Record Group TC6/1995
Massachusetts Port Authority Public Hearing Files, 1970-1986
Draft Master Plan Hearing in Revere, August 22, 1973 Tape 1

00:00:00,240 --> 00:04:01,840
Edward King: We're all ready to start. Those that are part of our team should come up. In the interest of uniformity, we take a moment to read to you—we hope you pardon us for doing that because we'd rather speak to you—some of the formalities of the evening governing the rules and regulations. The purpose of this hearing is to give interested persons an opportunity to comment on the draft master plan study for Logan International Airport prepared by the Mass Port Authority. 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 communities to provide inputs for the study. Upon completion of the public hearings a subcommittee of the board will consider the input from these hearings and, with the staff, develop the final plan for board action. Following board action, a plan will be held—a public hearing, excuse me, will be held in Boston to present the final master plan. Before the testimony begins, I will describe—briefly—the procedure 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 on the back of the room indicating that you wish to speak, you will be called on in your turn. If you have not yet done so, raise your hand and a card will be brought to you and collected. If you have any questions for the Authority, you should also write them on 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. Put your name and address, please, on the question with—on the card with your question. During the course of the hearing, I will read questions that have been presented, 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 individual to the questioner. All questions and answers will be made part of the formal record of this hearing. If you have a written statement, please present a copy to the stenographer 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 in order to give everyone an opportunity to present his or her views. The timekeeper will indicate when you have two minutes left by holding up a green card and when your 10 minutes has expired by holding up a red card. Should you wish additional time, you may return to speak after everyone else has had 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 been heard. Briefly then, we're now ready to start the presentation side of our program. What we're going to do is to show you the master plan development, perhaps over the past year, with particular emphasis on where we are at this moment, which is what we're here to hear your comments on. We have with us tonight our Director of Aviation, Mr. Richard E. Mooney, who perhaps provides the greatest technical expertise—certainly—that we have, and we think that anyone else in any airport in our country may have. Mr. Thomas P. Callaghan, our Director of Public Affairs, and—I didn't mean it in this order—Father Albert Sallese, the curate at the Holy Redeemer Parish in East Boston is a

member of the Authority. So, without more at this time, so that you may have the more time for participation, we'll have Mr. Mooney make his presentation.

00:04:01,840 --> 00:04:57,840
Father Sallese: Mr. King?
Edward King: Yes, Father?
Father Sallese: Just for the record, on the record I want it noted that I am opposing the manner that this meeting is being held, as I did Monday and Tuesday evening, the call for this meeting was called by the Massachusetts Port Authority Board of Directors convene and hold this meeting. I am the only member of the Authority here this evening. [inaudible] I've been conducting [inaudible] at this hearing I am refusing that by [inaudible] you in conjunction with [inaudible] here Monday because [inaudible] Monday evening. The Port Authority Board of Directors has called this meeting and you are not a member of that Authority, so the record for the people here are known that I oppose the manner in which this hearing is being held.
Richard Mooney: Thank you, Father. Your position is recorded. Mr. Mooney.

00:05:02,880 --> 00:24:31,200
Richard Mooney: As you may recall, we met with representatives from the Revere area in the latter part of April of this year, and at that time, we discussed a document that we referred to as the "Preliminary Airport Master Plan Review." This was a relatively short document, and it outlined the various improvements that the Port Authority staff felt would be appropriate for inclusion on a master plan. This was one of five hearings held in the principle five localities that are most affected or closely related to Logan International Airport. Following these five meetings, we then met with various public groups, agencies, and so forth. We held a series of 10 meetings, most of these were with elected representatives and planning-types of individuals. Based upon this and the study that had been performed by the Port Authority staff and its consultants, a master plan study report was prepared. Now, this document is approximately 375 pages in length and was completed and published on the 19th of—I believe—July. We distributed this based upon an advertisement; we indicated the availability of it and our intention to hold public hearings—one of which is being held tonight. These meetings—a series of six—were scheduled. The five will be held in each—once again—in each of the individual most directly affected communities. The sixth has been cancelled and will be held at a subsequent date. Now, the purpose of this is to briefly describe to you the process and what the contents of the recommendations the Port Authority staff is concerning the master plan report after the input that was provided by the community participation from the previous meetings. I'd like to then point out—Mr. King did mention the fact that there will be a further review of the master plan report following the completion of these hearings—the input that you provide tonight, as well as other individuals that are interested and participate in the other meetings, the points that you have to offer and that they will offer also will be considered by the staff and be incorporated, if appropriate, in our judgment in a final master plan draft. This will be submitted to the board, they'll determine its acceptability then to go to a final public hearing. Following this public hearing, the staff will prepare a final document to be acted upon by the Authority, which will ultimately become the Port Authority's new master plan. This in turn will be then submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration. I'd like to review, very briefly, with

you the master plan as we have evolved the plan—or recommend that it be evolved from the plan that was approved by the FAA and by the Port Authority the latter part of 1969 and early 1970. If you'll show the first slide—we'd like to show you what the Port Authority's official master plan has looked like. Now, we have added color here for purposes of emphasis and, very briefly: the existing airfield areas depicted in brown. This constitutes, primarily, the runways and taxiways for the airport as it existed at that time. In black are the existing buildings: primarily the terminal buildings, hangars, and air cargo. The next item is the proposed airfield, which includes the items in orange. Now, those, briefly, were the proposed parallel 1533, an extension to runway 27, a parallel 927, an extension to runway 9, extension to runway 4-Left, and a short parallel 1533 runway for a general aviation STOL-type of aircraft. The proposed buildings are shown in green; the principal terminal facilities at that time were the South Terminal, the International Terminal, a potential area for development of the added parking space, and various support buildings. The proposed fill is shown in the rather faded-out green color. Would you show the next slide, please? On March 1 of this year, the Port Authority board took action, based upon a recommendation by the Port Authority staff, to eliminate from consideration various improvements that had been shown on the, then official, airport master plan. Now, to highlight these we've indicated them primarily in red, and principally, they included the parallel runway 1533, the extension to 27, and, so that you can get your orientation—Armand would you show them the direction toward Revere so that they can understand what we're referring to? The next one was the elimination of the parallel 927, the elimination of fill in an area between the Bird Island Flats area and Jeffries Point—we also proposed a somewhat further extension of runway 9 and a longer parallel runway for use by smaller type of aircraft. Now at that time, a Bird Island Flats was committed; it was substantially filled at that point; we had not yet filled the pond areas between the parallel 27—I'm sorry, parallel 22s-Left and Right. Now, the purpose of removing these items was the fact that there had been some developments over a period of several years, primarily from 1970; it was an indication that there was a leveling-off of traffic—only aircraft traffic. We've had a continuous increase in passenger traffic, but the increase has slowed down; we do expect it to continue to increase into the future. We also recognize the public opposition to the parallel 1533 in particular, and we felt that the parallel 927 really was not realistically needed because of the limitations that this runway has because of the approach to the runway 9 end for landing purposes. We felt also that the length of 927 with the addition on 9 would be adequate for the future. Would you show the next slide please? Now, this is where we are today; this is the plan for development of Logan as contained in the master plan study report. Now, I'd like to point out that some of the projects we have shown as existing or completed because we were criticized—or at least it was a subject of discussion—during the meetings earlier this year because we had committed ourselves to the construction of the South Terminal, and at that time, we had indicated that it was a proposed building, and it was pointed out to us that actually we had let a contract—which was true—and it had been let between the time that had been placed on that plan, and the meeting had been held so that, in the case where a facility is either under construction or contractually committed, we have shown it as existing. Now briefly, I think you can see from this, the Port Authority staff is not recommending any extensive development at Logan. We're not saying that this plan as illustrated will take care of the air transportation needs for the Boston metropolitan area forever. We have considered the potential for high-speed rail and various other things, which

will extend the capacity of the facilities as they now exist and would be developed under this plan, and other types of things that may—although we're not confident, we would hope that there might be some possibilities of diversion, but we cannot absolutely assume it. There is a possibility that it may occur. We've indicated in the past that the Port Authority supports, in fact, high-speed rail, but if it doesn't develop, then there must be some way to meet the demand for transportation services. I'd like to point out in particular that the Port Authority really is not developing facilities to really attract additional business as much as it is to develop facilities to meet the demand that is created by the community which it serves. If the demand, for instance for additional parking, does not develop, then we will not develop the parking structure as we've indicated the potential for in our master plan. So that we have a plan which permits incremental development, and we are recommending certain things be done as required. Now part of this master plan that I believe has received the most attention by persons living in the vicinity of the airport revolve around the landing area. The three principal items that remain on the plan are the extension of runway 9, the extension of runway 4-Left, and the construction of the parallel 1533 GA STOL runway. The purpose for these improvements—first of all, the extension of runway 9 is primarily to permit the takeoff of aircraft so that they'll be at a higher level when passing over the Point Shirley area. We think it's a good noise abatement improvement; we're not saying that it eliminates noise, but it is a step in that direction. It's also a significant safety factor; the added runway length will provide an added increment of safety. We're not saying that the runway that exist now is not safe, but we are confident that it will be safer with this addition. We incidentally want to emphasize the fact that the threshold for landing on runway 9 will remain in its present location. We also recognize that some larger aircraft can take off on this runway, but, for all practical purposes, it will accommodate all existing aircraft. In some conditions, the largest four engine aircraft that are operating today—fully loaded—do have a problem taking off on this runway, so that they do operate and take off on runway 4-Right, but it will not mean that the airport is able to handle larger aircraft than it's able to handle today. So it's not being built or added to for the purpose of accommodating an SST, for example. Even when extended, this runway will still be shorter than two existing runways of 4-Right, 22-Left, and 15-Right, 33-Left. The extension of 4-Left is primarily for added safety when taking off from the 22-Right end. On those rare occasions when it's necessary to take off from the 4-Left end—under emergency conditions—and we don't anticipate—nor do we recommend—its use any different than it receives today, but it does provide an added measure of safety. And if you'll notice, of course, the runway parallel to it is still as long as the runway extended, so there would be no obvious purpose in extending it to put larger aircraft on this runway. The parallel runway, the general aviation STOL runway, will provide some added capacity; it's not a great deal, but it will help to compensate for the reduction in capacity that's caused by the extension of the other two runways. It also is quite significant in that it provides the separation of small aircraft and large aircraft. There's quite a problem of wake turbulence where small aircraft are operated immediately behind the larger aircraft, so that it's important—from a safety standpoint and a capacity standpoint. We are proposing the continuation of a taxiway turnoff for aircraft landing on 4-Right and the completion of the outer taxiway on the southern part of the field. We are also proposing the more precise instrumentation of runway 15-Right. This would require fill of a small area just to the northeast of the 15-Right runway. This, we think, is extremely important, primarily from a safety standpoint and does provide

added capability for Logan. In the terminal area, as we said, we've assumed the completion of the South Terminal and International Terminal. We have space available for the addition to the parking facility if, in fact, it is needed. We are working, incidentally, in a cooperative effort attempting to devise improved methods of arriving at the airport; we're very much interested in limousine service and promotion of this type of access to the airport. The Bird Island Flats area, essentially, is completed as far as the fill is concerned; it will be used for construction of primarily air cargo facilities. I believe that that covers it, as well as I need to at this time. I would like to emphasize, however, that, as you can see, we're not planning a great deal of improvement for Logan. We're hopeful that things will develop so that it will stretch the longevity of the airport and continue to be able to serve the Boston metropolitan area in a convenient and safe manner in the future. We've planned these facilities so that they will have a minimum environmental or adverse impact upon persons living in the vicinity of Logan; as a matter of fact, we believe that—without exception on the landing area improvements—that they will be added benefit, both environmentally and from a safety standpoint. We think that they'll withstand the test of the very close scrutiny that is being given to them by the various governmental agencies, and we believe that it is a good and reasonable plan. Thank you.

00:24:28,640 → 00:26:20,559
Edward King: All right. So far I have not received any cards indicating that anyone would wish to speak, card or not, is there anyone…? Yes, sir? You may. Would you just…
Bernard Foster: How about the low flying planes? Low, low flying planes.
Edward King: I heard you. Just once. Would you mind stating your name? Do you object?
Bernard Foster: Mr. Bernard C. Foster.
Edward King: Oh, I know. How are you, Bernie?
Bernard Foster: Hiya. Good.
Edward King: What about the low flying planes?
Bernard Foster: They continue flying lower and lower. The planes [inaudible].
Edward King: Well I'll answer it this way: that living on Beachmont Hill—correct?
Bernard Foster: On the top of the Hill.
Edward King: Can someone put the runway layout back on; it may help.
Bernard Foster: Now what is the name of this runway?
Edward King: Runway 22-Left is the landing runway, and there'll be this one here—Beachmont is up on top, maybe someone else can point to it. That you're probably directly under the approach path to runway 22-L, which is the only runway in that direction that's used for landing—the other one is not used, and you probably know that. You're about a mile and a half from the end of the runway where they touch down. It's a matter of trigonometry with altitude, and they're so high, and it is a noisy area. I don't think that on any one day or any one month—barring, you know, an exception—there might be some slight misjudgment or variance, that they're any lower on one day than another. It's a situation really, Bernie, that as long as the planes are going to land there—you know the same type of plane—some of them are getting quieter. Technology is improving. It's going to take a long time or an intermediate time. It's not going to happen immediately, but that noise, necessarily, is going to have to continue.

00:26:22,640 --> 00:27:47,039

Bernard Foster: But Mr. King, it’s not about the noise. It’s about the low flying planes.
Edward King: Well... Do you feel that you can improve on what I’ve said?
Richard Mooney: No, I don’t think so.
Bernard Foster: [inaudible] improve how low they come. They are very low. Low.
Edward King: We understand, you know, what you're saying, but I think that if there was a way to measure—and on complaints we always do inquire—and the usual report is: the pilot says he was at a normal altitude for a mile and a half short of touchdown. Now I’m not in a position to say that he was lower than he should have been or other—I really am not. I don't think, realistically now, that the pilot or his co-pilot or anyone would want to be lower because that means danger for them. Of course, if they are lower by any stretch, it means a bit more noise—you know, an unexpected noise, more for you—but I really don't think that it's happening—you know being lower than they should with any frequency. And if it does, I assure you that you can understand the pilot being in the plane wouldn't want to be lower because if he's too low, we have something that no one wants to discuss. I’m sorry, but you know there exists a problem, and there isn't anything that I can say to change where that runway is and that is directly in the flight path. That's the best I can tell you. Yes? The lady in front, please.

00:27:47,200 --> 00:28:10,480
Audience Member: I live right in the back of the school, and there are some planes that come so low that my house shakes like this, and it's too bad that they didn't try this run tonight so you could hear it for yourself.

00:28:06,799 --> 00:29:29,600
Edward King: A good item that Tom Callaghan mentions, which I know about and should have mentioned, but again—it's probably nine months to a year away—but the Port Authority hasn't approved the purchase and installation. This probably sounds like a departure—yeah, that's a departure. Yes. Authorize the purchase and installation of a noise monitoring system. Now admittedly, the noise monitoring system will not in and of itself, per flight lower the amount of noise, but what it will do is record and detect those who come in under the prescribed level. Then we will have just—as on a chart of a straight line—those under and those over; we will be able to detect and hopefully, record and correct on a next occasion any pilot who comes in underneath. But again I have to tell you that that's probably at least nine months to a year away, and what that does is detect those who came in under the prescribed limit; it doesn't abate the noise on any particular flight. But I do think it's a step in the right direction. Yes. Would you mind giving your name? We did this at all other meetings, so if you don't mind would…?

00:29:27,200 --> 00:29:43,769
Helen Zuko: My name is Helen Zuko.
Edward King: Thank you.
Helen Zuko: In reference to what you just said, I would like to know what you will be doing with the information obtained from the pilots who are under and who are over? What will you do with the pilots who violate the rule?

00:29:43,919 --> 00:31:22,559

Edward King: Well, as we do now on any, you know, extraordinary or exceptional complaint—and most of them are quite automatic because they have all the equipment and judgment to do that—but occasionally there is like, a missed approach and other things. We will interview the pilot. We're not in a position to take any punitive action or become a court of adjudication, but this incidence, now recorded, will certainly have a lot more veracity because, generally speaking, now when there is a real, let's say, exception to the novel flight path, the pilots generally say, “Yes, I did I missed that. I haven't been in here for some time.” or whatever, but those are infrequent. Most of the time you say, “Gee, I didn't notice anything unusual,” and, you know, that's the end of it. But we will have the device. We will be able to say, “Look. Here's what it shows,” and I think that that's about the end of it. If that man says, “Well fine. I’ll just have to be more careful,” or whatever, but if he continues to come in under the prescribed level—which is what we're looking for—I think that—well I don't know, but I think certainly his airline, who is his employer, would be interested in that particularly when there's no need for it—you know, an error in judgment or a slight miscalculation. Under visual conditions we can understand, but a continual thing, I’m sure that no employer—because believe this, that I or Tom Callaghan or anyone, the pilot or any person doesn't want to come in lower, for in fact they would prefer to be higher. Would you agree in that generally? They don't relish—I’m sure—making noise. I say that only to emphasize the other point—

00:31:19,919 --> 00:31:24,399
Helen Zuko: You really want me to answer that?
Edward King: If you wish. Sure.

00:31:22,559 --> 00:31:49,519
Helen Zuko: I think that what these people here said tonight—I think that they're very accurate that many planes have come in much lower than they should have been, and I would like to know exactly what the procedure would be when you get this. You spend, you know, thousands of dollars on this new equipment that's going to be a noise monitoring system, and then, if you're not going to set any fines or take any issue with this, then I think you're wasting your money in this area.

00:31:48,559 --> 00:32:25,360
Edward King: That may be, but I think at least that I’m positive—I feel and I believe the Port Authority board feels, at least this much and perhaps more—that it is a step in the right direction because we put in a system free, let's say, from federal control or other, does not put us in a position to take a reading and then summon a pilot into our office because we are not a court. We are not in a position to take any action like that, but what we are in a position to do is to keep these records, have them, and then cite these individual pilots, you know, ourselves and via their company. I think that that is—

00:32:23,919 --> 00:32:48,000
Helen Zuko: The reason why I bring this to your attention is because we now have a number that we call for noise complaints…
Edward King: Yes.

Helen Zuko: ...and many people have called this number—I'm speaking generally after Chelsea; I know that Revere has the same problem—and we still have the same existence of the noise problem. You know, nothing has been done; therefore; a noise meter isn't going to benefit the people in the surrounding community.

00:32:44,559 --> 00:33:47,360
Edward King: I think that that's a statement that I basically said, except for the fact that it does monitor and identify. Then, at least—by an installation that will cost somewhere around 175,000 or more—be able to say to Bernie Foster and to you that the record shows: yes, we agree this, this, this, flights were under or no, no, it was not. I think at least that we will have that. I also said that it will not, in and of itself, lower the noise. It may, by the fact that it's being monitored and have that known to all, occasion the pilots to stay—you know—just that extra little bit higher, and I think, in that sense, it could be a noise abatement measure. But there is no representation at all that because we purchased this that the Port Authority or anyone else, other than those now constituted, this may come about, but that anyone else is a court that can cite these people. Yes, sir?
Helen Zuko: My final question— Could I ask just one more?
Edward King: One more. Fine.

00:33:47,840 --> 00:34:07,360
Helen Zuko: This 175,000 dollars, will you be requesting federal funding for this also?
Edward King: Well we have not. Whether we will or not, I suppose, might depend on whether it's an eligible item or not. We have not pursued that because if we did, the only thing that I'm certain would result would be a delay. Yes, sir?

00:34:04,080 --> 00:34:24,800
Audience Member: Is the method of approach to the airport determined by the airport or the pilot?
Edward King: By Massport?
Audience Member: Yeah. I mean by the people who are running the airport or by the pilots who are coming in? Don't you set some limitations that these pilots have to follow?

00:34:22,320 --> 00:34:56,720
Edward King: No, I think they're really prescribed flight patterns, and—you have to look at it this way: I'm in the same category as you are, just an ordinary person. There is the runway, right? That doesn't change and the approach to a runway calls for a percentage decline—you know, each thousand feet—and it's like your angle on trigonometry. That's how it is. They really should—under ideal conditions—all come in at precisely the same level.
Audience Member: Is there a regulation set up? Like a street? Like a traffic signal regulating traffic?

00:34:55,200 --> 00:35:34,160
Edward King: To the extent that those arrival and departure courses are set up, it is a federal responsibility. This is not a buck passing exercise, but it's something over which Massport really

has no control, and, in a general sense, neither does the pilot because you have so many planes they all have to be controlled by the control apparatus. All right first please. Would you like to give your name, sir, just for the record please?
Audience Member: [inaudible]
Edward King: Thank you.

00:35:30,960 --> 00:36:05,599
Mr. McGrath: I live on Triton Avenue in Point Shirley. I've never come to one of your meetings or asked a question before, but I—after listening to you—I have about three or four of them, if I could take your time for a moment?
Edward King: Certainly.
Mr. McGrath: On this proposed runway that is going through on the master plan—on runway 9 is there going to be an instrument landing coming in from the ocean?
Edward King: I would defer to Mr. Mooney, please. Is there going to be an instrument landing on runway 9 on the 27 approach over the ocean?
Mr. McGrath: On the 27 coming in?

00:36:02,720 --> 00:36:21,680
Richard Mooney: No, there is none planned, only to put a VASI which is for VFR weather or—it is a light system that the pilot will observe to make sure that he's close to being on the three degree glide slope approach.

00:36:20,800 --> 00:37:08,480
Mr. McGrath: Fine. Question two:—the mic?—relative to this fog, not so much for the delta plain, but living down there I've noticed that the planes, the turbo jets, seem to break up much heavier turbulence. I don't know whether I'm right on this or not, but during foggy weather their engines seem to cause much heavier noise. It seems to be much more of a downdraft. If this is true, can you tell me: in the lack of high winds, why they don't use runway 33 and low 27 on foggy days?
Edward King: Again, I would defer to Mr. Mooney on that, if you don't mind. Why they don't use 33 on foggy days instead of 27? If that's a fact.

00:37:09,040 -->
Richard Mooney: Well, I can't understand why. If the weather is really bad, they wouldn't normally be using 27; it's not an instrumented runway as contrast with 33. So that—you know, I don't know how foggy it could be—and still use 27.

00:37:30,400 --> 00:38:10,079
Mr. McGrath: Sir, I hate to disagree with you like this, but I noticed very strong evidence of the plane flying—the so-called "whisper jets:" the 707s, the 727s—on days when the fog is very low. And what I'm referring to is: over Point Shirley, at my particular area, where we are directly in line with this 27—almost vertical—I'm wondering why they would use 33 or an instrument landing such as 4-Right. Is there any number that we can call whenever this happens?

00:38:07,280 --> 00:38:46,320
Richard Mooney: Yes, but—again, I guess it's a matter of degree—it's a non-instrumented runway so that the minimums must be higher, are certainly adequate to use that runway. Now why they would operate on that runway rather than on 4 when 4 gives greater capacity? Usually they try to stay away from 27. They like to use 9 for takeoffs because it's used in conjunction with 4s; they're landing on the 4-Left and Right and taking off on 9.

00:38:50,960 --> 00:39:12,160
Mr. McGrath: Taking off on 9 is coming right over our houses causing turbulence. I mean, besides the noise—I mean even my children now are cupping their ears because of the noise, and it's becoming really annoying sometimes at this point. Am I technically right in assuming that there is more wind turbulence from the jets when the fog is in the air? When the humidity is high like this?

00:39:10,800 --> 00:40:31,599
Richard Mooney: Well I don't know what you mean by “wind turbulence.” I am not familiar with the fact that there would be pressure
Mr. McGrath: Thrust pressure. Thrust noise.
Richard Mooney: You mean noise, not turbulence. So you're speaking of noise.
Mr. McGrath: There's a difference between noise and noise. I mean you can tell regular noise of an aircraft from noise when it's high humidity.
Richard Mooney: Well, I think that that's generally a feeling that is true, at least in—
Mr. McGrath: If this is the case, then why don't they use 33. And according to the plane here 33 and the existing—runway 15 I think it is—whenever there's heavy fog like this because after all, the air force bases use one runway. It’s not because of a wind factor because on foggy days there isn't that much wind.
Richard Mooney: Well, of course, when you land on 33, it means you take off on 33 also, and you're going over a heavily populated area on the other end, and I think that the FAA would agree that, from a noise abatement standpoint, that there's less of a problem on some runways and certainly taking off on 33. So that's not the best combination.

00:40:30,240 --> 00:40:58,640
Mr. McGrath: I have an alternate for that. On tower control they could use, such as a case of runway 22 for take off on foggy days and come in on 33 because there's no wind. I mean it's not because the wind is pushing the plane port or starboard, right?
Richard Mooney: Right.
Mr. McGrath: So why can't they use something like 33 for landing and 22 for taking off?

00:40:55,440 --> 00:42:54,720
Richard Mooney: Well I would say, primarily, from a— you’ve got to keep one thing in mind: that you've got airplanes flying around in the in the air, and they've got patterns that they have to fly, and to have them avoid one another in the air you—it's a similar problem, only not as critical, as conflicting on the ground. Now also, when you're using intersecting runways, you get very limited capacity, so that it creates delays when you operate that way and conflict in the

airspace. I think that you're asking some questions—these are things that, basically, I might know from my experience as a pilot and from our dealings here. If you would like to get into detail on this, this type of thing is looked at in great depth by the LANC Committee. Mr. Callaghan is the coordinator of that committee, and they have periodic meetings, and I'm sure that you'd be welcome to come in and attend the meeting and raise questions like this, and you'll be able to talk not only to the airport operator but the people that actually control the traffic. The FAA is represented on that group as well as the pilots from the airlines that fly in the Air Transport Association, so I think that if you've got any specific recommendations, we are looking for anything to improve the noise situation that can be done safely and without completely crippling the capacity of the airport because there is the need to accommodate the traffic and that is a factor as well as noise abatement. But safety, noise abatement, and capacity are the three principal factors.
Mr. McGrath: Strictly a question. I wondered if I could bring it up. Thank you very much. Thank you for your time.

00:42:54,800 --> 00:43:57,119
Edward King: A question is fine. The suggestion was also good. What I would suggest really, Mr. McGrath, is that this LANC committee will obtain your address; you should be invited to that. Now if you work during that time, I would like to really see that what you had to question or suggest is pursued with one of the chief pilots and an FAA person and our people there so that you could, really, see what they say the problems are and why. And additionally when this happens again, if you would call—me or Mr. Mooney or Mr. Callaghan, we'll find out exactly who's operating on what runways at the time and what their reason is.
Mr. McGrath: I'm free to call you?
Edward King: Surely.
Mr. McGrath: And the number?
Edward King: 482-2930
Mr. McGrath: 2930?
Edward King: Yeah. That's good on six days and Logan seven. [482-] 5400 on Sunday. And—no, either one because this doesn't happen that often.

00:43:54,720 --> 00:44:22,860
Mr. McGrath: [inaudible] not calling because I felt that though there is a technical reason for not having it, it seems rather noisy for us when we have to sit there and listen to it on foggy days.
Edward King: If you're interested enough to come and pursue it, we certainly should be more than interested and consider ourselves obligated to pursue it with you.
Mr. McGrath: I'd like to talk to you again on it. Thank you.

00:44:15,839 --> 00:44:51,839
Edward King: Thank you. Oh, yes, ma'am? Please.
Leanne McKenna: Mr. King, my name is Leanne McKenna.
Edward King: Great.

Leanne McKenna: And I'm from [inaudible] right up on the Hill. And I'd like to know what are you going to do about the revving of the jets late at night, between 1 and 3 o'clock in the morning on the runways?
Edward King: Well if it's preparation for takeoff, there isn't a great deal that can be done about it. If it's revving for repair purposes, we have— Pardon?
Audience Members: It's landings.
Edward King: Well no. I wouldn't think that you're talking about the landing of aircraft.

00:44:52,000 --> 00:45:22,319
Leanne McKenna: This is what we're talking about: two, three, four minutes at a time.
Female Audience Members: Three times a week. It's after midnight, they start coming in.
Leanne McKenna: I don't know if there's a reason for this.
Edward King: Are you reasonably sure it's an aircraft on the ground simply revving up, not taking —
Leanne McKenna: It's on the ground revving up.
Edward King: Okay, just one second now. Do we do we know anything about that especially, Tom? Mr. Callaghan is really our Director of Public Affairs, but more like a noise abatement officer, so I would see what he can offer.

00:45:20,319 --> 00:48:07,839
Thomas Callaghan: I don't want to disagree with the young lady—or other people who have affirmed her comment—but it is very difficult at night to determine just what the source of noise is if you are unaware of the technical operation of the airport and you're some distance away. Most of the time, people speak of revving up of planes or speak of maintenance work on planes when we actually—with our night noise patrol—find that it is another type of noise. Now, I don't say that it's any different or any more pleasant, but usually we find that it is either a plane landing, taking off, or taxiing. Also of course, if a plane lands and the pilot exercises reverse thrust, there's a certain type of noise there. So that to give you a description of what we do at night—let me just take a minute to tell you of the fact that from 11 o'clock at night to 7 o'clock in the morning we have a noise patrol which goes around the airfield, it takes sound level readings, it responds to complaints that come in over Logan 7-3333, and it makes a report which comes to me in the morning, and we take whatever action is necessary in respect to our noise abatement measures. We have prohibited nighttime run-ups, meaning the accelerated turning over of an aircraft engine for the purpose of maintenance—checking the various problems of aircraft. So I don't think that there are run-ups or revving up at the airport although we'd be perfectly happy to have you call at a precise time, and Mr. Ralph van Dien who's over against the wall would certainly check that. But we do find that it's a different source of noise. And I don't say it's any more pleasant but it's a different source.

00:48:09,359 --> 00:49:21,680
Leanne McKenna: But why should this noise go on at 2/3 o'clock in the morning anyways? I mean, it's happening; I can hear it. It wakes me up, so it must be something that's coming from the airplane, right?

Thomas Callaghan: Well, to get into that subject: the Massachusetts Port Authority is operating an airport which it did not locate. We didn't site this airport in this particular location. The Port Authority assumed responsibility for operating this airport in 1959. It did study a second major airport, but that has been overruled so that Port Authority has a responsibility of operating an international airport which is of tremendous importance to the area of greater Boston, Massachusetts, New England. We are aware of the problem of noise. We are trying to do our darndest to hold that noise down, but we still have a responsibility of operating an international airport which is not in an ideal position. There is an unhappy proximity between some of our runways and some of you people.

00:49:22,920 --> 00:49:31,839
Leanne McKenna: Well, I don't want to disagree with you, but I have—on more than one occasion—I have heard the planes revving up on the runway, and the next time they do I'll make sure to give you a call and let you now. I simply can't get something done about it.

00:49:33,119 --> 00:49:51,839
Edward King: Okay. I think I would sum that up by saying that, if it's an active aircraft operation, it's certainly permissible to operate aircraft at night at Logan. If it's repair and revving up unnecessarily, it's something we certainly would attempt to correct.

00:49:49,599 --> 00:50:13,680
Bernard Foster: Mr. King.
Edward King: Yes, Mr. Foster?
Bernard Foster: I think that they reference to the cargo planes at 3:20 a.m. in the morning.
Edward King: Okay. Is it coming in?
Bernard Foster: It's a cargo plane. I'm not sure.
Edward King: Well.
Bernard Foster: But he comes in very low. He's coming in [inaudible]
Audience Member: And he drives his crazy.
Bernard Foster: Oh yeah. These people have been talking for me. God, thank you for that.
Audience Member: It makes up jump from bed.
Bernard Foster: 3 or 3:20 a.m. in the morning.

00:50:11,839 --> 00:50:49,200
Edward King: All right. Mr. van Dien has heard this; if there's something special about that or anything that can be done to abate that noise, would you please let me know so I can let Mr. Foster—?
Bernard Foster: It's not the noise; it's the low-flying planes.
Edward King: Oh. Well, all right, but the others are complaining—I believe—about noise on the ground. I heard the reason—
Audience Member: No, no. That doesn't bother me at all. It's the plane comes in around 3, 3:20. It really wakes up right up and the whistle that goes with it.

00:50:46,160 --> 00:53:37,040

Edward King: All right. I have received one question in writing so far. The question is, “Could you explain the failure in the negotiations between the city Revere and Mass Port in regard to a new school in Beachmont subsidized by Massport?” Well the question may not be totally proper because the negotiations that started in January of 1972—to date—have not been successfully consummated. I have a little bit of disappointment, I must say, in the fact that they weren't. Massport was prepared—and I believe voted as the full authority—to permit the negotiation between the Authority and the city Revere to purchase three schools. This school being one of the three in Beachmont. The properties to be raised at Massport expense, so that was 500 plus whatever the cost of demolition would be, with the idea that the city would use this money to invest or help build—defray the cost of a new school a little bit out of the flight path on a consolidated basis. I think, in a nutshell, because there was some concern that because the Authority could not—and it really cannot—lease back the same properties that paid 500,000—that was one agreement—then there was one for 400 and the properties—Massport would lease one back to the city for storage. But because it could not lease the same properties that it had just bought back to the city indefinitely—40, 50 years, 25 years—for a dollar a year, that the citizenry felt that maybe Massport would come in and extend a runway or do something else for airport expansion. And the mayor, with the judgment of others included, I understand, decided that it would not be in the overall interest Revere—up to date at least—to negotiate this. Now just recently—in fact it was a week ago today or tomorrow—he made a suggestion that, without putting the total possibility aside, that the Authority contributes something to Revere for recreational purposes. Now—like as I would have—maybe it did come in rather late and the Authority has not acted on this request. So if anyone has the question, I think that I personally and I think the Authority is as disappointed in the fact that nothing has been consummated with Revere to date, but I don't think that that necessarily means that something may not in the future. Yes, sir? Please, the gentleman first, please.

00:53:34,559 --> 00:54:15,420
Harry Bergson: My name is Harry Bergson.
Edward King: Thank you.
Harry Bergson: I lived down here on Bellar Avenue. I’d just like to ask a question which may seem facetious. Is the airport, right now, shut down?
Edward King: Oh no. I’m certain. Not unless there's something I don't know.
Harry Bergson: Well in all this week, all last week, at this time, this area was saturated with noise. Where is it now?
Edward King: Well we can call and find out.
Harry Bergson: How did you change the route of the landing and the takeoff so you could have this meeting?
Edward King: We did not. I assure
Harry Bergson: Well somebody did.
Edward King: Just a second.
Harry Bergson: I’m sure you did because otherwise you would never have this thing here tonight.
Edward King: You asked—
Audience: [shouts]

Harry Bergson: Do you hear yourself?

00:54:36,480 --> 00:54:41,440
Edward King: Do you want me to answer that now?
Harry Bergson: Answer it.
Edward King: All right.
Harry Bergson: I mean truthfully.

00:54:41,680 --> 00:55:27,359
Edward King: As truthfully as your question, I'll try. You asked me how we did this. My answer to you is that we did not, and the flight and direction of the aircraft and the runways they use are really directed—to a sense—but accepted by the pilot of the plane, and I would be perfectly willing to have the controller in charge who would have the records for the last week or two or three or four—whatever you wish—meet with you and Mr. Callaghan and anyone else you may wish to bring and explain the reasons why. Maybe it's the wind direction or the velocity—
Harry Bergson: Wind is out of the question.
Edward King: You're saying that before you know.
Harry Bergson: I know.
Edward King: Oh, well then. If you—
Harry Bergson: I'll tell you why.
Edward King: Thank goodness.

00:55:24,079 --> 00:56:31,839
Harry Bergson: Because last night there was a plane and came in this way—over here—and five minutes later another plane came in that way.
Edward King: That's entirely possible.
Harry Bergson: Where's the wind?
Edward King: When the wind is low enough or—
Harry Bergson: What about a crosswind?
Edward King: All right. When the wind is low enough or not of sufficient velocity, it is possible to vary the directions into which they fly and from which they fly. I think that's possible.
Harry Bergson: Then why can't they come in over the water then?
Edward King: I think that they can, and they probably did. Maybe you didn't miss the ones that did come in over the water there were so many, but let me say this: I think that the best thing you should do—just as an experiment, it won't take much time, no longer than tonight—take advantage of that, sit down with the controller; they have records and tapes, and we'll have them ready so there wouldn't be any extra waste of time or delay, and take a look. I really don't know that answer.

00:56:26,000 --> 00:57:01,280
Harry Bergson: You know what I think it is? The cost of fuel. They go around and they come in over the water, and that's a factor.
Edward King: Well that would be a new explanation. I really—I honestly hadn't heard that one, but it might be. Certainly it's an understandable reason.

Harry Bergson: I know how much they use.
Edward King: No. I would accept that as an understandable reason, at least if it was. Did you have something to offer, Mr. Mooney? Please.

00:56:58,799 --> 00:57:55,839
Richard Mooney: I'd just like to comment because we went through a series of five meetings just like this back in the end of April and May, and it was interesting to us because four out of the five nights, the traffic was directly over the place where the hearing was being held, and we thought it was quite a joke among ourselves that the traffic seemed to be following us around. So anyone that attended those previous meetings might well recall the interruptions that we had when we were holding these meetings. So if, in fact, we could, we obviously wouldn't be consistent. Now there just is nothing planned at all in this connection, and I think it would be so transparent that—you know we know there's noise over here. We've been over here many times; Mr. King lives in the general vicinity, and we're not denying that the noise exists.

00:57:57,040 --> 00:58:09,839
Harry Bergson: I know the whole King family.
Edward King: May I have your address so we may invite you—and it's up to you—
Harry Bergson: 11 Belle Isle Ave.
Edward King: 11 Belle Isle. Thanks very much. Yes, sir. Right.

00:58:04,799 --> 00:58:45,200
Robert Mazzaro: Good evening, my name is Robert Mazzaro and I live [inaudible]. I just have one question to ask pertaining to this gentleman's question. Number one: why should he have to go up and do it? Now you people down at Mass Port Authority say, "Look. We want to help you. We want to be good neighbors, but if you want this you got to do this, you got to go here, you got to go there." Most people work 8, 9, 10, 12 hours a day. They don't have time to do it. They come home from work, they're tired. If you're really interested you can say, "Sir, I'll take your complaint. I'll send you a written letter two days from today."

00:58:43,520 --> 01:00:11,119
Edward King: I'll do that for you if your complaint is the same as his, and I'll do that for Mr. Bergson, if that's his wish.
Robert Mazzaro: My complaint is that aircraft coming over Endicott Ave early in the morning. I have a lot of other complaints about the airport, but it doesn't seem to do any good. "Go here. Go there. Go there." Yeah, okay. "Call up here." My wife had some gentlemen on the phone for two and a half hours one night, and they still came in.
Edward King: Well, please understand our situation. Mr. Bergson asked a question, and I told him, frankly, I could not answer it.
Robert Mazzaro: So my question—
Edward King: Well wait. May I finish?
Robert Mazzaro: Why can't you find out this information? Why put the burden of him finding out everything on him? He works. He's tired when he comes home, right?
Edward King: He spoke for himself, and I suggested that I have his—

Robert Mazzaro: I'm speaking for myself also.
Edward King: Well then—
Robert Mazzaro: I would like a lot of questions answered. I'm going to have to go write them down.
Edward King: You write them out or ask them. They'll be recorded, and we'll answer them for you. Sometimes I think it's better, though, for the individual. Rather than accept our answer—and he did not object to it, and he was the gentleman to whom I was speaking—to have the party that is in control of these flights, who does give the direction. We do not. The FAA does, and the pilot may reject that, but if he accepts it, then that's the total story, and they would then be—

01:00:11,119 --> 01:00:59,760
Robert Mazzaro: I just don't understand what you just said.
Edward King: Well I said that the FAA is the one that indicates the runway to be used on landing a takeoff. Now under certain conditions a pilot may say, "No. I don't want that. I would rather wait," or "I insist on a particular runway." Generally they accept the direction given by the FAA, so between the direction and the acceptance of that—or rejection—that dictates the runway use, and then, having those two there better than us—or with us—it indicates why runways are being used and why this one, 422 that Mr. Bergson mentions, is used in certain conditions when he feels others could be used. I'm not in a position, nor is anyone in Mass Port in a position to answer that, but if your question is the same, you leave your address.

01:00:57,280 --> 01:01:26,960
Robert Mazzaro: My question is not the same.
Edward King: Oh. Well, would you please…?
Robert Mazzaro: I do have a specific instance. I said, "Why should a citizen have to go—I don't remember the names of the committees you mentioned tonight, what they were. Land Act, a couple of other ones, Noise Abatement, I think. You kind of put the burden of responsibility on the citizen, the private citizen, to go run down this different information.

01:01:26,319 --> 01:01:45,599
Edward King: No, that's only an invitation. You ask any question and—
Robert Mazzaro: You know, this is this is how you put off your question. "You are invited to come to this committee meeting," "You are invited to come here," "You're invited to come here." How many people have the time to do it?
Edward King: Why don't you listen? Just a minute. Why don't you speak for yourself? You ask the questions.
Robert Mazzaro: I am speaking for myself.
Edward King: All right. What's your question, please?

01:01:44,240 --> 01:02:17,520
Robert Mazarro: I want to know why you can't—when someone calls up and gives a complaint, he can't get a report. Okay? It was this flight. It was this pilot. He was flying too low. He wasn't flying high enough. Here's what we're doing about it. We had noise abate, not the runway, that

they recorded the level of his decibel above a certain degree more than it's supposed to be. Why can't we get a report on it? Why do we have to go run it down to all these different committees?
Edward King: Well, you don't have to.
Robert Mazzaro: Isn't this part of your job?

01:02:15,359 --> 01:02:44,480
Edward King: You don't have to.
Robert Mazzaro: I haven't heard one answer. I haven't answered one question tonight “yes” or “no.” You said, “Well, you're invited to this committee meeting,” “You're invited to that committee meeting,” “We appreciate you coming to give us your information, but we're not guaranteed you'll get an answer.”
Edward King: Oh, I have guaranteed you'll get an answer. Yes, you will. Why don't you just ask a question so everyone can hear it—?
Robert Mazzaro: I just asked a question and I haven’t gotten an answer.
Edward King: What is it? What is your question?

01:02:41,680 --> 01:02:59,039
Robert Mazzaro: Why does a private citizen have to go run all this different information down himself?
Edward King: My answer is, very plainly: he does not.
Robert Mazzaro: “He does not.”
Edward King: “He does not,” is my answer.
Robert Mazzaro: Thank you.
Edward King: Yes, sir.

01:02:54,799 --> 01:03:55,920
Audience Member: Okay, once again on this question of the noise recorder?
Edward King: Yes, sir.
Audience Member: Will that decibel reading—or whatever kind of system they're going to use to decipher levels—will they automatically take action corresponding at that point or will it be a citizenry response that takes action?
Edward King: Well, there will be a recording, but I don't think the action will be instantaneous, you know, depending on the time of day, and I think that the procedure I described earlier as it now stands, under the existing laws, would be to cite the pilot, talk with them—see if there's any reason, did he acknowledge that he was lower or not, and if he had any reason—and I think a continuation of that, or a second offense, would be a basis for recourse to his employer, the company. We are not in a position to fine him or ground him or anything of that nature.

01:03:54,319 --> 01:04:25,280
Audience Member: Pardon me, but I thought it was something once they realized the level was low, they would change runway or something accordingly. That's what I thought it was, that type of a system.

Edward King: No, this really will be set up only to monitor and identify those that come in under, you know, the prescribed level, and those will show. And we should be able to identify the aircraft and find out from the pilot: did he know it, why, and “Please. Not again.”
Audience Member: One more thing?
Edward King: Yes, sir. Certainly.

01:04:23,599 --> 01:05:25,280
Audience Member: I mean, a few weeks ago when you had that accident over at the airport, in the paper they showed a map and a diagram of the flight. They coming in and if you're 10 miles out, you're supposed to be so high, and 6 miles out supposed to be so high; is it possible—could we get one for down this end, too? Well, how high are they're supposed to be in the 2 miles from the airport?
Edward King: Well, however high they’re supposed to be, understand that that differs as to how high they are when something extraordinary happens as it did in the incident, so what they're supposed to be and what they were—

01:05:22,240 --> 01:05:51,839
Audience Member: On a normal flight.
Edward King: Well. You want to know how high they would be over Beachmont Hill? Does anybody here have that? How high are they supposed to be?
Edward King: Is that a fact? If you don't know, we will find out. Just one second. Mr. Mooney will find that out.
Thomas Callaghan: [inaudible]

01:05:58,559 --> 01:06:51,440
Richard Mooney: Two miles out the aircraft should be about 570 feet high. [inaudible] that’s about another [inaudible] of the airport’s [inaudible] on Beachmont Hill.
Audience Member: [inaudible]
Audience Member: And the school? How far would you say it is from here to there? How far would you say?
Edward King: The school is about a mile and a half from the end of that runway.
Audience Member: So it’s slightly less than the two miles.
Edward King: Can you figure that out, trigonometry wise?
Audience Member: It’s half a mile.
Edward King: At two miles it's 570 feet. You are about one mile and a half, and they're coming down on a three percent.
Richard Mooney: It’s about 400 feet.

01:06:47,680 --> 01:07:18,640
Audience: [inaudible]
Audience Member: You know how high they are? I can go on the top my roof and I can touch them.
Audience Member: 400?
Edward King: Good reach.

Richard Mooney: 400 feet above the level of the airport. You'd subtract the altitude from the height—
Audience Member: Well this is sea level right here, practically.
Edward King: This is a hill.
Audience Member: There's a house about 50 feet high.
Audience Member: I could go up there on my roof and touch them as he goes by at 400 feet.

01:07:18,640 --> 01:07:43,839
Edward King: Well, if we're going to be seeing you or talking again we'll get you an actual height, but it's in that vicinity of 400 feet above the sea level.
Audience Member: [inaudible] I take pictures?
Edward King: Certainly.
Audience Member: How many feet are…?
Edward King: About 400 at that point on Beachmont Hill. 570, 2 miles out.
Edward King: Certainly I'd be interested if I was in a plane coming that close.
Audience Member: [inaudible]
Edward King: That's a good one. You're still sharp.

01:07:55,039 --> 01:10:20,400
Edward King: All right. Yes. Please, I didn't see it. Yes, ma'am.
Lynn Mazzarella: My name is Lynn Mazzarella. I live at 149 Endicott Avenue. My first question is since you don't think, from what you've said before, that most of the planes are too low—you've stated that most of the planes fly where they belong—
Edward King: Yes.
Lynn Mazzarella: We don't like that at that level, but it's unfortunately necessary, and the expansion of Logan means that more planes will be flying at this height. The result of the expansion for the citizens of Beachmont is that we're going to have more planes flying at a low height, and that's it for us, right?
Edward King: Right. Well I think that your concern about this runway—this being Beachmont, right?
Lynn Mazzarella: Both of them.
Edward King: Oh yes. But there are no landings on this runway by the way.
Lynn Mazzarella: You're supposed to get takeoffs too.
Edward King: Takeoffs from this end. That's not changing. This is not changing. This is being extended. Now this goes off by Commonwealth Pier Drive or over Deer Island or over Point Shirley. That has no effect on this operation: the extension of this. There are not going to be landings any closer than where they are now for the same reason that we have a displaced threshold of about 2,500 feet on this runway. And that means that even though there's 2500 feet of runway here for landings, the touchdown is right in this general direction. This extension here, additional length on takeoff for these aircraft, they will not allow aircraft that's not now landing here will land on here. There's not going to be any change in the operation. And this operation in here—the STOL—which is going to go all around those four properties, but at least it's in this direction, it doesn't concern Beachmont. And I'm saying, generally, I want to add this: it has no adverse effect, really, environmentally, but rather a plus on all areas. I'm not saying

that you should be for it because some other aircraft—more aircraft—will go in another direction. That's really not the case. This happens to be a pretty fair situation where, environmentally, noise and pollution and safety we have a total plus. I think.

01:10:17,199 --> 01:11:12,320
Lynn Mazzarella: Okay. You just said that there are no takeoffs from 22-Left, right? They're coming from 4-Right? No, that's not right. There are no takeoffs over our hill, really?
Edward King: Yeah. They take off from this. I think we heard one earlier.
Audience and people on stage: [clatter]
Lynn Mazzarella: What you said, as I understand it, is that we are going to continue to have the same takeoffs and landings that we've had before.
Edward King: Yes. No use is going to change on this runway or on this as a result of this extension or this or this, which is what we're planning. This is the—

01:11:09,199 --> 01:11:51,920
Lynn Mazzarella: All right now. I think that you're wrong—excuse me—for this reason: you are planning on extending certain runways thereby increasing possible places for planes to come in and go out so they're not in the air, but you're also planning to have many more planes coming in and out. What I'm saying is that, therefore, all of your runways—the new ones and the old ones—are going to be used more. I mean, we've had this last week or so has been terrible, but there are some weeks when there aren't that many planes around. So we're going to have less of those weeks without planes. That's what I'm asking.

01:11:48,800 --> 01:12:30,080
Edward King: Okay. What I would suggest is that if there are going to be more planes, the more planes are going to be there whether or not this extension is made, this extension is made, or that is. These planes will come. We have charts that show the increase in the number of flights; they have not been great in the last two or three years because the wider bodies are carrying more cargo and more people with a lesser number of planes, but all of these increases haven't taken affect and these aren't built, so they don't have any effect. And if we do more business—a lot more—and we have more planes they'll be there whether or not those extensions are made.

01:12:26,800 --> 01:13:07,600
Lynn Mazzarella: All right. Now, along this line what have you done to propose alternative transportation? And I'm thinking mainly in terms of two things: have you done any really aggressive thinking in terms of rail transportation or in terms of using other airports? Now on the second question—when you get around to that, I want to let talk about the rail first. What have you done about rail transportation? To alleviate the problem for us.

01:13:04,440 --> 01:15:36,640
Edward King: Well, in 1970 without specifically, very frankly, thinking of Beachmont or any other section, we, the Authority, voted to address itself to high-speed rail in deferring any discussion —or rather putting aside totally, not deferring, at that time any discussion of a second airport. Now, how was this pursued? Well I was involved in the—let's say limited—amount of pursuit

that there was. I use “limited” so that you will be extra fair and put in the right prospect. We contacted the Secretary of Transportation on a national level—it was then Governor Volpe—and he indicated the massive problems that there were in existence with the bankrupt railroads in all that we have, and that, with a state department of transportation around the corner, which did eventually get formed and with an existing organization in the state—the MBTA—who were already chartered for rail, that perhaps our best position would be to wait and see and avoid being a parent. And I might agree there is a void, but avoid being a parent then maybe someone would suggest that we concentrate on that and give us the franchise or the right to go in and do that. We're not at all opposed to high-speed rail. You may remember, or you may not, that we volunteered and submitted a proposal at the request of the then mayor, Mayor Collins, some years ago to build a trade and transportation center in the South Station of Boston. And a very integral part of that was a expanded train service because having a terminal, you know, without people coming through there and trains, was one of the ways, particularly, for the South Station —no airplanes there, no auto parking there, at least there wasn't then; we had planned one— very few buses, trains were one of the real sources of bringing people which is the way you generate economic benefit. [sound of airplane overhead] Here we are. That's a takeoff right?
Richard Mooney: That’s a takeoff.
Edward King: No, a landing? Yeah, I’d say that's a take-off. We were interested in that high-speed rail, and that's what I would say on that. Now what has happened—

01:15:37,120 --> 01:16:37,600
Lynn Mazzarella: In terms of the future you have no plans at this moment for, yourself, pursuing this alternative?
Edward King: No. We have no—yeah well that's one way to put it. The other idea is we're, in a very real sense, a small part of the overall Commonwealth Transportation System. Maybe you want to say medium; maybe you want to say large, but really, considering the road network and all of the railroads, another a small part but whatever relative position is, there is an overall state Department of Transportation. There is a New England Regional Commission. All of whom are looking into this and who do and should have the say as to who's going to do what when they have the will. And nobody has said “Why don't you do this? And if you do study it and find it feasible, you may go ahead.” That has not happened

01:16:35,040 --> 01:16:58,640
Lynn Mazzarella: Well again, you use the word aggressive. You have seen that you'll be—and we all want Massachusetts to be a prosperous state. Are you saying that we're going to be having more traffic, both freight and passenger, and so you're doing something about it. But what you're doing about it is increasing the use of the airport. It's not doing something else.

01:16:57,679 --> 01:17:37,840
Edward King: Well I think that's true. We're promoting and trying to improve everything over which we have control. We’re also have studied other things; we've recently studied the acquisition—it's not completed yet—of certain portions of the freight operation of the Boston and Maine railroad. That study really is in its final stages, so that may not be as sensational as an airport, but it's something we were asked to do, really, by the Department of Transportation and

or by the governor—I would say the governor—and we are doing it. It's practically done. We have not, contrasting with that, been asked to study the high-speed rail.

01:17:35,760 --> 01:18:54,239
Lynn Mazzarella: Now on the second thing on the other airport—before we get into that—in your master plan you state that it is unfeasible to have a nighttime curfew, and you state that there's only one airport in this country which has a nighttime curfew. Now I believe that that one other airport, which is National Airport in Washington, is, as far as I know, is the only one which is in the exact same predicament we are. National is right in Washington and Alexandria; it's right in that area. Logan is right in Boston; however, National is the oldest airport. Then they went and built Friendship. Then they went and built Dulles. But you're not building or using the other ones.
Edward King: That's true. We don't have any other—
Lynn Mazzarella: You're not building or using— Yes, there are. There's Westover and you bought Hanscom Field.
Edward King: Oh.
Lynn Mazzarella: Or you control it.
Edward King: Well…
Lynn Mazzarella: If you used it—if you made more use of those, then you could have a nighttime curfew in the area where many of the residents who were disturbed are, again, the poorer people. The people at Hanscom are more articulate and have more power.

01:18:52,000 --> 01:19:33,360
Edward King: Well, that's really not the reason that it's not being used. First of all, I think that, if you cared, that we could demonstrate to you the location of Logan versus Hanscom. Now Westover I think is entirely out of the question, being 140, -50, -60 miles away; it doesn't serve the same market at all.
Lynn Mazzarella: How far out is Dulles?
Edward King: Dulles from Washington National, there may be someone that lived in Washington for a while, but I would judge 25 miles thereabouts. Baltimore is about 20 miles or you know—
Lynn Mazzarella: Do you know how hard it is to get from Baltimore to Washington?

01:19:30,080 --> 01:20:48,239
Edward King: Well, I've been on the bus a couple of times, and, you know, it was 7 or 8 o'clock at night; it wasn't particularly difficult. It takes time, of course, like everything else, but that is the only reason that they have that curfew at Washington National. That's a doable proposition. You land and you know you're going to come back at a time; you make those arrangements. If your arrangements fail, there's limousine and or bus service there and/or rent-a-car. We don't have that situation. A second airport operation at Hanscom while Logan is fully developed, is not compatible airspace-wise. They do not have that reservation between National and Baltimore and Dulles. It's not really the same.
Lynn Mazzarella: You mean Hanscom is too far away from Logan?
Edward King: No. Too close airspace-wise is one reason. That's right. They're a very, relatively short airspace distance apart, and secondly—you know—it serves the same market and the

duplicity of operation, just for a small reliever versus Baltimore—is a big city, as is Washington—that's serving an entirely different area and that's further apart. Hanscom—you know—Bedford or Lincoln.
Lynn Mazzarella: How much would you have to…? You wouldn't even have to do or put any money into it. It's already there.

01:20:46,159 --> 01:21:13,840
Edward King: Well you would. It's not set for commercial operation. And the airfield. The runways up there are relatively short and there are only two of them. It just isn't in the cards to become a second airport. It really isn't it.
Lynn Mazzarella: I have more questions.
Edward King: Well let's see, do you want to… How many more, roughly?
Lynn Mazzarella: Well those are the two. I want to make a comment on—
Edward King: Okay.

01:21:11,280 --> 01:21:52,239
Lynn Mazzarella: You stated that you get less phone calls, fewer people are complaining to the noise abatement phone number.
Edward King: Right. I've heard that.
Lynn Mazzarella: And I want to give you at least three reasons why. One: it doesn't do any good. Two: some people who were most bothered by the planes have moved away, and if you walk around this hill you'll notice that there are a number of abandoned houses. Three of the wide-body jets—thank God—are much better than the old ones. The other question is on the schools.
Edward King: All right may I—I've already answered you. May I come back to you on that? Okay. The lady in front, please.

01:21:51,679 --> 01:22:13,419
Audience Member: I wanted to know if, as the runway conditions exist now at Logan, can an SST land at Logan?
Edward King: Yes.
Audience Member: Thank you.
Edward King: Thank you. Anyone else? Lady in green, please.

01:22:10,350 --> 01:23:35,760
Audience Member: Why can't the planes fly higher and land further in the airport or do more taxiing instead of flying low and landing just where they want to land?
Edward King: Well one of the reasons that we're extending—can we put that back on?—that we're extending this runway and this, is that on landings—at least in this direction—and take off, which is not what you're asking about, but take off in that direction, the extra length is an added safety measure. And they like to touch down near the end as possible so that in the event something, occasions—and this has happened, there's no question—basically it's happened on this end where they weren't quite able, despite where they landed—I would agree they probably landed up near the threshold, I'm not sure—went just slightly—you know

—over, and that really is the reason they like to maximize the length of the runway. And the other thing: how far down could they land? Is it questioned 2,000 feet, and what does that mean translated to your position, say assuming you're on the hill or in that direction, a mile and three quarters away. And while it's something—and I certainly would sell that, if that were the case—it's not a great deal. And perhaps I would suggest something that you may not notice, although I assume it would be a plus. Okay? Yes, sir.

01:23:33,360 --> 01:26:45,520
Audience Member: It seems to me most of the objections raised here tonight and not with you but with the FAA who determine the method of approach and the direction of approach and so forth.
Edward King: Well, it may be easy to grab on that and agree with you, but really, when you look at it, you see—speaking about Beachmont, and if we were in Winthrop or Point Shirley—this is what we're talking about. The runways are there. I don't believe you can assess or charge the FAA with any responsibility for putting them there. The reasons they're there are governed by the windrows, which is an analysis over a number of years of the direction of winds and where they best could get the links. Really, noise is a problem; I sense that you understand that we, as individuals or as a inanimate corporate body, do not like noise. No one does: the pilots or passengers or certainly the people underneath. But the question is: What can be done about it? And we'll take all of the—I don't know—abuse or blame, and it's justifiably due to us if there was something that we could do that could be done that we're not doing. If we're trying to save a dollar and a half or a million dollars or whatever and sacrificing the noise instead, I think would be culpable. The same is true of the FAA; if there's something that they could do that they're not doing, okay, then I'd joined with you in pursuing them. And I'm sure that we would be able, individually or together, to affect the action, but I really have to say that until the technology is developed via retrofit—and I think that may be at hand in technological theory and maybe a test instance or two, but not mass produced yet, and that will take some time (three to five years)—we're told when it is perfect—and I really think it's on the verge of perfection—and/or until the quiet engines come along—and one of the ladies mentioned the jumbos, which is true—you're still going to have noise. I've said this, and I hope it strikes a responsive chord. I had a letter this morning—very pleasant one by the way—from the Muscular Dystrophy Society. They ran some flights at Logan over the weekend, I believe, and made a considerable amount of money. Well the fact that Muscular Dystrophy still exists doesn't mean that a great number of doctors and individuals, youngsters, mothers, and fathers don't have any interest or aren't doing their work. It's just that they don't have that ability, that research yet. The cure hasn't been found, and that's been true with the aircraft engines. They're a tremendous machine, and no one has been able to make them so that they're really palatable with living as close as we at Logan, or we in Winthrop, or we in Beachmont are living. It is a problem which really hasn't had a solution; it's international. You can't go to any city—we happen to travel a little bit, not much lately—but every place you go you inquire about the airport. It's horrendous, so I hope that I don't want to blame the FAA when I can't.

01:26:41,679 --> 01:27:53,840

Audience Member: Since they've determined the type of approach and the direction of approach and so forth, and you have nothing to say about it… Actually, why should we register our complaints with you?
Edward King: Well, you do that to cite the unusual circumstance and/or to be sure that there isn't something that can be done. Now occasionally—unquestionably—a plane comes in a lot lower. A plane comes in off course. Maybe instead of being directly in line, he's over a little bit over—you know—100, 300, 400 feet. Well someone gets a noise much more severe than he's used to. Well, at least you can tell the person that, "Yes, he conceded he was off course," or whatever. I will agree with you, though. When the runway is there, a mile and a half out where you are on Beachmont Hill or a little closer right in this spot there's no place else that the plane can be but directly overhead on the way home if he's right. And we know that out of the recent last 3 million operations we've had one that's not been directly on course. So there isn't much. Oh! Next to the gentleman, please.

01:27:50,480 --> 01:29:00,719
Audience Member: Was there a second airport questioned for Dover, Mass and vetoed by the people? Was this a fact? At one time?
Edward King: There was mention of a second airport site in an overall second airport study. That was in the preliminary stage. Whether it was vetoed by the people or not, I don't think that that's fair although there was a considerable uprising from the people in Dover and the selectmen and town moderator and all officials—no question about that—but I think that the reason that that and/or any other proposal—well, let me talk about Dover first—did not materialize was that on a final analysis—that was preliminary,, I said and it's marked and dated and all that's all a matter of record—was that it really wasn't too close to Needham and Dedham, and the spot that was eventually recommended was Hopkinton, which was really airport-wise, airspace-wise, highway-wise, market (that's the area that would be served by the airport), rail or bus connection that Hopkinton was a much better site. Wide open spaces, and…

01:29:02,239 --> 01:29:26,159
Audience Member: Has that plan been abandoned then? Hopkinton?
Edward King: Yes, it has. As have many and all other second airport planning, both on an official basis for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by the present governor (this was done in 1970) and by the board of the Massachusetts Port Authority (also done in is that 1970).

01:29:25,280 --> 01:31:13,840
Audience Member: Then it is feasible, in time, that we will have the SSTs coming in to Logan? Is that right? Would you suppose that yourself?
Edward King: Well, I would say that if the SSTs fly in the United States in any kind of numbers and there is no second airport, my judgment would be that they would come in here. Now, I would mention—if any event you don't know—that flying in and about this airport—and let's say for 200 miles in and around, so within 200 miles around—the SST would come in on a subsonic, not a supersonic, basis. So it'll be just like an ordinary aircraft. It would not be supersonic. It reduces like going into second speed or third speed.
Audience Member: So it will be quieter? Is that what you mean?

Edward King: Well at least the one that— Well the one that we were sponsored—not sponsoring, but we lobbied—I did, anyway—against the prohibition of the SST coming into this Commonwealth was the United States supersonic, not the Concorde. We didn't know about that as much, or the British. Now they've combined. I don't think that this aircraft—I'm not an expert on this—is as good as the one that the United States was representing that it could build, but I really don't think that the supersonic flying at subsonic speeds will be any noisier, and at least that's the basis—
Audience Member: [inaudible]
Edward King: At subsonic speeds I don't think—but I don't know because we don't have that criteria yet—I think you're five years away (or four years, anyway) will be any noisier than the noisiest jet that you now have, but at least that was the position on which we lobbied that on the basis that it is not noisier than any aircraft now. There's no reason to bar. I would like to see it and give it a chance. Yes?

01:31:15,600 --> 01:31:46,800
Mr. McKinnon: My name is Mr. McKinnon, and I live on [inaudible] Avenue. I'd like to ask a question regarding the former statement that you made that they were going to try and put up a device that would check the altitude of the aircrafts coming in. Now you said that this would be a decibel-type device and would register the sound of the aircraft and then determine how high it was. Now, you can't determine how high an aircraft is by the sound. Obviously that's silly, so it's going to have to be a radar-type device. Is that true?

01:31:44,159 --> 01:32:10,960
Edward King: Well, I didn't say everything you said, but I didn't see any point agreeing—or disagreeing rather because we are going to measure whether that plane—and they're all the same 727s, I mean at least are all the same, and 707s are the same and the like—whether or not it comes in under the prescribed path, assuming if it comes under in under, it will make more noise. And are we measuring the height or the noise or both? I'm just asking Mr. Callaghan, here.

01:32:10,239 --> 01:32:26,880
Thomas Callaghan: Well, we hope to tie in with the [inaudible] 3 radar and determine the height that way, but at the present time the noise monitoring system would only measure decibels.
Edward King: The noise. Right.

01:32:24,960 --> 01:33:37,440
Mr. McKinnon: All right. You're saying that if a plane comes in too low that you will make note of it and at some later days you will try and talk to the person involved and get something straight away, but the question is: what type of immediate action—regarding the plane itself as it is in flight—can this be used to help the pilot to bring his plane up? Is there any sort of a system that can be put in? This is in regards to what had happened, the accident that happened. Okay? No one knew what happened, and all of a sudden the plane is on the ground. All right? I'm sure all of the people here were very concerned, overhearing that since this hill is probably a few hundred feet in the air, and you just stated that the planes came in 400 feet, approximately,

above sea level so that there isn't too much of a margin for error. Okay? If some of the people say 50 feet, 100 feet, whatever. 100 feet either way and somebody's going to be dead, okay? Now shouldn't there be some sort of a system which tells the pilot that, “Yes you're too low,” or if he doesn't respond, if he isn't looking at his instruments, and he isn’t following his instrument landing, tell this guy that, “Hey! You better bring that plane up!”

01:33:33,920 --> 01:34:04,960
Edward King: I think that we have at least one pilot here, but I think that all of the instrumentation for that is in the pilot's cockpit. Nothing that we're doing could be conveyed to the pilot.
Mr. McKinnon: The pilot’s control?
Edward King: The pilot. Right.
Mr. McKinnon: Shouldn’t there be some sort of intervention in that? For instance: some sort of communication with the pilot to tell the pilot that, “Yes, you are off control.” I’m sure that the electronics that we have today are sophisticated enough; we'd be able to tell a guy who was 4 or 5 miles up that he isn’t in the landing path and that “You need to get in the pattern.”

01:34:06,000 -->
Edward King: I think that... Would you be willing to…? Mr. Mooney would do better than I on that. Please.
Richard Mooney: Yes, there is radar that can do this. We, of course, are very familiar with the precision approach radar that was utilized by the military, but as a matter of fact, they did have it at Logan at one time. This has been discontinued by the FAA at all airports in the United States. There's only one airport in Alaska where they use this radar. Now, that includes not only Logan but the busiest airport in the world, Chicago. And this was abandoned in favor of the instrument landing system, which is a more precise system and places the responsibility and the decision with the pilot. There's nothing that will permit a misjudgment by a radar operator and then the transmission of information, such as you've heard. You've seen movies where they say, “You're on the glide path,” “You're above,” “You're below,” and so forth. Now certainly, it's possible, and the way it was operated before they were decommissioned, as a sort of a redundant system. But this was a decision that was made by the FAA that it was accurate—and more accurate than the radar itself. Now, there is a radar—they've commissioned one on the west coast—which will give information of a three-dimensional nature, but it is not intended to be used for that purpose, to—in other words—monitor or to advise the pilot and talk the pilot in. The instrument landing system, there's duplication; within the cockpit there are two instruments: one directly in front of the pilot and one directly in front of the co-pilot.
Mr. McKinnon: It’s still left completely up to the pilot.
Richard Mooney: That's right and that's— The feeling is…

(Continued on Tape 2)