

Record Group TC6/1995

Massachusetts Port Authority Public Hearing Files, 1970-1986

Draft master plan hearing in Winthrop, August 20, 1973 Tape 2

(Continued from Tape 1)

00:00:00,000 --> 00:00:19,440

Robert Gagan: ---period. I say the same thing; every time I come to one of these meetings doesn't anybody want to listen to me on the Port Authority? No more expansion, no more building period. That's all we have to say, thank you.

00:00:24,080 --> 00:00:55,320

Ed King: Thank you very much Mr. Gagan. And once again our procedure calls for anyone who wishes to speak to fill out one of the cards. If you come in late or otherwise don't have one raise your hand we'll see that you receive one. On the other hand if you have any questions you would like to put forth and do not want to ask them yourselves you ask for a card, you write the question. We have two such questions, and maybe more than two, but two people asking the questions and Mr. Mooney, our director of aviation, will read the question and our answer.

00:01:03,600 --> 00:06:58,800

Richard Mooney: We have a question from Gene Burg. First question is what do the extensions do? What do they accomplish? The extensions are on--- are proposed for runway 9 and for 4-left. Starting with runway 9, there are several things that we believe that this will do. First of all, we have stated--- we stated when we were here before; it's covered in considerable detail in the master plan report that the extension of this runway will permit the takeoff of aircraft to be at a higher elevation when passing over a Point Shirley. Now on the average we believe that based upon not only computations but actual decibel readings with through experimentation that it will reduce the decibels by approximately three. Another thing that it will do we believe it will add safety in the use of this runway. Now we know that the longer runway is that basically that it's that it's safer. Now in certification and operation of any aircraft, they have requirements that the aircraft be able to perform and pass over an obstruction of a certain height under very difficult conditions, and if it can't do this then if it's necessary, and we certainly don't like to have it occur, but it does occur on occasion where it's necessary to abort a takeoff then there's more runway remaining for this to be accomplished and it doesn't force the aircraft to take off and actually perform in a way that it's not capable of doing. So we feel that there's a definite safety advantage. We also recognize the fact that it will permit aircraft to take off on this runway which are unable to take off on that runway today. These are very very very limited in number; this is not the intent and we like we'd like to point out that we demonstrate this by the fact that we have two runways already existing which are longer than this runway once it is extended. In other words, it will still be shorter than two runways that already exist ,so that if we needed the longer runway for an SST or for aircraft that might be imagined for the future this is not a logical

thing in our judgment because we do have two as I say that are already longer. The extension of runway 4-left is primarily a safety matter for aircraft taking off from the 22-right end. Now this is used when these runways are being used 22-right is used primarily for takeoff. We do not need this runway extension again for the purpose of permitting the larger aircraft to operate since the runway immediately parallel to it will be longer even after the extension of 4-left. So that it does not mean that there will be larger aircraft operating at Logan. It does mean that again, for takeoff purposes, that it will be a safer runway that's taking off from 22-right. On very rare occasion under emergency conditions there are have been and we expect that there will be takeoffs from the other end that's the 4-left end, and those cases it will permit the aircraft again to be higher when passing over the residential area which will occur only as I say on rare occasion. Now the next question is this plan before the EPA. Well the present status of the plan with regard to the runway extensions in the short runway is this: We held a hearing on March 10th. We received comments on this the material together with the environmental impact statement or investigation that was made by the Port Authority was submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration. They in turn prepared a draft environmental impact statement and this is now in the process of being circulated. Now this will be distributed to all interested government agencies and the Environmental Protection Agency will have a very significant input into this particular study before there's any final finding or decision by the Federal Aviation Administration. Now the fourth question was can you detail recent compromise in East Boston residences? I assume that they may be referring to this recent board member and I think that either Tom Callaghan or Mr. King could best outline that.

00:06:58,960 --> 00:07:05,720

Audience Member: I was referring to last--- whoever asked the question--- [inaudible]

00:07:08,480 --> 00:07:29,920

Mooney: Gene Burg could you tell us more specifically what you refer to with regard to this compromise that you mentioned? Well I---. Oh yes, that's right.

00:07:35,360 --> 00:07:42,320

King: You want--- would you like to come up and speak? is that certainly we'll---

00:07:42,360 --> 00:07:50,240

Audience Member: [Inaudible]

00:07:51,120 --> 00:07:57,840

King: That's all right you and well you can answer Neptune Road

Mooney: Well I think Tom might on Neptune Road.

King: Neptune Road, you want to do that?

00:08:02,960 --> 00:13:16,040

Callaghan: In regard to Neptune Road after the authority had conducted hearings in Winthrop, East Boston, and Revere concerning the policy of purchasing homes or not purchasing homes, the authority voted not to purchase any homes in any of the areas contiguous to the airport or anywhere else. Then a group of people on Neptune Road pointed out by letter to the authority that they had a special situation which wasn't typical of any other situation. The authority considered the problem and assigned me to negotiate with the ad hoc committee on Neptune Road. They discussed over the course of the past six or eight months the hazard, the noise, the smell of gasoline, and everything else, particularly the hazard, so that we had appraisals made of the homes on in the Neptune Road neighborhood. The first appraisals didn't seem to make the people particularly happy, so they selected an appraiser and this appraiser came in with higher appraisals on three homes which were typical of the homes in the neighborhood. The authority then voted to accept the higher set of appraisals on which to appraise the other houses. There are 43 homes on the MBTA side of the airport comprising the basic part of the Neptune Road neighborhood. We have been asked to make appraisals on 28 of these homes. The appraisals run from 38,000 to 50,000 dollars. This was presented to the authority at the last meeting and the authority voted to purchase these homes based on the appraisals. It also voted to provide for the tenants a flat sum of a thousand dollars for all moving and related expenses plus either of two alternatives: one that a person would be subsidized if the family had to pay a higher rent for a comparable home, and that subsidy would be paid over the course of four years up to a maximum of four thousand dollars. The other alternative was that if a tenant wish to buy a home then the authority would pay two thousand dollars on a required down payment of a conventional loan, or if it were higher it would match dollar for dollar the additional amount of money up to a total payment by the authority of four thousand dollars. So fundamentally the authority is attempting to resolve the particular problem of Neptune Road in a way which I believe is generally agreed upon as the best and perhaps the only way of resolving that particular problem. There was a point made that there was a difference between the Neptune Road comment in the master plan and the comment that was made concerning any other areas where reuse of land might be affected, and there was a question on the point. The fact is that the Neptune role refers to a program which we feel should be carried on which is being carried on by vote of the authority, and the other refers to being responsive if there is a similar request from another area. It doesn't mean that another area would be considered in the same fashion as Neptune Road there might be many other considerations, but I believe that the points are that Neptune Road is a program which we believe should be and is being carried on the other is a matter of discussion, thank you.

00:13:20,280 --> 00:13:28,200

King: Okay all those questions are answered is that correct?

Audience Member: No, just on the one.

King: Fine go right ahead. Go right ahead.

00:13:33,800 --> 00:14:18,000

Audience Member: Thank you for the answer to the question. I think there is one general thing that needs to be discussed here. It's a little frightening it's the oil. The offshore oil. And I think that in failing to face that now you leave us with a lot of wondering what's going to happen next. I also think Father that perhaps not everybody came because in parts of Winthrop today it was unbearable. They were brave to come when they did. My question really was raised by you Mr. King; that the man who can say yes is never at these meetings. A representative of the FAA, and a representative of the EPA, and that no meeting between Winthrop and your organization should be here unless one of those men is here because you are not the ones that should filter through our comments he should be here to hear us.

[Applause]

00:14:28,160 --> 00:15:08,640

King: Thank you for your suggestion. I will be sure to invite you to the meeting that we will arrange---

Audience Member: No, I didn't make myself clear.

King: No I underst--- I understand that, and I will also ask him with your permission to contact you directly so that you will not have to filter it through us and you may discuss it directly with them. I think, I think that that's a reasonable request and if you'll just indicate, if there are enough here I don't know how we will do that, but why don't you just put your name on a card indicating you would like to meet directly with the FAA with us or without. We will certainly be here if that's your wish. Is that reasonable?

00:15:09,000 --> 00:15:13,120

Audience Member: No. [Inaudible]

00:15:13,520 --> 00:15:37,400

King: Well that's all right, they may come as well. We will definitely apprise the FAA of your wish, this is all being recorded, and maybe suggest to them that they hold a public meeting here where anyone and everyone can come. [Applause] Is that agreeable? Now our next speaker is Mr. Jerome Falbo, chairman of the Winthrop Planning Board.

00:15:56,000 --> 00:25:59,200

Jerome Falbo: Father Sallese, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Callaghan, Mr. King. The planning board had spent a considerable time attempting to analyze all of the reports and this approximately four or five reports which I have listed in my written report and I won't bother to mention, most of you people are aware of these reports. The difficulty was in attempting to weed through the voluminous highly technical and sometimes contradictory and repetitious material that was in the reports, but finally the planning board came to the conclusion that we do not believe that there exists a justifiable need for the proposed extensions after considering the insignificant relief to air traffic delay, congestion, and air traffic needs of the area with the accompanying increase in noise and decrease in the residential quality of Winthrop. Although we discussed

and are opposed to each of the proposed projects, we have directed our review to the impact of the extending runway 9 on the community of Winthrop; obviously because of our position Winthrop Planning Board. The board made every attempt to understand the various reports stated above and requested meetings with the MPA and the FAA. We question seriously the value of the brief discussions that we had merely because they were brief and infrequent. We had one meeting with the community representative from the Massachusetts Port Authority and also at a subsequent meeting with the board of selectmen in the planning board. We had a meeting with the same representative and a representative from the FAA, I believe a total of three hours were spent, but in viewing the studies they would have us believe that the extension of runway 9 will do the following: one improve future noise and air quality levels, two promote safety, three reasonably meet air service demands forecast by 1980. We would like to ask the MPA what consideration has been given to maintain the residential quality of Winthrop particularly Point Shirley? Throughout the draft master plan the emphasis is to accommodate and make it more convenient for the air travel of the future. And when I refer to reports now I'm referring to the most specific, most recent report by the Mass Port Authority which was of June, 1973. The position that I just mentioned is clearly stated on page 219 of the recent report. I quote in part "Without new facilities the demand for air service will exceed by greater and greater margins the capacity of existing facilities to provide it with growing levels of congestion and delay." This statement in addition it appears is also contradictory to a statement which appears further in the report under section entitled "The Impact Analysis for Proposed Facility Developments" page 301. Again I quote "These developments...", and they're referring to the two runway extensions 4-L and 9 only "...alone provide no capacity increase whatever." In viewing this with as much objectivity as possible under the circumstances, the planning board also attempted to view these proposals from the position of a simple problem existing and what is the cure as proposed by the Mass Port Authority studies. On page 290 of the same report the table relating to the effect of the extensions in aircraft delays when you look at it comes to a conclusion that if the extensions are built the delay factor in aircraft will be reduced only 11 percent. Now what about the noise factor? The charts on page 295, 296, 297, and 298 indicate that if the extension of runway 9 is completed the people who reside in the crucial noise impact area of which Winthrop's Point Shirley is included. In fact it's more commonly referred to the NEF-30 NEF-40 contour levels. These people will eventually experience, eventually experience an eight percent reduction in noise. These are the benefits that we allegedly will get. Again this remedy is anything but significant relief. What about the safety factor which the report alleges the extension of runway 9 will provide? True a lengthy runway 9 may provide for greater safety on takeoff, I'm assuming that, but the aircraft landing on Point Shirley will touch down at the same point. Where is the safety margin for Point Shirley? Our board, the planning board, cannot adequately stress the importance that there should be no further expansion on over the land runways and greater emphasis must be placed on decreasing the amount of flights using over the land routes. The recent tragedy which occurred at runway 4-R is a constant reminder that over-the-water landing policy must be considered as providing a greater operational safety margin than over the land approach. The planning board is of the option that extension of

runway 9 will decrease the residential character of Point Shirley and further reduce our tax base. The town of Winthrop is the second most densely populated community city or town in Massachusetts. There is little room for further expansion in terms of new construction, yet virtually all new construction in the past 10 years in Winthrop has been residential in nature. The Port Authority states on page 281 of the same report, this is the report--- the page in which they were talking about the communities that they interviewed and discussed, they stated there that we supplied them with a 14 year old master plan of the town of Winthrop. The implication obviously was that the town of Winthrop authorities, I presume the planning board, is not quite up to date with their existing needs. This is somewhat erroneous. The 1959 master plan which we turned over to the authority states the primary use of land in Winthrop is residential. The statement is applicable today as it was in 1959, no change. The board has clearly stated this position to the MPA's representatives on many occasions. We further maintain that the economic stability of the town is also solely dependent on residential taxes. Further airport expansion and increase in the noise factor is totally incompatible with our present land use in Winthrop and could destroy Winthrop's economic viability. The planning board concludes that extension of runways will not provide substantial relief as alleged by the report; that the extension will probably affect the residents of Point Shirley in a manner in nature, and gradually encourage them to sell their homes to the Port Authority. The board believes that the extending runway 9 will in the near future create a similar sellout anxiety in the residence of Point Shirley as now exists on Neptune Road. The board further believes that the MPA would not be disappointed if it could establish a clear zone at Point Shirley. The board agrees with the statement contained, that is our board the planning board, agrees with the statement contained in the Landrum and Brown report of December, 1972 page eight I quote "It has become increasingly evident that the needs which prompted the runway 15-L and 33-R project still exists and that only with such improvements can future environmental impacts be minimized. For these compelling reasons the runway extensions and STOL runway portion of that former project are being proposed as an interim step toward the objective." We strongly suspect that the real purpose to extend the runways is to commit the airport to an irrevocable and unretractable course of major expansion because of these reasons we are opposed to the proposed projects.

00:26:06,960 --> 00:26:11,960

King: Thank you Mr. Falbo. Mr. John A. Vitagliano. Map please.

00:26:24,040 --> 00:31:10,040

John Vitagliano: My name is John Vitagliano. I live at 111 Court Road and I'm the chairman of the town of Winthrop's Noise, Air Pollution, and Aircraft Hazards Committee. First of all, I want to start off by thanking Father Salles for taking the time to come here tonight. We have analyzed the Port Authority's latest draft master plan and have about half a dozen comments. One we have analyzed our proposed extensions of runway 9 and 4-L and construction of a new STOL runway. We are emphatically opposed to all three projects because, contrary to claims of

your staff, they mean more noise and pollution and less safety. Of primary importance to Winthrop is the proposed extension of runway 9 by nearly 2000 feet. Your public statements would have us believe that this plan means less noise for Point Shirley, yet your own consultant report submitted for the March 10th hearing in Boston indicates a 26 percent increase in takeoffs and a 100 percent increase in landings by 1980. Despite claims by your staff that we have misread these figures the Federal Aviation Administration has confirmed them in their own environmental impact statement for this runway extension, and it is the FAA that controls runway use, not the Port Authority. Your staff claims that there is no association between the proposed extension and the proposed increases in overflights, but it is difficult to imagine that you would make a runway longer to use it less. The key statement in your proposal is to increase operational flexibility this can only mean more over flights not less. If you are sincere about the primary purpose of this extension being noise abatement then you should let the supposed beneficiaries of the plan have the final say and we say no. The second point regarding the question of residential versus over water approaches. The recent Delta crash is a tragic illustration of the needs to emphasize over water approaches to Logan instead of over residential areas. Contrary to past statements of the Port Authority, we do not consider Point Shirley to be an over water approach path. Point Shirley is a viable residential neighborhood that must not become another Neptune Road. On the issue of aircraft safety please understand that everyone in this town is just as concerned as you are, perhaps more so. Every position that we have ever enunciated on Logan expansion is based on the fundamental precept of maximizing safety on the ground as well as in the air, after all it is our lives and homes that are at stake. Number three, on page 253 of your master plan you have deleted a number of projects including the parallel 1533. We totally agree with these deletions since we suggested that you do so over two years ago. At that time you claimed that these projects were needed for increased safety and reduced noise; you were wrong then and you are wrong now. Four, we strongly criticize the Massachusetts Port Authority for the lack of publicity given this very important hearing. There has been only one small paid advertising by the Port Authority in the Winthrop Sun transcript and that was a month ago on July the 25th. The only other advertising we have seen concerned the cancellation of the John Hancock Hall meeting in Boston. We wish you were more concerned with meetings that are held rather than rather than those that are not. Five, we disagree with your staff's conclusions regarding the effectiveness of noise barriers. We feel that certain areas of Winthrop, such as Court Road and others, could benefit from well-designed barriers to suppress noise from sideline takeoff and reverse thrust. We request that you consult further with the town in developing this concept. Six, we find that your treatment of a nighttime jet curfew is specious. We have commissioned, at a cost of some thirty six hundred dollars to the town, a consultant report that has demonstrated a two-thirds reduction of Logan's night flights is a viable option. Such a reduction would have a significant improvement on our noise problem; we like to sleep at night also. The issue of nighttime noise is so important that this committee takes a unanimous position of support for a full eight-hour jet curfew at Logan Airport and we will submit our consultant report as part of our official testimony for this hearing. We expect the entire report to be an official part of the record. We

will also submit a copy of the recent Supreme Court decision in the Burbank, California case which clearly states that the Massachusetts Port Authority as the proprietor of Logan Airport has not been excluded by the courts from implementing its own curfew; the key section is underlined on page 12. We will submit a more detailed reply to your draft master plan in the near future that expounds these issues thank you.

00:31:22,080 --> 00:31:31,840

King: Thank you Mr. Vitagliano. Edward J. Bandoni 144 Shore Drive. Is Mr. Bandoni here? Yes he's coming.

00:31:45,920 --> 00:33:41,680

Ed Bandoni: My name is Ed Bandoni. I've been a resident of Winthrop since I was 13 years of age and I was brought up under a flight path or over in Belle Isle. And the reason I'm asking to speak is because I was scared then of what was--- what I thought might happen to me and I'm scared now. I live between the flight paths now and I hear a plane coming over that's not coming the right direction. It comes over my area and I just sit and wait to hear the explosion. I think I'm speaking for a lot of people in this town because not too many people care to get up and voice their opinion, but I speak to them many times throughout the course of my day, week, month, and a lot of them are scared too. We just--- they tell me to pass on you people the fact that they do not want the airport expanded; they do not want more noise. They know the airport can't disappear. They know that we have to put up with you people, but please, they asked me to tell you, please do not expand any long--- any further than you have now. That's all I have to say.

00:33:42,320 --> 00:33:53,840

King: All right, Thank you Mr. Bandoni. Mr. Benjamin Moore Shirley Street in Winthrop, Mr. Moore.

00:34:10,320 --> 00:36:43,120

Benjamin Moore: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. I did not intend to come up here tonight. I came up here, this is the first time I have attended one of those meetings--- one of these meetings, but I became so incensed at the first two speakers who were apparently patent apologists for the Port Authority and the--- what appeared to be the blatant failure of the Port Authority to outline the proximity of their new airport layout to Point Shirley and adjacent land areas. I think this was left out deliberately. At two o'clock in the morning down on Point Shirley when a plane goes thundering through your bedroom it becomes a little hard to sleep. I listen to this gentleman here explain that the extension of a runway towards Point Shirley would reduce the decibel level about three points, three decibels. This is like saying that the decibel level now is this and they're going to reduce it this much. I have been employed for the past year in the setting up of OSHA requirements for a--- I work for a large manufacturing company based in New England. I am a methods engineer for them, so I am quite familiar with decibel levels. This

gentleman implies that the extension of this runway is going to reduce noise on Point Shirley. Either he's crazy or I am because it won't reduce noise levels at all it'll just increase them. Now the government says under OSHA requirements that a safe decibel level is about 80, and this is not for any sustained period of time. Now I don't know whether the Port Authority has ever measured the decibel level over Point Shirley at 200 feet when a four engine jet goes over, but it must be up around 150. Now I say that I think, after viewing what the Port Authority has done in the past and what they contemplate in the future, that their social conscience for the surrounding communities is about the same as a snake eyeing a rabbit, he's about to eat. Thank you.

00:37:01,520 --> 00:37:14,400

King: Thank you Mr. Moore. Our next speaker is Mr. Gene Wassermann, 19 Ocean Avenue Winthrop please. Thank you. Want to use up here?

00:37:28,960 --> 00:41:33,840

Gene Wasserman: Members of the Port Authority, Father Sallese, ladies and gentlemen. I hadn't intended to come up here to speak at all tonight, but there are two genuine fears that I have, one as chairman of the advisory committee. I have a fear that there's going to be, if things go on the way they are and the tremendous shortage of housing disappears, there's going to be a great general massive devaluation of all the property in the town of Winthrop because of the noise pollution and the air pollution. That's one genuine fear I have, and I think that the Port Authority ought to take that into consideration. The second fear that I have, and it's a genuine one and more important I think much more important than anything else that was expressed here tonight, is a fear for the health of the people of Winthrop. We are a small community, little over a mile square, with over 20,000 people and I don't know how many thousand automobiles and we are sprayed incessantly overhead, in addition to the automobile pollution, with the air pollution that this exhaust--- these exhaust pollutions that are cast out by the planes going over our head. Now the airport authority has some statistics to the effect that airport pollution is only two percent of the total pollution. Well it probably is if they measure the airport pollution against the whole United States, but if you measured the air pollution in the airport and within a mile or two adjacent to the airport and I asked the Environmental Protection Agency when they consider this expansion to check into the environmental rate the pollution that exists in the town of Winthrop as a result of the proximity of the airport. I think that's a genuine fear. It's a fear that the airport ought to give great consideration to because they breathe the same air we do. It's a situation where you have a small community probably the densest community in the United States and in point of automobiles. I think more automobiles in the town of Winthrop and a similar square mile than anywhere else in America, and that pollution plus the pollution from the planes is a serious health hazard to the people of Winthrop in my opinion. Now I'm being awakened from a sound sleep and I've been awakened at all hours of the morning right next to the Shirley Street School and I'm being subjected to incessant noise pollution and I'm being hurt by the befouling of the very air we breathe by unhealthy and dangerous air pollution

is an invasion of the privacy guaranteed each American citizen under article 9 of the Constitution of this country. It's an invasion of privacy on par with the worst in the Watergate scandal. Now the--- unless the airport pays attention to these two factors and they should. The Massport Authority will not go down in history as the builder of the eighth biggest airport, but it will go down in history as the biggest polluter that this nation ever saw.

00:41:43,680 --> 00:42:23,200

King: Thank you Mr. Wassermann. We have received one request from a lady which we certainly will honor that she be notified of a meeting with the FAA officials, anyone else we'll make a general notice hopefully I think we should do that, but anyone else in particular in addition to a general notice we would certainly like to specifically invite them. Another lady has asked this question; Mr. Thomas P. Callaghan will answer it. The question is why do you allow planes to periodically take a shortcut over the highland area of Winthrop instead of coming in over the water as they are supposed to? That is the question. Mr. Callaghan has the answer.

00:42:34,560 --> 00:47:38,480

Callaghan: I presume that the person asking the question is talking about landings on runway 27 coming in in that direction, am I correct? Here? Oh. Well I think that there are two possible answers neither of which are going to make people particularly happy. I am the coordinator of the Logan Airport Noise Abatement Committee and I disagree with my good friend Mr. Dimes that we're transferring noise, but that's only incidental he's entitled his opinion. We are attempting to do our best as an airport community to lower noise levels, but as I said to one of the recent complainants so long as we are running diesel locomotives over people's homes we're not going to make them happy. Now to this question I think that the problem really comes from this particular runway because we've investigated certain complaints. Let me describe what occasionally happens on takeoffs from runway 9 in the direction of Point Shirley. According to the noise abatement measures which are subscribed to by the Federal Aviation Air Controllers that are part of the Logan Airport Noise Abatement Committee, planes taking off from runway 9 are directed to go out three miles before they make a turn to the left. Most of the planes do make a turn to the left. Some of the planes occasionally don't go out the three miles, and they cut in after failing to reach the limit and they cut in over the highlands. The other possible answer to the question is that in landing on 22-left planes on the downwind leg coming along the ocean may on occasion be directed by the air controllers to fit into a separation between two aircraft that are approaching the runway. Let us say one aircraft is close to the runway and the other aircraft may be five or six miles out. On occasion the air controller says to the effect that if you feel you can get into that slot and land then go ahead. Actually I can't see how a plane could come over the highlands area. The plane would have to come from a point more northerly and swing in over Beechmont to make that approach, but I merely mention it because apparently people feel as though this is the cause of the problem. Furthermore, I'd like to mention two things: The FAA air controllers are responsible for the supervision of aircraft in flight not the Massachusetts Port Authority. The Massachusetts Port

Authority sponsors the Logan Airport Noise Abatement Committee and as Dick Dimes and others can tell you try to get everyone to cooperate to exercise their own responsibilities. We can't assume responsibilities that are delegated by congress to the FAA or any other responsibilities that are statutorily delegated to other parties. The second thing is that we are about to establish an automatic noise monitoring system and we will have microphones in an area north of runway 22-L that will enable us to pinpoint any aircraft that does fly over the Point Shirley area in either of the two situations that I mentioned. Thank you.

00:47:42,880 --> 00:47:57,120

King: Thank you Mr. Callaghan. We have one late arrival Anne Springer a town meeting member who wishes to speak. Mrs. Springer? Coming up can you get a---

00:48:01,600 --> 00:49:23,000

Anne Springer: Thank you Mr. King. I'd like to again thank Father Sallesse for coming here this evening and I would like to thank all of the other speakers who have taken their time to voice their opinions. It seems that throughout the entire meeting Mr. King and other members of the committee have been shuffling through cards penciling in comments, everything but paying their strict undivided attention to the concerned responsible citizens who have come here this evening to voice their opinions. It appears that we are following an all too familiar pattern. The people of Winthrop are already only too aware of the problems associated with Logan Airport. What we want is for the Massachusetts Port Authority to listen and act in the interests of safer air travel, less pollution, and less noise, not to ignore us in the interest of commercial factions. Our children should be given back their birthright which is clean air, freedom from noise, and simply the enjoyment of an unpolluted oceanfront. We oppose any further expansion or encroachment of this facility. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

00:49:32,480 --> 00:50:00,520

King: Thank you Anne Springer. I just several or at least two have mentioned the fact that we are looking at cards and we are; they're the way a manner of we keep track of things. Also I make notes, it's my own choice, on the back of these cards so that the things that we say we do can be instantly referred to. It is true of course that there's a stenotypist there, and there's also a recording I believe, yes there is, down here. The---

00:50:00,520 --> 00:50:15,800

Audience Member: Can I make a comment please?

King: Pardon?

Audience Member: [inaudible] ---and that is I feel that if you wish to make comments it would be a lot better if you could refrain from doing so until after the speaker has--- [inaudible].

00:50:16,800 --> 00:53:56,520

King: Well I would--- if I could finish I would say this that while we do have these individual aids it does take a considerable amount of time before they're available. Some of these things will be doing tomorrow and the next day, and I don't think the fact that I write because we attend a lot of meetings during our days means anyway that we're not paying attention, I can assure you of that. If we were not paying attention any one of us not myself only but any one of us it would be something less than satisfactory as far as I was concerned, so please do not be offended by that. It's only trying to get more done quickly, but we are paying attention. Now Mr. Milton Lamb does he want to speak? I'm not sure by the way this card is made out he's perfectly welcome. Come right up then please. And will you ask your own or I'll read your question when you get through and then answer, it is that agreeable? All right then will you speak? Okay. Mr. Lamb has made this statement: There are many land spaces such as Hanscom Field and part of South Weymouth Naval Air Station which the federal government has vacated. Why can't we use this land for an airport? Is this expansion going to stop here since the Boeing and Douglas are building planes like the 747, dc-10, and L-1011? Well we're aware of the discussions about Hanscom Field and Weymouth. We're familiar, more familiar, with Hanscom Field as we have been the lessee and operator of the civilian portion of that. In our second airport study which the authority conducted perhaps four or five years ago both of these sites were naturally considered being existing airfields. They're not considered suitable, in our judgments, for commercial airports such as Logan, nor could it be used really as a reliever for Logan in a true sense because the duplicity of operation is something that doesn't accomplish very much; and as far as airspace wise, as far as market wise the people who would be served by an airport in either Hanscom or Weymouth you're serving the basically speaking the same people and airspace wise there are complications with each airport. In other words a fully developed, fully utilized Logan would have aerial airspace conflicts with Logan and or with Weymouth in either case. Now the other question was is this expansion going to stop here or because of the new type planes? Well I think that as far as the extension of 4 and 9 are concerned and the construction of the STOL certainly the larger planes are not affected with a STOL runway except that their operation is improved because it will give an opportunity with a wind in that direction to separate the smaller aircraft from the larger ones. Now there will be no further extension of 4 or 9 I would believe because of existing physical or geographical limitations. I don't think the fact that these aircraft, which I believe you may be inferring can land or take off on seven or eight thousand feet of runway or maybe less than occasion, is a reason to assume that given the opportunity we would not extend the runway as we are trying to do up to a reasonable natural limit. Now if we did not have an inner channel or any other restrictions we would extend runway 9 back further and runway 4-L back further, but since there's a natural limitation there that's as far as we go. It really is a safety and an environmental enhancement. Floor is yours.

00:54:11,360 --> 00:55:11,680

Milton Lamb: Now I live up in the highlands like everybody else, well not like everybody else, but I'm a resident of Winthrop; I've been a resident for 28 years. I've seen this airport expanding and keep expanding. I'm presently employed with General Electric. I've worked in the aerospace

instrument division. I've actually had tours of these three planes, and I've seen I've seen him in operation. Now as he says, he says they're not going to expand anymore. There's an article in the times this Sunday on development of a 7x7 by Boeing, and this plane is going to be developed by Boeing. Now where are they going to put all these planes? I mean they're going to have to expand more runways I don't see where it's going to stop. I mean these companies this they're large plane companies, and the airlines want to make money so they're going to have more planes, so that means they're going to need more runways. It's all going to be one big vicious circle. I think we ought to stop right now.

00:55:19,040 --> 00:55:50,320

King: We have a question which has been submitted which Mr. Callaghan will answer, and I would like to make it clear again, although the record is here, that when I said that the we would not try to expand anymore that we were certainly speaking about the 4-L and the 9, not ever at any time anyplace else. Well don't forget that I said it sometime. The question is why do they rev up these planes at night? That is the question. Mr. Callaghan will try and provide an answer.

00:55:54,480 --> 00:58:42,080

Callaghan: Revving up planes is a diffuse term that many people use in regard to various types of noise from an airport particularly at night. Actually Logan Airport, as far as we know, is the first airport in the country to forbid the maintenance running up of planes at night, and this is strictly enforced by another first that Logan has and that is a night noise patrol. We have a noise patrol which moves around the airport particularly the airfield from 11 pm to 7 a.m. and makes a report to me reports any violation of the noise abatement regulations that we have. Now I'm not saying that there isn't nighttime noise; it comes from landings takeoffs taxiing and reverse thrust. We are doing our best to hold down the reverse thrust. We are doing our best to limit the noise of taxiing. We do have restrictions which the airport--- which the air controllers are following that is to land planes over the water and take off over the water as much as possible between midnight and 6 a.m. We also have the cooperation of the airlines in not having training flights at this station, this airport, which is a common thing to have during the nighttime hours because that's the time when aircraft are available for training. So that revving up does not occur in the under the term as we know it. Revving up did occur with piston propeller aircraft, but with jet aircraft they don't have to increase the revolutions of the engine before takeoff. I think that is the normal description of that particular term. So that yes there is nighttime noise, but we are preventing running up of aircraft for maintenance purposes and we are doing the other things that I have mentioned.

00:58:45,520 --> 00:58:54,200

King: Well thank you Tom. 10 o'clock has come and gone. We do not have any questions here has anyone submitted one? Fine. Excuse Me.

00:58:54,200 --> 00:59:37,800

Audience Member: That's my question I do believe now maybe I misworded that revving up an engine. I'm talking about when I come home from work anywhere from 12-1-2-3-4 o'clock in the morning. I used to work at three and now I reverse my day, and there is I go out of my porch which makes a beautiful ornament in my back house because I can't sleep on it because it's screened in, but there is a whining noise from the airport and either over by the hospital on Marsh no one has mentioned this particular part of town. And this goes on every night and it goes on 10-15-20-25 times in the course of the night. This is what I'm referring to, this whining noise.

00:59:38,640 --> 01:00:45,920

Callaghan: Well one thing that we do is to check out a complaint like this, and we realize that there are various types of noise that might be responsible for what you describe. We'd be glad to send our night noise patrol over there so that he can determine just what he thinks it is by listening to the noise and going back to the airport and seeing just what might be causing that particular noise. There are auxiliary power units running at the airport on stationary aircraft. This is for air conditioning and lights and so forth. We take readings around the airport every hour to determine whether this type of noise or any other type of noise has gone above the normal level, but we'll be glad to send the night noise patrol over to talk to you and see if we can determine what the noise is and how it might be alleviated.

01:00:47,080 --> 01:00:55,840

Audience Member: May I call them some night when I come home from work around 12-1-2 or 3 o'clock? Would they come over then and sit on my back porch with me?

Callaghan: Surely.

Audience Member: Without anybody in the airport knowing about it?

01:00:56,160 --> 01:01:22,520

Callaghan: Surely. The number is L-O-G-A-N-7-3-3-3 in case people don't know it.

Audience Member: [Inaudible] ---Air conditioning. Believe me I'm not joking.

Callaghan: Well I think he meant heating of the aircraft; in the summer it's air conditioning.

Audience Member: In January, every night, this whining. Seven nights a week, 365 days a year.

01:01:23,680 --> 01:04:53,840

Callaghan: Well I mean I don't want to try to ask for a precise description because I think we'd just get into a for a confusion of terms, but we'll be glad to send the night noise patrol, he's a very conscientious fellow, and well we'll do our darndest to find out what the noise is and if possible to lower the noise level. There's another--- there's a question here directed to me. A statement was made by Mr. Callaghan that pilot at times will not fly the required three miles over the ocean before taking left turn. Don't you consider this a dangerous situation? Why don't you people move into Winthrop with your families for a week? Answering the first question, the

noise abatement regulation is not actually designed for safety it's designed for noise abatement. To be specific the requirement that a pilot fly three miles on the extended on--- on the runway heading off runway 9 is designed to have the pilot turn inside Nahant and over the Revere-Saugus marsh area. If a pilot turns before he reaches the three miles that is a violation of the noise abatement measure, something which has to really be sighted by the air controllers, although we have made reports to the air controllers of pilots who have turned less than three miles on the runway heading. It is not designed as a safety measure; we're not making any excuse for a pilot. I do think that when we have the microphones we will be able to have actual data that a pilot has turned inside the three miles and will be able to take, or the FAA, will be able to take action. I'd be delighted to spend a week in Winthrop because I really know what the noise is, and we're doing a great many things to try to stop it, but as we told a expert in a lot of things from the city of Boston merely because the Logan Airport noise abatement committee can't solve the problem doesn't mean that it is not doing its best in its own area. The federal government has great responsibilities in noise abatement especially in the certification of aircraft and action on the sound proofing and the re-fanning of aircraft which are two very important measures to lower the noise at the source at the aircraft engine, but we're doing our best at the Logan Airport Noise Abatement Committee but we can't solve the problem until the problem is solved at the source, the aircraft engine.

01:04:56,800 --> 01:05:58,600

King: Mr. Burns at one step if it's agreeable to you we will have our noise abatement man in the evening call you and make an arrangement to come over I think that'll be more direct or just left, well we'll do it anyway. Now one more question that we received is this, no name on this. What is the decibel reading at Point Shirley? Our answer is the average is 102 without the runway extension 99 with, and that's set out on page 109 and 111 in between those pages of the environmental impact statement. The second question on the same sheet is what is the normal reading that will not affect hearing? Well that's something that I don't know it certainly is disputed, and I think that a source other than us--- we don't know that the aircraft noise, high as they are at spots and regrettable as that is for all of us, is any cause of a loss of hearing. Now do we have anyone else here who wishes to speak?

01:05:59,720 --> 01:06:12,640

Audience Member: ---affected my ears. I live on 444 Pleasant Street, and you're going to like to come to my home and stay at my home for a couple of nights. Then you'll write down---
[inaudible]

01:06:14,480 --> 01:06:28,320

King: Anybody else? Thank you.

Audience Member: Excuse me, one question. An airplane engine as it ages, does become get noisier?

King: Does it?

Audience Member: Does it become noisier as the engine ages?

01:06:28,560 --> 01:06:41,520

King: I don't know that. Does anyone here feel as though they can answer that? I tell you---

Audience Member: A simple level of mileage. An engine, a motor, I don't know an automobile engine gets noisier. Does an airplane engine become noisy?

01:06:41,720 --> 01:07:15,360

King: I just said that I don't know, but I'm perfectly willing, if you give me a name, to find out for you from some source like the engine manufacturer.

Audience Member: The reason I bring that point up is that I call the airport on complaint, and I get the story that on certain mornings from six to nine like every few minutes a plane is taking off and that's supposed to be the shuttles to New York. Now you use an older type plane on shuttles to New York.

01:07:16,400 --> 01:07:32,400

King: I don't think that the first section at least, that's the first one that goes, is as an older plane I think it's a 727, but it may well be that the backup section is an older plane. I know that they do use Electra's right on that on occasion.

01:07:32,400 --> 01:07:44,960

Audience Member: They use Electra's?

King: On occasion Mr. Mooney---

Audience Member: Would you say those are noisier planes?

King: ---would you care if you know if you don't we'll find out and give them an answer?

Mooney: Well actually---

Audience Member: You know the answer to that

King: I wish I did.

01:07:47,600 --> 01:08:24,400

Mooney: They started out with the they were using the Electra's then they moved to the dc-9 and they're using more 727s using the 9 to some extent as a backup, but the very backup is an Electra. And I don't know about the level of noise it depends upon--- if you don't like the compressor whine yeah it's a noisier airplane, but the lower tones it's not as noisy. It depends upon whether you're aggravated more by high tones or low tones.

01:08:25,360 --> 01:08:36,480

King: But if you would like us to pursue that and you let us have your name and address we'll be glad to do that. Now is there anyone else---

Audience Member: How many airlines run shuttles to New York?

King: Pardon?

Audience Member: How many airlines run shuttles to New York?

01:08:37,200 --> 01:08:51,840

King: Well I believe just Eastern. Others fly to New York, but the shuttle you know we will take you as long as you're there at the designated hour only Eastern. All right anyone else have that's a question? Fine.

01:08:52,080 --> 01:09:08,640

Audience Member: I'd like to ask one question. If the people the residents of Winthrop, East Boston, Revere, and Chelsea are dead set against this airport expansion will the Massport Authority go ahead with it anyway? Could we really have any say in this?

01:09:09,200 --> 01:

King: Well I think that regardless of how one may feel that everything you say is weighed, but for you or anyone else simply to say that I'm against it or we're all dead set against it that's one statement and that's probably true, but shouldn't the real question be what are your reasons and how valid are they? Wouldn't it be--- well I might give that a try sometime do you think that oh--- don't spoil this evening. May I answer it this way that wouldn't it be truly a shame you must understand that I don't like noise or Mr. Mooney or any of the younger or older people here, we all understand that, and the quicker the problem is combated and licked at the source with the aircraft engine certainly the easier everyone associated with an airport Authority will be. For instance tonight some one person may have said something nice about Massport we didn't come here for that, but that could happen if there wasn't any noise. But nevertheless the facts are that we really think, and we're getting to the essence of why we're here and why we propose the runway extensions, as we really and truly believe and I think if you look if that's the right plan I hope it is that extending say runway 9, because we're in Winthrop, back toward the main channel that's in the direction of pier 4, commonwealth pier, fish pier, areas generally that are on Northern Avenue and Atlantic Avenue that if you don't believe that those planes will be higher and therefore less noise over Point Shirley on departure I have to say that we disagree. Now then there's the argument that having extended that runway 1800 or 1900 feet that that will mean that more aircraft who otherwise would not be on that runway will be there. Well I think that our environmental impact says that that really isn't so, that if it is it's very slight. Does that mean that there won't be more aircraft there just more aircraft there in 1980 or than there are now? No it doesn't. It means that there won't be more aircraft there than there would be anyway, and I think that that's something you'll have to consider. Take also the added length for safety that's something you should be interested in. Something that when you say we're all dead set against it fine. Why? Because we are for it because we really think that it will be less noise and less pollution. We think that it will be a safety enhancement. At the same time doing that we are also advancing the economy which is something to be considered. We're not building that or recommending it be built just to put people to work, but as we enhance the safety which certainly is a major consideration I think that's number one and as we enhance the

environment at the same time when we can include an economic plus I certainly think that you have to come up with answers or reasons that supersede those. We--- everyone should try and understand our position. We certainly understand yours. Well--- now---

Audience Member: We have a problem and the airport at this point has given us nothing but problems and they have done very little for the surrounding towns.

01:12:42,960 --> 01:12:51,600

King: Well that's what you're saying and I say this that---

Audience Member: You can't dispute that

King: Oh now listen I---

Audience Member: [Inaudible]

01:12:52,160 --> 01:14:58,480

King: We've had a reasonably orderly hearing, I didn't interrupt you if you want to speak I'll wait but I would like to be able to finish because we are getting near the end of the evening. There isn't anything that I know of or I'm sure anything you can suggest if you can I suggest you do so so that we'll all have the benefit of it that Massachusetts Port Authority, or any pilot, or the FAA, I'm not going to say the FAA is at fault because they're not here they're in control of some things we're in control of others, or anyone that could be done to reduce noise or pollution at Logan or any other airport in the world that isn't being done. Why would there be a reluctance if it was doable? You talked someone mentioned here earlier and I have it marked on my cards about the pollution. There was an agreement a couple of years ago signed with the United States attorney general and the airlines giving time I believe it's 1974, March of 74. I think you won't see those smoky planes here then the ones and they are there. There isn't any question about it. But that's something that you I think you can observe gradually being controlled. There are less and less and less is that visible pollutant coming out. I think you're going to see improvements in noise, but unfortunately, yet very realistically, it is going to take time. I could say anything I want that we're going to put in part 36 and all of these other things, but nothing really is going to happen that quickly. It's coming, it has been coming, and it will continue to come, so understand what we're trying to do. We believe in what we're doing. The best that you folks really can do or anyone can do and I think it should be this way I think you'll agree with that I'm delighted to see you nodding, what are your reasons? To the extent they're valid we don't want to do anything wrong. We really don't. We don't want to spend money because we don't have any state subsidy or others. We spend our own money. We don't want to do anything against the environment, no we don't have that either but that's all right. We don't want to do anything that doesn't enhance safety, so try and understand that. Now anyone else that has any questions or comments why don't you come right up here and we'll talk about them informally because we'll consider our meeting closed. All right?

01:14:58,480 --> 01:15:01,360

Audience Member: I got something to say please.

King: Go all right yes sir.

01:15:05,840 --> 01:15:23,840

Audience Member: [Inaudible]. All I have to say is thank God that plane didn't come in on runway 9. If it ever hit that hill and if it caught the fire the whole point would have gone and that's just what's going to happen someday. Mark my words, if you put extend that runway 9.

01:15:24,960 --> 01:15:30,200

King: Thank you. Yeah, good. Anyone else has a question or comment we'd be delighted to talk to them up here please.