place a great safety burden on the Village, especially in case of medical or fire emergencies. I ask that you consider another alternative construction site for the triple track/center siding, a site which won't extend over the Village's six at-grade crossings.

Moreover, the DEIS does not address the reality of the time trains might wait on the additional siding and how these standing trains might further impact railway crossings while they block these crossings during their wait and further exacerbate the safety concerns for increased trains and faster speeds of the AAF project. According to the **DEIS: S-9, page 13, paragraph 5**: "Typical at-grade crossings (intersections of local roads with the FECR corridor) would be closed an average of 54 times per day (3 times per hour)..." The potential for catastrophic consequences created at the at-grade crossings is most frightening. I am also greatly concerned that malfunction of the safety equipment, electrical/mechanical errors, human error in operations, or trespassers' "challenges" to higher speed rail will result in a much higher risk of accidents at St. Lucie County's at-grade crossings.

Also evident is the DEIS does not address St. Lucie County's emergency evacuation impairment (both Nuclear and hurricane evacuation emergencies) created by the project. Furthermore, the DEIS does not address the safe passage of pedestrian and bicycle traffic through St. Lucie Village's at-grade crossings. Many crossing intersections in the Village along Old Dixie Highway (SR 605) and running parallel with the FEC tracks are used as school bus stops, where school children of all ages are picked up and dropped off daily throughout the school year. Safe passage across the crossings is a great concern. The at-grade crossings are also important for providing access and enjoyment to St. Lucie Village's Heritage Park, our residences and the Indian River Lagoon.. Construction of medians and quadrant gates will create neighborhood fragmentation and impair the quality of life in St. Lucie Village's residents.

One last safety concern for the project is noise and vibration. **According to page Methodology 4-37 Affected Environment---**" The Project Study Area for noise extends approximately 2,500 feet from the rail corridor and the Project Study Area for vibration extends approximately 600 feet. These study areas include all land uses that are sensitive to noise or vibration ("sensitive receptors"). This would most definitely include St. Lucie Village's historic district structures. Furthermore, under **Noise and Vibration... 5.2.2 page 5-39 the DEIS states** "The Project would result in long-term noise and vibration adverse impacts to residents and properties, primarily along the N-S Corridor." **Also, on page 5-51 under North-South Corridor about ground-borne vibration levels exceed FRA criteria.. North-South Corridor, the DEIS states** Ground-borne vibration levels already exceed the FRA criteria along the N-S Corridor due to the frequency and nature of current freight operations. FRA guidance for assessing project impacts along such "heavily used rail corridors" (more than 12 trains per day) states that additional impact would occur if the project approximately doubled the number of trains (FRA 2012a).

Thank you for addressing these important safety concerns as revisions to the final EIS document. Thank you also for halting all further action to advance the AAF project by FRA until all safety and environmental impacts of AAF are thoroughly addressed, assessed and mitigated.

Signed _____ printed name _____

Address _____

Email / telephone number _____

TO: **Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration**
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM: Donna Woodall
7895 134th St. Sebastian, Florida 32958

The Environmental Impact Statement for All Aboard Florida Does Not Adequately Address Environmental Issues - the permit should be denied. SE Florida coast line is not place for trains.

Comments regarding the EIS "Public Meeting" in Stuart from Greg Braun, an ecologist with over 25 years experience working in marine, estuarine, freshwater wetlands and upland habitats in Florida, the southeastern U.S., the Bahamas and the Caribbean.

"The chaos at the Federal Railway Administration's "Open House"-style public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that was held in Stuart on October 30 seemed well-orchestrated to make detailed information hard to acquire. No signs identified the area of expertise of the FRA representatives at the many "stations" that were set up around the large meeting room at the Kane Center, which made it difficult to find the right people to ask questions on specific topics.

If the right person could be located, answers were often vague or un-enlightening. Several attendees with experience in the financial world who wanted to pose questions searched unsuccessfully to find someone who could address detailed questions about financing and collateral.

Answers to detailed questions on potential ecological impacts were underwhelming – "No", they couldn't say how many territories of the Florida Scrub-jay (a state-listed and federal listed protected species) would be bisected by the train corridor in Jonathan Dickinson State Park. "No", they had no idea how many gopher tortoise burrows were present within the rail alignment (the State of Florida's "setback" for protection is 25 ft from the burrow entrance and the protection zone is in place even if the entrance is on a neighboring property owner). "No" they even weren't aware that the railway line straddles the Savannas Preserve State Park, which is home to scrub jays, gopher tortoises and endangered plants that are found practically nowhere else in the world. "No", they couldn't explain whether or not the addition of additional tracks (double-tracking or triple tracking) would involve removal of natural habitat or how much of the endangered scrub habitat would be converted to railway line.

Without answers to these and other similar level-of-detail questions, it is somewhere between surprising and unimaginable that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other state environmental agencies could "sign off" that the project's environmental impact would be insignificant.

One thing did become clear – the level of review was primarily "desktop" with inadequate time having been allocated to field investigations. Could it be that not knowing the accurate extent of environmental impact will result in approval of the EIS? It shouldn't be up to interested citizens to bring these types in information to the attention of FRA – a thoroughly completed EIS would have been forthright in identifying environmental impacts.

We need to be protecting our life support systems that remain on earth. As long as Environmental Impact Statements are done by consultants working on behalf of project proponents, questions of thoroughness will remain."

Sincerely,

cc: Recipients: Designated Comments Email as Provided In EIS Draft, Governor Rick Scott, Senator Marco Rubio, Senator Bill Nelson, Ananth Prasad Florida Department of Transportation, Andrew Philips - US Army, David Keys, Evelyn Smart - Coast Guard

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
 Room W38-311
 Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

The most shocking exposition in the E. I. S. is the flippant projection of statistics to give the appearance of a viable business plan. They don't compute, and don't match our knowledge of reality. Many problems of accuracy show up in the ridership projections purportedly "developed by the F.R.A. in its study." A good example of the muddled statistics is the statement by Druce, *"I am quite confused as to how All Aboard Florida can expect to divert 31,000 passengers from AMTRAK and 152,000 from air travel when these totals exceed the current passenger levels."* That may result from the railroaders wanting the \$1.6 billion loan so much. As I remember the old English saying, "If wishes were horses, all the infantry would be cavalry."

As our custodians of RIFF loan funds, you are responsible to your constituents to be certain that taxpayer monies are being properly and prudently spent and invested. It is your duty to be totally informed on matters as large as a \$1.8 billion dollar loan.

Look behind the curtain and view the process federal officials used in creating the draft Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed project.

Because the Federal Government does not have enough money to pay for Environmental Impact Studies — they allowed All Aboard Florida to:

1. Pay for the consultant
2. Provide the content

Does this sound like an objective, independent process? AAF bought and paid for consultants, and contributed the content. When Florida All Aboard applied for a \$1.6 billion federal loan, the Federal Railroad Administration was required to conduct a study on the feasibility of the project, as well as potential impacts — both beneficial and detrimental — to communities along the rail line.

Hone in on one paragraph (Chapter 1, page 7) in the draft report:

The Federal Railroad Administration "DOES NOT HAVE APPROPRIATED FUNDS TO SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT" of environmental impact statements. Hence, the agency "requires the applicant (All Aboard Florida) to engage the services of a qualified consultant approved by the Federal Railroad Administration to assist (the agency) in preparing the Environmental Impact Statement."

To repeat: **Who pays the consultant for these services?** "... the third-party contractor is paid for by ALL ABOARD FLORIDA but reports to and takes direction from the Federal Railroad Administration."

And what about the material contained in the draft report? **The third-party contractor "reviewed all materials provided by ALL ABOARD FLORIDA ..."**

This explains why a lot of the information is little more the usual All Aboard spiel. Example? Ridership projections (Chapter 3, page 45). We cannot assume the Federal Railroad Administration is a dispassionate, objective, independent third party that will weigh all the facts and render a fair, objective decision on the feasibility of the project.

The process is a sham.

The Treasure Coast is being railroaded into a project that will provide no direct benefits beyond the short-term, economic impact from construction, while experiencing the greatest number of negative impacts along the 235-mile rail line. The taxpayers of Florida and the nation expect their elected representatives to know and understand the true facts, not those purported in a biased document.

Sincerely,

Mr. Winkle,

The residents and business people in our communities **DO NOT** want The All Aboard Florida and the additional freight trains, for many reasons. **PLEASE WITHHOLD THE FUNDS FOR THIS PROJECT.**

Bullet Trains traveling over 100 mi per hour, 32 times a day. **HOW MANY STREETS AND HOW FAR AHEAD WILL THEY HAVE TO CLOSE THE CROSSINGS FOR THE TRAIN TRAVELING THAT FAST? ALSO THE FREIGHT WILL BE INCREASED TEN FOLD. THIS WILL NOT ONLY BE PASSENGER CARS.**

People with life threatening situations (Heart Attacks, Strokes, Accidents ,etc) will not be able to get to the hospital, which is located on the East side of the tracks. First responders, Police, fire fighters even the Coast Guard are all against this plan. Lives will be lost.

More and longer **FREIGHT TRAINS** are scheduled...two sets of tracks with trains running all the time. Traffic will be backed up for long periods of time.

Our Real Estate values will plummet for all businesses and for the Home Owners living near and west of the tracks. The Railroad goes right through our downtown. The noise and disruption will totally ruin our community.

Almost all of our **SHOPPING AND SERVICE BUSINESSES** are west of the tracks, making it a hardship for the beach population to support. These businesses are our tax base.

The AAF wants the Indian River Taxpayers to pay to create Quiet Zones and then maintain them. There are worries because the history of Bullet Trains shows they have not been profitable. Then who pays?



Cut Here

John Winkle
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Room W38-31
Washington, DC 20590

October 29, 2014

Dear Mr. Winkle,

We are strongly opposed to the proposed "All Aboard Florida" passenger train service from Miami to Orlando. Thirty-two high-speed trains (16 each direction) in addition to the existing freight trains is destructive to both the environment of Martin County and the quality of life of its citizens. We, in Martin County have been striving to return and or retain the natural wetlands essential to wildlife and a healthy water system. The rail beds, crossings, and fences necessary to accommodate 32 high-speed trains will mitigate those efforts. When wildlife meets a 100 mile an hour train, wildlife loses.

Noise from the trains will be very harmful to the thousands who live along its route, regardless of whether train whistles sound. Their quality of life will be destroyed. Their property values will plummet.

Highways and bridges will be clogged 32 plus times a day. This will happen when children are going to and being dismissed from school. It will happen during rush hour. It will happen during street fairs, air shows, festivals and all the other special activities that make Martin County special. The downtown Stuart shopping area will become a ghost town because no one will want to navigate "confusion corner" with that level of train traffic. Please consider what that will do to business in the area and tax revenues.

There are really no good reasons to approve this route and this number of trains through Martin County. Please reject the proposal.

Sincerely, _

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM: Patricia Horn
PO Box 1470
Fellsmere, Florida 32948

Who is watching out for the community's interest? So many questions remain unanswered. Who has the authority to say how many trains are too many? Uninterrupted frequency of trains flowing along the coastal track will diminish commerce and back up traffic. Underperforming passenger service may push freight service as the financial life-saver of the company. The trains' speed may result in fatal vehicle-versus-train collisions.

How many trains a day are too many? AAF and FECI say they can do whatever they want on the rail lines they own. But what mechanism is in place to protect the public from 32 trains increasing to who knows how many, 100, 200 passenger and freight trains running through the county?

This activity could virtually cut off the east from the west parts of town, impede emergency services and reduce commerce due to the relentless flow of trains. And will the rail cars move from passenger to the more lucrative and consistent freight when revenue falls short of expectations?

Sincerely,

cc: Recipients: Designated Comments Email as Provided In EIS Draft, Governor Rick Scott, Office of Rail Road Policy and Development, Senator Marco Rubio, Senator Bill Nelson, Ananth Prasad Florida Department of Transportation, Congressman Patrick Murphy

11/19/2014

Print letter | Citizens Against The Train

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
 Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

ALL ABOARD FLORIDA WILL SHUT DOWN THE OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FLORIDA'S PANAMA CANAL

It is not just a little problem of impatient "yachties" waiting. As illustrated by Barbara Cook, The St. Lucie River is not just another Florida river. It stands apart from the New River and Loxahatchee River and Miami River because it is not merely a vessel thoroughfare through some county roads. It is the equivalent of the Panama Canal for vessels transiting via the Okeechobee Waterway from the Atlantic Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico. Just as the Panama Canal is the only way to get from the Atlantic to the Pacific without going around notorious Cape Horn, the Okeechobee Waterway is the only way for vessels to transit from the Gulf of Mexico to the Atlantic Ocean without going south around the Florida Keys (for shallow-draft vessels) or Key West (for deep-draft vessels).

The railroad trestle across the St. Lucie River in Stuart is the motor vehicle equivalent of a traffic bottleneck closing Interstate 95, possibly for the majority of each daylight hour, considering All Aboard Florida plans of 32 transits per day, with most, if not all, during daylight hours. In its closed position, the trestle allows passage of boats that require clearance of less than of 6.2 feet, only the tiniest of boats. The trestle is not just another modern drawbridge. It is an ancient 100-year-old mechanism that opens and closes with the speed of a backward-facing turtle. It thus requires closures commencing well in advance of any approaching train, with sufficient advance time to alert and slow commercial barge traffic to complete passage prior to commencing its downward path. The Environmental Impact Statement says a closure cycle takes 15 minutes. That is not what I and others have measured, from red light to green light to coordination with opening the old Roosevelt vehicle bridge a few feet to the west of the trestle. Every time I have passaged the trestle, it takes 30 minutes to complete an open-and-close cycle, measured from the time the trestle red light heralds an approaching train, when vessels must halt their approach and when the old Roosevelt bridge tender will no longer open on request, including the time when the train passes sufficiently far to permit commencement of the closing process, to the time the green light once again allows passage of vessels and the old Roosevelt Bridge tender will once again open on request "after vehicle traffic clears".

The plan is for 32 All Aboard Florida mostly daylight-traveling trains. Add that to the current 22 freight trains. Even assuming all the freight trains travel at night (which they do not), at 30 minutes per event that is 16 hours when boat traffic cannot passage! That is more daylight hours than there are in December. That effectively closes down Florida's Panama Canal completely to the thousands of vessels that pass through the St. Lucie Lock on their passage from the Gulf of Mexico to the Atlantic Ocean. Those vessels include the new yachts that manufacturers bring to and from the boat

shows in Miami, Ft. Lauderdale, St. Pete, Newport and beyond, the many commercial barges, the yachts of cruisers and snowbirds headed home or to the Bahamas or to the Gulf on their way to Mexico, Texas and other states north and west, as well as the many casual recreational local boaters who live on the west side of the trestle.

*It is not just about impatient yachties having to wait. **The Okeechobee Waterway is a lifeline for Florida vessels transiting between the Gulf and the Atlantic, a lifeline that All Aboard Florida threatens to choke to its waterway death.***

Sincerely,

cc: Recipients: Designated Comments Email as Provided In EIS Draft, Governor Rick Scott, Senator Marco Rubio, Senator Bill Nelson, Ananth Prasad Florida Department of Transportation, Andrew Philips - US Army, David Keys, Evelyn Smart - Coast Guard, Congressman Paul Ryan

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
 Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

The East Coast of Florida has topography unique to the United States, and is not suited for railway expansion.

All Aboard Florida will significantly impact boaters who must cross under railway tracks and use drawbridge access to open water, as well as businesses dependent on those boaters, therefore impacting the economy, recreation and quality of life. Reports from a significant number of boaters indicate that they would no longer use these recreational areas and would not make their usual stops here.

4.1.3-C Navigational Report: Indicates a wait time of approximately 17.6 minutes of wait time for boats during train crossings at the St. Lucie River Crossing, while glossing over the actual impact of boating and boating businesses in the area, where at time several boats are stacked up waiting for trains to cross.

The study describes the impact as "minimal." It is difficult to believe than an additional 32 trains plus 20 freight trains plus more additional freight coming up from Miami crossing the New River would not have any impact.

The New River bridge would be closed 6.5 hours per day: 30 times a day for an average of 13 minutes vs. 10 times a day currently for an average of 19 minutes.

The Loxahatchee River Bridge currently is used by about 20 trains a day and the bridge is down and blocking marine traffic for about 20 minutes each time. The Loxahatchee span would be closed 8.4 hours per day: 42 times a day for an average of 12 minutes vs. 10 times a day for an average of 19 minutes.

The proposed additional AAF passenger train traffic will add at least one additional bridge lowering each hour — two additional lowerings unless the northbound and southbound trains cross at the exact same time, which is unlikely. That's 40 to 60 minutes each hour with the bridge being down, blocking all boat traffic, including emergency boats operated by the U.S. Coast Guard, the Jupiter Police, the Tequesta Police and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

Table 2.2-3 indicates 746 out of 900 Martin County's river marinas are affected by rail traffic, clearly showing the detriment of increased trains. The EIS indicates that the marine industry for the St. Lucie River was \$523.7 million in December 2013. The EIS state St. Lucie River has 1,307 slips; over half are commercial. Delayed boating will definitely impact these businesses and the economy. I refer to the EIS informational table:

The draft continues to misrepresent: "The St. Lucie River represents approximately 82.9% of the marine activity in Martin County and 15.3% in St. Lucie County. Because the economic activity associated with the St. Lucie River is located in both Martin and St. Lucie Counties, the total economic value of this river is equivalent to 82.9% of the

economic value of the marine industry in Martin County plus 15.3% of the economic value of the marine industry in St. Lucie County, resulting in a total economic value of \$648.8 million. This total value is comprised of \$481.3 million in direct expenditures, \$79.4 million in indirect effects, and \$88.1 million in indirect effects. This activity supports a total of 6,420 jobs and \$186.6 million in personal income (see Table 5.2-9).”

The EIS does not address the time trains might stand in queue waiting for the drawbridges to open and close and how these standing trains might further impact railway crossings while they block these crossings during their wait, further impacting all of the above problems caused by increased train traffic.

Sincerely,

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
 Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

Your agency should object to All Aboard because of the navigation, water quality and economy negative impacts. The DEIS has serious flaws, major deficiencies.

The most shocking exposition in the E. I. S. is the flippant projection of statistics to give the appearance of a viable business plan. They don't compute, and don't match our knowledge of reality. Many problems of accuracy show up in the ridership projections purportedly "developed by the F.R.A. in its study." A good example of the muddled statistics is the statement by Druce, "I am quite confused as to how All Aboard florida can expect to divert 31,000 passengers from AMTRAK and 152,000 from air travel when these totals exceed the current passenger levels." That may result from the railroaders wanting the \$1.6 billion loan so much. As I remember the old English saying, "If wishes were horses, all the infantry would be cavalry."

For example, the Marina and Boat Slip Inventory Needs Further Study

Draft EIS indicates: • 15 public and private marinas on the river (undefined subject area) with 439 total boat slips with Public and Private marine facilities are concentrated in eastern portion of the river (Stuart and Port Salerno) with 4 boat ramps

In reality, Martin-St. Lucie Regional Waterways Plan indicates:

- 13 boat ramps on the river in both counties.
- Numerous marinas in both Martin and St. Lucie County with 2,200 private slips; 2,000 dry storage

Second example, St. Lucie River Rail Drawbridge and Boat Traffic – Needs Further Study

- *The Draft EIS* reported an average daily vessel arrival of 157 per day passing through the Old Roosevelt Train Bridge
- In contrast, *Martin County Engineering Department* facilitated an independent study which showed a daily vessel count of 243 per day

As our custodians of RIFF loan funds, you are responsible to your constituents to be certain that taxpayer monies are being properly and prudently spent and invested. It is your duty to be totally informed on matters as large as a \$1.8 billion dollar loan. Look behind the curtain and view the process federal officials used in creating the draft Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed project.

Because the Federal Government does not have enough money to pay for Environmental Impact Studies – they allowed All Aboard Florida to:

1. Pay for the consultant
2. Provide the content

Does this sound like an objective, independent process? AAF bought and paid for consultants, and contributed the content. When Florida All Aboard applied for a \$1.6 billion federal loan, the Federal Railroad Administration was required to conduct a study on the feasibility of the project, as well as potential impacts — both beneficial and detrimental.— to communities along the rail line.

Hone in on one paragraph (Chapter 1, page 7) in the draft report:

The Federal Railroad Administration "DOES NOT HAVE APPROPRIATED FUNDS TO SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT" of environmental impact statements. Hence, the agency "requires the applicant (All Aboard Florida) to engage the services of a qualified consultant approved by the Federal Railroad Administration to assist (the agency) in preparing the Environmental Impact Statement."

To repeat: **Who pays the consultant for these services?** "... the third-party contractor is paid for by ALL ABOARD FLORIDA but reports to and takes direction from the Federal Railroad Administration."

And what about the material contained in the draft report? **The third-party contractor "reviewed all materials provided by ALL ABOARD FLORIDA ..."**

This explains why a lot of the information is little more the usual All Aboard spiel. Example? Ridership projections (**Chapter 3, page 45**). We cannot assume the Federal Railroad Administration is a dispassionate, objective, independent third party that will weigh all the facts and render a fair, objective decision on the feasibility of the project.

The process is a sham.

The Treasure Coast is being railroaded into a project that will provide no direct benefits beyond the short-term, economic impact from construction, while experiencing the greatest number of negative impacts along the 235-mile rail line. The taxpayers of Florida and the nation expect their elected representatives to know and understand the true facts, not those purported in a biased document.

Sincerely,

cc: Recipients: Designated Comments Email as Provided In EIS Draft, Governor Rick Scott, Senator Marco Rubio, Senator Bill Nelson, Office of Rail Road Policy and Development, Gov. Rick Scott, Congressman Patrick Murphy, Ananth Prasad Florida Department of Transportation

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

EIS meetings are merely "Show and tell for All Aboard Florida."-A Public meeting is a meeting in which members participate to exchange their ideas on a particular issue - and that does not happen at the EIS meetings. AND THE HEAD COUNT RELIES SOLELY ON SIGN IN SHEET- BUT AAF REPS TELL NO ONE.

Here is the scene:

The parking lot at Stuart's Kane Center is full; the extra cars land in a lot across the street and in a swale beside Salerno Road.

Florida Not All Aboard covers a car with a giant sign: "All Aboard Florida —NOT!! a done deal!" Opponents of the proposed high-speed passenger rail sell "Shoo Shoo Big Choo Choo" buttons for a buck at the door. Men and women in suits, wearing Citizens Against Rail Expansion buttons, talk in groups on the front sidewalk. Newspapers estimate the crowds at 750-800, and an informal head count is more than 1,000.

Inside, the Federal Railroad Administration seeks public comments on an environmental impact statement the railroad prepared.

Thursday's substitute for a public hearing is an odd production. Big sheets of cardboard with long and boring explanations about various aspects of All Aboard Florida line the walls. A slide show with a few chairs has a few watchers. So does a laughable animation showing dozens of boats speeding through the open railroad bridge. The bridge closes and a train crosses in seconds, then opens for more boats to speed through.

An AAF rep drags a supporter around to talk to reporters. Mike Cieslinski, a Stuart resident for two years, said he would drive to West Palm Beach to take the train to Miami for sports events.

Men in suits from AAF and AMEC, the environmental engineering firm that prepared the open house, mill about, smiling smugly and chatting with Martin residents. I ask one, Brad Flom, what All Aboard Florida plans to do with Stuart's ancient, rusty and rickety railroad bridge. "We hope,"

he said, "to get another 30 years out of rehabilitated bridges." So is the Stuart bridge on the rehab list? He directs me to another suit, but the guy vanishes by the time I elbow through the crowds.

Realtor Julia Sansevere, who sells luxury waterfront homes, worries home values will drop and the whole county real estate market will tank if the high-speed train goes through. Dennis Fadden, president of Martin's Board of Realtors, agrees, and also worries about marine navigation for those luxury homes with docks. No one answers his letters or concerns.

Greg Braun, one of the county's top environmental scientists, turns in comments citing the railroad's failure to address how more train traffic will affect wildlife, its failure to include the Savannas State Preserve in its plans, and concerns about additional tracks and trains affecting fire management there and at Jonathan Dickinson State Park.

Lisa Standley, with the firm running the open house, said the feds' head count relies solely on sign-in sheets. THERE WERE A COUPLE OF SHEETS WITH A FEW SIGNATURES ON TABLE AT THE ENTRANCE TO THE ROOM, BUT NO ONE TELLS RESIDENTS THAT THEY MUST SIGN IN TO BE COUNTED - WHY NOT?

"Thanks for telling me about this," she said, walking away.

Residents don't like the format of the meeting. "It's a zoo," says a local resident. "It's very poorly thought out, organized and executed. It's not a way the public can express feelings about All Aboard Florida." "And there is no way to find out true numbers for such things as ridership. It's all being hidden; there is no transparency."

EIS meetings are merely "Show and tell for All Aboard Florida."

Sincerely,

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

Please conduct a public hearing on this issue. The Environmental Impact Statement for All Aboard Florida Does Not Adequately Address Environmental Issues - the permit should be denied. SE Florida coast line is not place for trains.

Comments regarding the EIS "Public Meeting" in Stuart from Greg Braun, an ecologist with over 25 years experience working in marine, estuarine, freshwater wetlands and upland habitats in Florida, the southeastern U.S., the Bahamas and the Caribbean.

"The chaos at the Federal Railway Administration's "Open House"-style public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that was held in Stuart on October 30 seemed well-orchestrated to make detailed information hard to acquire. No signs identified the area of expertise of the FRA representatives at the many "stations" that were set up around the large meeting room at the Kane Center, which made it difficult to find the right people to ask questions on specific topics.

If the right person could be located, answers were often vague or un-enlightening. Several attendees with experience in the financial world who wanted to pose questions searched unsuccessfully to find someone who could address detailed questions about financing and collateral.

Answers to detailed questions on potential ecological impacts were underwhelming – "No", they couldn't say how many territories of the Florida Scrub-jay (a state-listed and federal listed protected species) would be bisected by the train corridor in Jonathan Dickinson State Park. "No", they had no idea how many gopher tortoise burrows were present within the rail alignment (the State of Florida's "setback" for protection is 25 ft from the burrow entrance and the protection zone is in place even if the entrance is on a neighboring property owner). "No" they even weren't aware that the railway line straddles the Savannas Preserve State Park, which is home to scrub jays, gopher tortoises and endangered plants that are found practically nowhere else in the world. "No", they couldn't explain whether or not the addition of additional tracks (double-tracking or triple tracking) would involve removal of natural habitat or how much of the endangered scrub habitat would be converted to railway line.

Without answers to these and other similar level-of-detail questions, it is somewhere between surprising and unimaginable that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other state environmental agencies could "sign off" that the project's environmental impact would be insignificant.

One thing did become clear – the level of review was primarily "desktop" with inadequate time having been allocated to field investigations. Could it be that not knowing the accurate extent of environmental impact will result in approval of the EIS? It shouldn't be up to interested citizens to bring these types in information to the attention of FRA – a thoroughly completed EIS would have been forthright in identifying environmental impacts.

We need to be protecting our life support systems that remain on earth. As long as Environmental Impact Statements are done by consultants working on behalf of project proponents, questions of thoroughness will remain."

Sincerely,

cc: Recipients: Designated Comments Email as Provided In EIS Draft, Governor Rick Scott, Senator Marco Rubio, Senator Bill Nelson, Ananth Prasad Florida Department of Transportation, Andrew Philips - US Army, David Keys, Evelyn Smart - Coast Guard, Congressman Paul Ryan

John Winkle
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Mr. Winkle: re All Aboard Florida DEIS 9/14/2014

Please extend the deadline for comments to this report from December 3, 2014 for 60 days until February 3, 2015.

There are at least three reasons you should consider agreeing to this request.

It is complex brought out by the fact it took you at least 4 months longer to issue the report than you originally estimated. There are many items that seem to be missing (archeological areas, minority housing, specific wetland and natural habitat). The very design and placement of the railroad in the 19th century along the coast presents complex ecological issues which need to be addressed.

The specific timing has hurt the public several ways. The report was issued on a Friday which ironically is the favorite time for organizations to release bad news --- they are assured of several "free" days. In order to be sure comment mail gets to you in Washington it must be mailed the Saturday after Thanksgiving, another practical constraint against the public. Note: few discerning citizens will email comments as the recipient is the consultant selected by AAF and paid by AAF. The real problem in our area about the timing has been the summer and fall absence of many of our residents. Thousands were not aware of the DEIS until sometime in November when they returned from summer homes.

Lastly, the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act were not followed. As a result we in Indian River County were not able to attend the Scoping meetings presented by FRA during May 2013. Our County had no newspaper advertisement or other notice of these meetings. As a result we were at least 7 months behind all other affected Counties to learn about the rail plan.

The sum total of these facts has placed an unreasonable burden on Indian River County which is contrary to public law and regulations. This can be partially mitigated if you extend the comment period to February 3, 2015. Thank you.

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

The "ridership" promises for All Aboard Florida in the EIS look overly optimistic. These numbers are unlikely to be attained. This could result in a loan default or immediate request for subsidies.

According to the EIS, All Aboard Florida projects to have 3.5 million riders in 2019. At the same time, AAF claims they will take 3 million car trips off the road annually. Both these numbers seem high, and the two contradict each other.

Assuming ridership of 3.5 million per year that equates to 9,589 passengers per day or approximately 300 on each of the 32 trains. That means 300 passengers on every train every day including weekends, holidays, etc. In comparison, the Amtrak Acela train in the northeast carried only 3.3 million passengers in 2013. Acela serves market areas with a combined population of 38 million. AAF states "9 million live along the AAF rail corridor." Thus, a huge number of tourists must opt for train trips between Miami and Orlando each year at whatever rate is being charged and with a full understanding that when they reach the Orlando airport they'll need transportation to their next destination and parking in both locations.

AAF also claims it will remove "at least 3 million car trips" from roadways each year. Given their ridership expectation of 29% solo travelers and 71% multiple travelers, we can assume an average of two persons in each of the 3 million car trips or 6 million in total. That equates to approximately 16,440 riders per year or 514 passengers on each train.

The question is: which numbers are correct? Regardless, both sets seem too high and the likelihood of default or subsidies being needed rises accordingly. The requested loan should be denied.

Sincerely,

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

CSX Transportation is one of only five Class One railroads in the United States. CSX currently furnishes passenger rail service between Miami and Orlando via Amtrak. If high-speed rail is such a great opportunity, I wonder why CSX has not jumped at the chance to prove that service.

In fact, no railroad company is planning to provide the high-speed rail service. The current proposal is by a Wall Street hedge fund, Fortress Investment Group. Fortress bought the FEC in 2007 and has set up All Aboard Florida as a subsidiary.

At a recent meeting with the St. Lucie County Commission, the All Aboard Florida representative acknowledged that the money being borrowed by All Aboard Florida would be used to build a second and third set of tracks that would be used by the FEC in its freight operations.

That's only half of the story. The first, second and third set of tracks and the roadbed will be owned by the FEC and will not be subject to the lien of the mortgage given by All Aboard Florida to secure its debt. If All Aboard Florida should fail, then the FEC has the improved roadbed and the second and third set of tracks free and clear of any lien.

This is like a bank lending someone the money to build and furnish a home and taking back a mortgage on only the furniture.

If the FEC is not willing to guarantee the loan to All Aboard Florida and secure it by a mortgage on the real estate and all improvements, then the loan should not be made.

Sincerely,

cc: Recipients: Designated Comments Email as Provided In EIS Draft, Governor Rick Scott, Office of Rail Road Policy and Development, Senator Marco Rubio, Senator Bill Nelson, Congressman Patrick Murphy

Mr. John Winkle
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Mr. Winkle,

Emergency vehicles access needs to be addressed much more fully in the EIS. According to the All Aboard Florida website, AAF "is committed to working with city and local officials to ensure that appropriate communications and logistics are in place so that response times for emergency vehicles are not impacted."

These communications include publishing schedules for crossing closures so emergency vehicles are aware of potential blockages ahead of time and additional warning measures to alert these vehicles of any schedule changes.

But none of these address the real problem. In an emergency, ambulances and fire trucks must take the most direct route to the problem area. Rerouting such vehicles to a more indirect route could result in serious injury or even death. Further, while AAF trains are supposed to pass through crossings in "less than 60 seconds," that time alone could be critical to the patient being transported. Finally, the reality is that only the first car in line faces such a short delay. In season, an ambulance could easily be number 15 in line, thus facing a more extensive delay that the passenger may not survive.

These delays of life-saving vehicles must be considered as critical, negative impacts in the EIS. People's lives are at stake.

Sincerely,

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

Grade Separation: the DEIS indicates that the East-West Corridor would be entirely grade separated at roadways. Existing roads would either be crossed using bridges or would be closed, eliminating any potential safety concerns. A similar commitment to safety does not appear to be provided in the North-South Corridor. The North-South Corridor should require the same level of safety as the East-West Corridor. AAF should be required to pay for grade separation of the major crossings when done in consultation with local communities.

Grade Crossings: The DEIS Grade Crossing Details report did not account for impacts on emergency vehicular traffic that must cross the railroad tracks to deliver services to or from Jupiter Medical Center and the neighborhoods located on the other side of the corridor. The impact on emergency and public safety facilities should be analyzed in the study.

As a condition of proceeding with the proposed project, the FRA should require AAF to finance safety improvements associated with as well as the process required for the creation and the on-going maintenance of quiet zones requested by local communities. Further, the scope of work at each crossing, which should include Vehicle Presence Detection devices, should be detailed within the study.

Safety has to be addressed in the DEIS for pedestrians and bicyclists as well. Pedestrian gates and sidewalks should be included in the scope of work for crossing safety upgrades. Communities should be included in the evaluation of safety needs given local knowledge of pedestrian and bicycle movements.

Sealed Corridor: A sealed corridor needs to be established that minimizes visual impacts while effectively preventing informal pedestrian crossing between the established at-grade crossings. This should be done in cooperation with the impacted communities.

Sincerely,

cc: Recipients: Designated Comments Email as Provided In EIS Draft, Office of Rail Road Policy and Development, Department of Rail Safety, Senator Marco Rubio, Senator Bill Nelson, Ananth Prasad Florida Department of Transportation, Congressman Patrick Murphy, Congressman Paul Ryan

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
 Washington, DC 20590

FROM:

Page S-23, Table S-2 of the EIS Draft regarding All Aboard Florida states that there will be "no effect on public health and safety" with an "Overall beneficial effect on public health, safety and security."

This statement, in a biased document paid for and written by All Aboard Florida, is absolutely untrue. Federal tax funds should not be spent for this private project, which will decimate our South East Florida coastal towns.

The AAF DEIS is completely partial and shamefully prepared, with the twisted summarizations and incongruous conclusions drawn in the report. Safety concerns were tossed along the wayside. The grade crossings details are frighteningly indicative of the company's lack of regulation in this project. AAF's attempt to regulate navigation of intracoastal waters is an outrage! (but an example of FEC history repeating itself) Mitigation measures in the Treasure Coast are ridiculously ineffective in reducing the impact of AAF on our safety and quality of life

This project will do great harm to Public Safety and Emergency Responders. There are 156 at grade crossings in the Brevard, Martin, Indian River, St. Lucie and Palm Beach County alone compared to 11 grade crossings on the route from Washington, DC to Boston. Grade crossings are where accidents do occur.

The sheer density of at grade crossings is staggering – often more than 1 per mile! Drivers can expect crossings to be closed 54 times a day or three times an hour, compared to once an hour now.

1. **Martin County has 25 grade crossings in 26 miles of track; 10 are in the town of Stuart.**
2. **Brevard County has 55 crossings in 42 miles of track**
3. **Indian River County has 30 crossings in 21 miles of track**
4. **St Lucie County has 20 crossings in 22 miles of track**
5. **Palm Beach County has 26 crossings in 18 miles of track**

The FEC now carries about 14 freight trains a day, but that's expected to increase to 20 a day by 2016. This number is projected to multiply with the expansion of canal and Miami shipping. A substantial increase of the already burdensome freight traffic could paralyze Treasure Coast Towns. Adding 32 high-speed passenger trains would potentially shut them down indefinitely for hours per day.

In addition there will be a substantial increase delays for emergency vehicles, ambulances, fire department, and police vehicles needing immediate access to therefore endangering human life. Neither the CSX nor the FEC will ever be the proper corridor of a true high-speed express train like the bullet trains in Japan or the TGV in France. A true high-speed train is a major commitment and has to be done right.

Sincerely,

Public Health and Safety

Mr. John Winkle
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue
SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Mr. Winkle,

The "Public Health and Safety" section of the EIS does not adequately address some important negative aspects of the proposed All Aboard Florida program.

On pages S-17 and S-18, the EIS states "The Project would have an overall beneficial effect on public health, safety and security in the rail corridor." Further, "The benefits resulting from decreased congestion and the potential for fewer vehicular crashes and fewer emissions indicate that there will be no significant negative impacts on public health and safety."

These claims are based solely on train riders reducing the number of cars on I95 annually. While the "potential" for fewer crashes exists, there is no way to ensure that fewer cars means fewer crashes. Moreover, the reduction of emissions on the I95 corridor will be offset by the increase in auto exhaust from cars idling at closed crossings 32 times a day near heavily populated communities further east. In season, car lines will be 12-15 strong in each direction, with each auto spewing exhaust while awaiting clearance.

In addition, you should note that All Aboard Florida has not always made safety a priority. They initially refused to provide "sealed corridors" in their plan. Only after the Government demanded that they provide these safety features did they agree to include them.

As in other areas, All Aboard Florida has not fully addressed the potential negative impacts of their service on "Public Health and Safety." Unless or until they do so, their loan should be denied.

TO: Mr. John Winkle, Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Room W38-311
Washington, DC 20590

FROM: [REDACTED]

Table S-2 of the EIS Draft claims "*beneficial effects by increased freight traffic efficiencies.*" **Those of who live here disagree.** This statement, in a biased document paid for and written by All Aboard Florida, is absolutely not documented.

The first conclusion of the study was that AAF would achieve 3.5 million annual ridership by 2019.

That is preposterous. The entire population of the four big southern counties that would be served by an AAF passenger service (McDade, Broward, Monroe, and Palm Beach) is 5,625,226. A ridership of 3.5 million is about 70 percent of the entire population. What kind of data could possibly predict that 70 percent of the entire southern population is going to abandon their cars and ride the train up to Orlando — every year.

The second conclusion of the Study was that AAF would achieve 4 million annual ridership by 2030.

That compounds the fallacy by predicting that 70 percent of the entire population would abandon their cars and ride up to Orlando on the train every year for a dozen years. I think it would kind to attribute this to the wishful thinking. As another version of the saying goes, "If wishes were horses, beggars would ride."

The question is how could an objective government study be so fanciful?

Saying there are 50 million people who drive between Miami and Orlando every year doesn't prove the trains will be full of passengers. AAF refuses to release any figures as to how they arrived at the 3,000,000 cars calculation and that's a lot of imagined riders. There is no transparency in examining the AAF ridership study. It is hidden behind a false claim of trade secrets and is off limits to taxpayer inquiry, understanding or review

According to the government's own studies, AAF will not take cars off the road.

The Federal Train Policy report, "The Development of High Speed Rail in the United States: Issues and Recent Events,"* published in December 30, 2013, quotes a 1997 study in which the FRA estimated, "In most cases rail improvements would divert only 3%-6% of intercity automobile trips, and even less in corridors with average trip lengths under 150 miles."

The report goes on to estimate a one-hour reduction in rail-trip times along the most densely populated corridor in the U.S.A. (Boston-New York and New York-Washington), which would reduce automobile ridership along the Northeast Corridor by less than 1%.

All Aboard Florida's proposed Orlando-Tampa route was also addressed. Estimations from the Federal Train Policy Report concluded less than 2% of traffic would be relieved on the busiest sections of Interstate 4 with the addition of HSR.

So 98% of cars will still be on the road.

And how much will a ticket really cost? It's another secret.

What are the anticipated ticket prices, and what does All Aboard Florida research say about how many people would be willing to take the train at those secret prices? These are fundamental questions, and since this allegedly private adventure relies on an awful lot of public money, All Aboard Florida ought to be forthcoming about such matters and stop the smoke and mirrors routine.

To quote columnist Frank Cerabino, "Let's assume conservatively the fare will be in the \$60 to \$70 range for one person each way from Orlando to West Palm Beach. So, for planning purposes, a family of four should budget about \$500 for the total round-trip fares." This does not include parking, cab fares or car rentals at the destination.

How many can afford the extra money it takes to ride the train, get there in the same amount of time, and the pay taxes to cover annual losses and maintenance of crossings? We will be taking a car.

Sincerely,

cc: Recipients: Designated Comments Email as Provided In EIS Draft, Governor Rick Scott, Office of Rail Road Policy and Development, Senator Marco Rubio, Senator Bill Nelson, Ananth Prasad Florida Department of Transportation, Congressman Patrick Murphy, Congressman Paul Ryan