

Record Group TC6/1995
Massachusetts Port Authority Public Hearing Files, 1970-1986
Draft Master Plan Hearing in Revere, August 22, 1973 Tape 2

(Continued from Tape 1)

00:00:00,080 --> 00:00:33,920

Thomas Callaghan: ...that's right, and the feeling is that that's the best place. The pilot reacts immediately to an electronic device rather than a situation where a third party reads, he interprets something from a radar scope, and then gives his interpretation to the pilot, and then he makes the adjustment. It's a much quicker thing, and it's a greater precision to have the ILS, which—

00:00:30,640 --> 00:01:07,600

Mr. McKinnon: It seems to me that you were going to put in a system which would check the h8 of an aircraft over a particular spot. Possibly, you would say that you would check it over the highest spot or the peak of Beachmont Hill, perchance, because that's exactly where they come over. That would be the point at which they would be closest to the ground in this particular area.

Thomas Callaghan: Right.

Mr. McKinnon: If you put up some sort of a system that checks the h8 of the aircraft at that particular point, it wouldn't be a very great problem to have that in direct communications with the airport to tell the airport, "Hey, this guy is really way off."

00:01:06,720 --> 00:02:32,560

Thomas Callaghan: Well, to answer your question: there is radar of this type. It's not in use. No airport operator would be in a position of transmitting this type of information; it would be a decision by the FAA, and it would be a matter of taking it up with them.

Mr. McKinnon: How many airports do you have where an aircraft comes in solo—all right?—over a particular area housing so many people in general?

Thomas Callaghan: Well, there are many places where this exists and to a greater or lesser degree. You can fly in and out of many airports. It was mentioned here that Logan was unique in all the world; that's not exactly true. We do know that Logan is closer in than, by far, the majority, but there are airports that are very close downtown, and we found that there are residential areas developing right around the airport. Los Angeles is a very good example of—I would say—many more people than exist here. Midway is one. LaGuardia is one. Kansas City was one. Washington National has been mentioned. We can go right down the list of them. Dallas. And there are just many that are similar to that.

00:02:31,040 --> 00:04:20,079

Mr. McKinnon: I have another question for you.

Edward King: May— All right. Go ahead.

Mr. McKinnon: I'm wondering... I remember reading that they had passed legislation that the planes would have to clean up their engines by a certain date. What was that date?

Thomas Callaghan: Well, it's the end of the year, and they have—I just read, as a matter of fact, within the last couple of weeks, that it's almost completed, and it will be by the end of this year.

Mr. McKinnon: I still see a hell of a lot of planes.

Thomas Callaghan: Now, well. Keep in mind one thing—that the aircraft engines that were involved were the primary offenders, where the majority of them were the JTAD engine which is used in the DC-9 and 727, which is the majority of the planes that operate in here. Now, we're confident that you will not see them, essentially, after the end of the year—smoke from that type of an airplane. This regulation does not apply to the Convair 880, which is operated, for instance, by—the only one in Boston is TWA, but TWA is replacing these airplanes—if you've noticed the L-1011? We've seen within the last several months fewer of this type of airplane—the 880—and the increase in the L-1011. This is not only cleaner, but it's quieter. It carries more people. It can mean increased capacity with the same number of flights, so that, essentially, with the exception of some eventual—Well, some offenders will continue after the first year.

00:04:17,840 --> 00:06:05,759

Edward King: Would—I'd like to ask Mr. McKinnon—if he would just let me ask you one question after the meeting? Thanks. Yes, sir. Again, please, Mr. Bergson.

Harry Bergson: You're talking about airports, and Logan is one of a kind, you say, like that? Nothing else in the country that is so close to the big city.

Edward King: Well, I believe he said it's not, and he named 5 or six, like Kansas City, Washington...

Harry Bergson: I mean for the flying over homes, you know? Over people's homes.

Edward King: What he said—Mr. Mooney said there were others like that and he meant... Right.

Harry Bergson: And they all do? I'm set out on the west coast there and in Los Angeles they have a big—did you ever fly to that international airport in Honolulu?

Thomas Callaghan: Yeah, I have.

Harry Bergson: Do they let them fly over Honolulu?

Thomas Callaghan: Well, they—

Harry Bergson: The minute they get up they have to bear out to sea.

Thomas Callaghan: They have a rather unique situation there in that they have continuing prevailing winds, which, fortunately, permits the aircraft to—the runways are oriented and the wind also is such that they can, yes. And they can actually stay away from the downtown area.

00:06:02,960 --> 00:07:03,840

Harry Bergson: When they get up there's a big sign at the end of the runway: "As soon as you get up, turn sharp right."

Thomas Callaghan: Well, we have similar things here where a turn can be negotiated by the aircraft and also where a turn results in taking the airplane away from the people. A good example is taking off on the other ends of the runways that you are bothered by where there's a requirement that they make a left turn out and they avoid South Boston. In taking off on runway 9, there's a requirement that it goes straight out over the Point Shirley area. You may recall that not too many years ago there were an awful lot of left turns that, actually, when they took off

on 9 they were running right across Beachmont and this is not permitted any longer. They have to go straight out until they reach a certain altitude and then make a left turn.

Harry Bergson: [inaudible]

00:07:06,160 --> 00:07:29,520

Edward King: The gentleman in the rear, please. You've been patient.

Audience Member: I've got a couple of questions. One: is that airport going to be expanded?

Edward King: Well, we're hoping to.

Audience Member: I came late. So are you going to expand that airport?

Edward King: Well, we call it improvement, and I think the answer to your question is: Yes.

Audience Member: Stop saying "improvement." You're going to expand.

Edward King: Well, here's what the—

Audience Member: And the only way you're going to expand is on land. Am I right?

Edward King: Well, this is land, yes. It's land now; it was water.

00:07:27,680 --> 00:09:26,320

Audience Member: But you're going to take land. You're going to move one way or the other. It's going to be land no matter how you look at it, not water. And the second one is this: how much money does that airport contribute to taxes?

Edward King: Well, you mean in real estate taxes?

Audience Member: Anything. To the state of the town or the city or anything.

Edward King: Well, they pay a lot of money to the state through personal property taxes: the individual carriers on their furnishings and fixtures and on the airplanes. They don't pay any real estate taxes because of the reason that the Enabling Act, which created the Port Authority, stated there would be none. And this was in recognition of the fact that, prior to the Port Authority operation, the airport—and port—but the airport we're talking about was operated at a deficit under successive state operations over a 20-year period, and prior to that the city. But putting that aside for a minute, even though they were operating in a deficit and you and I, whether we like the airport or not, whether we use the airport or not, paid for it. It wasn't competitive; it didn't help business in any way. Tourism is our number two business and a good bit of them come through the airport. We nevertheless paid. Now, on the other side of the question—putting the law and the reasoning behind it aside—you have equity, and at the airport there wouldn't be any real reason that I've been able to find—from anyone—why Massport should pay municipal taxes. I say that because the police and their barracks, the fire department and their station and equipment, the street cleaning, the ash barrels, the garbage, the sewer system, snow removal, grass cutting: all maintenance, all services which Revere supplies to you and Winthrop to me as taxpayers are supplied by Massport and so the tenants over there are like our citizens and taxpayers.

00:09:24,000 --> 00:09:54,640

Audience Member: In other words, it's a losing business. It's losing money.

Edward King: No, it's not.

Audience Member: It must be. You just told me they're losing money.

Edward King: No, I didn't tell you they're losing money.

Audience Member: You must be losing money.

Edward King: Well, we're not. I'm sorry.

Audience Member: Where's a million dollars coming from?

Edward King: Well, we have never paid any—

Audience Member: Airline ain't paying no million dollars.

Edward King: Well, I thought I read they did, but I really don't know.

Audience Member: Wait a minute now, Mr. Uncle Sam.

Edward King: I see.

Audience Member: Taxpayers.

Edward King: I see.

00:09:50,880 --> 00:11:01,839

Audience Member: Mr. King?

Edward King: Yes? Yes, back to...

Audience Member: I just want to comment on what you just said. You said that the airport takes care of its municipal services.

Edward King: Right.

Audience Member: Now, back to the crash again, and you have an awful lot of ambulances and police going in there from all different cities

Edward King: That's true. And that's a part of the mutual aid program of which Mass Port, with its fire and state police operation, are a member of. There isn't any question, and in a more formal speech, we always mention that we are members of this and are grateful for the standby assistance, not only of Boston but of all others. Revere. In fact Mayor Reinstein, I believe, was the first one to call. He was either first or second—and I couldn't tell you right now who was the second, but Mayor Reinstein was either the first or second to call, but I had already left the office. But a reciprocity is always there from us as it is between Winthrop and Malden or Medford and Revere or whatever. And I just say that that's one of the parts of mutual aid.

00:11:01,920 --> 00:11:46,000

Audience Member: When is the reciprocity returned?

Edward King: Well, we've had it on several occasions with chemical fires or fires in Saugus and/or Lynn. We've been to Hyde Park, in various sections of East Boston. We've been to Chelsea. So many things. I think that if we have a listing current enough, we'll send it to you if we have your address. Just yesterday—I believe—or maybe it was this morning—our state police scuba diver team was down in Dennis, Massachusetts and recovered a body. They're doing this regularly: bodies, automobiles, weapons that are thrown overboard, the various cities and towns including—

Audience Member: That answers the questions more than enough. I didn't know what you meant. Thank you.

Edward King: Okay.

00:11:43,519 --> 00:12:51,920

Audience Member: Can I go back to my other question?

Edward King: Fine.

Audience Member: What is the principle behind the 99,000 dollars which you contributed to various neighborhood organizations in the last year?

Edward King: Well, I think the principle is to do what we can with the people in the area, recognizing that—you know—we have a noise problem, and that's something about which we really are doing everything we can. So let's say, beyond what we're doing, we can do nothing. So if we can enhance the recreation facilities or their ability to help themselves with a scholarship which they contribute to—you know—by their earnings—you know—it's better than doing nothing or saying we have no obligations. I think all companies, all businesses—every business, I'm sure, in Beachmont center or up on Broadway contribute to little league or church functions or boy scouts or whatever, and we do the same. We do it a little bit, let's say more—and we should—than they do. We do, I think, P and L-wise, quite a bit better.

00:12:49,440 --> 00:13:57,839

Audience Member: Okay. Along that line, the greatest contribution we made was not to recreational scholarships, but it was to a drug counseling and hearing program. Practically half of the money that you contributed was for that. That doesn't fall into what you just said.

Edward King: Well, it maybe doesn't, but I think it's community assistance. We're determining—and I think it's worthwhile—whether or not there is hearing problems, generally, with the youngsters in the neighborhood of Winthrop or Boston, Revere included, I would presume. Yes. Yes, they are. Right. Revere and Chelsea and certainly no one—you know—is excluded, but it does take time. They're doing it two or three days a week during the school season. It's—I think—it's a community gesture. Anyone that wishes to participate. I think it's reassuring if a youngster goes to the medical station and has his ears checked, and he finds out they're fine. No, he didn't have to go, of course, and perhaps most of them are fine, so maybe, in that sense, nothing's gained, but at least I would judge it's reassuring.

00:13:56,000 --> 00:15:55,839

Audience Member: Right. So the principle behind that is not what you said before. You said just now “community assistance.” Was that the word you used?

Edward King: Well, I would say, “Yes,” and I'd be willing to use that, and I'd classify that as the saying. What would you—how would you distinguish...?

Audience Member: What I'm trying to do is get to the main question, which is to get back to the question of the schools. We believe that we need a new school. We believe that one reason that we cannot build in this land which we own is certainly because of the airport. Why can't you just give us the money—as you have given it to other people—to build a school. Maybe not pay for the whole thing, but why can't you give us the 400,000 or 500,000 with no strings attached.

Edward King: Well, I think that, really, we cannot spend that kind of money without receiving some value. These are small amounts of money to a variety of people. I think that that comes under what we can satisfy ourselves as a reasonable corporate expenditure. Now, no strings attached is really a very unfortunate situation because the city of Revere could have had—and I'm sure still could have tomorrow morning, Friday morning, next Monday—that amount of money on, really, what are very favorable conditions. But the reason that it hasn't happened yet—and I would hope that that would vanish next week or tomorrow—is that they're afraid that

some people will assume that this site here—right in the school and the others, the two others—that when they're razed or demolished, would be used for airport expansion. We're not in a position to say, “Here is a half a million dollars. We'll take these—buy these schools from you then give them back to you for 50 years,” because the question then arises—after we knocked them down, all—what did we spend this half a million dollars for?

00:15:58,399 --> 00:16:36,880

Audience Member: You spend it on the education of our children who have been deprived for quite a while.

Edward King: Well, I don't agree with you on the “deprived.” I agree we were willing to do this. I think—and I'm not the mayor of this city or on the school committee or anything else—that the city should have accepted the Authority's offer. And it really is regrettable with a generous package like that—and reasonable—and something that was requested and worked upon quite a bit did not materialize. I hope that it still does.

Audience Member: You say that the reason that you can't use this amount of money is that you need to have some kind of value for what you get if you're going to spend half a million dollars. Of what value is the land for the [inaudible]?

00:16:37,440 --> 00:17:55,120

Edward King: Well, at least it would be ours should a need occur. And an example of what value it was, was that the city entertained for perhaps two months or more the possibility—which was their suggestion, too—of leasing back one of the buildings for storage, just—you know—storage items and that's a perfectly good use for a building like this. It's not necessarily good in its location and age for the teaching of school, but for dead storage? It's perfectly all right. And I think the arrangement was for 5 years at 20,000 dollars a year, so that would be value. It wouldn't have any value, as I can see it, for a hangar or anything. No airport related thing. We said that time and time again, but then they say, “Can you guarantee it will never happen?” I can't guarantee that I'll be working with the Port Authority in October, really. I think I will, but not much beyond that I can guarantee. So I suggested uses like for a city yard—you know—storage of the snow equipment and in the summer? Different kind of things and maybe they have some value in that. I am not the mayor or the one who makes those decisions for the city. I recommended this arrangement to the Port Authority, and I was fortunate enough to have them agree to it. I hope that it comes to fruition. Please.

00:17:53,280 --> 00:18:28,240

Jim Prendergast: My name is Jim Prendergast. I represent the mayor. I work for him at City Hall. He asked me to come down this evening to express regrets of not being here, and also to inform you, Mr. King, and the committee, that the mayor at no time has taken a position or allowed the airport to encroach upon any properties in the city of Revere at any time, so long as he is mayor. And he will oppose any expansion any further into the area as it exists.

Edward King: He's always stated that. Did I state, as you understand it, his position on the schools or the city's? Right. Thank you. All right. This gentleman hasn't spoken yet.

00:18:25,200 --> 00:20:13,200

Audience Member: My name is [inaudible].

Edward King: Right.

Audience Member: I'd like to know, out of curiosity, I think that the gentlemen here said that two miles out, they were required to be 570 feet in the air. Someone was going to work it out—I don't think they made it.

Edward King: Did you do it?

Audience Member: I thought that when they went over here—I'm not sure this is a sliding scale — that would mean they're 400 feet over this ground level.

Edward King: They said sea level, but then you're on a hill.

Audience Member: Well sea level, well Rogan's Point at sea level.

Edward King: Okay. All right.

Audience Member: Rogan's point at sea level.

Edward King: Well, I tell you what. There is an exact height that they should be.

Audience Member: Excuse me. Regulated by the government, not by you people.

Edward King: That is correct.

Audience Member: And there will never be any change from the height that's regulated?

Edward King: Well, there is currently an experiment going on out on the west coast that's called a two segment approach and instead of a steady—you know—glide in, I think it's higher out and then a rather deeper drop. That has not been approved—you know—nationally. In fact it's isolated on a test basis, really, to the west coast as I understand it. But if the height above Rogan's Point at sea level and the hill— What I'll do is: we'll get those exact heights and pinpoint spots, and then we'll write a letter to the editor, and I'll write to you and to the others that I've written down.

Audience Member: I think the gentleman over there in the blue shirt—and I could be wrong—he seems to be working it out. I may be wrong.

Edward King: Well, he was, but he might be a little weak on trigonometry.

00:20:10,720 --> 00:21:08,539

Jerry: Oh, no. I've got the numbers.

Edward King: Okay, shoot.

Jerry: At a three degree glide slope, exactly two miles out, he should be at 578.6 feet above mean sea level.

Edward King: Okay, just one second now.

Audience Member: It's about a mile and a half.

Jerry: A mile and a half?

Audience Member: Yeah.

Edward King: So is there anything I have to do? Is it all done?

Stage Members: [inaudible]

00:21:09,840 --> 00:21:35,039

Edward King: Okay. Well, we're ready to go back. Our stenographer has—steno typist has more ammunition. We'll get those exact heights—Rogan's Point and on the hill—send it to you and—

Audience Member: I can wait until he figures it out. I think he's doing it.

Edward King: Okay. I think you can always blame the lack of light if he hasn't come up with it. Is there someone else that...? Yes, sir.

00:21:33,440 --> 00:22:45,360

Franklin LoCoupero: I'd like to direct my question to the gentleman on your left. Sort of a technical nature—we were on a technical theme here a little while ago. My name is Franklin LoCoupero. I am a resident of Revere, and I'm also a airlines mechanic for American. Now, these devices... My understanding—I don't know just where they're utilized. Don't we have a device called a transformer which aids the ATC controller in identifying aircraft? I don't know whether they're mandatory on all the aircraft. And we've incorporated into this thing, also, an altitude reporting system. Here again, I don't know whether they can use this on a low-level approach—you know—whether they can or not.

Edward King: Let me ask, are you asking whether they've included this system in our noise monitoring system?

Franklin LoCoupero: No, it's nothing really to do with noise monitoring. It's a means of altitude.

Edward King: Do you understand the question?

00:22:40,559 --> 00:23:52,080

Richard Mooney: Yeah. Well, of course it is required on air-carrier aircraft; it isn't required on all aircraft yet, but there is hope that there will be, and as Mr. Callaghan said, it's tied into arch 3. There will be certain improvements in that as time goes along on the system that I mentioned that had just been commissioned out in the California area. We checked on when it would be in operation here, and I'm not sure of the exact dates, but it seemed to me that it was sometime about the middle of 1974. But whether this could be utilized by the FAA to in some way monitor the aircraft and advise the pilots on their final approach, I don't know.

Franklin LoCoupero: Well, I'm still required to answer E6 items in log books regarding altitude reporting errors and how it functions in this particular phase, so they must be using them at some airports. They must be giving the pilots information on their altitudes.

00:23:48,640 --> 00:24:36,159

Richard Mooney: Well, it certainly gives the pilot— would be getting information from it, but just how it might be used—

Franklin LoCoupero: That's what I don't know. That's what I was... They must be reading it somewhere in order to give them that information.

Edward King: Well, is that something you'd wish Mr. Mooney to pursue because we would be...

Franklin LoCoupero: Well, I was just sort of making an inquiry of my own to sort of follow up this gentleman's inquiry.

Richard Mooney: Well, we are very much interested in this ability to not only locate aircraft in plan—in other words, the distance from the airport—but the altitude also. And so this is part of the thing that we are following up with the FAA on.

00:24:36,400 --> 00:25:16,080

Edward King: Okay. At one and a half miles out, Jerry. At a three percent glide path, 432 feet above mean sea level. You're about a mile and a half—maybe a trifle more—on Logan's Point. So it should be 432 and a half feet above sea level. Pardon?

Audience: [inaudible]

Edward King: FAA. Let me tell you. We will check that.

Audience: [inaudible]

Edward King: We will check that the extent we can; we'll drop you a note. Is that reasonable? Wait one second.

00:25:15,679 --> 00:26:02,400

Richard Mooney: There's one point on this. There is no law that requires that the aircraft fly at three degrees. This is a normal approach. And where there's an instrument landing system, the regulations say that the pilot will fly on the glide slope, which is a three degree approach. There is a back course approach on 22-Left, but there is no glide slope as such, and they have to really figure out their altitudes based upon the back course which is not as precise as the front course glide slope.

Franklin LoCoupero: In other words, he comes in as he wishes.

00:25:58,960 --> 00:26:33,760

Richard Mooney: Well, he's supposed to come in at approximately three degrees, yes. He has, as Mr. Callaghan pointed out, he has a VASI which, again, is a something that's usable and was installed for visual flying conditions so that the pilot, when he gets below the three degrees, he sees the red lights and it tells him whether he's above or below.

Edward King: Yes, sir. Statement or question?

00:26:32,080 --> 00:27:42,559

Audience Member: The statement he made, is that a safety device that he's talking about? This...

Edward King: Mr. LoCoupero?

Audience Member: That he was talking about on some of the aircraft, is that a safety device? Or considered a safety device?

Edward King: Mr. LoCoupero could...

Franklin LoCoupero: Yes, it is.

Audience Member: Then why is it that most planes don't have it? The lack of money?

Edward King; oh, no. That's a transponder that he's referring to.

Franklin LoCoupero and Audience Member: [overlapping speech]

Edward King: You're saying they're all equipped with that?

Franklin LoCoupero: All aircraft.

Richard Mooney: All airliners.

Audience Member: Well, I don't know about the other air—

Stage Members and Audience: [overlapping speech]

Richard Mooney: Yes. Some small airplanes do not. All large—or all airline aircraft do.

Audience Member: They shouldn't be in flight.

Edward King: Well, again that's a federal regulatory matter, but all airlines do have this equipment.

Audience Member: [inaudible]

Edward King: All right. Anyone else? Yes?

00:27:46,840 --> 00:29:08,159

Audience Member: You mentioned a law [inaudible]. There's no law that says they have to follow that glide path; it's just a regulation. You can't fine them or anything like that.

Edward King: Well, I would say that that is right although every indication is that they do follow the prescribed three degrees to go glide slope.

Audience Member: Well the ones that don't—you just speak with them and it won't do any good if they don't feel like following the rules, right? I mean, I'd like to see somebody get fined and then I think they'd remember to—

Edward King: Well—you know—I have to agree that that's a rather forceful reminder, but what I did say—I believe several times—is that the noise monitoring step is a first step. We will be able to detect those that come in under, lower. Okay? And the first thing that we're able to do—now the laws may change, it may be that in 1974 or 5 that we'd be able to do something about this. I don't think that will happen. Maybe the federal government will. We talk with the pilot, and he gets a letter saying he was in, and he admits it or he doesn't, and it can be verified or it can't. We do what we can, but it happens a second time, and I think we have every reason—without being punitive, without trying to hurt anybody because I'm positive no pilot wants to come in lower because he's endangering himself and his job and all that—you know—his life and his passengers.

00:29:05,760 --> 00:29:47,440

Audience Member: They're under pressure, too, to get in.

Edward King: No. No, they get in safely of course, but not nobody ever... No. Well, sure they have schedules, but there's no penalty for being a—you know—a few minutes late an hour late, —you know—aircraft are generally late anyway.

Audience Member: [inaudible]

Edward King: Well, I mean, what can I say to that? There are planes came in before them and planes come in after them. How do you suspect that something happened there? I don't know what happened, but I don't want to blame it on something or somebody that I don't know anything about. That's not going to help us with the noise. Did you want to ask something? You've been quiet all night. I thought you were just stretching. That's all right. Anybody else? Yes, ma'am?

00:29:46,000 --> 00:32:42,240

Audience Member: Yes. In addition to this proposal of the airport expansion of the runways for one reason: for noise abatement. Would you agree with that?

Edward King: Would you repeat that again, please?

Audience Member: The proposed runways' expansion: one of the reasons for—I don't need that, I'm sick of looking at it—one of the reasons— He types everything that I say.

Edward King: Oh yeah. He's typing—

Audience Member: Yeah, I know that.

Edward King: Would it be alright if I look at it?

Audience Member: Go right ahead. You should know it by heart by now. The noise is irritating.

Edward King: We won't do it, then, if the noise is irritating.

Audience Member: One of the primary reasons for expanding this airport is for noise abatement?

Edward King: In this instance, yes.

Audience Member: Okay. What are the other measures—what other steps would the Mass Port Authority take for noise abatement procedures such as a sliding scale for the loud aircraft to come in and use the loading airport—are they going to increase the scale?

Edward King: Well, I hope not. I would recommend against that.

Audience Member: Why?

Edward King: Well, suppose that we do charge a little less in the daytime but realistically more at night—or a lot more at night. The plane will still come in.

Audience Member: I'm talking about the older-type aircraft.

Edward King: Whatever it is. Whatever it is, the plane will still come in, and we'll charge them more and the noise will be exactly the same for you. Charging the more is not the answer. The answer to the noise problem is twofold. One: the engines—you know—really is the prime. And the other really is land compatibility. And I say to you very plainly that, as is the case on Neptune Road—and we have some others like maybe Beachmont Hill is one of them—that when you're flying aircraft directly over—you know, large aircraft—right, instantly— No, I'll finish first. At a level of whatever number. Some people are saying 100 feet—we say it's higher, but nevertheless—flying directly over you are going to have a noise problem, and if you charge him more or we purchase an easement in your property—you know—an air easement—you've heard of that—or whatever that is not going to abate the noise if we measure the noise and say it's so—

Audience Member: Wouldn't that give an incentive to the airlines to phase that particular airplane out if it's going to cost them a hell of a lot more money to land in that airport—you know? I haven't heard one constructive thing other than this airport expansion that the Port Authority has proposed tonight. All you've heard from the people is the complaints about the noise. Mow what is the Mass Port Authority going to do about the noise problem? It isn't just up here in this hill—you know? It's many, many communities that're being involved by this airport noise, and I think that the Mass Port Authority should take a position, and that position should be to incite the airlines—or whomever the responsibility is being, you know, placed on—make a decision. Who gets the blame, gives them the blame. We want to be—you know—have some elimination of this noise problem.

00:32:40,240 --> 00:33:41,360

Edward King: Well, how would you suggest that that be done?

Audience Member: I proposed one of the things: to increase the fees so that the airlines themselves might want to phase out that particular thing. I, for one, would like to see a partial nighttime curfew. You know, the feasibility of the high-speed rail. You know, there are many alternatives, and you're really not putting all your efforts into that. All you're simply doing is saying that we need airport expansion, and I don't think that's the answer. You're going to take

everything that the people have said here tonight and you're going to go back and say, "Well, gee—you know—they didn't say anything." We're saying a hell of a lot. We're saying we want to get rid of some of this noise problem

Edward King: Now...

Audience Member: It isn't simply by buying property and making us move. That isn't the answer—you know—it lies in your hands, and you could do something for the people, if you really wanted to. And I'm not specifically pointing at you; I'm saying in general.

Edward King: I thought you were. No, not really.

Audience Member: Good.

00:33:37,760 --> 00:34:40,079

Edward King: It doesn't make any difference. Fault isn't the answer. I stand quite confident that anything and everything that can be done—that's doable—is being done. I'd feel quite concerned if anyone or any airport came up with a novel idea ahead of us, particularly if we didn't immediately get to it because we have the resources. We have the intelligence and the staff and the money.

Audience Member: What are those resources? Like what could you throw out to these people today you're going to help eliminate the noise other than those runway expansions? I don't believe that those runway expansions isn't going to be a noisy procedure.

Edward King: Well, that's—you're entitled to your position. I think you're wrong, though. But I think what I've said all night is that the way to cure this problem is not within us or you but rather the technological advancements and the mass production of the engines that are substantially quiet. Now the question I was going to ask is this: do you notice—are you on the hill by the way?

00:34:38,480 --> 00:35:03,839

Audience Member: I don't live in the city. I live in Chelsea.

Edward King: Oh. Well, we'll be there tomorrow night. Well, from somebody that lives on the hill, can they really say that they notice a difference in the DC-10s and 747 Boeing or the L-1011? Is it noticeable like?

Audience Member: It's noticeable.

Edward King: Roughly what would you say? Is it livable?

Audience Member: Some of them are all right, but some of them...

Edward King: See. Even the new ones?

Audience Member: It depends on how low and how's the weather, the conditions.

Audience Member: The DC-8s in particular are always.

Edward King: Were you going to ask something, Mr. McKinnon?

00:35:14,960 --> 00:36:07,119

Mr. McKinnon: I was just going to ask something in regard to this particular question. Why is it that the 1011s and the 747s make less noise in the 27s, the 07s, and dc8s?

Edward King: Well, I think that that's a good question because it reminds me to say that the L-1011—are you saying is the least noisy?

Mr. McKinnon: The least noisy. The 747 is the least noisy and the L-1011 is the second least. They sound like you can hear them, and that you can hear them warming up, revving their engines prior to takeoff. You can hear them; they sound like a helicopter. They have a certain particular pitch, and you can pick them out from there before they even start running when they release their brakes.

Edward King: I think the manufacturers' specifications show—we're impartial, you know—understand the L-1011 is least noisy, I believe—and I'm not advertising anybody.

00:36:04,720 --> 00:37:09,520

Mr. McKinnon: And the Learjets should be taken off the airways.

Edward King: Well, all right. We don't have too many of those at least. The DC-10 is next less noisy and then the Boeing 747, and it comes in that order of their development. The L-1011 ran into considerable delays—if you follow this industry at all—but as a result of that, they came up with a quieter airplane still. And I think that the next set of airplanes—the advanced Boeings or the newer 747s, some of them have been three or 4 years—are going to be less noisy and that sole reason is, like in medicine or chemistry or whatever, time and research brings better results. It may cost money; it may not. Usually it does, but that's not really the prime concern at this moment with the airline industry. The prime concern is finding the technological benefits that will still make the plane fly without the visible pollutants and actual pollutants, and I think your results are seeing the Boeing—and all of those are much better than the 707s and 720s, so progress is being made.

00:37:08,240 --> 00:38:03,839

Audience Member: Yes, but wouldn't you agree that if you had, as a landlord, and if you had a sliding scale to phase out those older aircrafts now, that that would be beneficial to the people?

Edward King: I don't think so.

Audience Member: Why?

Edward King: Because it would not be anything that you could put in. Don't forget there are still laws—

Audience Member: You know—like tin can them. Do whatever you want with them, just phase them out and make the airlines buy the the newer-type aircraft that is generating less noise.

Edward King: Over what period of time?

Audience Member: Well, I don't know—you know? Present a figure. I'm just saying that I would like you to start making some decisions on phasing out the—giving the airline some incentive.

Edward King: Well, as I understand your statement or question, I think you're talking about—you know—sort of immediate—one or two years or something like that—that cannot be done.

00:37:59,920 --> 00:39:49,920

Audience Member: Why?

Edward King: Why? What will the airline company do with the airplane? And how quickly can they get another airplane? Now may I finish once in a while, please?

Audience Member: That's not my habit.

Edward King: It's not your habit. Other than tonight, here maybe?

Audience Member: No. This is my nature.

Edward King: Oh. It is your nature. I see. They would not... Suppose that we did—which I would not recommend, and I do not have the authority or desire to do—that American Airlines and the others—maybe cross that name out, someone might get nervous—that the airlines take their 10 noisiest planes that are in Boston and get rid of them, and that's the way it is, and you can only bring in, or substitute for them, 10 of the newer ones. They could not obtain those planes. They cost, depending on what type of plane it is—say it's a DC-10 or other—18 or 20 million dollars. That would be 200 million dollars, but you couldn't buy it. It takes time. They produce so many a year, and that's what the problem is on retrofit. I think, and I said earlier, that the technological advances have been made to retrofit existing engines at a reasonable cost. I believe it's about 350,000—that's what I think it is—per engine—750,000 per airplane, so that's 175,000 per engine or divided by three, it's 250, let's say. But you cannot take all of the airplanes out of service at once. They take out one engine, put in another, they retrofit it, and to take care of the fleet which is about 2,200 airplanes, maybe 6,600 engines or something in that general order, it's going to take 5 to 8 years. There's just not enough manpower and shops equipped to do it, but it's coming.

00:39:47,599 --> 00:40:41,200

Audience Member: But now with retrofitting, the companies still cannot get the equipment to retrofit the engines quick enough to satisfy the people. Is that right?

Edward King: It all depends how quickly the people want to be satisfied. I just said it would take about 5 to 8 years, but you will see gradual improvement because they're being done all the time.

Audience Member: Do you see the federal government paying for this retrofitting or do you see the air—you know—the airlines?

Edward King: No, I think the airlines should pay for it because then they charge the people who use the airport or ship the cargo—you know—a little bit extra to offset. I don't think that the general taxpayer should pay for that. I don't see why you should. I think the user—you know—

Audience Member: You know, like you want federal funding for your airport expansion and some of the people take that same position. We don't feel that federal funding, our money, should be put out to expand an airport that we really don't want.

00:40:39,200 --> 00:41:33,040

Edward King: The only place where you're not correct on that is that the money that comes for federal funding for airports is monies collected from the sale of tickets in the area. In this case it's say Logan Airport or one of the downtown ticket offices from people using Logan Airport. And we, at Logan, just as a matter of record, simply do not get back anywhere near the money that's collected from our passengers—you know—to fly in and out of this airport. We have not only in Beachmont some slight problems, but in Washington. But nevertheless, it's there. It's not a program that, personally, we at the Port Authority advocate. I think there's no reason why we couldn't go ahead and make these improvements, but the program having been established nationally, and they're being eligibilities and our people from this area contributing to the fund. We do file the applications to obtain what we're entitled to.

00:41:31,359 --> 00:41:58,480

Audience Member: Well, then why do you have to? If the money's there, and it's available, and it's purposely for airport expansion—is that right?

Edward King: That's right.

Audience Member: Why do you have to go through all this nonsense then to get it?

Edward King: I wish we didn't. A busy person like you might be able to help us and find out.

Audience Member: Oh, please. I'm too busy attacking you.

Edward King: Well, that would be a good rest for you. I don't mind that. Now, is there anyone else that has— Yes, sir, Mr. Bergson.

00:41:59,119 --> 00:42:45,839

Harry Bergson: Did you say before that at the airport there's a time that you slow up your operation? That you don't have anybody be taken off or in a landing? You have a curfew?

Edward King: No, we don't have any curfew. There are times like 2 or 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning—I understand the lady is left there is a—plane comes in and out, and there are some but not many at that time. You understand that; I'm sure.

Harry Bergson: What was the reference to 11 o'clock in the evening until 7 in the morning? You don't have the certain things there at the airport? What was it?

Edward King: Oh. Run-ups. I don't think that was mentioned; at least I didn't hear it tonight.

Men on stage: [affirming that King mentioned run-ups earlier in the night]

Edward King: Okay.

Harry Bergson: I'm going to keep a log.

00:42:51,040 --> 00:43:20,800

Edward King: Well, give us a call when something is happening. It's not that far away.

Harry Bergson: I'm going to send it in.

Edward King: Yes, sir.

Audience Member: I'd like to go back to that [inaudible]. We know that you can overhaul a jet engine and so forth, but how about the body of a plane? Do they got a life expectancy?

Edward King: I think they do. I think so.

Audience Member: They have it for so many year then they have to get rid of it?

Edward King: That's the answer to the retrofit program. You have an airplane so many years old, but the engines come in and out—you know—they're interchangeable.

Audience Member: But not the body?

00:43:18,160 --> 00:44:32,480

Edward King: That's correct. So I think you understand that they have so much wear and tear and—you know—it's almost required that they get close to the maximum use on it, and that's one of the problems. Good equipment, it's hard to disband, but when you fit it all in and take a period of time—I'm sure that's going to happen—and there will be improvements. That there really will be. Well, you've been very, very attentive. I have to say that it's probably been the most quiet, orderly, and pleasant meeting that we've had on our tour. And while that won't reduce the noise tonight if the planes come overhead, you nevertheless—I hope—understand our position, and as someone who's lived in Beachmont for a number of years in the summers and now live in Winthrop, I understand the problem. I don't like it or appreciate it any more

than you have. I have all kinds of cousins living up on Crescent and Crest, and they still like me, so I hope you won't totally discard that thought. Thank you for coming, and if you have any other question, you'd like to talk to any of our individuals, please don't hesitate to do that. I want to see Mr. McKinnon.