

Record Group TC6/Series 1995

Massachusetts Port Authority Public Hearing Files, 1970-1986

Draft master plan hearing in South Boston, August 24, 1973, Tape 1

00:00:02,159 --> 00:01:56,320

Edward King: It is at least 7:30 and we're prepared to start. If you will—and we hope you prefer—please come a little bit forward, the closer the better, and sit down, relax, and participate. Would you like to start tonight, Father to change it a little? No? Well, guess I'll start. In the interest of uniformity, I have a statement that's been read—

Father Sallese: Mr. King.

Edward King: Yes, Father.

Father Sallese: Thank you.

Edward King: Thank you, Father.

Father Sallese: For the record, Mr. King—I want the record to show that I am in opposition to the way this meeting is being conducted this evening. By the minutes of July 19, the Public Affairs Committee called these meetings—these hearings rather—to be considered Mass Port board meetings. The board, last week, adopted rules of procedure for this evening's hearing. The board was lax in appointing a delegate to preside this evening. For the last four evenings you have denied me that right as a board member, and I have challenged your right to preside. For the people from Southie will know a friend from Eastie opposes your presiding tonight.

00:01:58,240 --> 00:05:28,080

Edward King: Thank you very much, Father. Now we will commence once again. The purpose of this hearing—and you'll pardon me for reading because this is for uniformity, I would rather speak to you as we will later, but I must read this—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 one of five public hearings held in different communities on weekday evenings for the convenience of the local citizens. Preliminary public hearings were held last spring in the same communities to provide inputs for the study. Upon completion of the public hearings, a subcommittee of the board will consider the 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 hearing. Every person who wishes to testify will be permitted to do so. If you wish to testify and have filled out one of the cards available in the back of the room indicating that you wish to speak, you will be called upon in your turn. If you have not yet done so—that is fill out a card—please raise your hand when you're ready to speak and a card will be brought to you and collected. If you have any questions for the Authority you should also write them on the card. Should a question occur to you during the course of the hearing, even though you have already filled out a card, simply raise your hand and another card will be provided on which you may put your questions. 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 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, 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 this same subject at any previous public meeting held this week will not be recognized until all others have been heard. Now I am going to present to you Mr. Richard E. Mooney, our director of aviation. Mr. Mooney will outline the recent history, at least, of the master planning for Logan International Airport. He will indicate where we were a year or more ago, but more particularly, where we are this evening and the particular plan on which your comments, suggestions, criticisms, or whatever may be made. Mr. Richard E. Mooney.

00:05:25,680 --> 00:13:53,519

Richard Mooney: I think some of you may recall that we were here in early May of this year at which time we discussed with you a preliminary master plan review document. At that time we discussed various proposed improvements to be incorporated in a revised airport master plan for Logan International Airport. We have since considered these recommendations, and we have held numerous other discussions with various public officials and appropriate planning and political leaders within various communities. We, from this, developed what has been distributed, was completed, and made available on the 19th of July: a master plan report and draft form. This report has been made available to all those desiring it and is the subject of tonight's discussion. As Mr. King pointed out, the results of the discussions that we are holding—this is the last of a series of five—will be considered in the preparation of a revised report to be submitted to the board, and then ultimately to the public again at one full public hearing. And then, following this, there will be action by the board to approve the document as the master plan report, and it will incorporate the master plan itself. Now the Port Authority has had a master plan over a period of years. The currently approved master plan was completed by the Authority in late 1969—approved at that time by the Authority and then ultimately approved by the board in early 19— I'm sorry by the FAA—early in 1970. Pardon me. This document, or the plan, I'd like to, if you will, just show very briefly on the screen. We've indicated various pertinent or particularly prominent items by coloring them. The principal proposed areas for filling are depicted in green, the existing runways are shown in brown, and the proposed improvements on that plan for the landing area are shown in orange. Now if you would please go to the next slide. I'd like to show the areas principal modifications that were made by the board on March 1 based upon recommendation by the staff. The principal changes are shown in red; if you'll notice that these constituted primarily the deletion of the parallel runway 1533, the extension of runway 27 extension, and the deletion of a parallel runway 927. Also it was decided to eliminate the fill area between Bird Island Flats and the Jeffries Point area. Additions at that time were the slight extension of runway 9, as shown on the plan, and a longer general aviation STOL runway approximately parallel to the 1533 runway. I'd like to go on to the third slide, please. This plan illustrates the present proposal by the Port Authority staff.

You'll notice that there have been included on this only the basic improvements that remain following the March 1 deletions; I think that the items of particular interest to you are those in the landing area. The principal improvements are the extension of runway 9, the extension of runway 4-Left, and construction of a short general aviation STOL run way approximately parallel to 1533. The first improvement that I would like to mention or to explain in a little more detail is the extension of runway 9; the purpose of this extension is to permit the takeoff of aircraft starting to takeoff roll at a point more distant from Point Shirley in Winthrop. This improvement will permit aircraft to be higher and thus less noisy to the Winthrop community. It will also provide an added safety margin and will permit obviously somewhat larger aircraft to takeoff on this runway; I'd like to point out in particular the threshold for landing on this runway will remain at its present location. Next is the extension of 4-Left; this is being extended for increased safety of aircraft taking off on runway 22-Right; threshold also, in this instance, will remain in its present location. The proposed parallel general aviation STOL runway is built for the purpose of providing some additional capacity that will be lost primarily from the extensions of the two runways plus a small increment of added capacity, but it will be, or provide, a very significant safety improvement by separation of small from the large aircraft taking off and landing on the longer parallel 1533. Now on this plan we have also shown the South Terminal as existing and the new International Terminal as existing. We've done this because the last time that we were here there was some criticism of the fact that we'd already committed ourselves to that, and we're still showing it as proposed. So, we have indicated projects that are either under construction or contractually committed as being completed. The other improvements, somewhat limited, are those in the Bird Island Flats area and additional support facilities in the hangar area and the potential for added parking capacity, if it is required. Now this, I think, as you can see is a fairly minimal plan. We do think that it has a potential for meeting the air transportation needs of the Boston metropolitan area in the best possible way with the least community impact. As a matter of fact, we feel that these—and primarily the landing area—improvements are environmentally an improvement also for the neighbors surrounding the airport, but this will now be open to questions, and I'll turn the floor back to Mr. King.

00:13:54,240 --> 00:14:21,059

Edward King: Yes, thank you, Mr. Mooney. One other announcement I'd like to make is Mr. Thomas P Callaghan, our director of public affairs, who should be sitting up here, will be with us tonight and more than willing to participate. Our first speaker, arriving first and recording himself, Representative Ray Flynn from South Boston. Representative Flynn, please.

00:14:21,600 --> 00:18:46,960

Ray Flynn: Thank you, Mr. King. Mr. King, I'm not quite sure what the purpose of this hearing is. It's my understanding that the members of the Port Authority will ultimately make the deciding vote, is that correct?

Edward King: That is correct, as in all Authority matters, yes.

Ray Flynn: Are they here tonight, sir?

Edward King: Well one member is, but they rely on the staff. The members meet, generally speaking, now once a month—subcommittee assignments maybe once a month—but they're non-paid, and they depend on a paid staff.

Ray Flynn: So, and all due respect to everybody here, what we're really talking to is employees of the Massport Authority, is that correct?

Edward King: Well, not really because there are some things that might not be on there that, if we were to resolve it, would already be resolved. We're going through this process because the members indicated that that would be a thing that they would want before they would approve what we're suggesting.

Ray Flynn: Mr. King, what I would like to do—and I'm sure that Senator Bulger, who's also here—is, I feel, is submit a statement to the members of the Mass Port Authority who are going to ultimately make the deciding vote on this proposal that you people have for expansion of Logan Airport instead of wasting everybody's time here as far as making it a matter of record. I think where I have the opportunity to make that testimony before the Mass Port Authority board, I would like to give the people here an opportunity to be heard on this as they don't have access to the prepared statements; however, I—just for the record—in the absence of a prepared report, I would like to say that, once again, I think the people of South Boston, the area that I represent—and I'm so glad that there's a small crowd here in one respect because I can make a statement here without the fear of appealing on the emotions, which is often where the political figures in South Boston are often associated with. What I would like to say is that I think, once again, people of South Boston, whether it's City Hall or whether it's in the state legislature or whether it's by an agency of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, again is getting the getting shortchanged as far as recognition as far as having a say in in the affairs of government. I think that the tragedies all around us indicate this, and I think that it's terribly unfortunate and I've got a feeling that it's really going to come to a conclusion sometime in the very near future. And those people that are in positions of authority now are going to find out that the people of South Boston, perhaps, have sat down and let many of these problems go by without expressing strong opposition, but I will guarantee the members of the Port Authority—and this comes as no idle threat—that we are going to strongly oppose this, do everything we possibly can. I understand that the main argument here tonight is the safety factor. We personally don't have access to the staff that you people do as far as engineers and safety experts and so forth, but I think we certainly have some understanding of the airport and the effect that it's having on South Boston, particularly the environmental impact, the noise situation, the safety problem. I think that we certainly do understand that. Perhaps we lack the expertise as far as jargon is concerned, but one thing we certainly have to recognize and one thing that the people here have to recognize on the Mass Port Authority is that we live here and we understand what's happening. We're not satisfied with the Mass Port Authority, and we're not satisfied with governmental agencies in this state, and we feel that we're being shortchanged and deprived and we're being totally unrepresented and, Mr. King, I will conclude because there are people here that wish to testify, and I personally will submit a statement to each of the members of the Mass Port Authority strenuously objecting to this extension plan by the Mass Port Authority. Thank you.

00:18:45,520 --> 00:19:18,640

Edward King: Thank you. The only thing I would say is that our talents—to the limit of our ability—will be available to you or any of your constituents anytime you want.

Ray Flynn: I just, in conclusion, I just don't feel that it's totally imperative that I make a speech before the Mass Port Authority employees. I would rather make that before the Mass Port Authority board, and I'm just sorry that they're not here tonight. Thank you.

Edward King: Thank you very much. Senator William Bulger, please.

00:19:19,440 --> 00:31:48,640

William Bulger: Thank you. That Flynn's so tall, you know? Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to testify this evening on the draft master plan study for Logan Airport. This particular draft is a quantitative improvement over previous versions; however, the overall quality continues to remain unacceptable. What we have been given by Massport is a rehash of self-fulfilling data and perfunctory references to alternative solutions. I am compelled to, again, state that the fault of course does not lie solely with Massport; the problem is an institutional one. Massport is a single-purpose, self-interested entity which is being asked to pass upon alternative courses of action which it perceives not to be in its long-term best interest. These alternatives—such as high-speed rail to New York—run counter to Massport's basic instincts and run counter to Massport's obsession with expanding, at all costs, air travel in the Northeast Corridor. It is, in fact, much like asking General Motors to argue for a policy shift away from reliance upon the automobile towards a mass transit policy. One might say that its heart simply could not be in it. One might also say that Massport's institutional heart cannot be in anything but the growth of Logan and the continued reliance upon air travel. This is an institutional reality. With that established, it is obvious why the state needs to develop its own master plan for regional transportation growth and alternatives. This is what Secretary Altshuler has correctly perceived as necessary, and although I cannot agree with several of his decisions, I am convinced that the days of Massport setting transportation policy for this region are quickly drawing to a close, yet we continue with this charade. Hearings are held because they are required, and officials and the public appear to express their continued opposition. The one lesson to be learned is that the interests of Massport have been served up by its energetic executive director with programs that are at odds with sound transportation planning, and the executive director does so with an uncanny regularity. I want to briefly list several specific points of criticism of this master plan. First—and this is an important part of my criticism, and I would ask that the members of Massport heed the following—the section in which the master plan purports to analyze the limitation on nighttime flights is, as one might, expect self-serving, inaccurate, and incomplete. Its findings fly in the face of the conclusions made in an expert and an exhaustive study recently completed by Boston University economist Joseph Yance. The Yance report assesses the economic damage caused by the cruel and abusive noises from Logan activities, and it states—and I'm going to quote Mr. Yance's report with some detail quote, “The major shortcomings of Massport's evaluation of the effects of a curfew is the omission of a discussion of benefits. Direct dollar estimates of the cost people place on noise are impossible to obtain, but economic reasoning suggests that the disbenefit of noise will be reflected in rent levels and property values. Preliminary results of a research study indicate that rent charges from 1960 to 1970 in census areas in the Boston region show a statistically significant effect of aircraft noise. Rent levels increased an average of 66 percent in the Boston area over the decade, but where there is airport noise impact, rent increases were retarded by as much as twenty percent near the airport. Results of the statistical analysis lead to an estimated airport

noise cost of 11.1 million dollars a year. The benefit of nighttime restrictions is that these noise costs would be reduced by 3.8 million dollars per year with a curfew, or by at least 1.8 million dollars per year with a policy limiting flights to 20 jet operations a night." The very credible conclusion now of the Yance report is the following, and I believe it's extremely important that Massport hear it. Somehow Massport has never listened, and no one has ever successfully rebutted the Yance report. "We therefore proposed what we feel is a compromised solution, a policy which would result in a reduction of night flights per night. The figure is, to a degree, arbitrary—as is inevitable—however, it seems, on examining the data relating to nighttime air services, that there is room for considerable reduction in passenger flights and unscheduled jet flights which account for most of the night time operations and even for some reduction in all in all cargo flights. It is proposed that this reduction in night flights be brought about through a surcharge, a surcharge placed on the airlines by Massport. The main advantage of a pricing policy over non-price methods of limiting flights is that it offers the possibility of bringing about a reduction and nighttime flights at the least cost to the airlines and their customers. The least cost reduction in flights is virtually impossible to bring about in any other way due to the difficulties of formulating regulations or making administrative decisions about the value of flights." And that is the end of the quote of Professor Yance. I, therefore, strongly urge that Massport implement within 30 days a surcharge system whereby nighttime flights will be reduced from the present 60 to 20 per night. I also recommend that the master plan section dealing with nighttime limitations of flights be corrected by including the Yance report data. It is a reasonable and responsible request of Massport to begin a nighttime flight limitation during the summer months and to evaluate it for a year round extension. I understand that such a summertime nighttime limitation is the policy at one airport just outside of the city of London. Perhaps—although I would be the last to admit it—the English are a bit more civilized in this regard. My second criticism of this master plan—

Audience: [Applause]

William Bulger: My second criticism of this master plan lies in Massport's awkward attempt to downplay the potential for high-speed ground transportation to New York. It is not enough to dismiss as too late and too little the development of such high-speed rail service. The Massport plan takes us on a statistical odyssey to prove its conclusion that rail service will not prove a viable alternative. I do not accept that conclusion, nor does the Boston Transportation Planning Review in its May 1972 report on the subject. We do not need Massport standing on the sidelines cynically dismissing the one and only viable alternative to the creeping chaos that is marking the transportation generally in the Northeast Corridor. What is needed is Massport's support and Massport's resources in promoting rail travel between Boston and New York—and within this general region. I challenge Massport to enter into the passenger rail business and put its public relations machinery and its energetic executive director to work promoting rail service to New York. I also recommend that the board direct its exclusive—rather its executive director to explore with the New York Port Authority the potential for joint participation in corridor rail service. If additional legislation is necessary to enable Massport to function in this area, I would personally be anxious to late file such a bill. Massport can and must contribute to the expanded implementation of this technology. If Massport is the corporate and well-managed entity that it purports to be, then I would expect it to be able to read the trends in this area and to move to hedge against future developments in high-speed rail service. My third

criticism of this master plan is based upon my unalterable opposition to the construction of a third harbor tunnel to service Logan. To accept such a proposal would give credence to the absurd notion that the way to promote better alternatives to wasteful and increasingly inefficient air service is to expand Logan Airport. My fourth specific criticism is that the master plan too easily rejects a second airport alternative. It fails to acknowledge the fine work of the Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission which has done the most credible study in this area to date. The aeronautics commission report acknowledges both the feasibility and the desirability of a second airport based on the public interest and the need to prevent the negative impact of increased ground access to Logan. All four of my specific points of criticism raise questions about the mentality which surrounds this master plan. This Massport catch-22 mentality tells us that the way to diminish the negative impact of Logan is to expand it. I am, therefore, firmly opposed to the extension of runways.

Timekeeper: [rings bell]

William Bulger: You know, I'm not going to stop so... I am, therefore—

Audience: [applause]

William Bulger: [laughs] ...therefore, firmly opposed to the extensions of runways 4-L and 9 which will have the irresistible potential to increase the number of flights and to lower aircraft glide paths over South Boston and other communities. I am opposed to the STOL runway and recommend that, if it is to be considered, that it be moved to a second regional airport preferably Bedford, and we had discussion about that the last time we were here in May. I deeply regret that I find myself continually opposed to Massport activities and plans; I regret it because this Authority has the potential to truly serve the interests of this commonwealth more fully and more broadly. Massport, with innovative leadership and imagination, could contribute a great deal to solving this region's transportation problems. I am aware that Massport is negotiating over rail freight service, and I applaud such an undertaking, but I ask that more be done directly in the passenger rail service area. Massport needs new vision for the 1970s; it needs a broader perspective. I am impressed with the integrity and the professionalism of the new board chairman, James Fay, and with several others of the enlightened board members including our good friend from East Boston, Father Sallese. I believe that there is some hope for reversing the trends which have made the continued state of antagonism between the community and Massport unavoidable. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to conclude by mentioning that the special Legislative Commission on Marine Boundaries and Resources shall, over the next several months, resume hearings on the offshore tanker terminal proposal and related plans.

Edward King: I'll be there if you call, Senator.

William Bulger: We'll be pleased to have you.

00:31:47,360 --> 00:32:43,519

Edward King: All right. I would like to make a comment or two—I think three in total. One: the Yance report which you cite is a very new document; we perhaps received it about three weeks ago. We will, in a reasonable time, respond to that. We do not, of course, agree with many of the statements and particularly the conclusions, and as I mentioned, we simply haven't had the time. I believe the gentleman was well over a year in preparing it and to have some time to respond to it with the activity we've had is reasonable, but in there he does mention a job loss.

He differs with a figure that we had of 400 to 500—and I believe he puts it at 250 to 350—and that certainly is direct job loss with the ones that would be attached to it something of serious concern to us at the Port Authority. I'm sure you share that same concern.

00:32:40,880 --> 00:35:42,880

William Bulger: I certainly do. I'd like to address myself to that. Can I just say about the job? Could I inquire how many Dr. Yance, Professor Yance spoke of night flights and I—as is every person in this hall—I'm very concerned about jobs. We need jobs, and we're concerned about people's livelihoods. On the other hand, if we're talking about transporting 400 people—or whatever it is—a night out of Logan and the jobs that are attendant there—I don't know how many people go out of Logan—and between the curfew hours of 11 p.m. to 7 a.m.

Edward King: Well—

William Bulger: Several hundred is at most, isn't that about?

Edward King: No, I don't agree with that.

William Bulger: You don't agree?

Edward King: I am willing to say that I don't know, but I say this: that those passengers, together with the cargo—

William Bulger: Could we have an estimate of the passengers?

Edward King: No, I'd rather not, but I can get a very precise figure...

William Bulger: You'd rather not? But I'm not incorrect, am I Mr. King, when I say there probably are not more than 500 in a night?

Edward King: I would think you are incorrect.

William Bulger: I'm not very far off. I'm very close. Whatever it is, balancing that against 100 or 200,000 people who are awakened during those 11 to 7 a.m. hours, leaves no alternative but to say nighttime passenger flights should go. They're unnecessary. The people who have to: they can go the night before.

Audience: [Applause]

William Bulger: The passenger flights are unnecessary, anyway, between 11 p.m. and 7 a.m. And also, when you get on the subject of cargo: why shouldn't there be some sort of a premium paid? The airlines then are going to become more efficient. They're going to get their transport their planes off the ground during the day if it's going to cost more at night, and the hellish—I'm just pleading right now for some kind of relief for people during those hours: 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. It really would be a great step. And also, I restricted the—if you noticed—the recommendation to the summer months when it's most desperately needed, and hopefully we could expand on it thereafter, but these are very reasonable things. At some time Massport has to subordinate its interest in expanding its operation to the interests of the surrounding community. That's the substance of what I'm trying to say here.

00:35:41,040 --> 00:38:48,240

Edward King: I well understand what you're saying; it's not a simple matter, though, as I'm sure you realize. There is no such thing, really, as a passenger flight from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. It's really passenger and cargo—

William Bulger: Right.

Edward King: —and the resulting repair and overhaul works; it's a concern. That's where the jobs comes in. It's not solely the amount of passengers. It's not easy to decide; that's what we have weighed. Each time we've weighed we've decided, I think, on an Authority level not to have a curfew or a modified curfew, at least to date. But that's the weight of the Authority. Now on rail, in addition to the B&M—which you know about—we have recently completed a high-speed monorail study from supposedly Hartford, Connecticut to Springfield, Worcester, Framingham into Boston and/or the airport.

William Bulger: You were required to.

Edward King: No, we were not required to. It was a legislative suggestion which we responded to. We were asked: would we have any interest in doing it? And we agreed that, not being able to have it done the way the bill had been pushed prior, that we would do it. We were not required to, though. But we did it.

William Bulger: If you would ask me to help to expand the enabling legislation so as to put you and your tremendous energy behind rail service, I'd file the bill.

Edward King: If you feel that it's a need for your constituents, I wouldn't believe you should have to ask me, Senator. Really. You filed those before without consulting me.

William Bulger: You know full well, Mr. King, that in order for the bill to pass—a bill relating to Massport—I need Massport. I need your help. You know that.

Audience: [Applause]

William Bulger: And you know why that's so. You know that we who oppose Massport at a turn from East Boston or Winthrop or South Boston are misunderstood by other legislators who feel that we, somehow, would impede economic progress in New England, and we seek to make a stagecoach stop out of Logan International Airport. That is the stereotype kind of view that's taken of us when we oppose you, so that we need your enthusiastic support.

Edward King: I would conclude only, Senator, by saying that while it's a very fine posture for you —both as a humble person and as a political leader—that you need our help. I certainly would think that the majority whip—is it?—in the Senate would not be looking for help from such a scorned obstacle as Massport for any assistance in legislative matters. I didn't realize that.

William Bulger: I don't want to get off on a tangent, but Mr. King, I have the highest regard for your lobbying abilities.

Edward King: I don't even lobby, Senator. Thank you. Thank you particularly, Senator, for your compliments tonight. You've been very kind.

William Bulger: You'll find your job in lobbying.

00:38:46,000 --> 00:46:01,839

Edward King: Thank you, Senator.

William Bulger: I know that Mrs. Willy is on her way to New Hampshire and she's asked that you kind of consider that, Mrs. —

Edward King: Well, ordinarily I make no exceptions, but—

Jean Willy: I was here before a whole bunch of other people, I'm sure—if you're taking them in order—I was right beside the senator when he filled out his card and mine should be next.

Edward King: Well I was just going to say, but since you were next in order we would.

Jean Willy: Okay, because I was getting ready to fight you before we even started talking. I got a few notes here that I really had to scribble down, but I've done some thinking about. I'm very

disappointed that the Massport board is not here. I, too, I'm getting very tired of talking the same old people with the same old rhetoric and the same old jargon. I don't understand any of it. But I would like to make a couple of statements on the—well I'll just start with what I got down here. First of all, I'm angry about the notices, or the lack of notices. If it weren't for the South Boston Residents Group—of which I am president—having a notice in this week's tribune, I don't think there'd be 15 people in this hall. You are required by law to let us know. You let us know you canceled the 25th; a lot of people assumed that the 24th was also cancelled. So I'm angry at you for that, too. I suppose you're hoping we just go away, though, but we're here. Furthermore, my dealings with you Massport people started about three years ago—just about three years ago. I first met Mr. King himself and some of the representatives on December 14, 1970 when they were the invited guests of the South Boston Residence Group meeting. At that time we were told, in no uncertain terms, that the FAA were responsible for flight patterns. Incidentally, I live under one of them: 9, runway 9. And that we had to take our grudge up with the FAA. Everybody, at that time, believed that, as I did, I presume, that the Massport representatives were intelligent, shrewd, honest, businessmen. I since have found out that they are insensitive and ruthless and not always telling the truth. I called the FAA a week ago Monday when I was going right out of my mind with planes, and I said, "Can't you change the flight patterns a little bit over South Boston?" And the man said we're not responsible for flight patterns over South Boston; Massport does that themselves. We sit as an advisory capacity. Now somebody is being very careless with the truth; either the FAA is lying or Massport is lying because somebody has to set up the flight patterns. There's one lie. In July last year several people on my executive board began to have doubts that all the complaints were being reported honestly on the Noise Abatement Committee, so a few of us kept a record of the amount of calls that we made to 567-3333. We came up—a group of us—with over 100, and we heard that South Boston had 3 complaints the same month that we had documented over 100. So there again, we thought, there was some hanky-panky going on. Now here on Farragut Road, which is rapidly becoming the Neptune Road of East Boston—

Audience: [Applause]

Jean Willy: —and I don't live there, I live a long way away from it, but I—really, my heart goes out with those people. But we have documented on that gizmo, that machine that I cannot pronounce the name of, 125 decibels of noise. It has registered 125 when everybody knows 120 is beyond human endurance, and this 125 has gone on consistently day after day with this little machine. Now I understand—I saw on television last night and I know you were irritated, but I'm going to bring it up anyway—on the noise study that the Massachusetts Logan Airport has not instituted any of the noise lessening devices. And I saw Mr. King immediately afterwards saying no other airport has. Naturally! No other airport sits on top of the communities like Logan Airport, so they don't have to! I think that Massport should be looking into these noise lessening devices. I don't care how much money it costs—you've got plenty anyway.

Audience: [Applause]

Jean Willy: Now there's one more thing—oh yeah: we have a legacy from some of the Massport directors as John Locke and Thompson. We have Barry's bumper on our beach. Mr. Thompson's wife was involved with that, and we, every time we look at that bumper there, we do think of Massport. There is a connection, and it's not your fault now because he's gone, but he was your buddy.

Edward King: It's probably not in the master plan, though.

Jean Willy: I wouldn't be surprised. Maybe if we build it higher you keep the planes out of us. Now the feeling you never have that runways, the ones that come to right to Southie—I don't understand all the technology stuff—but I do think that instead of coming into South Boston, and gradually filling in right up—here they go fellas—gradually filling all the way right into Castle Island, which I believe is an ultimate master plan in somebody's head. I may not live to see it, Mr. King—maybe you won't—but some brain child has, right now, what's going on that Logan Airport will run right into South Boston's Castle Island. You've already got Wiggins Terminal, you're going to soon have Marine Road if you keep it up, and then all you have to do is stick with the MDC for Marine Park and you get a big landing strip. Now I may not live to see it, but I'm afraid that's going to happen. Why can't you fill in the other end of the harbor where you want to put in your tanks and your oil things and all that stuff? This is a question that I want you to answer, if you will, but not now. I'm not through. And when I get through, if you'd make some kind of comment on it. And then last, I have one statement to make about the crash. I have heard you say, because we have met at lots of meetings, that 4-R was the sophisticated runway. This was the one that has electronic gear. 4-R is where the awful crash was. What the heck are the rest of them look like if that's a sophisticated one; I'm scared of death of what the rest of them might be. Now one more thing on this 4-R and that Delta Airline: if that had had a mechanical failure shortly before it did whatever it did, there wouldn't have been 88 there would have been 1,088 because it was right over the residential area of South Boston. Now I have always been very polite and very nice to you, but I took off the white gloves tonight because I've had it up to here with Massport. Thank you.

00:45:50,640 --> 00:48:07,680

Edward King: Thank you. I would like to mention, in line with one of the things you said—although we disagree with many more, of course—that others have mentioned the fact that they feel they have been told by the FAA, as a for instance, that the FAA is not responsible for flight patterns, and they also say they have been told by Massport that we or they, Massport, are not responsible, but it's FAA and vice versa. To me that would be a very serious matter, something that would bother me. I don't think, and I would wish you would reserve your judgment, on suggesting that the ultimate answer has to be that one of the parties is lying because I'm quite positive that's not so. But having heard this at other meetings, you know, this week and even prior, what we are doing is arranging a meeting with the FAA there and the pilot representatives there and the Mass Port and the CAB—not particularly for this matter but for other things that other people have mentioned—so that those interested, and I certainly hope you will come—you'll have at least a week or two notice—we will have them all there and then the questions can be asked. We'll be certain that the question that answered is yours, and I think once and for all, at least for you and for those there. And hopefully you'll come back and tell everybody in your club or group what the answer really is, but until then, I really suggest that to say one is lying is not fair, and I hope you would reserve your final judgment until we have the opportunity to do that for you and for others. Okay? Now we go on to Virginia Sheehy. Please. Fine. You will let us know if you want to or do you want me to call you? Okay, Paul White. Representative Paul White?

Unnamed Representative: I'll go, I'll go.

Edward King: You look a bit, a little bit younger than Representative White.

00:48:05,040 --> 00:50:06,960

Unnamed Representative: Thanks a lot. That's not going to help you over here, Ed.

Audience: [Applause] [laughter]

Edward King: I try hard.

Unnamed Representative: You know, there's a story in the paper a couple of weeks ago in Helbank's column which resulted in a phone call from myself to you—as you recall—at which time it said that myself and several of the legislators were sitting down with you at dinner. At which time we were discussing your candidacy for governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Well, again, you and I and everybody else at that meeting denied such a meeting took place, but had there been any truth in it, it would probably be that I was trying to get you away from the airport, so that we can get some peace over here in South Boston.

Edward King: Thank you, Representative.

Unnamed Representative: Anything that I could say would be superfluous as to what Senator Bulger has already said and the speakers before me, and it's a hot night, and I'm not going to go into a long detailed statement. But what I would like to do is highlight two issues that Senator Bulger has brought out, one of which is one that you're familiar with because I filed a legislation for three years in a row and that is to put a surcharge on the night flights coming into Logan. Each of which, the three years, needless to say it was defeated in the legislature. And again, the second reason, is that we are in fact a minority in the legislature. The people from the western part of the state, from Cape Cod, and from the Berkshires have no idea as to what we here in South Boston and what we here in East Boston go through night after night. So again, without belaying the issue I think I'll confine myself to that particular area, that if you could find yourself able to support us in our legislation relative to a surcharge on the night flights that would get rid of the airplanes over South Boston during the evening hours 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. and again give us the help that you have, the clout that you have in terms of lobbyists in the State House, we would be more than grateful. Thank you very much.

00:50:04,319 --> 00:52:48,800

Edward King: Thank you. Representative Paul White.

Paul White: Thank you very much, Mr. King. For the record: Representative Paul White, 47 Rosemont Street in Dorchester. I apologize to my neighbors in South Boston for coming over here tonight somewhat as an interloper and taking up some of the time which they have reserved this evening for comment, but I will be brief. I just want to state, first of all, that I am opposed to any sections of the master plan which would result in increased traffic for the South Boston, Dorchester, Quincy corridor. As a legislator from that district which is so terribly affected by the airport noise, I just really, sincerely feel that our efforts to secure other methods of transportation in and out of Boston and alternative sites have been woefully inadequate. I, for one, am perfectly willing to support legislation or any types of proposals which would divert traffic from the Boston airport. I know that some efforts have been made in this area, but I do not feel that those efforts have been sufficient. I just want to state to you, Mr. King, and to the others present and relay this to the board, that it is my feeling that Dorchester, as an adjacent community to South Boston, is tremendously affected by the airport and its plans for the future.

I do not feel that the community has been given an adequate opportunity to comment or to reflect upon the changes which, in your preliminary and draft master plans, you have put forward. And I would like to suggest that, as you did to the five communities this week, you come out to Dorchester and give the people in my community an opportunity to comment on these proposals. I can give you just one brief example of some of the problems that we have been having. And of course, it is accentuated it is acute in the summertime, but the people of Saint Mark's Parish, a Catholic church on Dorchester Avenue in Dorchester, I think they're seriously considering the installation of hearing devices like they have in the United Nations because every Sunday it seems, just at the midst of the mass in which the pastor presides, no one can hear a word, and we have to have a momentary pause. Now that happens throughout this area, throughout this community, and as a legislator representing Dorchester, I join with my South Boston colleagues in asking you to do everything in your power to see that this problem is diminished and/or alleviated. Thank you.

00:52:46,480 --> 00:56:14,160

Edward King: Thank you, Representative. In response to that, Representative, we certainly have to be receptive to a suggestion that we visit Dorchester and explain, just as we would, you know in any reasonable degree to, any other area. We're also sure you realize and appreciate the manner in which you presented your petition. Your position on the noise: I hope you realize ours is that were it within our power to simply turn down the volume or to send it someplace where it could be sent reasonably without disturbing someone else equally or more that we would do that. Now, Ann Icardi 99 Old Harbor Street. Is that a right name? Please.

Ann Icardi: Ann Icardi, 99 Old Harbor Street. This is a safety program, as I understand, and I want to say a little bit of criticism here. Whenever you come in with these routes, you never put on that map the direction that those routes are taking: whether they're coming over South Boston, over the Head House way, or I will say over Carson Beach way, or over City Point, or over Castle Island. These people are sitting here with these lines and 4-R and 15-R. This doesn't mean a thing to them; they don't know what direction that plane is taking! And this is another thing that the BRA always did to us. You should have—on the edge of those maps—the direction that that plane is flying over.

Edward King: May we put that last plan on. See if we can do something about that now?

Ann Icardi: Well it's not now, you've already explained it.

Edward King: Well it might be that we could help you a little bit. Point to, please, 4-R.

Ann Icardi: Where the accident was.

Edward King: Yeah, where the accident was. Can somebody point to that? There's a gentleman going up. Now that is a runway which, on landing, comes directly over Castle Island.

Ann Icardi: Yes.

Edward King: What's beyond that you, probably better than I, realize. The other runway, 4-Left—there are no landings on 4-Left. Oh yes—there are landings on 4-Left, right.

Ann Icardi: Yes, there are.

Edward King: Yes, well it is possible to make a mistake even, or to say something that's not accurate. There are landings on 4-Left. And do we have someone here that can say what part of South Boston that is? For the group?

Audience: [shouting various location names]

Ann Icardi: When those planes land on 4-R where the accident was, they come in over the water, but they do a circling the same way when they're leaving the airport. They go out, they circle over Dorchester Bay, then they come up over Dorchester Heights, and over through the neighborhood. I see them landing day after day. I work on City Hall, and I see them. They're coming down almost over the rooftops. I was at P and Farragut Road—not P and Farragut—P and Columbia Road last weekend. Now the Marine Garden Apartments, that plane was, I don't think it was 20 feet over the top of that house. Now I think that's—really how can..? I'm watching them.

00:56:10,720 --> 01:00:15,839

Edward King: Well, may I say this: that, in response to your question, this is the best we can do. Now I understand quite well, which is saying that our map plan should be extended and show the streets in the general area, but landings on 4-Right—that's the accident on which the runway occurred—those planes come right directly over Castle Island. We're talking about landings.

Ann Icardi: I'm not talking about coming over Castle Island. Where it comes from isn't just Castle Island.

Edward King: No, I understand that.

Ann Icardi: It comes over, some days I see them coming over the area of Broadway and M Street.

Edward King: Well I believe that those would be—

Ann Icardi: Right over their roofs! I'm out of my office every night at five o'clock, and I see these landings, and I know that they're very low. Now of course that's one thing I want to bring up. Now you say this is a safety angle. Now, talking about the day of the accident, those poor pilots—I pity them—they were both local boys that were fairly new or, if they were not local boys, I'll bet you ten or one they would have hit the oil farm over there. And you say this is a safety factor? I've talked to the Department of Safety in the State House, and I want to tell you something on safety, how important it is to get these runways away from the oil tanks. We have 20 tanks over there. We have in them 47 million gallons of bunker oil, 24 million gallons plus—almost 25—of fuel oil, 48 thousand gallons of lubricating oil, and—get this—we have 7,860,000 gallons of gasoline. Now if the that poor pilot didn't hit as close to 4-R, if he went over—just a little way over—and hit that oil farm what would happen? It would have been worse; the people would have been killed and we would have had a terrific explosion over there. And you can talk safely all you want about these oil tanks; they'll tell you that there's water around them and they're insulated and then a plane coming in at 200 miles an hour landing—or 150 miles an hour—you think that that any safety feature over there is going to save it? I get a son that's a retired pilot, and I know what would happen there. Now you're talking about safety; I think this is something we should look toward. You should get those lines away from the oil farm, and also you have Wiggins Terminal. I came back there the day of the accident and along what we call—the back of Marine Park—we used to call it Lover's Lane. You have two oil tanks over there. I remember, I think the last one went in around 1964. Wiggins Terminal, 6 million gallons of fuel oil that was piped over through that tank from the White Fuel. I noticed the other day you had a second tank over there. This is on the Wiggins Terminal and the planes come over, as you say, over Castle Island which I consider Wiggins Terminal's Castle Island also. Now when did this

second tank go in?

Edward King: I assure you, it's been there for a number of years.

Ann Icardi: And not before '64?

Edward King: Well it might be '65 or '6, but it's at least that long.

Ann Icardi: Well didn't we have to have permits to get these over there?

Edward King: Whatever permits are required, I'm sure we're secured.

Ann Icardi: Well you know now your planes are going over Castle Island and if we get fog again —we had one land on Castle Island in a snowstorm. Didn't we a few years back?

Edward King: That is correct.

Ann Icardi: So why couldn't it land on one of these oil tanks? A block of so away?

Edward King: I suppose it could. Hopefully it will not.

Ann Icardi: Well that's all I have to say.

01:00:12,160 --> 01:01:18,480

Edward King: Thank you very much. Now the next item we have is a question. Louis P. Cardinale. The question is—and perhaps Mr. Callaghan will address himself to this—“Why can't planes fly over the bay instead of the homes?” May I ask, Mr. Cardinale, would that be on landing at Logan or taking off?

Louis Cardinale: You're coming in right over the beach! You're coming in right over O Street and P Street and then why can't you come in over the Bay from out past the island? Out that way, out from the ocean. During the winter you people come in over the ocean. We have our windows closed, fine. In the summer we have our windows open and you're coming right over the homes.

Audience: [Applause]

Edward King: Well, I assure you that whether your windows are open or not does not determine which way the planes land, but—do you understand the question well enough? Mr. Callaghan will answer that.

01:01:18,799 --> 01:03:33,359

Thomas Callaghan: I'm the coordinator of the Logan Airport Noise Abatement Committee, and some of you people realize that we have monthly meetings at which we have community representatives, we have representatives of the FAA, the Airline Pilots Association, last year's Aeronautics Commission, the airlines, and ourselves, and we go over these problems and requests. The general situation is, as this gentleman describes, for this reason: that in the winter you have strong northwest winds, and they are landing into those northwest winds a good part of the time. In the summer you have a good deal of weather where there isn't much of any wind —perhaps as tonight because we did happen to see them using various runway— but there is the southwest wind and there are takeoffs toward the southwest when we have the hot summer winds. Actually, the air controllers try to get as many planes off, particularly at night, over the Harbor by taking them off from runway 15-Right and taking them off directly over the Harbor. And also they land them over the Harbor when they're able to do that in periods of low traffic, such as between midnight and six o'clock in the morning. But they're not able to do that all the time—as you well know—because they have to consider atmospheric conditions. So we

realize that there's a good deal of unpleasantness here, but please don't think that the problem is being ignored or that we're not taking them off of the harbor as much as we can
Edward King: Thank you, Mr. Callaghan. Our next speaker Louise Day Hicks, please.
Audience: [Applause]

01:03:30,000 --> 01:06:23,870

Louise Hicks: Thank you very much. I've been a lifelong resident of South Boston, I've lived in the same house on Columbia Road, and I want you to know that every year I get more fearful that one of the planes will land right on the top of my house because when it comes over there it sounds like it's coming right on the roof, and I want you to also know that this fear is shared by all of the people in this area of South Boston. We are very cognizant of the fact of the financial impact of an airport on a city. We realize the job opportunities that an airport brings, but we also realize the dangers of having an airport on top of a congested neighborhood, such as we have around here in this area. We just cannot have an expansion of the Logan Airport. In fact, for many times that I've appeared before you I have asked for a curfew in the evenings and I've also asked for a second airport, and as the senator said, in Bedford. You just cannot keep coming before the people, listening to them, but not heeding them. This is what the problem is: I don't believe there's one person in this hall tonight that would agree with you that they want an expansion of the airport, and you will listen to all of them if they were to stand up and be recorded. They would be recorded against such an expansion because they have lived with it, and they know that an expansion will mean more planes for the Logan Airport, more noise for the citizens to endure, and greater hazards for them to endure. I would like to, also, ask that you do take cognizance of the fact that we do need some type of a rail system between Boston and New York, and this would alleviate the necessity of having so many of these night flights. They could be taken out of New York rather than out of Boston, and have them go into New York by rail. Please heed the needs of the people of this district because they are necessary for the welfare of this great city. If you're going to keep expanding the Logan Airport instead of pushing out these so-called expressways out into the sea, you're pushing the people out of Boston, and that's what I fear. And, as I heard from Ann Icardi tonight—and she's so right—that what we fear is, with those oil stations here, that we will have an explosion, and believe me, if we ever have this in Boston, you won't have to worry about the Logan Airport because it will be in the sea. Thank you very much.

Audience: [Applause]

01:06:25,760 --> 01:09:49,839

Edward King: Thank you, Mrs. Hicks. Mrs. Sapphire, 921 East Squantum Street, is that right?
Grace Sapphire: Thank you, Mr. King. Gentlemen, my name is Grace Sapphire. I live at 921 East Squantum Street in Squantum. I thank you very much for holding these hearings to allow the public to express their opinions about the expansion at Logan. I would like to speak on behalf of myself and then for thousands of members of Save Our Shores Incorporated, of which I am a president. One question I have before proceeding: I wonder why you do not consider holding a hearing in Quincy. People in that city are just as affected by Logan Airport as those on the other side of the waterway. I have grown up with the airplane flying overhead, and so I have grown with the Logan Airport. We need Logan. It is a great convenience to those who use it, and

economically it should be a great benefit; however, the physical sprawl of the airport has gone a little beyond common sense. It is my belief that the airport and people can live in harmony; all the people want is the right to live in their homes without fear from the horrible noise which, at times, is unbearable and frightening. It interferes with every activity whether it be sleeping, reading, telephoning, or just having a conversation in a room. May I relate one incident from my own home—and believe me I enjoy the hum of the planes overhead. My husband must carry on his business by way of phones sometimes. The other night an emergency arose; do you think that it is fair for him to say to a patient in distress, “Wait a minute. I can't hear you.” Doesn't this appear to you to be in violation of our constitutional rights as a citizen?

Audience: [Applause]

Grace Sapphire: Certainly Massport could consider the neighbors by thinking quality instead of quantity and insist on noiseless aircraft, free of pollution, and a craft which does which does not need so much area for takeoff. If we can send a man to the moon it should be simple to develop a vertical takeoff. Save Our Shores realizes that the pier head and bulkhead lines of Boston Harbor have been changed to benefit the Logan Airport, thereby allowing Logan to sprawl into the harbor until it virtually reaches Spectacle Island. There are laws in our state and at federal level prohibiting any filling being placed in the waterways for very good, sound reasons. Surely Massport is aware of these laws. How do you justify taking these waterways? Save Our Shores Incorporated would like to be recorded as disapproving vehemently any further physical expansion of Logan International Airport into the waterways in any direction. Thank you, gentlemen.

01:09:50,159 --> 01:10:59,840

Edward King: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mrs. Sapphire, we appreciate your comments. I would add that—and I hope everyone here realizes—that just as soon as there is a no-noise, smokeless airplane flying anywhere in the United States in commercial service, it will unquestionably fly in and out of Logan. No way—and I'm not sure you suggested that, in fact I'm sure you did not—is Massport opposed to the development of such aircraft. It certainly would make our lives a bit more pleasant. You also mentioned the filling in the waterways, and I think I received, anyway, an implication that we were filling in areas over which the federal government has said that we should not fill. Well that simply is not so because the filling has been a matter of public advertisement, contract bids and all with permits from whatever regulatory bodies and—I believe—in almost every case, at least two, we always have the permits, including a federal permit. Now Mr. William F. Ezekiel, 535 East Broadway.

01:11:00,880 --> 01:11:36,400

William Ezekiel: Just here, Mr. King, representing the South Boston Little City Hall, and we would like to go on record as opposing any extension of Logan Airport. And we would also like to urge that the Massport redirect its energies to the refurbishing of the port which hasn't flourished since Grant took Richmond. Thank you.

Audience: [Applause]

01:11:32,719 --> 01:11:54,800

Edward King: Reluctant as I am to make any suggestion to an official of the city of Boston, I would suggest though that things have changed since Grant did take Richmond, and a look at our current poor statistics would put your mind at ease if our port business is your only concern. Mr. James F. McCarty, South Boston, please.

01:11:59,360 --> 01:14:58,159

James McCarthy: Mr. King, members of the Mass Port. I am chairman of the transportation committee for the South Boston Citizens Association and the South Boston Citizens Association want to go on record this evening is opposing any expansion, in any degree whatsoever, of the airport at Logan. Definitely we are opposed to the extensions of runways 4-L and 9. I think what we're losing sight of here tonight, Mr. King and members of your board—and I related this to you down in your building downtown—that there is more to this than just name calling, that there is an issue here, and it is the issue of people. There is a moral issue here. People have worked all their lives to build their homes here, to build them in East Boston, Winthrop, Quincy, the surrounding areas. They've invested great deal of money in these homes, and they don't want to lose them. I was looking at your master plan when we had a hearing here not too long ago—and I think Mr. Callaghan can verify this—and I looked at the number of takeoffs that you were proposing in that plan projecting yourselves to 1975. And it's almost prohibitive to live in the neighborhood such as this, or any surrounding areas, if this plan goes through. But we have a moral issue here. It's more important than the economy of the city. It's more important than statistics. It is the right for people in the greater Boston area to live where they would like to live without harassment and without health hazards. And this evening, gentlemen, as I said to you downtown—Father Sallesse remembers me saying this—that we have a moral issue here. And the most important thing here today is the feelings and the right of people to live where they want to live. I want to record again that the South Boston Citizens Association opposes this expansion. Thank you very much.

01:14:55,360 --> 01:15:25,840

Edward King: Thank you, Mr. McCarthy. Our next speaker is our first repeat speaker for this evening and one of the very few repeat speakers that we've had during a weekday hearing. City Councilor Albert L. O'Neil.

Audience: [Applause]

01:15:28,480 --> 01:24:59,840

Albert O'Neil: Gentlemen, my name's Albert O'Neil. I live at 4354 Washington Street in Roslindale. I'm a duly elected official in the Boston City Council. Gentlemen, my presentation here tonight—I have read your plan, I have seen your slides at least six times—mine is more or less of a different presentation. My presentation here tonight is of a man that is almost in the same position as you, Mr. King, and the members of the Port Authority. My position goes back—and this all ties in with my presentation—my position goes back as former chairman and former commissioner of the Boston Licensing Board. When the Boston Redevelopment Authority came into the city and they were at their peak in taking small business people's businesses away and taking people's homes, and I had no time, since I was on that commission to have represented the liquor industry, but there were some cases that came before my board of restaurants that

had liquor licenses that were good licensees, that paid their license fee every year, never had a violation. They lived in this city. They raised their families, and they came before my board—and I think that the people here in South Boston can attest to this—the Boston Redevelopment Authority put me in rather very embarrassing position. It was me that had to make a decision as to when a man's business was taken and, the large organization that the BRA is, they never had a relocation plan. Not once did they ever have a relocation plan for anybody that they ever displaced. And because of the will of the people and public sentiment by coming into the public hearings, simply because that licensee found a location in another area of the city and it was the will of the people that make it responsible not only for me but also for men and women in your position to be where you are today. It was a terrible thing, and yet, in some instances, I did not mind rejecting applications because they were not good licensees, but in many cases of people that would stand before you and say to me, "Mr. Chairman," or "Members of the commission what have I done in this life? I have paid my license fee. I have never committed a violation, that I had to be before you on a violation. I've raised my family. This is my whole livelihood; I must have this transfer." But because of the organization of the people coming in, it was my duty, because of the will of the people, to reject that application. It was my duty—and I say this in all sincerity—one of the two votes that voted against Park Plaza, not because I was against people, but I asked for two important questions at 21 meetings. At no time did I ever get produced a copy of the financial status of the developer. At no time was it ever produced for the relocation of 256 more businesses and 7,000 people to be put out of work, and I voted against it because they had no compassion for human beings. Mr. King, I'm going to ask you this question—or I'll present this point to you. We can't, in this city, take much more; 56 percent of the property in this city is tax free and there is no end in sight. You take the people in East Boston. If ever the word that's been screamed around here for the last 10 years of discrimination is against the people in East Boston because of one thing—not only the airport, but they are the only people in this city that have to pay to go back and forth to their own homes. True.

Audience: [Applause]

Albert O'Neil: Mr. King, I've known you a long time, and I'm not trying to butter you up. I have great admiration for you; I have great admiration for your ability, but I must say this at this time that the Boston Redevelopment Authority, the Port Authority, the Turnpike Authority, the bankers, and the developers they're swallowing up this city. Now what we would like to ask of you—and I could go on and on and on—I know that I recall standing in the back of the hall at Gardner Auditorium one day when all of the people in the Dover area came in and they were terribly upset about even a small thought or a proposal to build a second airport in that particular area. And that was soon abandoned, that plan. I haven't the slightest idea where any one of you men live, but you put yourselves in these seats. And I know that, because it would be human nature, that you would feel identically the same way as we do. Progress, I'm not against progress. We've lost over 300,000 people in this city; we've got 39 million dollars that were just sent to us in revenue sharing, and there's absolutely no need for this mayor of the city of Boston—he must bring this tax rate down at least 37 dollars. We've got the money; we put it away, but now we spending it on this group and that group and another group. What we're asking for, in conclusion, Mr. King, is this the will of the people. You men have been traveling all over; I've spoken before you before. I even went out of Boston one night, to Beechmont. I'm asking you this: sit down and say to yourselves, "Look we don't pay taxes in the city of Boston. Neither does

the Turnpike Authority.” I’m sorry to say that for the sixth year in a row this year I file legislation for constitutional convention to bring before the constitutional convention some sort of a plan to, at least on the 56 percent of tax-free property, at least let the bankers and the developers and the authorities pay some something into this city. All it is progress for big people and demolition for little people. And I might say this for the record—and it’s going on this record and I certainly hope it goes on because this is the very first time I’ve said it. I said to the chairman of the committee and taxation, “I come here every year alone. I ask you now, Mr. Chairman, do you ever approve or do I get a favorable report from this committee? Because I’m tired of coming back every year alone.” And when he answered me in this manner, I couldn’t believe him. He said, “I think it’s time that I said to you that your presentation here this morning and the facts and the figures that you bring out, we give you an approval every year!” But it’s shocking when you hear this from this man. “When it goes out this door it gets lost.” Well that’s no way to answer me, but—I can assure you, gentlemen—relative to taxation of all of these authorities that I will refile that again next year, and when it goes out the door, I’ll carry it out and make sure that nothing happens between there and the lobby because I never see the lobbyists show up because they’ve got it locked in—they think. But this time it’s going to be different. I present this to you respectfully because of your positions. At no time do I like to badger any men that give me the privilege and the opportunity to speak here, but for God’s sake we’ve got to get a break here. Now this is what they don’t want: they don’t want any more expansions, they want no flights from 11 to 7 in the morning, they want no further extensions. For god’s sake start thinking of another human being! It’s as simple as that. So whomever you have to report to on your deliberations—and I’m fully aware of the expense of this master plan, the money that it cost to produce it, I know this—I will ask you in all fairness to human beings, the will of the people, you act the same way I did when the public trust was put on my shoulders. Please reject any plans, extensions, expansions, or any night flights here. We’ve had it, all right? Thank you very much.

01:25:01,120 --> 01:25:27,360

Edward King: Thank you, Councilor O’Neil. Before you leave I’m sure you would be disappointed if I did not add that you well know I trust the other side of that story on taxes with the city of Boston. And secondly, let me assure you that the mayor has not sent any of that 39 million dollars to us; we don’t expect any either. Thank you.

01:25:29,440 --> 01:26:54,719

Virginia Sheehy: Can I go now?

Edward King: Mrs. Sheehy? Fine.

Virginia Sheehy: I wasn’t going to bother to speak at all, but I thought I’d take this opportunity to come up and say hello. Mr. King, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Callaghan, I’ve spoken before you before at the New England Life Hall in other times when you have come out to the community. I want to say, first of all, that I’m very, very disappointed, and I wasn’t going to say a word because I felt that I wasn’t talking to the people that ultimately had the votes and would make the decision on whether or not any of these proposals go through. I read in my local paper, “Come one and come all, you citizens. Here’s your chance to meet with the board.” The appointed board by the governor, the people who vote and then you carry through, as employees of the Port Authority,

and do what the board tells you to do, and I kind of thought it was a little silly to get up and to say, “No, no. We don't like the proposal,” and maybe give some technical statements as to why we think the proposals aren't worthy or maybe make some suggestions as to what they can do, but would it be enough Mr. King to ask you: when do the board members get to hear what the citizens have to say?

01:26:52,239 --> 01:27:48,159

Edward King: Well they hear it continually. We have a subcommittee specifically designated to review the master plan proceedings. All of the members will receive a copy of the verbatim transcript and the four-man sub-committee of seven so that, in addition to the staff input, certainly gives all of the members an opportunity. Now the fact that only four members run the committee does not mean that all seven may not read all of the proceedings. F

Virginia Sheehy: Four members of the Massachusetts Board? The Port Board?

Edward King: Yes. Are on a subcommittee for the master plan.

Virginia Sheehy: Are they here tonight?

Edward King: One is. One member: Father Sallèse is.

Virginia Sheehy: Who might the other three be, please?

Edward King: Mr. Maher, Mr. Christian, and Mr. Harrington.

Virginia Sheehy: Mr. Christian is the new young gentleman just appointed by the Governor?

Edward King: Yes. Yes.

Virginia Sheehy: All right, thank you very much.

Edward King: Thank you.

01:27:45,600 --> 01:30:59,520

Virginia Sheehy: I want to say also that I went over and I looked at the three plans over on the wall, and it is a little difficult for an ordinary lay-person—you know housewives and husbands who work all day and try to get some sleep—to figure out, unless you have a little prior knowledge of what runways go where, just where that is. And I would agree with Mrs. Icardi. Would you answer for me now—I know underneath where the extensions are going in South Boston—what is up to the northeast? Is that Winthrop?

Edward King: Beechmont.

Virginia Sheehy: Beechmont, right.

Edward King: The runway that comes over Castle Island and Bridge Street—I believe—I heard mentioned go right out over Orient Heights first in East Boston—

Virginia Sheehy: Where is East Boston in...?

Edward King: Well...

Virginia Sheehy: That's East Boston, yeah? Well, you know, it sounds—well I'll just have to say it — it seems as though,, for instance all the time when we read the *Globe* editorials in the *Herald* editorials in all the articles written by all of these so-called experts on airplane and Logan, that always we hear about the people of East Boston. Now no one would say that East Boston doesn't have a problem, and probably, their problem is slightly worse than ours as far as noise goes but I saw on the TV where the TV reporters were there, and I'd like to know: is there anyone here from the press tonight?

Audience Members: [noises of affirmation]

Virginia Sheehy: You are. Well it's good. I was going to say that it seems as though—you know—always South Boston is omitted; they say East Boston, Winthrop, and Revere. And as I look at the map and some of the proposals, it would seem like it's a game: playing off one area against another. When the heat gets hot in East Boston, you don't bother them too much and you come over here. And then if we holler too much, then maybe the next extension will go someplace else. It's like sharing the wealth; although in this case, the wealth isn't very good: it's noise.

Audience: [Applause]

Virginia Sheehy: And I might ask, too, that with Mr. Sapphire was here from Squantum in Quincy, and there was a gentleman, an elected official, from Dorchester, and my daughter lived in Dorchester in the Saint Kevin's Parish, and when visiting her you couldn't hear much either, that maybe you might consider,, Mr. King in taking your hearings out to some of the other areas. And maybe that way some of us can all get together and sit down and maybe come to some conclusion that might be beneficial to all of the citizens, not only in Boston but some of the outlying areas that are trying very, very hard to live with Logan Airport. Thank you very much.

Audience: [Applause]

01:30:53,410 --> 01:33:09,840

Edward King: Thank you. Father Tollen, Saint Bridget's Parish, please.

Audience: [Applause]

Father Tollen: Mr. King, gentlemen, thanks for the opportunity to have us here before you a few months ago, and I'm afraid my feelings haven't changed. I think they've become a little incensed since as to the noise. Mr. McCarthy who spoke some time ago placed this on a moral basis, pointing it out to the effect on people, and I'm afraid that's the way I feel about it. I think that the noise level now is almost, absolutely, and completely intolerable to the people of the area when you have to sleep in a hot summer night with your window closed so you're not awakened at 4:15 by a light in your window on a plane coming overhead—not 20 feet over the buildings but at a fairly decent level. It's difficult. It's tough. People have their lives, their homes their families, their futures here, and no one is going to buy their homes because the land is not needed, just the area over the land is needed, I'm afraid. I hate to cavil—I think is the word—and nitpick, but I just like to present my feelings on the subject that it's becoming more and more difficult to live and to think, as a matter of fact, under these circumstances. In the church they used to say, "Roma locuta est; causa finita est." *Rome has spoken; the matter is over.* I'm afraid that we're beating a dead horse here. In all honesty gentlemen I think Massport locuta est; causa finita est. Thanks for the opportunity.

Audience: [Applause]

01:33:17,760 --> 01:34:39,199

Edward King: Father, let me assure you that we understand, the way you put forth your position — and it certainly is understandable—noise is most undesirable for any of us, and our position is—you know—a little bit difficult this evening because we're not in a position to say that particularly for South Boston that anything we're doing here will decrease the noise over South Boston. That unfortunately is best I can see, or anyone else that we talked to can see, is going to take some time. I do think it's coming with the technological improvements, but short of land

relocation or home relocation, any relief realistically is not in sight. But I would point out that the particular elements of expansion if you will—improvement we call it within our master plan now—certainly do not adversely affect anyone, including, of course, South Boston. But I hope you understand that we would do—of course—quickly anything that we could. We have a repeat now. Another one. Patrick F McDonough, please.