

Record Group TC6/Series 1995

Massachusetts Port Authority Public hearing files, 1970-1986

Draft master plan hearing in Chelsea, August 23, 1973 Tape 1

00:00:00,000 --> 00:00:13,760

Edward King: Ladies and gentlemen it is at least 7:30, and we're prepared to start, and we hope you are. The purpose of this hearing—and I'm reading this in the interest of uniformity, this is the [inaudible] Yes, Father.

00:00:27,840 --> 00:00:38,400

Father Sallese: Asking once again, as I did on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday evening, I rise to challenge your right to preside at this meeting. And I would ask that you step down from the podium.

00:00:40,560 --> 00:00:48,640

Edward King: I didn't hear the last part, Father.

Father Sallese: I would ask that you step down from the podium and let me preside.

Edward King: I'm sorry, Father that I'm not in a position to do that.

00:00:48,960 --> 00:02:35,840

Father Sallese: For the record, I inform you once again of the minutes of July 19 board meeting where the recommendation of the public affairs committee, of which you and I are a member, recommended to the board that these meetings be considered Massachusetts Port Authority board meetings. I am a board member. You are not. You are a paid staff member; therefore, I—and also I call your attention to the notice of these hearings published in the newspaper, that they were called by the Massachusetts Port Authority will convene and hold these meetings. You are not the Massachusetts Port Authority, and although you have ruled me out of order three nights in the past, I again, for the record, make that known. And while I'm sure you will again win your way and preside this evening, I want the record to know that I feel this is an illegal calling of this meeting—not the calling but presiding on your part. Last evening I gave you a letter in which I requested a complete verbatim transcript of the five meetings coming up as well as a copy of all the testimony submitted in evidence, and I assume I and the other members of my committee—on the ad hoc committee for master planning (Mr. Defalco, Mr. Maher, and Mr. Christian and myself as chairman) will receive this evening. I have no letter for you. In addition I would like a copy of all the cards submitted of the participants along with their questions and along with a copy of any communication issued by you or any staff member pertaining to any question asked at any of the five meetings. I believe it's important that the committee have this information if we are to evaluate completely these hearings.

00:02:36,880 --> 00:06:18,320

Edward King: Thank you, Father. Was that something? Thank you, Father. Now, back to the beginning. I indicated to you that I would read—solely in the interest of uniformity. I would prefer to speak directly to you, but uniformity requires, or at least strongly suggests, that we read the same thing at the outset of each hearing. Starting again. 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 Massachusetts Port Authority. This is the fourth 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 inputs from these hearings and, with the staff, develop the final plan for board action. Following board action, a public hearing will be held in Boston to present the final master plan. Before testimony begins, I will describe briefly the procedures for tonight's hearings. Every person who wishes to testify will be permitted to do so. If you wish to testify and have filled out one of the cards available in the back or on the side of the room indicating that you wish to speak, you will be called upon in turn. If you have not yet done so, raise your hand, and one of these cards will be brought to you and collected. If you have any questions for the Authority, you should also write them on the same type of card. Should a question occur to you during the course of the hearing even though you have already filled out a card, simply raise your hand and another card will be provided on which you may put your questions in writing. Put your name and address, please, 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 individually to the questioner. All questions and answers will be made part of the formal record of this hearing. If you have a written statement present a copy to the stenographer when you come to speak—stenographer is located right in front of the podium here—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 time keeper 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 need 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. Now, for the main purpose of the evening—essentially your participation, your comments or suggestions on the master plan that we have come up with to date. I will present Mr. Richard E. Mooney, our Director of Aviation, who will detail to you the history—more recent history at least—of the master plan at Logan. He will indicate what it was perhaps a year ago, an intermediate plan or a suggested modification, if you wish, and finally the plan before you which is what we expect you to address your remarks to this evening. Mr. Mooney.

00:06:24,479 --> 00:16:05,080

Richard Mooney: Thank you. This is the second in a series of public meetings to review the master plan evolution. We were here—and I'm not sure the exact date; it was the latter part of April—to discuss with you the preliminary airport master plan review. We received comments at that time, and they were considered in preparation of the master plan report document that was distributed and is the subject of this meeting. Mr. King has explained to you the process from this point through the adoption of the master plan—or a revised master plan report by the board. I'd like to discuss very briefly with you the changes in this plan and what the staff is proposing as part of this master plan report. First of all, we have indicated previously that the Port Authority does have a master plan, has maintained one over a period of years. The present approved master plan was approved by the Port Authority the latter part of 1969 and by the FAA early in 1970. This is the plan that we have followed essentially in the development since that time of Logan International Airport. On March 1 of this year the Port Authority Board, before going to public hearing on several proposed runway improvements, on March 1 decided that, based upon a staff recommendation, to remove from the approved master plan several specific projects. Now, these are depicted primarily—I hope that you can see rather than having to run the— maybe the slide will be alright. We've got them also shown on tripods over to your right. This plan is the existing or approved master plan; if you'll show the second slide, I'd like to demonstrate what the major modifications were. The areas shown in red were, by vote of the board on March 1 of 1973, deleted from the approved master plan. These essentially were the parallel 1533, the extension of runway 9, and a parallel 927, an area filled between the Bird Island Flats area and the Jeffries Point area; these were the principal revisions. Now I'd like to— if you'll show the next slide please. This is the plan as we now envision it and are proposing as part of the master plan report. We have made the deletions as indicated on the previous slide, and essentially, we are not recommending major improvements at Logan. Our objective is to meet the air transportation needs of the Boston metropolitan area. We feel that the plan as proposed is a good plan. We think that it's the minimum that will permit us to continue to meet these traffic demands hopefully into the future. Specifically, the proposal for additions to the landing area include the extension of runway 9, extension of runway 4-Left, and a short parallel general aviation STOL runway approximately parallel to runway 1533. Now, the purpose of the extension of runway 9 is primarily for noise abatement. It will permit the aircraft taking off from 9 to be over the Winthrop, Point Shirley area at a higher elevation and reduce the noise level in that location. It also provides an added margin of safety and in fact, will result in a slight reduction in airport capacity. It will permit the takeoff of a small number of additional, larger aircraft but will not provide a capability for aircraft greater than what exists today. We have two runways already available that are longer than this runway, and it is not being designed—as some people may think—for the purposes of accommodating the SST. The SST incidentally can be accommodated at Logan today without any modifications of the runways. Runway 4-Left is an extension for increased safety for takeoffs from runway 22-Right, and the short runway approximately parallel to 1533 will provide some added capacity that's lost by virtue of the runway extensions, offers a very significant safety potential for separation of small aircraft from large aircraft. This runway has been laid out to minimize the potential for overflights of the Jeffries Point area, and based upon demonstration of actual flights and also investigation by the FAA, we are confident that this runway can be utilized without direct overflights over Jeffries Point. As a matter of fact, we indicate in the report that we would preclude direct over flights by

aircraft utilizing this runway. We also include a small area of fill to the left of runway 15-Left for purposes of improved instrumentation on--- I'm sorry, to the left of 15-Right. This would be for improved instrumentation of runway 15-Right. The terminal area: the principal projects are either completed or under construction. We've completed, of course, the North Terminal; the Eastern Terminal, with the exception of a potential for addition of one satellite; we have the South Terminal under construction, and we also are nearing completion of the International Terminal. There is potential for limited development of support facilities in the old Air National Guard area. There's a possibility of expansion of the parking garage if and when it's needed, likewise with the roadway system; there is added potential available if it is required. The Bird Island Flats area has essentially been completed as far as fill and will soon be available for development primarily of air cargo. This, as you can see, is a rather limited program it does not propose any real dramatic improvements. We do feel that with the added potential in the future for handling traffic, the possibilities of diversion to other modes of transportation is existent. Although at this point, it does not look too bright, we would hope that other forms of ground transportation could be developed that would be competitive, but we do stand ready to accommodate air transportation and fulfill the need, as demonstrated and determined by the community. We do not, in fact, generate traffic; we meet the demand created by this community. We intend to fulfill the obligations of accomplishing this: serving the community, the greater Boston metropolitan area, as well as a state with a minimum environmental impact possible on the immediately surrounding communities. We think that what is illustrated on this plan will be environmentally far superior to a program of do nothing. And with this, we're available now for discussion and response to your comments and questions.

00:16:22,399 --> 00:17:18,640

Edward King: All right, according to our card system, our first participant is Devonne Benton. I understand that Devonne may be 4 to 6 years old. This card indicates she's neither in favor or opposed to the airport program; she just wants less noise. That's certainly understandable Devonne. Do you want to speak? No, I thought that may be wrong. That certainly is understandable. It's something which I hope, whether you're 4 or 46 or whatever, you would also understand far more desirable from our individual and authority point of view. Noise is something which we're all not interested in having, and we would like to have as less of as possible. Devonne is going to speak for himself. Is that my—that's the boy... or girl.

00:17:18,640 --> 00:17:23,160

Audience Member: It's a girl.

Edward King: Excuse me, sorry. Very sorry. Go ahead, Devonne, please.

00:17:23,920 --> 00:17:48,160

Devonne Benton: Every night when I'm in bed, I'm sleeping and the airplanes come up and they wake over my head, and they wake me up. And when I'm watching TV sometimes it messes up the TV. And that's all.

00:17:48,560 --> 00:18:23,840

Edward King: Thank you very much. You're very very scholarly and courageous, really, to step up and speak before all these people. I want to assure you that, although I can't promise you nor can any of us very much immediate relief, we understand what you're saying. We wish that you didn't have to come and remind us. Okay? Thank you. Our next participant is Grant Bennett Jr., and he requests information. And Mr. Bennett would let us know what that information is we'd be pleased to... Yes, sir.

00:18:23,840 --> 00:18:36,200

Grant Bennet: You say that, I read in the paper yesterday that said they are trying to lengthen one runway because we'll have an instrumentation landing so that you can land in bad weather or any kind of weather really.

00:18:36,200 --> 00:18:48,800

Edward King: I don't believe that was lengthening—rather put on an existing runway the instrumentation that would permit landing under safer conditions in lower or less desirable weather conditions.

00:18:49,560 --> 00:19:23,720

Grant Bennet: Well I mean that is a possibility that should be because just you know just that the airport is not going to close. They're not going to close, and one safety factor is to let this instrumentation, just like that plane crashed the other day! Suppose it had crashed into the neighborhood instead of the water. I mean, if you had had better guidance, he wouldn't have hit the doggone fence. And another thing. If you do let them make the runways, you'll get the larger planes in here who will haul more people and that'll keep--- that'll be less airplanes. I mean, one airplane instead of five to hold the same amount of people. Don't you think that's true, too?

00:19:24,640 --> 00:19:47,800

Edward King: Well, are you saying that if we instrument the runway that more---

Grant Bennet: Not necessarily instrument the runway, but let them lengthen it to let larger planes in. If you get the larger planes in, then you'll have less planes coming all the time. You get one plane overseas will bring two plane loads, and you won't have to have three of them from overseas. After all, this is an international airport, right?

00:19:47,960 --> 00:20:00,480

Edward King: Correct. Yes, sir.

Grant Bennet: So you've got them coming in from every place. So if you let one flight come in a day—say from Shannon— with the jumbo jet coming in, then you only have one plane coming in from there a day instead of having five from that same place.

00:20:00,920 --> 00:20:28,320

Edward King: Well, it would be desirable, in a sense, if we could have the volume of the five passenger, but really we have one a day from Shannon and/or Dublin. But-

Bennet: What about Swiss Air—you know, the rest of them! I mean, could that be an instrumentation instead of—you know—just having these countries that bring these planes in or the Air Force—the limit that these planes come in! Instead of having 10 flights a day, just have one of them.

00:20:28,320 --> 00:20:40,160

Edward King: Are you suggesting that the more jumbos we have like to the same cities for transport that the less flights we'll have? And is that desirable?

Grant Bennet: Or either a limitation of the flights that come in here. Could that be controllable?

00:20:40,160 --> 00:21:21,520

Edward King: Well, let's say this. The limitation of flights: no. That's something that the government through the CAB, not the FAA, has endeavored to try and control—in the interest of noise, conservation of fuel, and profit of airlines—in large routes like New York to Los Angeles and possibly New York to Chicago. But certainly to have one flight via a jumbo—say at 8 o'clock in the morning instead of 2 or 3 sections from LaGuardia to Boston, from Boston to LaGuardia is highly desirable. That's something we certainly agree on, but throughout the day, whether you can accumulate that number of people at that time to go to a similar destination, that is the problem.

00:21:21,920 --> 00:21:31,680

Grant Bennet: But see, accumulating the people just like those accumulated people at that time and still the airlines run when they get ready. And you have to be there when they want to run, so if they run one plane a day, you're still going to be there.

00:21:32,440 --> 00:22:56,000

Edward King: Well I believe really, and I think you'll understand this, that the reason the airplanes run at a given time, although sometimes they do change them, is because their traffic studies or surveys have indicated that's a desirable time for the people that want to travel, and they consider the competition of course. Let me point this out that what we're talking about now for extensions over what are presently at Logan Airport are simply an extension of this—the fill, the dike, the land area—all of which is present. What we're suggesting is the paving, the completion of the runway, —the fill is only—it's not a question of water to be filled. It's all filled, dike and all. We're also considering this extension from this point here. This is the Commonwealth pier 5 or pier 4, that's Point Shirley and Deer Island off that way, and then this is the runway for the short aircraft. It's only 3,800 feet, and that would be really for single-engine, smaller type aircraft, not for the commercial jets. And the fact that this is extended to approximately 8,800 feet or 8,900 feet really isn't totally significant because already, this runway is 10,000 plus feet, and there's a runway in this direction 10,000 plus feet. So even when extended we already have two runways that are at least 1,200---

00:22:56,000 ---> 00:23:02,360

Grant Bennet: Yeah, but what's going to go with the wind factor, you know? They got to land and take off with whichever way the wind is blowing.

Edward King: That's correct but I-

00:23:02,360 --> 00:23:09,360

Grant Bennet: So your best bet is to try and get them to limit the flights that comes into these airports because they're not going to close.

Edward King: Well let me-

00:23:09,360 --> 00:23:25,040

Grant Bennet: That the only way you can work this thing and get us the best result because they not going to close them, we not going to close them here. They going to extend the runway if they want; it's too much money involved. The only thing you try to do is get them to limit the number of aircraft that's coming into the different cities.

00:23:25,240 --> 00:24:23,280

Edward King: Alright. Let me let me say this: that to the best of my knowledge, we have not had any aircraft not take off because of a lack of runway length and the compelling wind direction—which is one item you mentioned. Number 2: we can mail to you at 131 Williams Street some of our statistics over the last 3 or 4 years which clearly indicate that despite sharp increases in the pounds of cargo carried and the number of passengers carried, the number of aircraft movements has not increased anyways accordingly. That means that the larger planes are having an effect which is I believe the way you're talking—which I agree with to the extent it can be done. Okay? Thank you, sir. Our next will be Michael W. Kane. Mr. Kane please.

00:24:44,240 --> 00:26:08,920

Michael Kane: My name is Michael W. Kane my organization is the Massachusetts Public Interest Research Group East. Our organization was initiated by Ralph Nader about a year ago and is currently funded and organized by students on 11 campuses in the Eastern Massachusetts area. We represent over 20,000 students from throughout Boston, including communities that are impacted by Logan Airport. My role at Mass PIRG East is a staff person supervising a summer program. We're currently engaged in several projects; one of the projects was completed today. Today—some of you may have seen—the results of our research over the summer on the impact of noise produced by jets at Logan Airport on communities near the airport. The title of our report, which I will read—and was authored by Gerald Polner, who is with me tonight and an engineering student at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and by two medical students John Macy and Jeff Breider, who are currently out of town at Boston University Medical School—and what I will do is—I've just submitted a copy of our report to the record, and if we're having some of them printed up now, and if people from the community are interested in seeing this, I'll be glad to give you copies as soon as they're available, and if you can contact Jerry or me after the hearing tonight, we'll be glad to make sure that you get one.

00:26:09,040 --> 00:26:13,120

Edward King: You have passed one in?

Michael Kane: Yes, I handed one to the record.

Edward King: Thank you.

00:26:13,320 --> 00:34:31,400

Michael Kane: The title of our report is "Noise is King: Massport's Idea of Community Health."  
[report read into the record]

"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. On the bottom of every piece of Massport letterhead stationary is the inscription 'Catalyst for New England Commerce.' These five words seem to 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 quote, 'will be in all respects for the benefit of the people of the commonwealth for the increase of their commerce and prosperity,...' and we should emphasize this, '...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, Chelsea, Revere, Winthrop, but the most immediately hit is East Boston where planes fly 50 feet above the houses. I think it's reasonable to anticipate that as airport activity is increased and as runways are expanded, that other communities around the airport, including Chelsea, will be impacted in the same way that East Boston has been impacted by community noise. Let me give you some examples of what this means in terms of health and safety for people in the community. In the school year 1970 to 1971 audiometer hearing tests measured the hearing of all public school students in Boston. In East Boston six and a half percent of the students failed the test. This failure rate was 43 percent higher than the city-wide average. Is the noise necessary? Logan Airport officials claim to be doing all that is physically possible to quote, 'reduce the noise at its source,' according to their own documents. Is Massport in fact making an attempt to do this? We must examine extensively first whether the noise is really all that bad, and second whether there are any procedures which Logan could adopt which it hasn't. Several years ago an East Boston woman 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 now must wear ear guards at all times. Elsewhere in the same community, 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 sound proof his bedroom at a cost of 5,000 dollars. A standard currently in use by the Federal Aviation Administration is the noise exposure forecast—called the NEF. The NEF level is determined from the subjective noisiness of a single aircraft with added consideration given to things such as the frequency of occurrence of flights, the time of day, and aircraft track and profile. The NEF represents a compound criterion for determining the impact of aircraft noise in the community. An NEF contour is a line drawn between points of equal NEF level. Those living within NEF-25 contour, for example, experience NEF levels of 25 or greater. In a report prepared by Bolt, Beranek, and Newman—which is a consulting firm that has done research on noise—for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation, various

land usages were evaluated as to their compatibility with NEF levels between 30-40 and above 40. Between 30-40 schools, hospitals, churches, and theaters are considered to be absolutely unworkable. Residences in such areas are considered to be barely tolerable. Above NEF 40, residences, offices, and public buildings become unbearable. In 1967, 94,000 people lived inside the NEF-30 contour and 18,000 lived inside the NEF-40 area. There were 44,500 students enrolled in schools within the NEF-30 contour and 4,000 were enrolled in schools within the NEF-40 contour. Also in 1967, according to the Bolt, Beranek, and Newman study, there were 5 hospitals within the NEF-30 area representing a total of 1,391 beds, and 1 hospital inside the NEF-40 area representing 560 hospital beds. It was predicted that these areas of dangerous noise would expand, and more recent noise contour maps have verified that the areas have indeed expanded. And I think again, as the airport continues to expand, as indicated in the master plan that is being considered tonight, we can anticipate that these contours will also expand. Thousands of residents, students, and hospital patients are asked to maintain their existence in a noise climate where it is physically impossible to do so. 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 on the basis of rent levels in the community; however, a regression analysis was recently made in order to find the correlation—if any between—1970 noise levels and the rise in rents from 1960 to 1970. It was shown that in an area with NEF equal to 30, rents went up 12 percent less than they would have in an area free of aircraft noise. This is clear evidence that aircraft noise has an impact on rents and by implication, property values in the community. In an NEF-35 zone rents went up 18 percent less, and in an NEF-40 area rents climbed 21 percent less. The annual loss to a community of these rent shortfalls is a measure of the noise cost paid by the community. In South Boston the annual noise impact amounts to 0.92 million dollars. In Winthrop it is over 1 million dollars, and in East Boston it is over 1.3 million dollars. As bad as jet noise is during the daytime, it is far worse at night as indicated by a number of studies. According to a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Transportation the interruption of sleep is noise's most annoying feature. The impairment to sleep can even be caused without the victim being aware. In the formulas used to calculate NEF levels, a nighttime flight is considered to be noise equivalent to 17 daytime flights. This is justified by the fact that at night, with the absence of daytime background noise, jet noise can be heard a further distance, and when people are trying to sleep, they are more sensitive to the noise. The ratio comes about from the accepted assumption that aircraft are subjectively 10 decibels louder at night and the convention that there are 9 nighttime hours from 10 p.m. until 7 a.m. and 15 day time hours. In conclusion, the noise is that bad. It affects a large number of people in their homes and schools and is particularly damaging at night. In view of this hazard to the health of people in the community we need to look at what Logan has done.”

Is there a time limit on this?

00:34:31,400 --> 00:34:44,560

Edward King: There is a 10-minute time limit. You're on page 7, I believe of... We don't have that large an audience, so I think—would anyone here in mind if we permitted Mr. Kane to go on and finish? Perhaps another 10 minutes?

00:34:44,800 --> 00:34:52,800

Audience Member: Yeah, go ahead.

Edward King: Well, you wouldn't mind is your answer?

Michael Kane: If there are other people who want to testify.

Edward King: Nobody else? Okay then. You may go right ahead, please.

00:34:54,480 --> 00:45:02,120

Michael Kane: [continues to read report into the record]

"The draft of Logan's master plan,"

We're talking now about what Logan has done to deal with the noise problem.

"...which has come out in June explains Massport's current and future prospects for jet traffic and its resultant noise. It gives the population and number of schools and land area within the NEF-30 and NEF-40 zones as of 1970."

I won't go into reading the quotes and the statistics because that's too long. It is available in the report. In— okay, I'll skip over this section to save time. Okay. Let me talk about Massport's institutional answer to the aircraft noise hazard.

"The institutional answer is called the 'Logan Airport Noise Abatement Committee.' LANAC's membership in addition to the widely touted community representatives, consists of the Airline Pilots Association, the airlines serving Boston, the FAA, the Massachusetts Aeronautics Administration, and of course the Massachusetts Port Authority. The coordinator of the committee, Thomas Callaghan, is on Massport's staff. He edits and issues the minutes of each meeting. Mr. Callaghan frequently introduces information to the minutes such as the following." Let me quote from the minutes.

"Coordinator Callaghan reported the statistics for the last 6 months of 1971, showed that there were fewer flights, and more passengers as compared with the same period of 1970" And then he cited some figures to that effect.

"Citing the short-run decrease of 1.1 percent, Mr. Callaghan completely ignores all the forecasts made which we document in our report of future operations which indicate that in the next 10 to 15 years operations will rise sharply. In LANAC's minutes, Mr. Callaghan divides the information into several groups and precedes each group with an underlying heading. Under the heading 'Aircraft Noise Complaints,' for example, there appeared this comment: 'Chief Air Controller Connolly noted that the volume of flights was approximately 1,000 fewer each month this year as compared with 1971. In 1971 there were a total of 7,500 fewer flights than in 1970.' This is similar to the other misleading statements noted earlier, except that this time we are asked to believe that an operation statistic is the same thing as a noise complaint. When aircraft noise complaints are mentioned, however, only monthly or yearly totals are given. Immediately afterward Mr. Callaghan cites the fact that the previous months or year's 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 in

into any detail as to why the number of complaints, in fact, is lower. The possibility that perhaps people in the community has simply given up complaining is never considered in the LANAC minutes by Mr. Callaghan. So Callaghan praises LANAC because it has effectively reduced the complaints. In successfully abating the complaints rather than the noise, LANAC has turned into 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.”

And we document instances of this sort.

“In the June '73 master plan, Massport details their measures employed to minimize noise. The Port discusses quote, ‘one of the first preferential runway system programs in the United States,’ and then ignores 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 in a sufficient means of dealing with complaints. The draft talks about overwater operations, maintaining that when wind weather and traffic conditions permit during the early morning hours of midnight to 6 a.m. runway 15-R is used for departures and runway 33-L is used for arrivals. A question to put to Massport is why can't runways 15-R and 33-L be used whenever wind, weather, and traffic conditions permit instead of only during the early morning hours? Massport admits that quote ‘There remain limited areas which are immediately adjacent to the airport 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 that it is the perpetrator of a health hazard—not the victim—who is obliged to correct the hazard. The final safety valve in Massport's account of its own noise abatement policies is the following statement, ‘The authority has continued to follow a policy of providing the airport facilities necessary to adequately accommodate air service demands generated by the Boston region. Had this policy not been followed in the past high levels of congestion and delay would have developed, producing a greater noise impact than has actually been experienced.’ This argument is similar to the one which favors building more highways so that we can have twice as many traffic congested roads as we have now. An airport which strains to meet the demand will be forced to adapt to higher and higher demands with no limit in sight. If Massport continues to look at demand as a sacred and independent variable and refuses to turn away traffic, this can only be construed as an admission that Logan will put no limits on the amount of noise it will create. 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. In assessing what Logan has done about noise, this report suggests that there just might be room for improvement. Massport's concessions have been minimal. When the City of Winthrop asked Massport to pay for the soundproofing of their new junior high school, board member Edward J. Maher said that although he was sympathetic to the jet plane noise and other problems of communities near Logan, quote, ‘I see a bottomless pit if we are going to embark on a program involving millions of dollars.’ Another board member, Anthony P. DeFalco, raised the question about the noise in existing schools near Logan where studies have indicated a need for soundproofing. Apparently Massport's board members are afraid to set a precedent for favoring

education lest it become a nasty habit. Massport's solution to the noise problem on many occasions has been the assertion that the victim of the noise is responsible for his own hardship. In other words, the party which inflicts the noise need take no responsibility for it. Houses, such as at Neptune Road are bought up. Homeowners and tenants alike are pressured to move. The consideration of who is intruded on whom is ignored. What can be done? 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 and we present them here. All but 1 have been implemented by other airports or airlines."

And I want to emphasize this point.

"The 4 which involve operating procedure entail little cost and no extra traffic but would result in substantial noise abatement. The first that we would recommend to be considered is the glide slope method. According to a June '71 report for the Boeing Company on the effects of aircraft operations pardon me on community noise, noise reductions in the order of 5-7 effective perceived decibel levels have been shown for a one percent increase in glide slope for a 727-200 airplane. Glide slopes of 3 percent are accepted as standard at most airports today, but on many operations at Logan, pilots regularly fly in at a glide slope of less than 3 percent. According to the 1977 Bolt, Beranek, and Newman study—which we've mentioned earlier—large jets were observed over Point Shirley and Winthrop 6,000 feet horizontally from touchdown at an altitude of 305 feet. This deviation means that their approaches were conducted at 2.8 degrees rather than 3 degrees. That results in substantial increase in noise levels. Jets were also observed over Neptune Road in East Boston at an altitude of 205 feet where a 3 degree glide slope would have required an altitude of 240 feet. This deviation indicates that the landings were executed at a glide path less than 2 and a half degrees. There is ample evidence to the fact that landings which are this flat in nature are unnecessary and quite dangerous when taking into account the tremendous number of people who could be spared jet noise if a higher glide slope was used. Looking at the noise from the standpoint of the community area in square miles, the area under the approach path is subjected to a noise level of 90 EPNDB, which is a measure of noise levels, or higher could be reduced by nearly 70 percent if the glide slope were raised from 2 and a half to 3 and a half degrees. This particular procedure is used regularly at San Diego International Airport. Hundreds of jets per week have landed at a runway at Tempelhof Airport in Berlin for several years using a three and a half degree ILS glide slope. The general acceptance by pilots of a 3 and a half degree ILS glide slope without any need for changes in approach has been indicated by Captain Robert N. Rockwell, Chairman of the Airline Pilots Association Noise Abatement Committee."

Another period is up.

00:45:02,880 --> 00:45:05,720

Edward King: Finish. You might as well. You're pretty near finish, right? Please.

00:45:07,240 --> 00:55:06,400

Michael Kane: [continues to read report into the record]

"Numerous test flights have been conducted by Northwest Airlines and different types of planes used at Logan at glide slopes 1 half degree above the normal ILS slope. These flights have

demonstrated approach noise reductions of 1 to 5 EPND. In summing up the Boeing study says, 'The foregoing discussion has related to small changes in glide slope that we believe could be implemented at relatively low cost at all airports without degrading safety.' Flap management is another method that could be adopted at Logan. The pilot has an option of a flap position selection during approach and landing although 50 degree flaps are customary. The dragging of flaps for many miles over a residential community requires the plane to exert more thrust, and the result is more noise. Such noise is unnecessary. Other sources have suggested a compromise plan: 707s could reduce flaps to 40 degrees and 727s could reduce to 30 degrees. American Airlines, including American Airlines at Logan, adopted a plan of flap management over 2 years ago, but other airlines are slow to change. Logan has made no attempt—to our knowledge—to pressure them. Another procedure which could be adopted that would not endanger passengers, would improve health in the community, and not cost money is the 2 segment approach. Considerable community noise can be abated by exercising the approach in 2 segments instead of the customary 1. What this means is that the initial segment is flown in at a 6 degree angle and at a distance of..."

A certain number of miles. I think it's 3 miles.

"...The angle is changed to 3 degrees or slightly higher. That can result in a substantial reduction in noise."

The Boeing study explains how this particular thing works. I won't go into the documentation that we present.

"The 2 segment was tested using Boeing prototypes at Oakland International Airport in 1968, and the reports were favorable. The conclusions reached were: the 2 segment profiles could be flown in a modified jet transport with the same precision as a conventional instrument approach without a significant reduction in community noise. Another study done more recently by NASA and American Airlines: the 2 segment approach is, again, evaluated favorably. Pacific Southwest Airlines adopted the 2 segment approach over 2 years ago as a regular operating procedure. Another method which has not been operational but which has been tested and proven safe, is called the 'delayed flap and gear extension procedure.' The way this works is that the distance from the threshold at which landing flaps and gear are normally extended affects the amount of noise created. A reduction of this would result, if implemented, in a reduction of 7 decibels within certain geographic areas near the airport. Now, although this particular procedure is not operational, it has been proven safe by extensive tests. We feel that, at a minimum, it could be attempted here on a pilot program. The other methods that we've mentioned are all operational either by airlines or airports in the United States and Europe. I'd like to speak for a moment about the issue of safety. It must be noted that of all the operating procedures that we have mentioned so far not a single one has been declared or implied to be unsafe. More important these practices can only be adopted if they are in fact declared safe by the Federal Aviation Administration. What that means is that the procedures that are operational have been declared safe by the FAA. If the procedure involves aircraft adjustment, the FAA must oversee that adjustment. If the procedure involves a flying maneuver, then FAA pilots must fly with the airline pilots on a number of test flights before the procedure is certified for safety; only then can the procedure be adopted. Our report would not even consider any procedure whose safety could not be verified before being adopted. There is an additional procedure which clearly does not entail safety which would cost Logan a marginal amount of

revenue. This is called the night surcharge. We are not advocating a night curfew; we do believe that a night surcharge is in order to reduce unnecessary night flights and cargo flights at Logan Airport. We should point out that airport noise is most damaging at night when people are asleep by a factor of 17. This is particularly important in evaluating the impact of flights and noise caused by them on community health. An extensive study by Professor Joseph Yance of the Boston University Economics Department was released in April 1973. Night flights are 10 times as bothersome and, to a great extent, unnecessary. Freight rates have been set so that shippers are encouraged to fly cargo at night on all cargo planes rather than take advantage of the belly pit space at the daytime combined carrier aircraft. The all-cargo planes are mostly turbofan and 4-engine jets and hence are noisier. A 1970 Civil Aeronautics Board survey indicated that only 23 percent of the seats on night flights are filled. This contrasts to the normal daytime percentage of 46 percent, or twice as much. A reasonable compromise suggested by Professor Yance is a night surcharge—an example would be \$400 per flight—in order to curtail the amount of nighttime operations from 60 to 20. Precise value of the surcharge required to cut operations by a third would have to be determined, but the practice is feasible. In 1970 the governor's task force on intercity transportation suggested a special night tax on operations. Night curfews and surcharges have been instituted at Washington National Airport and at many other airports around the world, and clearly, safety is not a factor when you're talking about reducing night flights. So in conclusion, we must recommend—in view of the forecast for increased jet operations in the future—that this plan anticipates and acknowledges the health hazards caused by jet noise in the past, that Massport set a noise limit on approaches and takeoffs at Logan Airport. The limit must be set so as not to permit noise at levels incompatible with the present status of land usage—which is to say, the present location—and numbers of residences—homes such as on those at Neptune Road, schools, hospitals, libraries, public buildings, and so forth according to the study that we cited earlier by Bolt, Beranek, and Newman). It is clear that the airlines have a number of options open to them in abating noise. The ones that we have listed are certainly not exclusive; there are others that have been researched and recommended. We are pointing to these because they are clear cases of those that have been shown to be safe and have been proven to be operational, and we're not saying that Massport should implement them.”

What we are saying is that Massport should set a limit on noise and take steps to encourage airlines to come within that limit and let the airlines make the decision perhaps—or you could make some recommendations to them—as to which specific procedures or what group of procedures be used in order to bring about a noise reduction. And we should point out that Massport itself has the option of instituting a night surcharge at any time.

“In the past Logan has implemented or claimed to be implementing a number of noise abatement procedures. These include the specific restrictions on nighttime run ups and even on flight operating procedures. In issuing these, Logan has shown us that it has the power to restrict various airline practices according to its own publications. As the airport provider, Massport must use this power to achieve necessary noise reduction by setting a quantitative limit on noise. All of the flight practices which we have mentioned have been well tested. 3 have been operational for over 2 years. According to the Boeing study, such changes can be made at little cost, would require no particular increase in pilot skill or pilot workload, which is a safety consideration, and are not considered to have any effect on safety.”

Now we present some statistics which contest the claims by Massport that a night flight—or that a night surcharge would result in substantial economic loss to the area. There are figures that Professor Yance, for example, has cited which indicate that another economic multiplier is possible.

“A 1970 study of transportation noise prepared by a consulting firm for the Department of Transportation assigns the responsibility for noise abatement quite clearly. While the federal government—and this is a quote, ‘can regulate noise producing capacity of aircraft and the manner in which such aircraft are flown, responsibility for determining the permissible noise levels for aircraft using an airport remains with the proprietor of the of the airport.’ That means that Massport is in a position, according to the Department of Transportation, to set a quantitative noise limit. Airline safety does not end with provisions for the health of the passengers. The health of the people on the ground must be considered. In its actions Massport remains the quote, ‘catalyst for New England commerce.’ It claims that it has decreased the number of noise complaints, ignoring the real reason why so many residents have given up complaining. Only with public support—public pressure—will Massport pay the social debt incurred by its thriving airport.”

00:55:07,520 --> 00:55:20,160

Edward King: All through? Thank you, Mr. Kane, and may I ask you one question about the report you referred to on page 2 by Bolt, Beranek, and Newman? What year was that report? If you know.

Michael Kane: Let me direct that to-

Audience Member: March 1970.

00:55:20,960 --> 00:56:41,240

Edward King: Right. Well, if it's the same report prepared in 1970 by Bolt-Beranek—basically for the same group, HUD and Department of Transportation—I hope that I’m surprising you when I say that we have found that report to be over 200 percent in error. Now, 200 percent is a large margin of error, and that's one of the reasons why I feel it's unfortunate that before you come out and make press releases—as you apparently did today—and/or speak at a public gathering like this and alarm people, that you did not consult with us. Now, item number 1 that was erroneous in that report, and which, to their credit, the same firm Bolt, Beranek, and Newman corrected in a supplement number 1 to that report, was that they doubled the number of aircraft movements. The mistake occurred at the outset when they took a figure given by the FAA, I understand as the number of flights; they assumed it was either takeoffs or landings and doubled it. Actually it was a total. So you can see how that noise really did affect the contours which you refer to for schools and hospitals, but if you ask them for their supplement number 1, I hope that you'll come back and correct that report and mail it to all of the people that you mail that.

00:56:41,360 --> 00:56:51,240

Michael Kane: Yes, but we have done that. The report that we have today includes the figures that were available to us by Bolt, Beranek, and Newman which updated the initial report that they issued in 1970.

00:56:51,480 --> 00:56:57,160

Edward King: Did they also give you supplement number 2 which further corrected their original, erroneous report?

00:56:57,160 --> 00:57:17,000

Michael Kane: Is that the---

Audience Member: Mr. King we have the right to know this [inaudible] ... the population in the land area within those contours, this takes into account the [inaudible]... The other things is concerning a number of schools and a number of hospitals that are not... [inaudible]

00:57:17,680 --> 00:57:23,720

Edward King: Well, shouldn't you refer it to the supplements? But that's a matter that we can correct later. As long as you knew that the first report was erroneous.

00:57:23,720 --> 00:57:33,520

Michael Kane: We knew that and we incorporated that in our conclusion. Let me point out that the figures are not available. Some of the revised figures were not available to us although we asked for them.

00:57:33,680 --> 00:57:39,280

Edward King: Right.

Michael Kane: We also asked Logan, I believe, for those figures and got no response.

Edward King: Well, who did—

00:57:39,280 --> 00:58:36,040

Michael Kane: And in response to your statement in the newspaper that we did not try to contact you, I simply have to point to the letter which we sent to you—return receipt requested—2 weeks ago which went into the specific operational procedures that we detail in the report asking for information as to why they had not been implemented at Logan. We felt that if you couldn't come up with an adequate staff response in that time—and we had tried to get similar information from Mr. Callaghan, unsuccessfully over the course of the summer in interviews—if you couldn't come up with a specific information, we would hope that you could have at least acknowledged the letter which we did not receive. Now, we notice that you did acknowledge it later in the day after you talked to the *Globe* reporter on Channel 5 I think it was. We would appreciate a response to that because we think that these issues should be debated publicly.

00:58:36,200 --> 00:59:07,000

Edward King: They certainly should, but your letter was received in our offices by me, and there's a date on the return receipt, I presume—I did not know it was return receipt—on Wednesday the 15<sup>th</sup>, and you suggest in your last paragraph a 10-day response which certainly has not yet expired. Now, pardon me. Pardon me. You'll have your opportunity to speak, all right? Are we all listening? To one either one. If you want to finish, it's okay with me. Are you all set?

00:59:07:720 --> 00:59:14,560

Michael Kane: Well we just wanted to say that our receipt says it August the 7<sup>th</sup> was the ...

Edward King: August the 7<sup>th</sup>.

Michael Kane: I think that. Is that correct? Yes.

00:59:15,040 --> 01:00:33,360

Edward King: Well, I know nothing about that, I received it on the 15<sup>th</sup>, the day before our board meeting. I think if I saw the receipt with someone's signature in our office, it would help me. We may have a deficiency there. I'm inclined to doubt it, but there is there are phone calls you could reach—assuming that—because we do answer our mail. But now, I think, in mentioning San Diego because we have people here that are interested in an abatement of noise as I am, shouldn't you mention that that is 1 airline, an intra-state airline that flies only between Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco? Trip in and trip out, not different pilots in different cities. Wouldn't that be really fair to explain that? And also include that this 2-segment approach is not in effect at any other airport than the California airports with this local, state carrier? I think that you might give the impression that there were noise abatement measures, which at no cost to us and a savings to the airlines according to the Airport Operators Council that could be put in effect for some reason despite that save money and abate noise are not being put into effect or even further, being prohibited by Massport. Now, that simply is not logical, and I assure you it's not so.

01:00:35,520 --> 01:00:51,480

Michael Kane: What is not so?

Edward King: That we are preventing any airline from putting in any measure that would abate noise and particularly, at the same time, any airline declining to put this in with FAA approval which saves them money. That simply isn't logical.

01:00:51,480 --> 01:01:11,120

Michael Kane: We didn't say that you were preventing them; we simply pointed to the lack of encouragement or pressure that you have the power to put on the airlines. It's obvious that the airlines aren't particularly enthusiastic about implementing these either with the exception of American which does, in fact, use a flat management techniques at Logan.

01:01:11,120 --> 01:01:38,360

Edward King: Airlines have faced tremendous costs, and they face further tremendous costs with retrofit new aircraft to abate noise. I'm certain that anything they could do with a 2-segment approach without any cost, you say—we're suggesting even a savings in fuel—that they certainly would do that. Doesn't that seem sensible really? Rather than be faced with a 750,000 dollars per airplane in service—and there are 2,200 of them—put that in effect.

01:01:38:920 --> 01:01:45,320

Father Sallèse: Mr. King, excuse me, please. Might I remind you of the rules of procedure adopted by the board of directors?

Edward King: You may.

01:01:45,960 --> 01:02:07,080

Father Sallèse: Paragraph 4.5: "No cross-examination of any person shall be permitted. However, members of the authority may, at their discretion, make comments or ask questions of any person present at the meeting." You are not a member of the authority, Mr. King.

01:02:07,240 --> 01:02:13,400

Edward King: That's correct, Father, but I am presiding, and I'm interpreting that broadly.

Father Sallèse: And I also say you are presiding illegally.

01:02:13,720 --> 00:02:32,640

Edward King: You have already said that, Father, and you have been judged not to be correct. Now, all right, we'll go on with the next gentleman who wishes to speak in the order on which they were received, and that's Jerry Palner of Cabot---

Audience Member: [Inaudible]

01:02:32,720 --> 01:02:42,800

Edward King: Same. Fine. In that instance, we're down to the next speaker: Philip J. Spellman, a familiar name, the Mayor of Chelsea.

01:02:46,640 --> 01:03:00,840

Philip Spellman: Thank you very much, Reverend Father. Mr. King, we're indeed honored tonight by your presence here, and I welcome you to the city of Chelsea, and I want to assure you your car hasn't been towed from out in front of this place.

Edward King: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, that's a relief.

01:03:00,840 --> 01:04:42,080

Philip Spellman: I want to thank you first Ed—and Mr. Callaghan—for the installation of these standing water pipes on the bridge that we needed so many years—since 1955—and putting out the fires on the bridge. And as I stand here I'm utterly amazed at the fact that not one single plane has passed over this school since this hearing started an hour ago. So I think we have all found a solution: we'll have a hearing here every night, and there'll be no noise. As you probably know—and Marsha Peters is going to talk on it, I know—we were recently refused—we had a proposal in the Chelsea Association to Save Homes because of the existing noise level factors. I spoke with Mr. Callaghan today and I seek tonight permission to give me any information you might have available at your level—recent information—on noise level tests that were taken in this area. We have enlisted the aid of Senator Brooks, and we're going to meet with Mr. Richardson over in HUD, and we hope that, with the recent information, we might get a review on this Chelsea Association to Save Homes proposal. And the other information I'd like to bring forward at this time tonight: several weeks back I sent you a request in reference to defraying the installation cost of public alarm systems in our firehouses in the

area. Because of the increased noise generated from the airplanes that the firemen, at nighttime particularly, cannot hear the alarm system, so we we're in the process now of installing new alarms in all the firehouses, particularly the ones in this area. So the bill comes to around \$4,000, Ed, and any help that the Massport can give the poor city of Chelsea we'd greatly appreciate. Thank you very much.

01:04:42,080 --> 01:05:46,280

Edward King: Thank you, Mayor. Right. And Tom will contact you tomorrow or the first of the week. I rush to announce that the letter referred to was received on August 7<sup>th</sup>, as stated by Mr. Kane, by a young lady who does perform at our reception desk, so the fact that I received it on the 15<sup>th</sup> is our burden and something which—you know—we just did not respond to within the request. And certainly if I understood that we wouldn't be responding for 15 days or within the requested time, we would have written and/or responded, but we will get to—probably by Monday or Tuesday at the latest—a point-by-point response, but it was received, as Mr. Kane stated, on August 7<sup>th</sup> in our offices. Now, I believe that we have a repeat speaker. Is the only card and/or question that I have. It's Helen Zuko, Chelsea Pollution Control Committee. Is Ms. Zuko here?

01:05:49,880 --> 01:11:17,040

Helen Zuko: Thank you. I hate to disappoint you, Mr. King, but I won't be repeating what I said last night. You know, I can do better than that. I hadn't planned on speaking on LANAC this evening, but one of the major points I'd like to bring out: when the young lady—the first speaker who spoke this evening—she brought out a very interesting point. She's a young person, and when she said that the aircraft come over her home, and it wakes her up at night, and also it interferes with the T.V., I noticed up on the stage that many of you had a grin on your face. This irritated me. My son went to a LANAC meeting a couple of weeks ago, and he was in enticed to give a similar testimony, and he was 4 years old. And the aircraft are waking him up, and we're having a problem in this community which we'll all accept. However, the young lady who was speaking told you that she had leukemia or muscular dystrophy, I'm wondering, Mr. King, if you would have grinned and put a smile on your face. She was telling you about a problem that existed in her life which is an existing health problem, and it doesn't give anyone any reason to smile. You know, it was very—it took quite an effort for her to get up here, and I'm sure that if she was telling you something about a terminal problem—which noise pollution is a great problem to the people that surround the airport. So therefore, you know, I resented the fact that many of you that were sitting up there did have a grin on your face. I also regret the fact and resent the fact that I'm here this evening. I don't think that you people at Massport take these public hearings very seriously. I don't feel that you take what the community residents say to heart or even into consideration, and you may have, in the back of your mind, his response is, "You know, what are you doing here?" Well if I didn't come here tonight, Mr. King, you would have the attitude that nobody really cared about instrumenting landing guidance system here over the Chelsea area. Just as in LANAC, one of the favorite positions is that there are less noise complaints in the community surrounding the Logan Airport; however, that is an irritation also. Because I feel that the people that live in the community surrounding the airport are sick and tired of complaining about the noise. It's an obvious factor, and it's

about time that the Port Authority starts considering the problems of the people who live around the airport and just settle down now and put aside the airport expansion for now and start doing things like soundproofing our schools, really, seriously think about a partial nighttime curfew. Also, you know, this instrumentation that you want to propose—this ILS, the category 2 that's going to be coming—it will affect the Chelsea area. We would prefer you putting this over the runways not affecting the residential areas, you know? To like 4-Right or wherever you want to put it, but don't put it affecting Chelsea. In addition, I would like the record to know that we fully support the recommendations of Joseph Yance—the study on the partial nighttime curfew. Now, we're really being generous; we're recommending that. We support the partial nighttime curfew, you know? That is not an unreasonable request for you to seriously think about something like that. I won't rehash about—as I spoke last night about—the landing fees; I'm not going to rehash that. Although the only thing that I would like to say is that I feel that it would enhance the economical conditions of the state if the airlines were—I'm losing myself—if the airlines were forced to phase out the older type aircraft, you know? Then perhaps we could give more jobs to the people to build better aircrafts and the retrofit and what have you. So, also the alternative to expansion would be high speed rail. So, you know, please. It's about time that you start considering the problems of the communities and listening to the people. When young people that—I'm sure that she isn't more than 8 years old, my son 4 and a half—have to come and tell you that it's really affecting their lives, you know, something has to be done. Thank you. In addition to that—sorry! —I have a petition which I'll run off and get to you at your office of 524 people who do not want airport expansion, and the petition says, “We protest the plans of the Mass Port Authority to expand Logan Airport either through runways or through the use of new equipment such as category 2. Chelsea is already bombarded by Logan jet noise. Instead of more runways, Massport should soundproof our schools and hospitals and use over-water flight paths and put a nighttime jet curfew at Logan so that we can at least sleep at night.” I'll get this to you. Would you want me to send it to your attention or to Mr. Callaghan?

01:11:17,240 --> 01:11:19,440

Edward King: Thank you. Send it to me if you wish. It's easier. Okay, thank you.

Helen Zuko: Ok, fine. Thank you.

01:11:19,440 --> 01:12:46,040

Edward King: Thank you very much. Now, do we have any other person here interested in speaking or asking a question? Either orally or in writing? In that case, we thank you very much for coming. We hope you understand that we're here, really, to hear what you have to say. We concede that we're not going to be able to do everything—or possibly anything—on what you say. We don't conclude that we won't be able to do anything. Nevertheless, please understand that while there's considerable enjoyment in air travel, considerable necessity economically for business in cargo and also for passengers, that nevertheless it does bring noise. We recognize that; it's an unpleasant phase of the operation. We're as interested and dedicated and concerned about noise as you are, and I want to assure you that despite whatever differences we may have that are established and some tonight with this new group that are unexplored, that we are and will do anything and everything we can. We don't have economic or financial problems—thank goodness—at this time within Massport, to see that the maximum amount of

noise abatement or the least noise possible comes over this and every other area. Our hearing is adjourned and thank you.