

Record Group TC6/1995
Massachusetts Port Authority Public Hearing Files, 1970-1986
Draft Master Plan Hearing in South Boston, August 24, 1973, Tape 2

(Continued from Tape 1)

00:00:00,120 --> 00:01:42,479

Audience: [Applause]

Patrick McDonough: Thank you very much Mr. King for giving me this opportunity to talk to you again. As I've said at the East Boston hearing, and it's no news to you or Mr. Callaghan or the other members representing the Port, my position is basically this: that I am paid to reflect the attitudes and opinions of the people of Boston who were affected by your operation until such time as they substantially accept your plan, that the people who are affected by this expansion find general acceptance of the ideas and the plans that you wish to have them accept. I will not accept them. My position is one in which I represent them; in this case I intend to do it. I don't know as far as—I also said in East Boston: I don't see that there is anything that you can do to that will make your plan any more palatable or in any way palatable to the people who have to listen, who have to practically feel the vibrations and listen to the intense noise. I live five miles south of here—further down those glide paths—and when my window is open in Dorchester I feel as though that that plane is going to hop into bed with me at any moment, and I can just imagine what it is here in Saint Bridget's. So beyond that I have nothing to say other than thank you for giving me the opportunity to come up here and say it again. Thank you.

Audience: [Applause]

00:01:39,520 --> 00:01:50,349

Edward King: Thank you, Councilor McDonough. John J. Regan, please.

Audience: [Applause]

00:01:53,360 --> 00:07:21,039

John Regan: Mr. Chairman, and gentleman, my name is John J. Regan. I live at 69 Telegraph Street, which is about a mile and a half from a threshold at Logan Airport. My concern, primarily, was the noise factor, as well as the safety. I recall a meeting in December of 1970 at which time we met with members of the Port Authority, and we, at that time, attempted to discuss a certain report which had been written by Bolt, Beranek, and Newman, and it had been financed by the Department of Transportation. This report made some very interesting conclusions. Its subject was "Aircraft Noise and Airport Neighbors: A Study of Logan International Airport." I recently had access to a copy of the master plan, and looking through it I expected to find some rebuttal to the previous report which had been financed by the government and prepared by this other consulting firm. I went through the 374 pages, and nowhere in there did I find Bolt, Beranek, and Newman's report mentioned; it could possibly have been there. The report is extremely thick—it would take a better part of an hour to read it—however, I could not find it. The other thing I would like to say in reference to noise is that I was very pleased to notice—from a Boston paper—that at a meeting of the Port Authority on July the 19th they had voted an appropriation of 200,000 dollars to make a computer study

which would be accomplished—if I understand it correctly—by positioning microphones at 12 different locations, tying them into a computer so that they might be able to pinpoint or verify whether there was a noise problem. And, you know, this is real interesting because since 1970 I have heard it said at various times and places, “Well there really is no severe noise problem,” “We don't get it on our complaint line,” or “We don't get as much of it on our complaint line.” And I think the reason why would be: Number one: the population of Boston has gone down in the last six years and number two: people grow tired of calling a number, getting conversation, and hearing nothing further.

Audience: [Applause]

John Regan: So now—after first claiming that the problem might be exaggerated—the board—and it's a compliment to the board—they have decided that they will spend 200,000 dollars to verify whether if, in fact, it is as severe as the people have tried to tell them. That is a compliment to the makeup of the present board, and the findings, I think, will substantiate that noise is a real problem over here, whether or not anyone cares to agree with us at the moment. The other thing I found in that report was that, on navigation aids on page 51, when it inventories the existing facilities, it mentions an airport surveillance and surface detection radar system. One of the Boston papers on August 1st stated that this report, that this equipment, particularly the ground survey radar, was not in operation and had not been for two years. I'm in no position to make a judgment other than what I read in the paper, but the last point is this: I, personally, my own opinion—admittedly that of a layman—have slowly come to the conclusion that if we were to have a second regional airport there is no assurance that Mass Port Authority would operate the second airport, and, therefore, I think it is probably in Mass Port Authority's own selfish interest to concentrate upon expanding the existing facility. In other words, they will go with what they have because this is it. And, rather than go through some more enabling legislation, they'll just expand what they have., I'm also not surprised to find as I did at the hearing on the third harbor tunnel, people are coming up from Weymouth, they're coming from outside points, and they're asking to be heard, and I point out to you that one of the conclusions in that Bolt, Beranek, and Newman report was to the effect that as the air traffic increases, the disturbance area, or the area of people which are affected, expands. And I think I have seen that happen, too. Thank you.

00:07:17,120 --> 00:09:51,839

Edward King: Thank you, Mr. Regan. I'd like to make two comments. One on that Bolt, Beranek, and Newman report of December 1970 which you referred to—perhaps was not specifically referred to or rebutted, as you indicated—in our master plan, and I think that that wasn't necessary because, better than Mass Port rebutting it, both Beranek and Newman themselves, the author of the report, via a “Supplemental Report Number One” some year or more later, and then via “Supplemental Report Number Two” some further six to nine months—or thereabouts—after that, corrected the report. You see it seemed that rather than have the accurate number of aircraft movements in a given year—which were used as a basis for projection—they took a figure from the FAA which represented the total number of movements and then proceeded to double that on the theory that what they received from the FAA was only landings or takeoffs—I don't know which—and they doubled it, which made the noise effects just double. And there is a further correction I'm sure will be coming because they made

some predictions for 1975 about the mix of aircraft we would have at Logan and the number of SSTs—I believe it was about 20 per day in 1975. So in 1971 and '2 they weren't able to really ascertain how wrong they were,, but I'm sure that by 1975 they will and we'll look forward to a third report, and then perhaps—if it's still of interest to anyone—be able to compare the original report really with what it should have been. Now on the navigational age, there was a story in the *Boston Globe*. The instrumentation or equipment, perhaps better put, that you referred to had no effect whatever on the daily operations at Logan. It had been decommissioned—not out of water, but rather decommissioned not two, but I believe seven years ago. It has absolutely no effect on the operations of Logan; it's not something that's essential to the operation or something that everyone else has and we do not. I mentioned those only because there are people here who justifiably have an interest and certainly would—and should—be concerned that they thought we were operating with something that we needed. We have another repeat appearance here from Michael Kane, and that's the last card that I have. Michael Kane, please.

00:09:59,200 --> 00:21:15,520

Michael Kane: My name is Michael Kane. My organization is the Massachusetts Public Interest Research Group East. It's an organization based in Boston but which represents 11 college campuses in the Eastern Massachusetts area. We're funded by student fees collected from students on these campuses, and the idea was initially founded by Ralph Nader in Massachusetts about a year ago.

Audience: [Applause]

Michael Kane: I am directing a summer program at Mass PIRG East. We have a number of students working on projects this summer; one of the projects has been a study of noise pollution at Mass Port. Yesterday we released a report entitled "Noise is King: Massport's Idea of Community Health." The report was reported in the media yesterday, and we presented it at the hearing last night in detail. The report last night went on for 30 minutes; tonight I'll simply summarize the major points and direct a few questions to Mr. King about specific procedures that we suggested could be adopted to help reduce airport noise and improve community health in Boston. Some of Logan Airport's neighbors have been concerned recently because, through no fault of their own, they have experienced periodic difficulty hearing themselves think. Their homes, schools, libraries, hospitals, and places of business have been pierced by sounds of the wonderful world of aircraft; In fact, this hearing tonight has been pierced by sounds of the wonderful world of aircraft since I've arrived. On the bottom of every piece of Massport letterhead stationary is the inscription "Catalyst for New England commerce." These five words summarize quite well what Massport sees its purpose and primary objective as being. Perhaps it is a reasonable goal for a private corporation, but Massport's, special, semi-public tax-free status was set up by the state legislature's 1956 Enabling Act. Section 17 stipulates that the powers given to Massport by the Act will be in all respects for the benefit of the people of the Commonwealth, and I quote, "...for the improvement of their health and living conditions." What is the authority doing for the improvement of the health and living conditions of the people of the Commonwealth? Several different communities are affected by the airport's noise: South Boston, Winthrop, Revere, and Chelsea are examples. The most immediately hit, however, has been East Boston, where planes fly 50 feet above the houses. In

the school year of 1970 to 1971 audiometer hearing tests measured the hearing of all public school students in Boston; in East Boston 6.5% of the students failed the test. This failure rate was over 40 percent higher than the city-wide average. I think we can anticipate that as Logan Airport has expanded, the same sorts of conditions will prevail in other communities as have existed in East Boston, suggests that in South Boston, for example, the situation may very well be worse if this master plan is adopted. There's a question as to whether this noise is necessary. Logan Airport officials claim to be doing all that is physically possible to quote, "reduce the noise at its source." Is Massport, in fact, making an attempt to do this? We must examine first, whether the noise is that bad and secondly, whether there are any procedures which Logan could encourage airlines to adopt which it hasn't. To give you some examples of the types of health problems that have arisen as due to aircraft noise: one example is an East Boston woman who had to cover her ears to shield the sound of a noisy jet taking off. When she uncovered her right ear, she realized that it was blocked. An examination revealed that she had suffered a bone fracture; she had no history of ear trouble but must now wear ear guards at all times. Elsewhere, in the same community of East Boston, a doctor explained to his patient that he had developed hearing problems from the aircraft noise and that he was not to open his windows under any circumstances. Eventually the man had to soundproof his bedroom at an expense of 5,000 dollars. The noise level is sufficiently severe for the Department of Housing and Urban Development to deny grants or subsidies for development. This was demonstrated by HUD's rejection—on the grounds of noise pollution—of a renovation proposal made by the East Boston Community Development Corporation. HUD's decision would seem to be justified in the basis of rent levels in the community. There is an analysis which has shown that the amount of rent increases have been less in communities near the airport which is a reflection of declining property values. The annual loss to a community of these rent shortfalls is a measure of the noise cost paid by a community in purely economic terms; this is not to put a value on the amount of health damage which is also caused by aircraft noise. In South Boston the annual noise impact amounts to over 900,000 dollars. In Winthrop it is over a million dollars a year, and in East Boston it is over 1.3 million dollars. As bad as jet noise is during the day time, it is far worse at night as indicated by a number of studies. According to a report prepared for the United States Department of Transportation, the interruption of sleep is noise's most annoying feature; the impairment of sleep can even be caused without the victim being aware. A nighttime flight is considered to be noise equivalent to 17 daytime flights. This is explained by the fact that at night, with the absence of daytime background noise, jet noise can be heard of further distance, and when people are trying to sleep they are more sensitive to the noise. We conclude that the noise is that bad; it affects a large number of people in their homes and schools and is particularly damaging at night. Should look at what Logan has done and what it plans to do in its master plan. According to forecasts made by Logan's own consultants, Landrum and Brown, and by the FAA, flights will increase sharply in the future if this plan is adopted, and unless a new effective policy of noise abatement is instituted, the jet noise will similarly increase. We present statistics to verify this conclusion in our report. Massport's institutional answer to the aircraft noise hazard has been the Logan Airport Noise Abatement Committee. LANAC membership, in addition to the widely touted community representatives, consists of the Airline Pilots Association, the airlines, which quote, "serve Boston," the FAA, the Massachusetts Aeronautics Administration, and—of course—the Massachusetts Port Authority.

The coordinator of the committee is Mr. Thomas Callaghan, who is on Massport's staff. In LANAC minutes, when aircraft noise complaints are mentioned, only monthly or yearly totals are given. After these figures are cited, Mr. Callaghan cites the fact that the previous months or years total was higher. There is no information given as to the substance of the complaints or what steps have been taken to rectify the particular annoyances which precipitated the complaints. Mr. Callaghan then congratulates the committee on effectively lowering the number of complaints without going into any detail as to why the number of complaints has declined. Mr. Callaghan praises LANAC because it has effectively reduced the complaints and successfully abating the complaints rather than the noise; LANAC has become LACAC, the Logan Airport Complaint Abatement Committee. This is especially regrettable when considering community evidence to the effect that some complaints aren't even being recorded. In this master plan, Massport details its measures employed to minimize noise they discuss quote, "one of the first preferential runway system programs in the United States," and ignore the fact that the runways are only preferential on takeoffs; no such system exists for approaches. Massport goes on to explain LANAC and its comprehensive noise complaint program; this report has already examined LANAC and its efficient means of dealing with complaints. The draft talks about over-water operations maintaining that quote, "When wind, weather, and traffic conditions permit, during the early morning hours at two runways, runway 15-R is used for departures and runway 33-L is used for arrivals between the hours of midnight and 6 a.m." Why can't these two runways be used whenever wind, weather, and traffic conditions permit instead of only during the early morning hours? Massport admits that there remain limited areas which are located immediately adjacent to the airport. I'm quoting now from Massport statements, "and directly under approach and departure paths such as Neptune Road in East Boston" which will probably never be free of irritating noise. It is the approach and departure paths which have infringed on Neptune Road and not the other way around. Massport's statement ignores the basic principle; it is the perpetrator of a health hazard, not the victim, who is obligated to correct the hazard. Of the 15 noise reduction measures which are listed in the master plan, only 6 actually abate noise at Logan, and the amount of noise they abate is not mentioned. The remaining measures either monitor, discuss, or evade the responsibility for aircraft noise. Massport's solution to the noise problem, on many occasions, has been the assertion that the victim is responsible for his own hardships. In other words, the party which inflicts the noise need take no responsibility for it. Houses are brought up, as on Neptune Road; homeowners and tenants alike are pressured to move. The consideration of who has intruded on whom is ignored. Our study attempted to find out whether noise could be abated by reasonable actions on the part of the force which creates the noise. We have researched and compiled a number of operational procedures which we presented at the hearing last night and sent in a letter to Mr. King over two weeks ago. Our recommendation is that Massport institute a quantitative noise limit and take steps to ensure that airlines comply to that limit by adopting any one of a number of procedures. Now, we have looked at several procedures which, if instituted, could reduce noise. There are other procedures that have been discussed in other places. I would like to address some questions to Mr. King about specific procedures. I'm quoting from the letter which we sent, which Mr. King's office received on August the 7th. "Glide slope: Logan runs most of its landings with glide slopes approximately three degrees, the normally accepted standard. A flatter approach exposes more people to very dangerous noise. Why hasn't Logan raised its glide slopes to three and a half

degrees as has been done in several existing airports, a level more respectful of the health of the community?"

00:21:12,960 --> 00:21:24,640

Edward King: You want to ask them one at a time?

Michael Kane: Yes.

Edward King: Okay. Mr. Mooney—if you don't mind—our Director of Aviation, would do a better job on that, so I'll ask him to answer that.

00:21:25,120 --> 00:22:48,480

Richard Mooney: I will say that it is a bit difficult to respond to a report of this nature in any detail. I will speak on the specific proposals, but it is a report that is so fraught with misinformation and miscalculations and so many other things that it really is difficult to address it and cover it adequately without taking a great deal of time. Now let me get a copy of that first. On this particular one—I've got a copy of the letter here. First of all, you say that Logan Airport has not established a glide slope.

Michael Kane: No, that is not what I said. I said that Logan Airport is not set a quantitative noise limit.

Richard Mooney: No, that's not what you said; I'll read from your letter.

Edward King: Do you want to read back the question? Because it was about a glide scope and an angle. Would you read that back, please? The stenographer will read the question back.

00:22:52,559 --> 00:23:33,039

Stenographer: "I would like to address some questions to Mr. King about specific procedures. I'm quoting from the letter which we sent, which Mr. King's office received on August the 7th. 'Glide slope: Logan runs most of its landings with glide slopes approximately three degrees, the normally accepted standard. A flatter approach exposes more people to very dangerous noise. Why hasn't Logan raised its glide slopes to three and a half degrees as has been done in several existing airports, a level more respectful of the health of the community?'"

00:23:29,280 --> 00:25:10,320

Edward King: Do you understand?

Richard Mooney: Yes, I do. Now specifically, the glide slope at Logan, like all other airports in the United States, is not set by the airport operator; not in any instance is that correct, so the implication is that Logan should set its glide slope at a lower level—or higher level. Also, you have cited an example of one airport—San Diego—which has a glide slope set slightly above a three degree angle, and this is strictly—yes, in the United States—this is strictly for purposes of avoiding an obstruction. The same is true at Tempelhof, and as I've mentioned to you and I mentioned last night, I've flown into both of those airports and had occasion to experience that, so that, first of all, I want everyone to clearly understand that it's not the Port Authority nor the airport operator in any location that sets the glide path. If, in fact, the glide path can be set higher—and safely—then we are in favor of it, but we have nothing to do with that nor does other any other airport operate in the United States.

Audience Member: Who does?

Richard Mooney: The FAA establishes that. They install it, they set the standards, and they operate the instrument landing system. The airport operator is not involved other than to provide the site for the installation of the equipment.

00:25:09,200 --> 00:26:17,600

Michael Kane: Would you agree that Massport can take steps to pressure the airlines to adopt procedures such as this, to come into—

Richard Mooney: No, I would not agree that they can pressure them into moving to establish a glide slope that is higher than that.

Michael Kane: Can Logan Airport set higher landing fees?

Richard Mooney: I think that it's questionable. If it affects the scheduling of aircraft and affects the scheduling of interstate air transportation.

Michael Kane: Can it—can Logan Airport—set higher landing fees?

Richard Mooney: We can as long as it's uniformly applied and does not control the scheduling of aircraft and interstate transportation.

Michael Kane: Have you considered using a step such as that which is a form of pressure on the airlines—

Richard Mooney: Yes. We have and it has been looked at from a legal standpoint, and we do not believe that the Authority has the right to establish fees at a level which would, in effect, control the scheduling of interstate air traffic.

00:26:15,600 --> 00:27:53,039

Edward King: But one thing at a time. You're going off your first subject and the answer that Mr. Mooney gave is that it's questionable—legally—and it's also, where it counts, the effectiveness is a very deep question. Now when the ladies asked—and we appreciate you asking that—who is responsible, we said clearly here that it is not ours; it is the FAA, and that's exactly the type of question that we will ask, and hope that you would ask, if you come to the meeting or if Jean Willy comes to a meeting when the FAA are there. They will not you know shake away or sneak away from that question. Then I think you and I and the FAA also would feel better because if they were here, they would say that that is their responsibility. One other item I'd like to clear up before you proceed is that "could we pressure the airlines on a matter of a deeper descent or glide scope alteration?" I would hope that we couldn't. I would hope that being expert in their field and with the supervision of the FAA that any pressure would be considered out of line because, certainly, even if we could, I would personally not tolerate that on any member of Massport pressuring any airline on the operation of its aircraft in a manner in which others—FAA and the pilots—have far greater expertise. So I'd like to make that plain. If there's anything that can be done to reduce noise we have ways of suggesting, but we do not pressure, particularly in areas where we have no expertise compared to those involved. Next question.

00:27:51,679 --> 00:29:05,679

Michael Kane: So you would not consider putting pressure on the airlines even if you had the power under your consideration—if you had the power to do so?

Edward King: Not in a matter involving the operation of an aircraft which is unproven and not accepted by the FAA. That is correct.

Michael Kane: Okay. I would like to—without going further into detail about the specific procedures which we cite as could be adopted, I'll simply summarize them. All of the operating procedures which we discussed in our report, not a single one of those procedures has been declared or implied to be unsafe, but more important than that, procedures can only be adopted if in fact they are approved by the FAA. Three of the procedures which we cite have been approved by the FAA and are operational by either airlines or airports in the United States. An example is flat management which has been adopted by American Airlines and which is being used at Logan Airport. Why have not other airlines, or why haven't you suggested to other airlines that this particular policy be adopted?

00:29:05,120 --> 00:32:00,399

Edward King: Would you prefer to respond to that?

Michael Kane: Yes.

Richard Mooney: Well I would like to say, first of all, that you say airlines and airports. Now I'm telling you with absolute certainty that there is no airport in the United States that has established any type of flight procedure. It is not permitted to and there are none. And I mean none. And you persist insane airports. Now the airlines have developed and have been experimenting with various things. Now we told you last night that we're very much familiar with the experimentation and the work that American Airlines has been doing, as well as other airlines. We have met with the president of American Airlines; we've had discussions with him. We have been down in their flight transportation center in the Dallas/Fort Worth area, and we have urged that they do it as long as it's consistent with safety. We followed this; this was before they even started the operation of it or before there was any announcement by the Air Transport Association. We are in favor of any noise abatement procedure which is accepted by the FAA and the pilots. Now you say that the pilots do not object to it, in fact, there is serious question by pilots. The Airline Pilots Association, which represents all of the pilots in the United States—with the exception of American Airlines and possibly PSA—have expressed concern about this—and you're very much familiar with the fact that NASA has not completed its experimentations with this, and right now they have only completed a first phase, and we're looking for the report of the next phase in October. This is going to be taken to the Airline Pilots Association and the International Airline Pilots Association. And there's a report from a NASA document that we have with us that quotes verbatim from the minutes the concern of the International Airline Pilots, so based upon that all I can say is that we have continuously urged research and to prove that various procedures can be worked and operated safely. We're behind it, but we're against any type of procedure which would jeopardize safety in any way, and your suggestion to use economics to force an airline or anyone else to alter their judgment on a safety matter, I think is incredible.

00:31:58,320 --> 00:33:19,360

Michael Kane: Would you dispute, then, the FAA certification of safety of these procedures?

Richard Mooney: No, I would not, but they have not certified it as being either a requirement—they have permitted it in some locations and under some circumstances

Michael Kane: But they have in fact certified these procedures where—?

Richard Mooney: They have approved a two-segment approach by PSA, but they do not require it.

Michael Kane: We're not saying that they require it; we're simply saying that it has been certified as safe.

Richard Mooney: The airlines have not accepted it, and the airline pilots have not accepted it, so we don't know exactly what they will accept and what they won't accept. They have permitted it in some locations and by some airlines, and they've got varying types of programs for flat management. Now you suggest that we should take and pressure the airlines and the FAA to do something along this line. We have encouraged them to do it as long as it's safe, but we have not pressured them by using—or attempting to use—dollars to control such a program.

00:33:17,039 --> 00:35:09,119

Edward King: Let me say this. Not in direct response to your question, but I think having heard you last night and Mr. Mooney last night that we all understand—certainly you've heard the people here tonight, if you were here and you know yourself—there is a noise problem here, and aircraft are noisy, and there's no immediate relief. Let's accept that. It's a warm night, and people work hard, and they should be able to have all of the peace and tranquility of minds in their homes as possible. Airplanes do disturb that. That's maybe, let's say, necessary and to that extent has to be at least pro temp tolerable, but for you to come and indicate that you're a consumer representative and that you're interested in the people and make statements which are absolutely misleading and, in most cases, totally without foundation, when you can call the FAA before you put out your material to the media to check any of that, when you could have called and discussed them at any length with us, when you could have called the pilots association and had these answers, and not put out this extra dispute which these people or East Boston or any place else in the nation do not need. Noise is enough of a problem without making misunderstandings which shouldn't—really is something that doesn't do credit to you. Now if you have a lack of funds and you want to come to our office and discuss with us: use the phones, call the FAA tomorrow, please, in Washington. Use our phones, whatever. Write to the pilots of the FAA, get the answers, and then send them and have them published in the paper compared with your statement so that at least these people will know to what extent you are attempting—if you really are attempting—to mislead them. If not, acknowledge what you've said is wrong—unless it comes out that you're right, in which case we will do that. Next question.

00:35:07,359 --> 00:36:50,800

Michael Kane: Well, we'll be glad to pay our own bills, although I appreciate the offer.

Edward King: Fine. Then you have no reason whatever then not to correct that or have us stand up and say you're right.

Michael Kane: We have been in touch with the FAA; we know that these procedures have been certified by the FAA and that is satisfactory to us. Evidently it's not to Mr. Mooney.

Edward King: Then we ought to sit down together and straighten that out.

Michael Kane: We sent a letter which went into the specifics of these procedures to your office over two and a half weeks ago. Prior to that, we had indeed approached your staff and discussed these matters. We did not get what we felt were satisfactory answers, and we felt

that a letter was necessary, and we sent it—return receipt requested, as you know. So we cannot be criticized for not having attempted to get information from Logan Airport.

Edward King: Well, I think you can because you know the misunderstanding on the letter—we discussed that last night—I know when I received that letter—and that was August 15th. It was postmarked return receipt requested August 7th. There is no question about that, and I acknowledged that last night, and I do again. But I saw it on the 15th, that letter will be answered, and we'll see that your questions and answers and our answers are published in this paper. I think when you mention this two-segment approach you know that it is confined to California, generally by an interstate carrier that only flies to the three airports, and those pilots go from one to two to three or one to three and back and forth. It's not the same as flying into a different airport practically every day, as is the case with most others. I think you should point those things out because you're interested in getting the correct story to the people, and you're not doing it the way you're approaching it.

Michael Kane: We feel that we are.

Edward King: Fine.

Michael Kane I'll simply have to dispute you.

00:36:48,320 --> 00:39:03,680

Edward King: Let's go on.

Michael Kane: In conclusion, I would like to say that, first of all, what we're recommending is that Massport set a quantitative noise limit. We're not saying that any specific procedure should be adopted, but we are saying that there are procedures which are available which have been proven and operational at other airports or by other airlines including one that lands at Massport all the time. These procedures are certified as safe. One of the procedures that we recommend does not entail safety at all, and that is a night surcharge which Professor Joseph Yance of Boston University economics department has recommended, and I'm sure has been presented to you in other testimony. I would like to address myself to your evident claim that you have no power over the airlines. There are Logan Airport documents, LANAC documents, which cite, for example, a number of noise abatement procedures which you claim Logan implemented. These include specific restrictions on nighttime run-ups and even on flight operation procedures. And I would also like to quote from a Department of Transportation Office of Noise Abatement statement which says quote, "While the federal government can regulate noise-producing capacity of aircraft by noise certification and the manner in which such aircraft are flown..." air traffic controls quote, "...responsibility for determining the permissible noise levels for aircraft using an airport remains with the proprietor of that airport." Which is to say Massport. Certainly no one would dispute the Massport is a powerful institution in Massachusetts, and I would find it hard to believe that the airlines would not listen to you, particularly if you suggested that landing fees might be raised in particular noise abatement procedures were implemented by the airlines, and you could leave the mix of procedures up to the airlines. We would certainly not recommend anything that was not known to be safe, but we have to take into account the safety and health of people on the ground, and that's what noise pollution is all about. And that finishes our statement.

Edward King: I would be surprised—

00:39:00,880 --> 00:40:24,480

Mary Eager: Mr. King?

Edward King: Just a second. The gentleman has to fix his machine. Did you sign a card?

Mary Eager: No, I didn't. My name is Mary Eager. You and I have had several confrontations about this. I have another problem to bring up. I know that noise and safety are important but

Edward King: Would you rather wait until—

Mary Eager: I'm sorry. Excuse me.

Edward King: Only a second.

Mary Eager: Okay? Thank you. I'm sorry I don't mean to crash this meeting, but I did not intend to speak. But I feel there's something very important; we're speaking very directly about the health and the welfare and the safety of the people South Boston. Mr. King, at the time that I was President of the Residence Group we had many discussions. One of them was I'd have a specific question, and I would like a specific answer, if it's possible. We discussed why it was necessary for the planes to come over South Boston, dump all of their fuel over the homes when you do not see this in the suburb. To me this is most important. Was there any corrective measure instituted? I have seen it; it still exists. Is there any plan to take care of this particular problem?

00:40:22,800 --> 00:40:32,720

Edward King: Yes, I believe that that problem has been corrected. I just want to ask Mr. Callaghan; is it fair for you to answer that better than I? Mr. Callaghan.

Mary Eager: Thank you.

Edward King: Excuse me.

00:40:35,359 --> 00:43:38,480

Thomas Callaghan: The problem of dumping of fuel, I think, has to be described in little more precise terms. Number one: there had been a situation where the fuel which accumulated after a plane stopped at an airport and the fuel that was in the hot engine drained down into drain cans, then when the plane took off again, there was a suction out of the drain cans which, I believe, ranged anywhere from a quart to three quarts of fuel. And the suction occurred when a plane reached 200 knots, which was presumably at least three miles or more from the airport. That situation was brought to the attention of the public; there was an investigation by the various groups and I think Senator Bulger was one of those who filed legislation. And in the course of the aircraft operators (that is the airlines) taking action and there being action at the legislature under Senator Bulger's bill, that has been remedied. Now, on approach people have told us that there is a dumping of fuel. We've talked to pilots, and we've investigated it, and as far as we can determine, the only time that a plane would dump fuel when it was coming in was when it was under some emergency condition—that is it had to turn back to the airport, and it had a full load, and it couldn't land with a full load, so presumably, it would be sent out over the water to dump its fuel. I do think that at times, as Mrs. Eager is probably thinking there has been and—under certain conditions—a certain mist that may come from an engine as a plane is landing, but that is not in any sense a pilot pulling a lever and dumping his fuel. So that unless there was something done which was illegal—and I am sure that it wouldn't be done on any regular basis—then I trust I've described the situation. The takeoff situation has been corrected.

The landing situation I believe that Mrs. Eager is describing is a matter of the operation of the engine under certain conditions.

00:43:36,000 --> 00:44:38,000

Mary Eager: Then, Mr. Callaghan, not to not to argue with you, but there must be an awful lot of emergencies then because it still happens. If you stand down the corner of the beach on I Street—almost any street there—and you watch those planes come in, they don't dump over the water—right over the house, and it's a big, long, black hole—jet smoke, whatever it is I don't know.

Thomas Callaghan: Well I, too, don't want to argue the point, but I would suggest that, of course, when certain planes are landing and the engine is running at less than full speed because it's more or less gliding in, there is some black smoke from a certain number of planes—most of them have been cleared. But I don't really think—I just went off my personal opinion—that black smoke is really pure gasoline that's being dumped or pure kerosene or jet fuel is being dumped from the plane.

00:44:36,079 --> 00:45:15,200

Mary Eager: Whatever it is shows a contrast with the clouds. I have been out in the suburbs, and you don't see this occur. This is why I say, “Why should it happen here to the people South Boston?”

Audience

Edward King: Well, may I suggest that—there may be a difference of opinion or judgment but what we will do, I suggest, is to go over to the site—we certainly know where it is—when they're using that runway and somehow catch or sample some of this and find out what it is. And having done that, find out if it's possible to correct it or prevent it. Fair enough?

00:45:17,680 --> 00:46:43,839

Mary Eager: when they come in they seem to come in, like, from Squantum and straight up over. This particular flight that it seems to happen.

Edward King: Just not all of them. Are most of them? Maybe put it that way? Is that what you're saying?

Mary Eager: No. Well, for a while it seemed to be much better, but it seems to have been on the increase. I was just curious as to whether it had been given any attention or thought. At least this would establish a little feeling with the people that maybe the Port Authority is thinking in the lines of the welfare of the people. Thank you.

Edward King: Thank you. Well there was legislation definitely enacted prohibiting that dumping of fuel—whether it's what you're describing or not—but it was a dumping. In fact, a date was in the bill and when it was found out that that bill technologically—that date rather—could not technologically be met, it was suspended for six months, which I think was a realistic thing to do and, again, gets back to doing what is doable and promising people something and then having to change it is far less desirable, but all or not, we will spend some time when they're using that runway, see if we can find out what it is and have it analyzed or whatever—I don't know the course of action—until we find it and come back to you as soon as we know something. If we don't find anything, we'll call you for some help fair. Thank you Mr. Phillip Giffie, please.

00:46:47,520 --> 00:49:39,760

Phillip Giffie: Good evening. My name is Phil Giffie. I live at 112 Trenton Street in East Boston, and I work with East Boston Community News. I breathe a lot of that kerosene in the hydrocarbons as a result of Massport and the tunnel. I breathe a lot of the kerosene and a lot of the hydrocarbons that are produced by jets in East Boston and many of the cars that pass through there, and I do work for East Boston Community News, so rather than put this in the paper and take potshots from behind the press, I'd like to read it to you—early edition. “In spite of what you claim, I think Massport is not doing all it can to reduce noise pollution. I think you've assumed a fairly passive role in the transportation crisis. I think, if you wanted to, you could do a lot more. I think the major argument that Massport offers for not doing more about the environment is that they do not have the authority to make the changes that people seek. That is only partially true; it's true that you don't have the power to implement a high speed rail system or to make airlines retrofit their noisy engines, but you do have the authority to implement a nighttime curfew, build fewer parking spaces, not to build an oil farm in a salt water marsh under a runway, not to push for a six-lane tunnel through our already polluted community, not for advertised Logan Airport down in New York, out in the Midwest, or in Brussels to attract more passengers or freight service. The Port Authority chose to become a partner—even an advocate—of the communities it plagues. People in East Boston and this area would not have to pay the price for progress we now pay with the deteriorating quality of our lives. If Massport and other airport operators put pressure on the airlines themselves and the airline industry to retrofit those old engines, maybe that industry would get the message and assume their social responsibility by putting people before profits. If Massport went to those federal bureaucracies down in Washington and demanded high-speed rail and mass transit, imagine the effect that would have on them. If Massport were to tell the Civil Aeronautics Board that nighttime flights are largely unnecessary and, as a result of Mr. Yance's study, I think they are, and they are particularly damaging to people. The CAB would have to listen to you and us. If you were to tell labor and the construction trades that they should be down in Washington demanding that housing be built instead of tunnels in East Boston, everybody would gain, especially those in need of shelter. If you were to tell the oil industry that it's absurd to build in a saltwater marsh and under a runway maybe that industry would wake up also. If Massport were to inform the traveling public on how their demands for their convenience destroys our lives and communities maybe that could influence them to change their traveling habits. If the Port Authority chose to become a leader instead of a follower on these major issues real changes for the better could be made to benefit us all.”

Audience: [Applause]

00:49:36,800 --> 00:50:45,200

Edward King: Thank you. We have no more cards requesting the opportunity to speak. We have no more questions requesting an answer. We'll close our hearing then by just repeating simply, once more, that noise is at least as undesirable to me, to everyone here, to everyone at Massport, and in the aviation community as it is to you, and just as soon as there is a way, through technological advances at the source, and—I hope that sooner via retrofit than was earlier expected—I hope that some relief, which you're certainly entitled to— and for our part,

we hope you receive promptly—that that comes about. Thank you for your courteousness and participation. Pardon?

Audience Member: [inaudible]

Edward King: Well, we intend, as far as I'm concerned—oh, you asked me a question? I'm willing to answer it. Okay. Thank you.