

Record Group TC6/1995

Massachusetts Port Authority Public Hearing Files, 1970-1986

Draft master plan hearing in East Boston, August 21, 1973 Tape 1

00:00:00,160 --> 00:01:52,960

Edward King: Ladies and gentlemen and Reverend Fathers, right at this moment we have not received any requests from anyone to speak or any questions submitted. Two gentlemen Tom Mann, here, and Gary Lanter, there, will walk up and down the aisle and should you have a desire to speak with a request that you would write your name and we will acknowledge that in the order they're received. If you have any question which you would prefer not to ask and write out we'd be positive to have that that question is answered. And gentlemen, 7:30 has arrived. We would like to start the program for the evening. Please. Do we have enough seats? Are there enough seats? If everyone up in the rear would take a seat so we can start or, at least, if they prefer to stand would stop talking we can start under more desirable conditions, please. In the interest of uniformity, I hope you'll bear with me while I read just a few lines of what we read at each meeting so that our procedure for all of the meetings is basically the same.

00:01:50,000 --> 00:02:19,040

Father Sallese: Mr. King?

Edward King: Yes, Father Sallese?

Father Sallese: Before you read your statement I'd like to challenge your presence as presiding this evening.

Edward King: Well, you have already done that Father and we've discussed that this evening, as we did last evening—

Father Sallese: Last evening I had no facts. This evening I have them.

Edward King: I've read your facts Father and—

Father Sallese: And I'd like to read for the people here this evening

Audience Member: Quiet.

00:02:19,040 --> 00:07:09,440

Father Sallese: From the transcript of our board meeting of Thursday July 19, 1973, and this is a verbatim transcript of that meeting. If we just give me a minute to find the right—here it is. As you all know, Mr. Defalco and myself are members of the public affair committee, and Mr. Defalco gave the following report to the board and I quote, on page 123, and follow, Mr. Defalco quote, "Unfortunately we may have to reinst..."—no, I have the wrong... All right. Mr. Defalco is giving a report as chairman of the public affairs committee and he is giving an oral report. Unfortunately, Mr. Callaghan has not got our notes typed up, but what we discussed, so you could then go on with this discussion. "I think it suffices to say that the executive director was premature in putting this newspaper ad in, but I don't think there is any malicious intent here because we have thoroughly discussed this entire program at the public affairs committee which Father Sallese and I were present and all other members of the committee were present. I would just like to outline to you all what we agreed upon, in my conversation to you, and I believe we will all be in accord then." I, then, challenge the part about the ad, and he comments on that again. I'll skip over that part. Number one, since the number one concern of all the

members of the public affairs committee was to overcome the objections which always we seem to get for the Mass Port Authority when it holds a public hearing. I am referring to the board has arrived at a predisposed position and is merely going through the motions of listening to the community. He goes on to—if I'll just summarize the part, I'll get to the piece that I want to—in his report he talks about the master plan being what he considered a good tool for discussion. And now I will quote the part where I challenge your presiding here this evening. "So, therefore, it was our general recommendation that the board should consider these meetings as meetings of the Massachusetts Port Authority Board to receive community comments on the draft master plan statement as prepared by our staff. And then the final meeting would be the final official board meeting where the board will have it will make its final review and come to its conclusion as to what master plan it shall adopt." That report was given at the same board meeting, Mr. King, as you are aware, Mr. Defalco presented a draft of the procedures of our public hearing and those rules of procedures, were adopted last week at our board meeting. I will read for you two paragraphs from that. "The presiding officer at all said hearings shall be the chairman, vice chairman, or any person designated by vote of the authority. The presiding officer shall call the meeting to order, preside at the meeting, recognize witnesses, make rulings in regard to procedural matters, and admissibility of evidence, and do all things necessary or convenient for the orderly conduct of the meeting." Paragraph three, "Any such hearing will be duly held in accordance with these rules if it is before any member of the authority or a designee of the authority, there being no requirement that a quorum or a member of the authority be present." Mr. King, I was not delegated by the same token. You were not delegated to preside at these meetings. Mr. Harrington and myself are here this evening, I think we should preside. And, as elected by the board to be chairman of the ad hoc committee on master planning, I will therefore preside at this hearing this evening and after I give the opening remarks you may speak on behalf of the staff.

00:07:07,199 --> 00:08:29,120

Edward King: That's not acceptable, Father, because I think it's clear that you have not been designated as the hearing officer.

Father Sallese: I so say that I was designated—

Edward King: Father, I did not interrupt you. You've interrupted me three times in a matter of 15 words or so that I've spoken. I recognize that neither have I been designated, but in conversations with the members of the authority, as late as of this morning, it's my clear understanding that this is a hearing for which I am perfectly capable of seeing that all witnesses are heard. Now the one thing that I'm willing to do—I understand Mr. Harrington is here. If Mr. Harrington would come up I will talk with Mr. Harrington and Father Sallese and we'll see if there is some resolution. But, I must say that the prime purpose of this meeting is to acquaint the people here with our current plan and invite their comments, suggestive criticism, or other. It is not to be involved in who presides. That's the least important thing, who presides. The most important thing is that the people who are here, who have a judgment, who wish to record themselves, have that opportunity to do so. I can assure you that whoever does that that will happen. Mr. Harrington if you're here, do you mind coming up please?

00:08:27,520 --> 00:08:41,839

Father Sallèse: I will also, almost to hang things up, is reminding Mr. King that the notice of this hearing was called by the Massachusetts Port Authority of which Mr. Harrington and myself are members of.

00:08:46,000 --> 00:10:29,010

Edward King: Father, [inaudible]?

Father Sallèse: Excuse me?

Edward King: [inaudible]

Father Sallèse: I will tell them what you people decide, then. Ladies and gentlemen, if I may have your attention, please. Two members of the authority consulting with a member of our staff, Mr. King, Mr. Harrington and myself as member of the authority, Mr. Harrington feels that I am causing division here this evening and it is his opinion that I do not have the support of the staff to preside at this hearing. I disagree with him. He recommends that Mr. King continue as he did last evening by hearing. I want you to know that I will raise this issue every night until Friday evening. As the chairman of the ad hoc committee appointed by the board, it is my responsibility to convene the other members of that committee to study your comments, as well as a staff's proposal, and work on a redraft. Again, I would remind you that the notice of this open hearing was called by the Massachusetts Port Authority of which Mr. Harrington and myself are members. Mr. Harrington has refused to preside this evening. I'd prefer to. I have been overruled. That is my position.

00:10:26,720 --> 00:14:19,680

Edward King: Right. Thank you, Father. And apologies—

Father Sallèse: Therefore I'll come out and sit with you as I did in Winthrop last evening.

Edward King: Thank you, Father. [Applause] And apologies to all for the slight delay in beginning. Now, back to the uniform type announcements which will take but a minute. I'll read these and, you pardon that, because it's not my custom to read I would rather speak, but I want to be exact. This is one of five public hearings held in different communities on weekday evenings for the convenience of the local citizens. Preliminary public hearings were held last spring in the same community to provide inputs for the study. Upon completion of the public hearings, a subcommittee of the board will consider the inputs from these hearings and, with the staff of Massport, develop the final plan for board action. Following board action, a public hearing we held in Boston to present the final master plan before the testimony begins I will describe briefly the procedures for tonight's hearing. Every person who wishes to testify will be permitted to do so. If you wish to testify and have filled out one of the cards available in the back of the room indicating that you wish to speak, you will be called upon in turn as they are received here. If you have not yet done so—that is filled out a card—raise your hand, a card will be brought to you and collected. If you have any questions for anyone here you should also write them in the card. Should a question occur to you during the course of the hearing even though you have already filled out a card just raise your hand and another card will be provided on which you may put your questions. Please, put your name and address on the card with your question. During the course of the hearing I will read questions received. Representatives of the authority will answer as many questions as they can during the hearing. Others will be answered later, and a copy of the answer will be mailed individually to the person asking the

question. All questions and answers will be made part of the formal record of the hearing. If you have a written statement, please, present a copy to the sonographer when you come to speak, and the whole of your statement will be made part of the formal record. You may, if you wish, simply summarize your written statement orally. Each oral presentation will be limited to 10 minutes or less. This is so in order to give everyone an opportunity to present his or her views. The time keeper will indicate when you have two minutes left by holding up a green card, and when your 10 minutes is expired by holding up a red card. Should you need additional time, you may return to speak after everyone else has had their 10 minutes, and following the questions and answers. Those who have spoken on the same subject at any previous public hearing held this week will not be recognized until all others have had an opportunity to hear. Now, briefly, the purpose of this hearing is to discuss where we have been with our master planning process and, more specifically, where we are now, the reasons why we are at this stage, and what you as a community member feel about that plan. In order to see that the most expertise that we have available is given to you I will ask that our director of aviation Mr. Richard E. Mooney who is with us here tonight and Mr. Thomas P Callaghan, our director of public affairs, will participate in the proceedings. First Mr. Mooney, the director of aviation, will make a brief recap after which the meeting will start with the speakers who have been listed here in the order that I received them. Mr. Mooney.

00:14:16,480 --> 00:31:08,240

Richard Mooney: In the latter part of May of this year we met with you and had an informal discussion based upon a booklet that described, briefly, the types of development that the Port Authority staff felt would be appropriate based upon studies that have been completed in the past. This was entitled the Preliminary Airport Master Plan Review. Now, this meeting that was held at that time with you was this one of a series of five. Now following this meeting we then met with public officials and various other groups. We had 10 additional meetings to review and receive comments on that document. Following this review we reviewed the comments made at each of these meetings, and we considered them in the preparation of the document which is the subject of this particular hearing. This document, which is composed of approximately 375 pages, was completed and published on July 19th, and notice of this public hearing and a series of what was to be six public hearings was announced at that time. We have since decided that it would be best to hold only five of these meetings, one in each of the principally affected communities. The meeting that had been initially scheduled for this Saturday to be held in downtown Boston has been cancelled, and I'll explain why. After the completion of these five meetings, we'll then meet with other groups and again go through a process of review and revision of this document. When this is completed it will be submitted to the Port Authority board who will determine whether or not it is then appropriate to be distributed and then made the subject of a final public hearing. This will be done. We'll hold a single public hearing on that revised document and, once again, the comments from that hearing will be considered and a final master plan study will be prepared and acted upon by the board, and at that time, also be submitted to the FAA. Now we the Port Authority, have had an accepted airport master plan, and it is approved by the Federal Aviation Administration. And it is this plan that the Port Authority has worked with in the past. We have undertaken this project to provide a significant amount of data that goes with the physical plan and is contained in this document that has

been made available to anyone wishing to have a copy and to review it. I'd like to, very briefly, review with you the evolution of this plan and where we stand at the moment and what constitutes the principle of conditions or the principal projects and so forth that compose the proposed master plan. Now, the plan which is shown at present on the screen is the approved airport master plan. It is referred to by the Federal Aviation Administration as the airport layout plan. It was approved by the Port Authority, signed by the chairman the latter part of 1969, and was signed by the FAA early in 1970. In March of this year, on March 1, after considerable study, part of which was involved in the analysis made on the proposed parallel 1533 and other investigations that have been made since 1970, this plan was once again reconsidered. The Port Authority staff made a recommendation to the board that certain major modifications be made. Now, first of all, I would like to point out that on the plan that is approved, if you will notice, I hope that you can distinguish the colors, but the landing area, which is composed primarily of the runways and taxiways that existed at the time of the adoption of that plan, are shown in the dark brown. The proposed additional items that would be considered for future development by the Authority are illustrated in orange. The buildings which are not constructed are shown in this plan—and I'm sorry, I'm afraid that it can't be distinguished—but they're in green. They're primarily the South Terminal, the International Terminal, the development of Bird Island Flats. Now, on March 1 the Port Authority took what we felt to be a very significant step and made the basic changes as follows. Would you please show the next slide? This slide is still the same plan approved by the Authority and the Federal Aviation Administration, but at that time, the Authority, based upon staff recommendation, requested and the staff undertook to delete the areas that are shown in red. Now these primarily are shown as what was to be fill area, runway improvements and taxiway improvements. Now the most significant one was the parallel 1533. That was deleted together with the related fill: the fill on the end of 15, the fill in the center, and then off the end of the 33 end. Also deleted was the extension of the existing runway 27. In addition the parallel 927 was deleted. The fill area between the Bird Island Flats a development area and Jeffries Point was deleted, and a small area of industrial property to the northwest was deleted from the plan. Also, at that time, it was recommended that the general aviation stole runway be increased in length and that also the proposed extension to runway 9 be increased. Now this was what was done in March. We're now reviewing and we'd like to demonstrate very briefly the plan as it has evolved and is proposed by the staff today. The land areas are shown in white. Now it's all of the white area within the blue line. Now if you'll notice, we have indicated that Bird Island Flat fill area is completed, that the pond areas between runways 22 left and 22 right have been filled, and the only additional fill area that is proposed on this plan is the filling of an area to the left of runway 15 right. This would be for the purpose of installation of a glide slope for an improved instrument landing system on that runway. Now I'd like to mention specifically the reason for in some instances indicating that the projects are completed although they're in process of construction. When we met with the various community representatives in April and May, we were criticized for showing for instance the South Terminal as being proposed when, in fact, between the time that that plan had been prepared and we held these meetings the Port Authority had actually led a contract for the construction of this building so that what we've done is shown, as existing, all projects that are under construction or contractually committed so that we will not be accused of indicating that we're proposing something and, in fact, we're actually going ahead and have it that substantially committed toward completion.

Now in the building area, since that plan as I pointed out we show the South Terminal as existing the International Terminal as existing—we expect that to be completed early next year. The Bird Island Flats area, we show proposed development of buildings in that location; we expect to put in air freight type of buildings primarily in this area. In addition to that, we have the limited development that's possible with the Southwest Terminal or Eastern Airlines Terminal and very limited other development within the support area. Now, the principal projects that I believe are of interest to you are the proposed construction of two runway extensions: one on runway 9 the other on runway 4 left. The third major project would be the construction of an approximately a 3,800 foot general aviation stole runway. These improvements—and I'd like to say briefly that starting with runway 9 the purpose of this extension is to provide an additional increment of safety for the operation of aircraft on this runway, to provide an opportunity to permit aircraft taking off from this runway to be off and at a higher elevation when passing over the Point Shirley area, and also to have additional capability as far as its capacity to handle large aircraft. Now in this connection, we've had the point raised that possibly this is being done for the supersonic transport or types of aircraft that don't operate today. This is not correct and I think that the logic of this can be demonstrated by the fact that two runways already constructed and in operation, in use, are actually longer than this runway 9 will be when it is completed, assuming that this project proceeds. Runway 4 left would be extended principally for the purpose of providing additional safety for takeoffs from runway 22 right. Now again, we do not need this additional length in order to permit larger aircraft to take off since the runway immediately adjacent to it and parallel is longer, and again, will be longer than the runway even after it is extended. The third project is the construction of a general aviation stole runway which is oriented approximately parallel to runway 1533. This is slightly off parallel. We have attempted to orient it so that, to the greatest extent possible, we can avoid any direct overflights of the Jeffries Point area. Now we have stated before, and we contend the same, and we have since spent considerable amount of time with the Federal Aviation Administration, we have indicated that there will not be direct overflights of the Jeffries Point area this has been demonstrated by operation of aircraft by the Port Authority and also by the Federal Aviation Administration, so we're confident that it will not result in overflights of the Jeffries Point area. It will provide some additional capacity for Logan, but to a large extent it makes up for the capacity that's lost by the extension of the two runways that I mentioned previously. Another very significant factor is that it provides for separation of traffic of the small aircraft that would operate from this runway and the large aircraft that will continue to operate on parallel runway 1533. And that basically is the plan proposed by the Port Authority staff. Another particular thing which is not shown on this plan, but is discussed in the master plan study, is the possibility of construction of a so-called noise barrier which would be along the edge of the outer taxiway. Armen, if you would point that out. Now based upon studies that have been made by acoustical engineers, we definitely feel that this wall will not provide any significant relief at all and we'll be glad to discuss that in more detail if you wish, but we have recommended against the construction of this barrier. We feel that it would not be effective that the noise, that it would attenuate is not the principal noise that has created a problem, and also, it would provide a very detrimental wall which in my judgment would be quite similar to a prison type of wall. We've been asked if we could do it so that it would be designed and be more aesthetically acceptable; I do not feel that it can be done to have it so that it would be

anything other than a noise or an eyesore which would be with not only the Jeffries Point area, but the entire Boston community. So, with that, I would like to turn it back to Mr. King.

00:31:04,240 --> 00:31:33,840

Edward King: Thank you, Dick Mooney. Thank you for your courtesies, ladies and gentlemen. Now for your participation. Our first speaker is Mr. Anthony Baxter, Cottage Street, East Boston. It would be helpful during the course of the evening if those who have—come right up, Mr. Baxter—who have indicated a willingness to speak would be sitting near the front, if they would. Mr. Baxter there's a microphone there or here. Please.

00:31:34,320 --> 00:32:28,830

Anthony Baxter: Okay, I think personally the most important element has been left out of your master plan and that's people. I don't see anywhere or any mention of any MDs, medical doctors, city planners, sociologists who have taken hand or taken part in this plan. I think people are left out all the time. I heard mention of aesthetic qualities. The airport is atrocious. I don't see how you can mention aesthetics at all. And I think I'd like to leave with just saying that you should not forget about people. And I think it's atrocious on your part Mr. King that people are always forgotten especially in communities like East Boston.

00:32:27,679 --> 00:33:01,840

Edward King: Thank you, thank you. [Applause] Thank you, Mr. Baxter. We would like to ensure, or assure rather, all those here that we have considered people in every aspect. Certainly from the environmental aspect, we feel that this will be less noise, less pollution. From safety those who use the airport—

Father Sallese: Mr. Chairman?

Edward King: We feel that we have considered people, and also from those who work at the airport we feel that they have been considered. Yes, Father?

00:32:59,760 --> 00:33:25,600

Father Sallese: Mr. King. I believe the procedure that adopted by the board, this allows you that right unless you are asked a specific question. [Applause]

Edward King: Well I don't agree with that, Father. We discussed that this morning.

Father Sallese: You have disagreed with a lot of things this evening, Mr. King, that the board has voted.

00:33:01,840 --> 00:33:55,279

Edward King: Thank you, Father. This next speaker is Mr. C. L. Regano, Webster Street, East Boston. Please, Mr. Regano? Mr. Regano may not be here at the moment. Our next speaker then would be Mr. Michael A. Interbartolo Jr., Meridian Street, East Boston, please. Mister?

00:34:05,440 --> 00:43:28,880

As I understand it, the purpose of this hearing is to discuss the economic, social, and environmental impact of the contents of the Massachusetts Port Authority proposed master plan. In the draft of a copy of your plan, which is nearly 400 pages long, much too long for the

typical layman to read, you very specifically defined the economic impact of benefits that Logan has had on the metropolitan Boston area, and you outline in detail the reasons of safety and economics for moving ahead with the recommended proposals in your plan. You also identify, relative to the environmental impact, and I quote, "The most serious environmental problem that presents, existing in the certain areas in the vicinity of the airport, is the noise generated by aircraft operating in and out of Logan." Before we discuss the specifics of this problem—the contents of your document—I would first like to define certain information relative to the community of East Boston and the growth that Logan Airport has taken or experienced since 1960. Some of the facts which I feel are important relative to East Boston's economic contribution to the city of Boston and the Boston metropolitan area: the community of East Boston generates approximately 9 million dollars in property taxes to the city of Boston. How much does the Port Authority pay? [Applause] The East Boston labor force represents an annual income of approximately 115 million dollars and if we were to determine that just 50 percent of that income was spent within the city and the community, then that would represent an expenditure of nearly 60 million dollars per year by residents of East Boston to the Boston metropolitan area and the city as a whole. Since the Port Authority has taken over operation of Logan International Airport and has expanded its property ownership in several parts of the community it is responsible for the acquisition of 1.8 million square feet of area within a period of 1961 to 1971, the large majority of which generated property taxes to the city of Boston. But since acquisition by Mass Port Authority, this land has been eliminated from the tax roll of the city. Of this 1.8 million square feet nearly 150,000 square feet was residential property, consisting of approximately 120 dwelling units, of which Massport is seen fit to demolish 80 while replacing none. There presently exists approximately 2000 of 13,700 dwelling units in the community that lie within the approach surfaces of runways located at Logan. In your master plan you state and I quote, "Although no finite scientific method exists of measuring and determining the actual impact of aircraft noise in our defining geographically its boundaries, the general area where the impact is greatest are those in close proximity to the airport and/or beneath its approach and departure paths." You also state that although noise exposure forecast, NEF, currently represents the most accepted methodology for development of data to compare to relative noise impact should not be considered as an absolute indicator of noise impact or noise annoyance. This statement may be true, but the fact remains that the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, which is the parent organization for the Federal Finance Administration, which is the financing agency for all federally assisted housing, has clearly used the noise exposure forecast contours as the guidelines for determining site evaluation and site acceptability. And according to their guidelines, that land which falls within the NEF 40 contour is clearly unacceptable for consideration for federal funding of housing development and that land which falls within the 30 NAF contour is defined as normally unacceptable for consideration for federal assistance. Now according to the map illustrated in your document on page 295 the of the existing NEF contours generated by activities of Logan, in 1970 it is cleared that only the southwesterly tip of East Boston is located outside of the NEF contour 30. All other parts of each parts and are located either within the NEF 30 or NEF 40 contour, which means according to HUD standards. The overwhelming majority of land in East Boston is considered either clearly unacceptable or normally unacceptable for consideration of federal finance assistance whether it be new development or rehab. The maps illustrated on

page 296 and 297 show the NEF consoles as of 1980, and in comparing them with the NEF contours in 1970, the area of East Boston which is not located within the critical contours has only decreased marginally. Now, what is your solution to the noise problem generated by your facilities relative to the community of East Boston? You state on page 264 of your document that the Port Authority does not contemplate purchase of additional property adjacent to Logan International Airport for expansion purposes. It does recognize, however, that aircraft approaches and departures over certain residential areas and sections close in and along the extended center line of certain runways as such as to cause some landowners to desire to sell their properties. This property is not needed for airport use but may be considered for purchase by the authority should the majority of property owners in the above described areas so desire and petition the Port Authority to consider such purchase. One could interpret this statement as meaning that you will purchase some 2,000 housing units which are presently located within the approach surface of Logan's runways. The interpretation of such a program, the implementation of such a program, rather, would be devastating to the economic, social, and physical environment of our community. The Mass Port Authority has already gone unrecognized and is stated in your report the Port Authority policy positions page 370 number 9 which states, "Develop with the community assistance a program for land purchase and relocation for the Neptune Road area residents located between the MBTA tracks and the present Logan boundary. Several questions arise when reviewing this position. Why do you stop at the MBTA tracks? Any of us who are familiar with the area know that the people on the other side of the MBTA tracks, which is 25 feet away, don't suffer any less than the people on the Port Authority side of the MBTA tracks. If the Port Authority is successful in purchasing the stated buildings as presented in the position, which represents about 120 throwing units, are you committed to building replacement housing on a one-to-one basis? If the Mass Port Authority is successful in purchasing these properties, it will represent an investment of well over two million dollars. Is the Port Authority seriously considering such an expenditure, such a large sum of money, just to make it grass and trees? Or do they have other plans for the property? Also, in your document you talk about the possibilities of contours and nighttime curfews. You address the problems that you say are economic problems. The Community Development Corporation, of which I am employee, has sent you a document for your review, which is a study that was done over the last few months about a nighttime curfew and there are recommendations in there. Although it doesn't recommend a full-time curfew, it does recommend a partial curfew. We requested that you people give us your input to this document before our board officially approves it or accepts it or adopts it by August 17th of this month, which we all know was last Friday. As of today we have not received any response by your people. What our concerns are, are what are the Port Authority going to do for the people the social and physical environment in East Boston and beyond the points of the safety of the air freight passengers and the airline passenger?. You have extensive land holdings on Bayswater Street, Saratoga Street, Saint Andrews Road. What happens to that property? If you were to implement your program of purchasing all that property which lies within the approach zones, you would practically wipe out major portions and major neighborhoods, strong neighborhoods I might add, of East Boston's residential areas.

00:43:28,079 --> 00:45:05,200

Edward King: Thank you, Mr. Interbartolo. A couple of items I would like to comment is that I did receive, as did other members of our staff, the report that was prepared for the CDC and others. I responded the same day I received it and indicated that, while the August date may be a little ambitious, that we nevertheless would respond to that. I think we should and I assure you we will, although time has not permitted an answer by August 17th. Secondly, the Authority, the board, the members of the authority are the only ones who may authorize the purchase of property, and the only property purchases that are authorized any place in the Commonwealth are in the Neptune Road area. And that plan has been the subject of wide media distribution and if anyone has a question on that we'd be perfectly pleased to distribute to you a copy of just what that plan is for that Neptune Road area. Our next speaker is Mr. Pasquale Pignato, 2 Saint Andrew Road. Mr. Pignato, please. Last evening everyone was permitted to speak with very, very little interference. Please do the same for all of us here tonight.

00:45:02,160 --> 00:50:24,839

Pasquale Pignato: Mr. Chairman, members of the press and television, and ladies and gentlemen from East Boston. First of all, let me congratulate you because you have a vested interest in your community by your appearance here tonight. For that I personally feel that the right of expression is that that is given to everybody. As far as I'm personally concerned, I recognize the need of keeping a level-headed discussion amongst people who are interested. The previous speakers spoke with reference to the economic impact of Logan International Airport. I'm willing to go and say that today many people from East Boston, either as individuals or business people, direct benefits are paid to them because there is located in East Boston area Logan International Airport. You go outside this street and you'll find that the rental agreements advertised in the Boston Globe cite the fact that four rooms five minutes from the airport rent for 145 dollars but that's not simply on the economics. Let's consider the impact of the thrust of the planes as it affects the safety of human lives. You know and I know that regulations governing the automobiles are being studied now with an airbag that will protect the human life against the tragedy of an action. We have to consider that the air traveler likewise. The Mass Port Authority did not select the present location. They have developed it with the understanding that their responsibility is for the safety of the air traveler, but there has been an understanding for the sacrifices of the residents. There has been a meeting of the minds and those that have been the beneficiaries are there to say that they received—I want to say this—that as one who uses the airways I feel quite comfortable in my seat on the way back from Rome knowing that the latest equipment available will guarantee my safety return. Oh yes, you may not agree with me but you have the perfect right, but when you disagree come like myself to the microphone, express yourself, don't hide between a political ambition—a falsely distorted untruth. I never saw so many people interested in community relations until the federal government set up programs for them to draw funds. All of a sudden these hero worshipers of the district, find themselves in the payroll. I say to you ladies and gentlemen, place yourselves in the administrative position to reduce this hearsay to a truth and you find that they who portray the interest in the community are the selfish ones against constructive criticism. Let them come up and offer a plan. Let them come up and say, "This is wrong; we offer this." You don't condemn. I have this offer to make to that disturbing person who says I am not for real. I have a piece of property on 2 Saint Andrew Road. I have another one at 159 Princeton

Street and a third one - 93 and 1/2. I will make them available. Listen carefully! I will make those properties available to any resident on Neptune Road who is being displaced, not to the Port Authority—they're vultures!—but anybody on Neptune Road. What a popular thing for me to do! Classification is something that I bought for your realization. I offer those properties appraised by the same person who appraised the properties on Neptune Road. At 2 Saint Andrew Road you have four, five, and six rooms available. At 159, there are 3 apartments—

00:50:21,680 --> 00:51:21,119

Edward King: Mister. Mr. Pignato. Thank you. No free advertising. We understand.

Pasquale Pignato: I want to portray that my feeling is for human life because, remember folks, it is not funny. You take the very statistics that are ready tonight, a wind factor change, a wind factor change of five points and the radar, the radar the tower would have directed that delta over Neptune Road. Where would you be now if that Delta had been directed by the air traffic of not the Mass Port Authority—they don't run the traffic pattern! Remember that you sit and take the position that everything is wrong. Everything is not wrong as long as you find a solution to make it right. Thank you very much.

00:51:19,280 --> 00:55:49,839

Edward King: Thank you Mr. Pignato. Now, now, I think that a little change in tempo is in order. Our next card is from a lady who prefers to submit a written statement at a later date; we'll gladly accept that. The next item that we have is in the form of a question. It says, "Please, comment on the problem of a curfew." A curfew at Logan International Airport is something that has been mentioned every year, at least over the past four or five years; it was mentioned in Winthrop last night and it's mentioned very frequently at public meetings and our authority meetings. It has been the subject of legislative action, I believe over the last three or four years, and the problem has always been that we oppose at Mass Port Authority, a curfew and our efforts in the legislature in seeing that a curfew did not come from Massachusetts have been successful. Now what are the reasons for this? I think that briefly in layman's language that I will be able to at least scratch the surface. Several problems and please—I don't mind as much myself, but we will have other speakers—if you wish to talk with one another I think that you may do that outside, if you wish. I would like that there are those here, a goodly number, who may want to listen, particularly to the other speakers. Now the curfew in Massachusetts, and in no other city in the United States, would make Massachusetts at a tremendous economic advantage. Economics is not the only thing that we consider, but, when we consider environment, we have to consider man who is a very integral part of the environment. And man without an opportunity for gainful employment is someone without dignity, and I don't think something that a wholesome environment should consider. We have the utilization of aircraft. We have time zone changes. And I only suggest that the Massachusetts Port Authority or Logan Airport, if we had the authority, now, there are those who say that the airport proprietor does—I personally don't believe that this—has never been tested in court. But every test that there has been, for instance, a municipality to impose a curfew on an airport, has met with defeat. This cannot be done. That does not mean necessarily, because it has not been adjudicated at the highest federal court, that perhaps a proprietor could not. We do not think a proprietor may because it's interstate commerce. It's not Massachusetts or East Boston or Boston, but rather it

is national, international commerce. I say that we have not been lagging and point to the fact that, realistically—effectively, if that's a better word for you—substantially. No other airport in the United States has a curfew. Now you say they do have one at Washington National and that's true, but I mentioned effectively and substantially. While they have one at Washington National, there's Washington Dulles some 20 or 30 miles away from that, which is a very favorable alternate. They have on the other side the Baltimore Airport, again a short distance away. So what I'm saying effectively is that under similar conditions, with no realistic alternative, no other airport in the nation has one. We don't have one. If they all did, let's say that would be something entirely different Massachusetts economy, job opportunities would not suffer, but that question has been asked I think in general layman terms that I've done a fair job in answering that. Anyone who would like more literature like the time zones that are prepared by the Airport Operators Council by Massport—we have studies on it—or by the American Transport Association, if you leave your name we would be delighted to furnish you with additional information. Our next speaker, then, is Mr. Joseph Posio, co-chairman, Legislative Committee of the East Boston Neighborhood Council. Mr. Posio.

00:55:56,720 --> 01:05:02,559

Joseph Posio: First of all, I'm going to have to beg—you hear me? First of all, I'm going to have to beg your indulgence because I cannot talk as loud as my previous speaker. I'm by nature a soft-spoken individual. Also, I am a working man like most of you people here, and as a result of my having attended last night's public hearing in Winthrop, I had all I could do. When I got home to try to get some, a good night's sleep, after I had the nerve racked of what I had seen, and all the lies that had been transported, that this morning I got up and went to work and trying to concentrate on my job, by the same token, tried to make some points and, as a result, I just wrote them down between working assignments and all I have is pencil notes, a lot of scratches, so I'm going to have to, once again, say I'm sorry if I hesitate at parts because sometimes it's even difficult to read your own notes when you have to, you can't put all your attention on it. But I am here to address myself to the Massport on behalf of the Legislative Committee of the East Boston Neighborhood Council. I would also like to preface my remark that this committee wishes to go on record as being unoperably and opposed to any further physical expansion of Logan International Airport, be it in the form of runways or extensions, construction or otherwise, the installation of an ILS system at the Neptune Road end of runway 1533, any form of the third harbor crossing, and finally the installation of an oil refinery in the Belle Isle Flats area. Last night in Winthrop, with all its testimonies, the final question to be asked was, I quote, "In view of all the objections here tonight, will Massport still go on to achieve its goal?" To this, Mr. King replied 'that it was not fair to merely oppose everything for the sake of opposing. State your reasons, and let them be valid reasons.' To this we say Massport created the problems and it should be up to Massport to solve them. We don't profess to be engineers. [applause] The residents were here long before Massport; I was here long before Massport and the airport. On the basis of this reply, it was quite evident that the entire series of hearings will be insults upon the people by King's men. There has been, and will be, many suggestions and alternatives. Also, last night, in response to another question, it was pointed out by Mr. Mooney that extending runway 927 would decrease the noise over Point Shirley, Winthrop from 102 to 99 decibels. A massive total of three decibels! Three decibels

decreased! The place was in an uproar and laughter. No consideration had been given after the increase in noise for the Jeffries Point section of East Boston and South Boston as well. Still another question that was brought, an emphatic contradiction it was, "Will not the extension of 927 bring more traffic on its runway?" I say the 54,500 dollar answer—mind you—the 54,500 dollar answer was, "No." The obvious question now is, then why does the master plan project increased traffic by the 1980s? There is a contradiction, isn't there? As usual, is right. If we may make some observations at this time before going to some suggestions for alternatives, a night curfew at Logan could easily be implemented if the landlord, Massport, so wishes. The feasibility of reducing nighttime noise, that Logan airport study made by Professor Yance explains it all well, and Massport has a copy of it. Now Massport could act. As far as air curfews, night curfew is a concern—I'm going to be repetitious now—because he did say that no other airport in the entire country has a night curfew and I says, boy here's an opening for me, but he jumped the gun; he beat me to it, "Washington DC does have one." But I say there are curfews in such big cities as Heathrow, England, Zurich and Geneva, Switzerland, Paris, France, Los Angeles (is questioning that right now) and Tokyo. Now, these are all International Airports. I don't see any one of these airports claiming that they're starving to spoil the economy. These are words that Massport is putting into the heads of people and this is gives them the impetus to keep on going. In reply to Mr. King—incidentally those facts come out of the March 1973 *Reader's Digest* which excerpted from the *Business Week*—in reply to Mr. King who said, "The airlines are doing all in their power to reduce the noise and pollution emissions from their planes." I say, "Hogwash!" A recent airways magazine stated that the Eastern Airlines, the biggest carry at Logan, has not long since purchased several 727s, which barely meet the latest requirements. As for the black jet emissions, it has been brought to our attention that the reason why many planes don't show it is that it has been bleached, but the pollutants still remain the same. In a recent article by Dr. Paul Epstein, medical doctor at one of our local clinics here, one fan jet alone produces the same amount of carbon monoxide as 200 cars, as much poison gas, nitrogen oxide, as 500 cars, as many hydrocarbons as 5,000 cars, as many harmful particles as 12,000 cars. Even lead poisoning exists, which causes brain damage especially in children. One more observation: the claim of Logan being the eighth busiest airport in the world. I forgot to bring it with me. The latest almanac according to the United States Department of Transportation doesn't even list Logan in the top 10 in the country. That was of 1971. Nevertheless, FAA's latest report has Logan takeoffs and landings at a peak of 307,744 as of 1969. Since then it has been declining steadily to 293,058, 1972. Last year's almanac, they carry the listing of all the airports around the world—Logan ranked 24th. They still claim it's the eighth busiest. Did I hear a bell?

Edward King: Pardon?

Joseph Posio: As an alternative to—something's wrong—as an alternative to halting further expansion of Logan, Massport, with sincerity, should look into and start implementing the air cushion train, already in operation in France. Mr. Crocker Snow of the Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission spoke highly of it after having ridden in one; we talked about this at the Gardner Auditorium May of this year. They have been clocked at 300 miles per hour—
Time Keeper: [bell chimes]

01:04:59,359 --> 01:05:26,000

Joseph Posio: ...implementation of a system—

Edward King: Sorry.

Joseph Posio: All right I'll let someone else read the rest of me, if you don't mind.

Edward King: Go ahead, go ahead! Let him. You can, you may finish Joe. We'll make an exception, Joe. Your information is very good.

Joseph Posio: Thank you.

01:05:22,720 --> 01:09:46,799

Joseph Posio: They have been clocked at 300 miles per hour. Implementation of such a system to New York and Washington could very well give people an option to choose, and thereby cut, some of the flights out of the present air facility, that is Logan. The Arthur D. Little report of May 1973—which I have here—lists 76 of the flights out of Logan to fly within a 400 mile radius. I'm going to read just this one sentence out of it. "At the present time, 76% of the air carrier flights leaving Boston Logan fly less than 500 miles on the first segment of their flight. The long runways at Boston Logan could handle the remaining 24% long-haul flights indefinitely if they were not used for anything else." Let me see. Where am I now? The Arthur D. Little report also states that Hanscom Airfield in Bedford could very easily be converted into a relief facility to Logan since it is primarily owned by Massport, and the bulk of users from the latter come from that area. Consequently, the travelers would rather stand their flights from there than to fight the congestion of in-town travel. I will read an excerpt from there, too. Taking under consideration all the airports, such as South Weymouth, Beverly, Lawrence, Norwood, and Bedford, they took these following statistics under consideration before they finally decided that Bedford was the best available airport. They took on the consideration the availability of excess capacity, convenience to market runways, and social costs in all respects, put them all together in one unit. They found that Bedford would have been the best because they said that since the bulk of the travelers using Logan airport come from that area, would just as soon say "Go to Bedford," or even if they had to go to South Weymouth, travel 30 miles, than to come into Boston (which is only about 20 miles) because they wouldn't have to fight the crowd and the traffic in the city of Boston. Concerning of employment now, if Massport is truly, as it leads many to believe, construction of the Bedford facility could very easily put an innumerable amount of people to work and, thereby, upgrade the sliding economy of New England. Finally, if Massport is all sincere and is really interested in the safety of passengers in the planes, it could very easily extend the threshold of 1533 in an easterly manner, then fill out to sea. If they can fill out the harbor on the Bird Isle Flats they can do it very easily at the end of 1533 out in the ocean-side. In so doing, the touchdown point for aircraft landing on that runway would be further away from the residential area and the millions of gallons of fuel stored in the vicinity. It would also have the planes land at a higher altitude over the Neptune Road. God forbid, should a dense fog occur one day to cover the entire airport, as it has on many occasions, that a plane should be coming in on 1533 and the slightest malfunction of the plane system should cause it to crash, then it would not be considered a tragedy or rather a holocaust. Then again, I'll truly concern other Massport planners and, for that matter the FAA, in the safety of passengers when they continuously subject their travelers to all sorts of hazardous conditions. As some of the nation's top airport designers have said, Logan can't ever be classified as a number one airport

because of its close proximity to the city and residential areas around three quarters of its periphery. Thank you.

01:09:57,199 --> 01:10:35,679

Edward King: Thank you, Mr. Posio.

Audience: [Applause]

Edward King: While our next speaker, Mr. George DiLorenzo, State Representative, is coming forward, I would have mentioned that we have at least four seats here that someone in the rear, if they wish, may take and bring wherever they wish to sit. And one comment on one thing that Mr. Posio mentioned. He mentioned 54,509. I don't know why I picked that one out, but—and as much as I know something about 54,005 I can assure you I know as much about runway 9, and I would refer you to the environmental impact statement. Representative.

Audience Member: You didn't get that.

01:10:39,600 --> 01:12:25,600

George DiLorenzo: Mr. Chairman, thank you—

Edward King: Thank you.

George DiLorenzo: —for this opportunity to again, maybe for the 50th time in the last eight years, to discuss East Boston problems with the Mass Port Authority. I think we've got to a point now where maybe we are to start to realize that this master plan has revealed one victory anyway. I can remember on the Florida House requesting and demanding that you submit a 10-year master plan, and it is before us. I want to compliment you on at least that part of an agreement that you kept three years ago to the House of Representatives. I would like also to congratulate you on depleting 1533 parallel runway when we originally, as I can remember, I felt that that would have been a real serious problem. But what you really did was to move the noise from one section and spread it out into another area. I really don't know the effect of this STOL runway over Jeffries Point. Can you give someone Mr. King, or can you give me a rough idea just what kind of traffic is this STOL over Jeffries Point, so the people who live here who live in this area that I specifically like to cite can at least expect something in this sense. Just what is meant by this STOL runway that's coming right over Jeffries Point? What's the traffic going to be? What's the noise intense? What's the decibel reading? And what effect will this have over the churches, the schools, and the sleeping pattern?

01:12:24,159 --> 01:12:43,840

Edward King: All right now. Would that be your only question? I ask that—

George DiLorenzo: That's all. One question.

Edward King: Okay. Mr. Mooney, then, I would ask to answer that question because he's more qualified to do that than I. You heard the questions. What does it mean? What kind of aircraft? What are the noise decibels and all? Correct? If he does not answer anything you asked, you remind him, please.

01:12:45,040 --> 01:16:08,880

Richard Mooney: I'd like to point out that in the draft master plan study we have discussed that particular subject and also, at the end of the study, we indicate the fact that we are ready to

commit to the fact that overflights of the Jeffries Point area will be prohibited. As I said earlier, it has been demonstrated that it can be done, technically, and we have said that this restriction would be accepted on this runway. The FAA says that they feel that this can be accomplished so that there will be no direct overflights on the 15 approach, which would be over the Jeffries Point area. That would be the same for departures from the other end. And again the turns would be left and out over the harbor area. Now we took some decibel readings of that and I don't recall exactly what each one of these were. We took two types of aircraft that we felt would be representative of the type that would be operating from that runway, but it's approximately at a level of 85 decibels, as I recall. I've got the actual report here. We took the reading on an Apache Aircraft the—I'm sorry, the level that I mentioned was the noise on the takeoff from runway 9 for a regular, jet-type of aircraft—the approach on an Apache was 72 decibels peak, on takeoff it was 70 decibels. On the Twin Otter it was an approach of 72 and on takeoff it was 68. Now also, one of the commitments that we have said was that we would limit the use of that runway to aircraft that would meet noise certification standards set by the federal government under FAR 36. In this case there is a varying level of noise that's tolerable, but, for the type of aircraft that can operate on that shorter runway, it's relatively low. It's somewhat higher than the levels that have been mentioned here, but primarily we expect this runway to be used by the commuter type of aircraft, which are, most of them, a 20-passenger type of aircraft. Ultimately STOL aircraft, if they are developed, they must meet FAR 36 to operate from that runway and we feel that it would be not significantly above the ambient noise level of the Jeffries Point area.

01:16:08,880 --> 01:16:47,280

Edward King: In essence, perhaps, better in your language and mine as layman, it'll be the smaller aircraft, generally single engine, with no overflight of Jeffries Point. On takeoff they come and they go around by the waterfront and on coming in they go around the waterfront. That's the question. That's the answer.

George DiLorenzo: In other words, we are again moving it from one section to another over East Boston—

Edward King: Now—

George DiLorenzo: —in this particular segment.

Edward King: In this instance, it's really over the airport and over the main shipping channel. That's as we see it. We're committed, as Mr. Mooney said, to no overflights of the Jeffries Point area. And the advantage of moving them from the existing 15 is to segregate them from the larger aircraft, all right?

01:16:52,159 --> 01:17:39,280

George DiLorenzo: Thank you very much I'll be keenly observing this particular part of the master plan sheet. I've gone through the master plan sort of horribly and I've noticed quite a few points, so I close and I just want to hope that you would consider just exactly what this particular growth in the next 10 years means to East Boston. It means that it's going to be the start of its demise and whether you're talking about the Neptune Road and you want to transport them somewhere else, whether you're talking about the Bayswater area, whether you're talking of the Winthrop area now to Jeffries Point. I think it's time that maybe the people

with the powers to be who may be keenly observing what this is going to do to the next generation as far as the health and the educational standards is something that we'll be working. And I want to tell you that we'll be working on that.

01:17:41,920 --> 01:17:59,840

Edward King: Thank you. Thank you, Representative. Our next speaker is city councilor Albert L. O'Neil. We'll then answer two questions.

Audience: [applause]

01:18:10,080 --> 01:25:18,520

Albert O'Neil: Mr. King, thank you. Gentlemen, I don't think that I'm much of a stranger to your committee. I came here tonight, Mr. King, in addition to being at about five other hearings today, simply to say that I have always advocated the will of the people. It reminds me when I was chairman of the Boston Licensing Board and the Boston Redevelopment Authority had swallowed up all types of homes and businesses in the great city of Boston that when the people came to object to a man that found another location to relocate his restaurant, or his liquor license, or his package door, that I was sitting there in judgment with my colleagues. And that was the will of the people. And that was the devastation with the BIRA with another human being. Many times it was very, very difficult to make a decision because some of the businesses that were displaced they were good licensees: they never had violations and they were good citizens and they paid their taxes and they paid their license fees. But yet, when the people organized and came in it was the will of my decision, unfortunately I had to reject that application, and the same thing applies here, Mr. King and members of the committee. That the people here in East Boston, it is the will of the people of East Boston that they basically have really had enough. I think, basically, Mr. King and members of the committee, that people in the entire country have had enough of port authorities, turnpike authorities, Boston Redevelopment Authorities, all types of authorities just coming in with big business and swallowing up people that all they want to do is raise their families, see that their children are properly educated. It's a very serious thing that's happening here gentlemen, not only here in East Boston, but it's happening all over the country that big business is swallowing up decent human beings. I have had the opportunity to read your plan, and I know that the budget that set the money up to make this plan, and the study, it's costing enough a lot of money. I'm not here to try to impress anybody. I'm here as a man that represents four generations here in Boston. And I'm here wondering what's going to happen to this city because everything seems to be in the direction of the commuter. And everything seems to be in the direction gentlemen of people that will come into this city and use the facilities and leave nothing for us. Now for the last six years, as you well know, that I have filed legislation to force the Turnpike Authority, and also the Port Authority, to pay full tax value to the city of Boston. Here are people in East Boston that I think—

Audience: [Applause]

Albert O'Neil: —we're going back to use the word discrimination. That seems to be a very popular word these days in this country. Here are people that live here in the city of Boston like I do, and if you tell this story to any people that I meet—and I meet many of them from out of town and I meet them from out of state and I meet them in other countries—you tell them that

one section of this city of Boston, that the people that live in East Boston actually have to pay to go back and forth to get to their own homes, I think that's basically discrimination. I think what's happening in this city today is that men in public life should stop thinking about their own personal gains. I think they should stop thinking that if it weren't for the people that go out and vote for them that they wouldn't be in the position they are today. For example, you're reading the task force reports in some of the Boston newspapers, not only this state, Mr. King and gentlemen, but this country is in a state of turmoil! People today don't know who to believe! In this great country people today are concerned about the high cost of food and meats and how much a gas shot is when we should have everything! So all I'm saying to you, gentlemen, in conclusion, is this. I could stand here like the other gentleman and the other people who will talk and stop talking statistics and start confining my remarks to the plan and stop confining my remarks to the drawings here, but they've had all they can possibly take in East Boston! I mean you gentlemen mean well—I suppose you do—but we've got to take into consideration that, as one man said here tonight, these people have been here long before Logan Airport and how much is going to go on in this great country in this great city? So if you would do in the practice that I had advocated to you at the beginning of my presentation, that I have to go every day before the appeals board. I have to go before the licensing board. I go before the zoning board. I go at hearings at the State House. I just go and go and go and wonder in my own heart if it someday will mean something. The country's being torn apart! Education is being destroyed! Everything's being destroyed in this wonderful country! So, in your deliberation to whom maybe you have to report to, I will ask you this in all sincerity. It's very meaningful that these people are here tonight. It's showing that they have a desire to tell you we just don't want an expansion or any extensions or anything further. We've got it here; it's something that was created. One man told me tonight in the hall he's been battling the Port Authority and Logan Airport since 1918. Now, for god's sake, would you do us one personal favor? And I hate humbly as an elected official to ask a favor of a great big organization such as the Port Authority. Will you please take into consideration that this could happen where you come from? And that this is this could happen? All I'm asking you to do in your deliberation is abide, gentlemen—please abide—by the will of the people. They just don't want it. Thank you very much.

Edward King: Thank you, councilor.

Audience: [Applause]

01:25:21,280 --> 01:27:00,239

Edward King: Next, for a break in the proceedings, we have two questions on one card. The first question is, "Have devices for measuring and recording noise levels been installed by the Mass Port Authority? It was announced several years ago that this would be done." Well, actually, in October of 1971, very close to two years ago, the Authority did vote for a noise monitoring study and the associated work that goes with that. At its July meeting, having taken bids, had a designer that designed the equipment, and all taken bids received them, and studied them in light of recent technological developments, it was voted to authorize the signing of that contract. That contract has been signed. It is estimated now that the actual time of installation will run somewhere between 9 and 12 months. That's the best estimate I can give. So the answer to the question is, have devices been installed? No. Have they been ordered? Yes. Probably within a year they will be installed.

Audience: [loud murmurs]

Edward King: The second—okay—the second question is, “What is the—” please, because I’m sure that the person that asked the question would like to hear the answer— “What is the current status of plans from an alternative airport?” At the present time, the position of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as announced by the Governor of the Commonwealth in 1970 and as voted by the authority, I believe, in the same year is that there will be no second airport. So—

01:27:06,239 --> 01:27:19,199

Audience Member: [inaudible]

Edward King: Well you may have your own interpretation, but I can assure you

Audience Member: [inaudible]

Edward King: Please don't interrupt.

Audience Member: [inaudible]

Edward King: Please.

Audience Member: [inaudible]

Edward King: Please

Audience Member: [inaudible]

01:27:19,199 --> 01:28:23,919

Edward King: Please. The Authority's official position is that there will be no second airport planning or consideration. That may change, but it has not changed since 1970 when the position was taken. We have another individual who asks, “What is the FAA doing to meet the ecology standards of cleaning our air? What are their regulations?” Perhaps I would defer that to Mr. Callaghan. If that's fair to you? The question is, “What is the FAA doing to meet the ecology standards of cleaning our air?” and then, “What are these regulations?”

01:28:00,159 --> 01:30:07,840

Thomas Callaghan: As far as the FAA is concerned—

Audience Member: If you're on the committee I think that, if you're on the committee, it's not valid! I don't [inaudible]

Audience: [Applause]

Audience Member: [inaudible]

Thomas Callaghan: I believe that whoever answers the question is supposed to know a little bit more about it than anyone else and is not expected to have any special prejudice about the situation, so I'll sum it all up by saying that the FAA doesn't actually have any environmental restrictions which are related to the quality of the air. The Environmental Protection Agency does have standards, and you may have read of the transportation controls that have been proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency, also the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, is issuing standards on the exhaust of aircraft so that they will limit whatever pollution they provide. Also, there may be restrictions on the way in which aircraft move around on the airfield. So, fundamentally, there are restrictions being established for all kinds of transportation vehicles: automobiles, trains, aircraft. But, fundamentally, the aircraft is not providing a great deal of the pollution in the total—

01:30:07,840 --> 01:31:03,840

Audience Member: Quit talking about cars! We're talking about airplanes. I don't want to listen about cars!

Thomas Callaghan: ...in the—excuse me—in the total metropolitan area and I realize that is not merely East Boston. The total amount of pollution caused by aircraft is one to two percent.

Audience: [inaudible]

Audience Member: [inaudible]...East Boston?

Thomas Callaghan: Now, these figures can be found in any scientific treatise on the subject so I would welcome anyone providing material which refutes that particular statement.

Audience Member: That's what I said!

Thomas Callaghan: Thank you.

Audience: [inaudible]

01:31:07,440 -->

Edward King: All right. Now we will go on with others who have indicated a desire to speak. Joan Piteri—or Pittori—28 Monmouth Street. Ms. Joan, still here?

01:31:31,520 --> 01:32:48,800

Joan Pittori: I am a parent from East Boston and we have a petition which we would like to present to the Massport and it's as following, "We, the undesigned teachers, students, and parents of the Eagle Hill Schools in East Boston, protest the extreme and unbearable jet aircraft noise from Logan Airport that invalidates the learning process. These schools have an enrollment of 2,300 pupils whose education must not be sacrificed simply because the aircraft operator and users do not account for the served community impact of their operation; therefore, we demand that the Mass Port Authority, as the operator and landlord of Logan Airport, which is the source of this problem be required to pay for soundproofing our schools. The students of East Boston deserve equal opportunity for a decent education. Thank you.

Audience: [Applause]

01:32:45,600 --> 01:33:54,000

Edward King: Thank you very much, Joan. Mrs. Elizabeth Mazzarini, Maverick Street, East Boston, please.

Elizabeth Mazzarini: I wasn't going to mention about the STOL runway, Mr. King, but one night we had—I don't know whether to say the pleasure or not—Mr. Tom Callaghan in our presence, and there was a plane that flew over Jeffries Point and we don't even have the STOL runway yet. So he can verify to the fact I'm sure that there was a plane flying over Jeffries Point even without the STOL runway, so I can imagine when we get it what we'd get then. I have a little speech... What was your answer to that Tom? Did he answer to that?

01:33:54,000 --> 01:35:53,520

Edward King: Yes. He didn't say the exact same thing you did, but I was just wondering—

Elizabeth Mazzarini: He didn't. Tom, I'm sure you didn't. And I'm surprised at you.

Audience: [laughter]

Edward King: Would you—

Eizabeth Mazzarini: Well, okay. I don't see why we, the people of East Boston, should have to come to the hearings of the Massport board and be told of what is being planned for the future growth of Logan. Supposedly we have been asked to have an input into the plans, and we have made suggestions would have which have gone unheard such as a night curfew, quieter engines, and mostly that we, the residents and people who live closest to Logan—not the Massport members or the staff—that we, the residents who live closest to Logan, do not want any further expansion at Logan. Of course we don't expect Logan to fold up and go away, but we would hope that the Mass Port Authority and the Federal Aviation Agency would recognize our position and call a halt to any further expansion of Logan. The recent Delta DC-9 jetline tragedy that claimed the lives of 88 people, and disrupted the lives of 88 families, I would hope that the Mass Port would realize, and the FAA would realize that Logan has indeed reached its saturation point. It should not be allowed to expand. It is surrounded by too many densely populated communities such as Winthrop, East Boston, Revere, Beachmont, Chelsea, South Boston, and many more. This tragedy was a great loss indeed, but imagine, what an even greater catastrophe had one of these communities been involved. How many of you, and you Mr. King, want to live with the fact...

(Continued on Tape 2)