

Record Group TC6/1995

Massachusetts Port Authority Public Hearing Files, 1970-1986

Preliminary master plan meeting in Revere, April 26, 1973 Tape 2

(Continued from Tape 1)

00:00:00,000 --> 00:00:15,240

Callaghan: ---and as much this is a silent movie let me say that there's just a couple more minutes and it shows a plane really being tossed in the turbulence so just to wait a minute we'll see the most important part of the film I think.

00:00:22,320 --> 00:07:10,360

Doherty: ---Bigger airplane than the ones we fly and the biggest defense you've got, if you've got to fly through one of these wake vortices, is to have a sizeable aircraft. Here you see a large plane making a flyover at a high angle of attack that is touching down and going around, and you'll see a 737 attempt to follow it through. I would have hated to have tried to do the same thing in the kind of aircraft we fly. That's a 737 which is much more resistant to the wake vertices than the smaller planes that presently have to land behind the large aircraft at Logan on the single runway 1533 under instrument conditions. If we had a separate parallel runway which could be instrumented for landing in instrument conditions, on instrument weather days we wouldn't have to follow them in on that runway. In the next scenes you're going to see progressively smaller planes following a c5a which is a large aircraft which is an excellent generator of wingtip vortices. Here's the generator of the wingtip vortices, and you'll see airplanes deliberately flown through the flight path. The fact that it's done high in the air is only for safety. You--- you'd get the same effect or perhaps more from the c5a if it were down close to the ground in a landing attitude. The first plane that's going to fall out is a Convair 990 which is a pretty sizable four-engine jet airplane and he's in for a fairly rough time. I don't think anybody would want to be a passenger in this aircraft. You notice the air speeds, 170 and 190 knots, are speeds far above the landing speeds of these aircraft and the landing when they're down near the landing speed is the time when they create the maximum jet vortices. I think you have a lot of air sick passengers on this airplane, but it's big enough that it's able to resist the effects of the preceding plane and that's why 1533 isn't that big a hazard to the major air carriers that use Logan. The next one we're going to get a little small we're going to go down to a dc-9 now and you're going to see he's in for a rougher time than the conveyor 990. These films aren't quite as high quality they're taken with a videotape camera, so you have to bear with us a little bit on the quality of the film, but you're going to see it gets in some fairly steep turns and dives and pull-ups. Now you're going to see a smaller aircraft getting close to the size we fly the rear jet 23. The film quality is even poorer here but you'll still be able to see what happens to the virgin what's happened to a number of light planes that have tried to follow these planes into large aircraft into major airports. You can see the wings of the rear jet and if you keep your eye on it you'll see it has the most trouble of all. Now we're getting near the end of the film, I

appreciate very much your patience in letting a member of the airline industry present their needs with regard to this just as you do. Here he gets into an uncontrollable situation where he meets a wake vortex that exceeds the ability of his the aircraft to keep his wings level, and you'll get to see what that looks like if you're the pilot in the cockpit or if you're one of the passengers in the aircraft, if you go through that experience. The same thing happened to an awfully good friend of mine a few years ago while he was trying to land the plane, so I've become a real believer in jet vortices. This is an informational meeting, I appreciate the fact that you let a representative of a rather small airline speak to you, but there are--- there is more than one point of view when it comes to people proposing to enlarge an airport. The runway we're interested in is a small one, I don't particularly think it affects Revere, but it certainly affects our operation and has an awful lot to do with how safe you'll be if if you fly on an Executive Airline aircraft in and out of Logan airport, thank you. Any questions here?

00:07:10,720 --> 00:07:18,160

Audience Member: Are you a representative of---

Doherty: Of Executive Airlines that's right.

Audience Member: [Inaudible]

Doherty: Yes sir they are. It's the only airline I know that's ever worked its way out of bankruptcy.

00:07:18,480 --> 00:07:27,400

Audience Member: ---they were recently bankrupted have they solved it now?

Doherty: They're no longer operating under the bankruptcy code that's right. They're in the process of paying the creditors off.

00:07:27,960 --> 00:07:35,760

Audience Member: This all happened within the past few---

Doherty: Within the last couple of years.

Audience Member: past couple of months?

Doherty: Well within the last six months with regard to getting out from under bankruptcy.

00:07:35,880 --> 00:07:44,840

Audience Member: You're not on the payroll of the Massport sir, are you?

Doherty: No sir I'm not. They've never paid me a penny.

Audience Member: You're representing the union sir?

Doherty: I'm representing the Commuter Airlines that's right.

00:07:46,440 --> 00:08:12,479

Audience Member: [Inaudible]

Doherty: It's very small, it's very small, but to some places like New Hampshire and Vermont and Maine it's very important. We in terms of making Logan airport the eighth largest airport in the world don't have much to do about it, in terms of passengers carried.

00:08:13,120 --> 00:08:37,080

Audience Member: [Inaudible]

Doherty: The reason that we want to go into Logan, you might say why don't we go on a Hanscom, is almost all our people want to get off executive airlines from Martha's Vineyard, or from Lebanon, New Hampshire and go to Europe or go to St. Louis or go somewhere else. If we go to Hanscom then they have to change modes of transportation come to Logan and take off again.

00:08:38,000 --> 00:08:59,080

Audience Member: [Inaudible]

Doherty: Now where our point of view is it's not safe for us to use 1533 when there's instrument conditions because we have to land after those other aircraft. There is at present a parallel runway, but it can't be instrumented.

00:09:01,040 --> 00:09:22,520

Audience Member: At the present time, as per your point of view--- [inaudible].

Doherty: That's right

Audience Member: [Inaudible]

00:09:22,520 --> 00:09:48,120

Doherty: That's right so what you have to do is judge what the harm of that STOL runway is to your community, and in terms of Revere I don't think it affects you at all.

Audience Member: [Inaudible].

Doherty: In terms of safety, in terms of safety it benefits people from Martha's Vineyard, New Hampshire and Vermont. That's my concern is safety.

00:09:48,560 --> 00:10:01,280

Audience Member: [Inaudible]

Doherty: Well that's a separate issue. As long as we operate out of Logan we want a separate runway from 1533, and our passengers want to go to Logan.

00:10:02,240 --> 00:10:46,240

Mooney: Doctor I might be able to help on that question as to the volume of operations. In 19--- in 1971 there was a little over 37,000 aircraft operations there were several hundred thousand passengers. That's fairly significant and it's particularly true because of the fact that the--- in the New England area northeast obviously dropped a lot of its schedules to a lot of different cities and so these airlines are picking up and providing service to these smaller communities into

Boston and whereas there used to be a say a dc-9 there were there are now the twin otters and so forth.

00:10:46,880 --> 00:10:53,920

Audience Member: My point is this that you already have a small splendid facility that exists in the south point of--- [inaudible].

00:10:54,240 --> 00:11:05,560

Mooney: Well I'd like to point out---

Callaghan: Excuse me a second. If you care to would you speak at the microphone so that we can have it on the tape?

00:11:06,440 --> 00:11:46,120

Mooney: Could I just mention in response to that I'm not saying that they couldn't operate into South Weymouth, but just for your information approximately 65 percent of the passengers connect with the other airlines and almost without exception each of the airplanes that brings passengers in has connecting traffic. Now if they're going to connect the only other way obviously would be to bring them on the ground and that also seems to be a problem one of access and so you know some way you've got to move the people and it seems that maybe this is one of the better ways to do it.

00:11:46,320 --> 00:12:59,680

John McMahon: Oh one of those---

Callaghan: Excuse me would you mind giving your name---

McMahon: My name is John McMahon it's M-C-M-A-H-O-N. I'm a resident of Winthrop at 102 Shaw drive, and I'd like to respond to Mr. Mooney's question at least in part that it seems that the interfacing of the schedule of the STOL airline or the community airline and the short haul carrier is just a matter of scheduling. It also seems to me that you could use the existing military facilities of the South Weymouth Naval Air Station in terms of STOL takeoff and landing. There's no problem there. You have the same geographic factors that are involved in getting in and out of Boston. In terms of people that go to Boston, and in fact I've used Executive probably more than I've used any of the others flying up to Maine and New Hampshire I admit it's the only way to get there. At times I wondered when we flew around the hills instead of going over them, but you know that's part of the problem. But my only point is that I suddenly see that, and I didn't realize the significance of that STOL project until tonight, that it does benefit only the commuter airlines. It's an enormous economic cost and yet there are seem to be facilities that are already existing in this immediate area, particularly that South Weymouth Naval Air Station. I only offer that for your consideration.

00:13:00,040 --> 00:14:19,080

Mooney: Well let me say this that this has been done we, as I mentioned before, we operate hanscom field and commuter airlines have operated out there but unsuccessfully. Each one of them have discontinued service because they not having the opportunity to connect and have the 65 percent of the additional traffic they haven't been economically been able to continue that service, so as a result the service is not available. Now it was pointed out and the question was raised about the bankruptcy of Executive Airlines. They've managed to get through it there are more commuter airlines that have not been able to make it and I dare say that some of them that are operating into Logan today will eventually disappear, and all we're saying is that there are many people such as yourself that use these, have a need in the Boston area, and it is the only way at least up to this point that they've been able to be economically viable by having the combination of the origin destination and connecting traffic.

00:14:19,080 --> 00:14:43,600

McMahon: I would agree with you in terms of Hanscom as a community airline site of operations, but at the same time I totally disagree with you in terms of the availability of South Weymouth, and in fact the commuter airline problem hasn't been applied, at least to my knowledge, to South Weymouth, and in terms of interfacing your origins and in terms of interfacing departures.

00:14:44,400 --> 00:15:20,240

Mooney: Well, actually South Weymouth probably as far as market is concerned we've done quite a lot of origin destination surveys, and they're fairly comparable. South Weymouth is not a great area as far as generation of traffic. I doubt personally that it would be a stronger area than Hanscom Field, and keep in mind that we're not only talking about general the commuter airlines but also general aviation type of aircraft.

00:15:20,240 --> 00:15:28,600

McMahon: That poses another question.

Mooney: Okay.

McMahon: Is there any real reason for any general aviation use of aircraft at Logan?

00:15:28,840 --> 00:16:24,640

Mooney: Well there yes there is. I personally feel that there will be a decreasing quantity of general aviation traffic, a lot of them do connect. Also as you know we are not able to restrict these aircraft. We can't say that you can't come in. Now when the pilot of these smaller aircraft have that option, which we cannot deny nor does the FAA are they in a position to deny this, they take a slot that could be used by a commercial airline aircraft and as a result it creates capacity problems, causes delays of the larger airplanes, delays again I pointed out result in unnecessary noise unnecessary air pollution.

00:16:24,520 --> 00:17:08,960

McMahon: But also isn't that a question of the both the industry and the airport, or any airport operator, simply going to the FAA and saying "Look it you're making by allowing general aviation unrestricted access to our sites you are now creating a problem". Why not shut off Logan to general aviation and at the same time relegate it to the outlying airports and you have a number of small community airports, I can think of one the Norwood Airport, which can handle I believe perhaps all of the general aviation traffic that Logan presently handles, and I'm talking in terms of the small single and twin engine aircraft.

00:17:10,880 --> 00:18:48,080

Mooney: well---

McMahon: That's a matter of lobbying with the FAA.

Mooney: Actually the Massachusetts Port Authority probably has had a little more experience than most airport operators on this particular subject because we were involved in litigation a number of years ago in 1963, and a complaint was brought by the fixed base operators, two of them, when we attempted to limit the general aviation operations at Logan. We tried to limit it to one operator and as a result the FAA stepped in after a hearing and required us to take on a second operator, and for a period of time we tried to settle the suit. We had numerous meetings with the FAA, I was directly involved over a period of years, and we said that we feel that there's going to be a diminishing need and they said in spite of that as long as there is the demand and the desire by these operators to come in under the grant agreements that were signed many years ago and extend for a period each one of them for 25 years, there is a right that they have which the airport operator can only say or state their position that we would rather not have quite so many in there, but so far this has never been the position taken by the FAA and we---

00:18:48,080 --> 00:18:51,840

McMahon: Excuse me, have you ever really asked them to take that position

Callaghan: Excuse me too gentlemen.

McMahon: Sure.

00:18:53,160 --> 00:19:08,440

Callaghan: This is an interesting discussion, but we--- I wonder if we could defer it for a time until---

McMahon: I would ask one other question, one other question that presently deals---

Callaghan: Just so we could have Revere people finish their discussions, that's all.

00:19:09,520 --> 00:20:07,480

McMahon: With one of the points that you made in a discussion with Mrs. Mazzarella in terms of the present traffic and aircraft types and I think it's pages 22, 23, and 24 of your distribution where you list aircraft types of 6 and 7 that are high bypass engine types, and at the same time

you show a reduction in the volume of non-high bypass from 92 percent to 68 percent. I believe that's page 24, am I correct? And I think that her question was predicated on those figures that it still remains the same in terms of your 300,000 and your 500,000 units you still have in 1983 non-high bypass aircraft.

00:20:08,320 --> 00:20:13,600

Mooney: Yes what---

McMahon: Which would be the exact number of flights that you have today, the same percent or the same number of flights 300,000.

00:20:13,760 --> 00:21:03,400

Mooney: Well I'm saying that first of all, you don't know when you speak of high bypass ratio engines and so forth you're assuming that's the only way that you can meet FAR-36,---

McMahon well that's not the strongest in the world either.

Mooney: That we don't think is going to be the case and the fact is that we know, and as a matter of fact during the past year we've had a number of developments that we are quite confident are going to result in by 1980 a practical elimination of aircraft that are unable to meet that FAR-36 required.

00:21:03,400 --> 00:21:07,240

McMahon: Would you would you want to extend a guarantee to us that by 1980 that will be eliminated?

00:21:07,480 --> 00:21:11,440

Mooney: Well no I don't think that---

McMahon: Thank you

Mooney: ---position to guarantee that.

00:21:11,800 --> 00:21:19,520

Callaghan: Thank you would you mind giving me your name? I don't know whether the stenographer caught it.

McMahon: It's John McMahon M-C-M-A-H-O-N

00:21:20,040 --> 00:21:35,600

Callaghan: Thank you. Excuse me Mrs. Mazzarella, is there anyone from Revere who hasn't spoken as yet? We'd just like to keep it in order, if not go right ahead Mrs. Mazzarella.

00:21:36,040 --> 00:00:21:45,480

Mazzarella: This is just on what Mr. McMahon was just discussing. You just said Mr. Mooney that 65 percent of the passengers that come into Logan are transferring to other airlines.

00:21:45,720 --> 00:21:53,360

Mooney: No, no I didn't say that. I said 65 percent of the commuter airline passengers connect.

00:21:53,760 --> 00:22:06,840

Mazzarella: All right. I believe that I read somewhere in this booklet, and I can't find it right now, that Logan is primarily an origin destination airport. Now don't those two facts disagree with each other?

00:22:06,840 --> 00:23:04,640

Mooney: No because a commuter airline 65 percent of the commuter airline traffic connects, but approximately 10 percent of the total airline passenger including that the commuters connects. So that what what's happening? That indicates to us is that the people from these small airlines in fact are feeding into Logan which is a hub and connecting and most of the Boston passengers obviously well are originating or terminating their flight in Boston, so you know I don't think one conflicts the facts are that just what I stated 65 and 10 percent of the total approximately 10 percent

00:23:05,000 --> 00:23:05,360

Mazzarella: Okay.

00:23:09,600 --> 00:23:15,120

Callaghan: Is there anyone else that cares to make comment? Yes John?

00:23:15,720 --> 00:24:01,040

McMahon: Mr. Callaghan this is a comment just on page 9. I would like to the purposes given for this project I would like to see them extended beyond that particular area within the airport. "To eliminate a breeding ground for insects, rodents, and obnoxious odors and provide more a more pleasing aesthetic appearance". This shouldn't be restricted just to that one area, so I would hope that would be a airport wide objective. Now just jumping back to this graph just these are short questions so what is the left-hand column it says "operations" are those flights?

00:24:02,320 --> 00:24:29,720

Callaghan: On what page?

McMahon: Page 20 and 21. Yes 20 and 21 sir, "Operations in Thousands", what are those figures? 100,000-200 000. Are those flights?

Mooney: well 20.

McMahon: What type of index is it sir?

Mooney: what on page---

Callaghan: 20.

Mooney: 20?

McMahon: Yes it's graphed on page 21 and it's detailed on page 20.



00:24:30,680 --> 00:24:49,000

Mooney: Those are, well wait a second, this this is an aircraft operation that represents one takeoff or one landing.

McMahon: Nice. Okay. I would suggest sir that you just define that for the--- for the layman.

00:24:49,320 --> 00:24:50,720

Mooney: Okay

Callaghan: It's a good idea.

00:24:52,360 --> 00:25:05,920

McMahon: Now going to page 23, while I think of it that plane that just went by sir would you call that would it be are we affected or unaffected by that plane that you just heard?

00:25:05,920 --> 00:25:24,560

Mooney: Well you're obviously affected because you noticed it. I don't know how you were affected other than it interrupted your speech to some extent. It was it was noticeable. it's like any noise that is objectionable.

00:25:24,640 --> 00:25:36,320

McMahon: Okay. In that pamphlet, which was quoted earlier, this the new school is going into an area unaffected by airplane noise.

Mooney: Unaffected?

McMahon: Unaffected.

Mooney: Is that what it said?

00:25:36,600 --> 00:25:47,800

McMahon: Yes sir. Now I think it's probably on the same path as this building here on the other side of the hill. This is--- I'm just asking how you arrived at it being unaffected?

00:25:48,120 --> 00:26:16,640

Mooney: Well I---

McMahon: But I'm not---

Mooney: I didn't really write it and I guess I could take some responsibility for it, but affected is a matter of degree. I don't think that--- I mean this was objectionable the conversation did continue what effect it would have on a school room classroom I i don't know, I mean---

00:26:16,640 --> 00:26:49,160

McMahon: I don't even know, but I just wanted to see if you had a definition because it is put in a positive vein in that in that particular pamphlet and I think it's misquoted the word. Now

going to page 24. Okay this take off stage lengths in nautical miles. Are these miles? Excuse my ignorance about nautical miles, but I don't know what that means sir.

Mooney: Well it's a mile that's a little longer than a statute mile.

00:26:49,240 --> 00:27:04,400

McMahon: Does that mean--- As I read it 72 percent of the planes need zero to 500 miles to take off.

Mooney: No they travel--- stage length means the distance between the point of takeoff and the point of landing.

00:27:06,800 --> 00:27:39,960

McMahon: I'd suggest, I'd suggest that you elaborate. Now my last question sir has to do with in 1980 you will have 24 percent of planes in aircraft type 7, this is on page 23 and 22. What will they be servicing? If this is the northeast--- I'm asking will they be servicing this northeast corridor. Which I would suggest that they'd be diverted to Hanscom, but---

00:27:39,960 --> 00:27:44,200

Mooney: Are you talking about seven?

McMahon: Yes sir, aircraft type seven.

00:27:44,440 --> 00:29:06,159

Mooney: These are wide as you know wide-bodied jets, high, high capacity, dc-10 say runs about 250 passengers, can carry a bit more than that. It's a--- it's not a quiet airplane, but it's a quieter airplane. It really is an excellent one, at least by comparison with aircraft like the 707. Now they are not scheduled in the northeast corridor, normally they operate best at stage lengths of a 1,000 say to 3,000 miles. Swiss Air will operate a dc-10 30 series non-stop to Zurich, that's a longer-range one, but we feel as a matter of fact that they can operate in a short-haul market. We've asked the airlines to consider this because we think that rather than, for instance the Eastern Airlines shuttle, rather than running one airplane to New York followed up by maybe one or two extra session--- sections that they could run one airplane rather than say three airplanes having the same capacity and the obvious advantages of that are quite apparent.

00:29:10,240 --> 00:28:960

McMahon: So these would not be servicing the northeast corridor these---

Mooney: Well we think that some will be, yes. As a matter of fact it's assumed that that probably at least in the Boston-Washington market which is a little bit longer distance, but they will be operating

00:29:29,040 --> 00:29:46,720

McMahon: I would like to see more of the northeast corridor originating and ending at Hanscom sir. And one last question, would the revenue generated by a plane landing at Logan be as much as a plane landing at Hanscom?

00:29:48,080 --> 00:30:14:040

Mooney: The revenue generated by an airplane is directly related to the cost of providing the facilities they use. In other words the landing fee they pay it at Logan is related to the cost. It's computed on a weight frequency basis so that if your cost is lower at Hanscom Field to provide the runway---

00:30:14,440 --> 00:31:08,360

McMahon: That's the Massport's cost.

Mooney: Yes. If the cost is lower and the volume of operations is at least comparable computed on a weight frequency basis then the rates would be the same, but if it's well it's hard to explain. Even though the landing area would be less or could be less expensive at Hanscom Field, if you have fewer airplanes than it's divided among fewer customers in effect, so that the cost per airplane could be higher at Hanscom Field than at Logan. It is it's a direct computation of cost of the facility related to the volume of use.

00:31:09,000 --> 00:31:11,480

McMahon: The operations.

Mooney: that's right

McMahon: I see.

00:31:11,720 --> 00:31:39,280

Mooney: It's no advantage to us, if that's your possibly your point, to have them landed at Logan for financial reasons because the landing fee is computed to return the cost of the landing area and if there are fewer operations the rate will go up. If there is more cost of the landing area the rate will go up, so it's---

00:31:39,520 --> 00:31:45,920

McMahon: No my point was that I would like to see just Hanscom used more by airplanes. Thank you.

00:31:51,680 --> 00:32:12:160

Callaghan: Is there anyone else that cares to make any further comment? It's been a very productive evening I think. I think we've all learned something, and we certainly want to respond to the questions that have been asked. Mrs. Mazzarella I don't think we have your address if, I may have it?

00:32:13,560 --> 00:32:14,880

Audience Member: Can I say something please?

Callaghan: Yeah Surely.

00:32:18,160 --> 00:33:07,680

Mazzarella: My name is Mr. Mazzarella and you know I've just I've just been sitting here listening to you, and some of the questions that come up you say "Well we can't do anything about it, that's FAA's area", or "We try to get the airplanes to land down at Hanscom or Westover or South Weymouth, the airlines don't want to do it", so I mean what's the sense of having this meeting tonight? It seems like you people can do nothing. You have to check with the "FHA", you have to check with the airlines, they say no, and I think this is one reason why there's a lot of people not here tonight because they just feel frustrated. They come down here, they use you for a whipping boy for maybe an hour, two hours, then we go home and they do what they want. That's all I want to say. That I think that's why there's a lot of people not here tonight.

00:33:08,880 --> 00:35:22:120

Callaghan: Well I don't know how they you know would anticipate what answers would be given, although I do agree with the part that sometimes we are the whipping boys in a functional operation, which is not entirely that of the Massachusetts Port Authority. I happen to be the chairman of the Logan Airport Noise Abatement Committee, and we have meetings about once a month and people are welcome to drop in, Mrs. Zuko here is a regular attendant, and at those meetings we try to explain what the different functions are. What the responsibility of the federal government is. As Mr. Mooney explained the federal government is responsible for setting maximum noise limits for the new aircraft. We can't do that. It is also a federal government responsibility to concern itself with the use of aircraft revenues and passenger taxes. They are the ones that have to put funds into research, we can't do that. They are the ones that have to determine whether or not there's going to be sound proof retrofitting of the older and noisier aircraft. Yes we are in a fairly complex function. We are the landlord, and we feel that we can exercise a certain influence in most any situation, and we do have very definite responsibilities in particular situations and we want to exercise them and we appreciate the fact that you people have come here and given us a very very pointed comments. So I think that we can do certain things, and I think as time goes on there will be more and more input more and more result of that input. We thank you for coming here, and if this gentleman wants to add something to the evening?

00:35:22:880 --> 00:36:47,880

Leonard Punch: Leonard Punch, I'm a resident of Winthrop. My property is not for sale, the airport can't buy it. But over and above that I've been in many public hearings especially in the city of Chelsea in my youth when they try to drive the oil farms out of there before they were built driving down to Quincy and Braintree. If they didn't have them in Chelsea today there wouldn't be any city of Chelsea right now because of the tax structure. And if people want to

take this port and put it down in South Weymouth, or up to Bedford, or down to Otis, down the cape, we're in very serious trouble right here now in the employment field. And I don't know what the port payroll is, I mean I'm not talking about the port itself I'm talking about all the functions of the port. I think it'll be very serious matter to consider of the people in the city of Revere, East Boston, Boston-metropolitan Boston if you're going to take and deprive these people of a livelihood. So I am supporting the Port Authority, not in anything they want to do, but in building this new facility they anticipate, so that's all I have to say.

00:36:48,440 --> 00:37:26,240

Callaghan: Thank you Mr. Punch. If there is no one else that cares to make comment, we want to thank you once again. We appreciate the, not only your presence here, but the tenor of your comments and the consideration that you gave to us in our rather difficult function of representing all of the elements at the airport, and we will report back through the draft master plan and through the answers to specific questions. Thank you very kindly.