

Record Group TC6 / Series 1995

Massachusetts Port Authority Public hearing files, 1970-1986

Preliminary master plan meeting in Chelsea, April 30, 1973 Tape 1

00:00:00,000 --> 00:03:54,720

Tom Callaghan: Gentlemen I think we might as well begin, I think that anyone who comes in the next few minutes will not find it difficult to pick up the thread of discussion. I was at the Alderman Chambers and expressed my regrets that there was a conflict in dates tonight. I spoke to the mayor also and he said that he was coming down to speak to this meeting here but, let me outline for you the purpose of the meeting and the reason that we're here and the general scope and purpose of this meeting. The Massachusetts Port Authority has called this meeting to give you our initial ideas concerning the airport master plan. My name is Tom Callaghan I'm the director of community relations. To my right here is Mr. Richard Mooney the aviation director and to his right Mr. Al Bratt who's a member of the aviation department. The purpose of these informal meetings is to present to you, as Mr. Mooney will do in a few minutes, the outline of what the staff considers to be the significant points of a master plan insofar as the staff itself is concerned. The authority has not passed any judgment on the master plan and there will be a process of considerable magnitude to draft a master plan. After we present to you our ideas then we would like to have any input that you people have, any agreement, disagreement, any criticism, any other suggestions. And this meeting is being recorded, Mr. Mooney and his staff will go over the suggestions and criticisms and they will attempt to evaluate those. There will be a draft master plan formulated it will be more detailed than the blue book that you have here tonight. There will be a public hearing on that master plan-that draft master plan-and then, there will be a continuing process of review, before state and federal agencies, before any final judgment is made by the federal Department of Transportation as to the adequacy or the balanced viewpoint of this master plan. As I said I think that this meeting will be helpful as a matter of information for you people and I know it will be helpful for us so that without any further preliminaries, I'd like to introduce our aviation director Richard E. Mooney who will present to you the preliminary master plan, Mr. Mooney.

00:04:03,439 --> 00:13:10,000

Richard Mooney: I'd like to spend just a moment to run through with you very briefly the recommendations at this point by the staff. Before doing so however, I'd like to point out that what is being presented is a scaled-down version of the master plan which has been maintained by the Port Authority over a period of years. On March 1<sup>st</sup>, the Port Authority voted based upon a recommendation by the staff to remove certain projects from the master plan, and they've advised or made the decision that these were not to be further considered by the Port Authority staff in the development of a new master plan study. Specifically these are, first of all, the most controversial project was the parallel 1533 runway. The second item was the elimination of a portion of area which lies between the Bird Island Flats area and Jeffries Point, which was the subject of potential fill if and when needed and if and when approved by the board. A third land area was the potential acquisition of prop-- personal or private property located on the north side of the airport in the vicinity of the present hangar located next to the Allegheny hangar and in the vicinity of the old northeast but currently the Delta Airlines hangar.

Now two other landing area improvements that were contained on that plan was the parallel 927 runway and the extension of the 27 end of the present 927 runway. Now I'd like to, if you would please turn on the film, this will indicate a layout of the landing area, total area. This is actually an aerial photograph of the airport. It's a fairly recent one, done within the past several months with potential improvements included on this and I'd like to run through them very briefly one at a time. First, are 3 items that were the subject of public hearings on March 10<sup>th</sup> in which the Port Authority has made a proposal in the form of an environmental impact statement. It was discussed publicly at the public hearing and will be the subject a very extensive review probably will take in the vicinity of, well, almost a year from the time of start of this project. First item is the extension of runway 9 by 1855 feet. This is in the direction of the harbor, and is primarily for the purpose of increasing the altitude of aircraft on takeoff from this runway and also provides added safety in view of the greater length. The second item is extension of runway 4 left 2020 feet. The construction of a STOL general aviation runway approximately oriented in the 1533 direction for a length of 3830 feet. I'd like to point out that these are master plan lengths. When they actually are designed sometimes there's some variation, but we feel that this is quite accurate at this point. Fourth item is the dual peripheral apron taxiway system. It would provide for completion of the system, there's a very small portion that remains to be completed. Item five is the-- in the airfield taxiway system improvements. One particular item, a high-speed exit from runway four right, which will permit aircraft landing on four right to exit the runway prior to reaching the area adjacent to Winthrop. Next item is to fill the areas between runway 22 and left and right. This is primarily from a--- needed from a safety standpoint. Seven, would be fill--- actually seven and eight, they're both parts of providing the foundation and area for instrumentation on runway 15 right. One area, specifically the fill area to the left, approaching 15 right--an area of approximately 1900 feet by 400 feet--and then, on the other end of that runway, the 33 end, would be a pile and timber platform for the localizer component of the instrument landing system. Item 9 is the south terminal. This terminal has been placed under contract and was included for the reason that at the time that this was put together the contract had not--- has yet been led. Item 10 southwest terminal this is the Eastern Airlines terminal. There's provision for the addition of an additional satellite which, will permit the parking of 18 aircraft as contrasted with the present 15. Eleven is Bird Island Flats. This area is substantially filled but eventually will be the site for further air cargo and possibly hangar development. Item 12 is the area available for extension of the Eastern Airlines hangar. This is primarily the area acquired from the Air National Guard. Thirteen, the north fuel farm area will permit the relocation of fuel storage facilities now located on the south side of the field to be relocated to the north side. Item 14 is what we refer to as a sub-terminal facility, which will permit the check in and pick up of baggage in a location which is remote from the main terminals and also, would be a terminal for eventually what may be an automated people mover system that will operate throughout the terminal area. Item 15 is the central parking garage addition, if and when added parking is needed. Now that is all of the items that we are thinking of at least the major items. We have, we believe, cut the program back very significantly from what was contained or is actually contained on the current master plan. Most of the cutbacks are in the areas of the primary runway improvements specifically, the parallel 1533, parallel 927, and the extension of runway 27. These runway improvements

we felt were the most controversial and had been subject to the most criticism, and we are now recommending, as pointed out, a significantly reduced airfield development plan. Thank you.

00:13:22,240 --> 00:14:39,600

Callaghan: Thank you Mr. Mooney. Just let me add one more word, and that is that if people feel as though they have additional comments to make after this evening, whether or not they have spoken this evening, we welcome any comments that they may have and we suggest that you send them in writing within a couple of weeks to executive director Edward J. King at 470 Atlantic Avenue Boston Mass 02210. We will, from those comments and the ones given at this meeting and the other meetings in the communities, organize a draft master plan, which will also be made available to everyone, and will be the subject of a public hearing. We're ready for comment, Helen. Would please give--- people give their name and address so the record will be clear please.

00:14:42,160 --> 00:17:19,839

Helen Zuko: My name is Helen Zuko and I'm a member of the Chelsea Pollution Control Committee. First of all this evening I would like to say that this public hearing is one of the biggest pretend games I've ever participated in my life. I didn't like them when I was younger and I really don't like playing it tonight. I am of the opinion that the port authority is going to initiate these expansions and category 2 with or without federal funds and so therefore, I would like to say that this public hearing is really a big farce and I'd like to go on record to say that. Also I'd like to give the Port Authority the same feeling that the people here this evening have received when they were handed the blue book the Mass Port Authority's position and their proposal for the preliminary master plan. This, I present to whomever would like it, is the standard the Chelsea Pollution Control Committee is taking opposing category 2. Would you like it? The final thing I would like to bring out once again, is to repeat myself that I'm still committed to the position that the slide on 4 right--- Could I have that slide again Ralph? I would like the people to notice that in the middle of the screen where the 4 right--- it's a red marking and it goes to the left. No up, four right--- left. Okay, I'm sorry. Right. Well, right. We feel in the blue book, the preliminary report, one of the first reasons for making this deviation is for noise abatement, and the committee feels that it may be on paper a true noise abatement position however, if you continue to keep the runway going to the full extent out into the water area that I like to suggest that the FAA and the Port Authority will continue to use the runway and it then will still be a noise problem to Winthrop and the city of Chelsea so therefore, we are in opposition to that also.

00:17:25,839 --> 00:18:21,440

Callaghan: Thank you. Helen is a valued member of the Logan Airport Noise Abatement Committee. And I just have one thought, Mr. Mooney may have some other thoughts, we like to try to be responsive. It does seem as though in the past a few weeks many many people have spoken of the need of the port authority presenting a master plan. After we go to the trouble of scheduling meetings and it's not great trouble but after we do schedule meetings in the local communities and people feel that there is an opportunity to at least listen and make comment.

Then, people claim that they're either boycotting the meeting or there wasn't enough publicity---

00:18:21,440 --> 00:18:33,000

Audience Member: No there wasn't enough publicity. I'm sorry to interfere. They should--- the mayor should have had every home owner have a special notice because it's a great disaster that's befalling our city here.

00:18:35,120 → 00:19:18,000

Callaghan: Well, we would welcome any specific comments in regard to how this master plan will adversely affect Chelsea. I did want to point out, and I'm not attempting to deny any reaction that people may have, but I would like to point out that the announcement of these meetings were printed in a sizable ad in the newspapers. There was a newspaper release issued which was published. The notice of the meeting was also sent to every pastor in the areas involved and excuse me let me finish up---

00:19:18,000 --> 00:19:51,000

Audience Member: But you're incorrect to that point, I checked with [inaudible ---Baptist Church] of which I am actually a member, as secretary of the church, and I spoke to the minister this evening and I asked him if he received notification of a public hearing to be announced in the pulpit and he said "No". Now, if you had called him you would have received my telephone number because I am secretary and he has an unpublished number, so I think you're incorrect on what happened. You wished that you had done this in this community, but I was in service on Sunday and it was not mentioned and it [inaudible]

00:19:51,600 --> 00:19:55,280

Callaghan: What--- what--- what church was that Please?

Audience Member: [Inaudible ---Baptist Church]

00:19:58,960 --> 00:20:02,000

Callaghan: Perhaps---

Audience Member: Can I make a comment Sir?

Callaghan: Yes, surely. That's what we're here for.

00:20:03,000 --> 00:20:21,840

Patrick Day: Officer Patrick Day, you know, this particular night for a mass meeting may not be appropriate because on Mondays the Board of Alderman meets and it's quite possible that some of the people, who perhaps otherwise would have come here, perhaps, they are over there or vice versa.

00:20:23,360 --> 00:21:31,000

Callaghan: Well as I mentioned in the beginning, and perhaps you weren't here at that time—

Patrick Day: No, no, I came in

Callaghan: Well, I did express my regrets that there was a conflict with the--- with the Alderman's meeting. Actually, I was over there and I don't know whether additional people

came in, but I'd presume that roughly the same number was over there that is here. Now I'm not attempting to say that there should be a great number of people here, or that there won't be other opportunities for people to express themselves, but it is a fact that there has been a demand for master plan discussions and that's why we're here and that's why we have given everybody the opportunity and we would welcome any additional comment that anyone cares to make. Yes Mr. Quigley?

00:21:31,500 --> 00:27:49,120

Quigley: Mr. Callaghan, my name is Quigley q-u-i-g-l-e-y, member of the school committee. You can, of course, see this is your first meeting in Chelsea, and you can see some of the resentment that has over the years been so broiled over here against the port, not only the airport, but naturally the bridge with which we are more familiar and which quite frankly we have had a longer run of unhappy association over the many years. I don't want you to be do--- disappointed in this crowd because I can assure you that when they are aroused here there was a time that this hall and the balcony and the outside could not hold all the people that used to come to these meetings when we were being so threatened by the bridge, needless to say, many years ago. Insofar as the airport, the particular purpose for which you are here tonight, needless to say one would be insensitive to fact not to realize that the elimination of 1533 as a parallel runway is, of course, a tremendous asset to Chelsea. Now these figures that took me so long to try to decipher, not being as fast as so many others, just so much I'm sure gobbledygook to these people who are hearing 1533, four right, 927. But, for the information of the people here, 1533 is the runway that that plane now going over will land on and that's the one that affects us here in Chelsea. 927 goes off toward Winthrop on another angle and despite the fact that we are in a solidly brick enclosed building, I think you can get some idea of the discomfort to which the people are continually assessed. So the elimination of 1533 is of some benefit. Quite frankly I view with some concern the STOL runway here. Now while the STOL runway, and for the information you can correct me, STOL in the parlance of the people here is short-take off-landing I believe, is that right Mr.--? It's a new-type runway that they have that will not be the long runway that you have known for so many years, but rather it will be a short takeoff runway that will allow planes with exceptional power, however they're devising them let me say that, engineering wise at takeoff in one-half or probably one-third the space of the normal runway going along. Now this runway is going to be--- this STOL runway is going to be at the bottom of the airport. That one coming in is coming in over 1533. This STOL runway is going to be down here and item three, I don't know what these items are on the STOL runway, but item--- you don't have to put it on, but one and two obviously do not affect us because the purpose of this airport--- of the airport authority, and quite frankly the time has come when they are trying to do something for the people that are in the surrounding communities. We of course in Chelsea do not recognize that because we have been so subjected to the heavy-handed methods in the past. And I say this with no slight toward you people, because long before you were even associated with them, the people in Chelsea, when the eviction notices were served, were served only by going to the houses and nailing them onto the doors, a thing right out of the mid-centuries as far as barbarism is concerned, but that's the history of what our association has been. Now on this one, two, and three Mr. Callaghan on the STOL runway, it's the items one and two, the runways one and two, obviously the purpose of having STOL

down here, in what is called the Jeffries Point of East Boston, is to take these, as many as possible, out over the harbor and that of course is commendable. However, on runway three, which seems to be the longest one, I can view that with some misgiving and quite frankly grave disquiet and how it will affect Chelsea coming up unless, of course, they are under instructions to turn to the left, which needless to say in Winthrop, I have found that no matter what the pilots are told to do they, I think we all realize, they do what they feel they have to do or what they want to do. As far as the community itself is concerned, I think we've discussed it at other times, but being a public hearing might be just as well that what we're hoping to get from the Port Authority are some hearing tests for the children in this school-the Williams School that has been affected, the Saint Stanislaus, and the Shurtleff School that has been affected by the constant use of this area for the planes coming in. As I say, while we hear them and so clearly in the homes around here. It's even more so for the children that once this kind of weather comes that we're having now and the open windows is seriously affecting their hearing. There is, as Mr. Callaghan knows, a committee with which we have been working in Chelsea with his authority and with him as the community representative, and we're hoping also to bring in the ideas of Mrs. Zuko here on this matter because these--- this is the citizen participation, and quite frankly I feel I've talked long enough being a city official because I think the purpose of this meeting is to hear from the citizens themselves, but basically it's that item three on the STOL runway I think, that might give some uh some view for concern for Chelsea and needless to say the elimination of 1533, the parallel runway, is a tremendous boom for the city.

00:27:50,500 --> 00:28:00,000

Audience Member: There's a bunch of planes flying low, way down low, almost hit our house. Down--- every three minutes about 20 planes went.

00:28:02,000 --> 00:28:15,500

Audience Member: May I ask a question please? Will you tell us how many of the Port Authority live around this area?

Second Audience Member: Good Question, very good one.

00:28:16,480 --> 00:28:54,240

Callaghan: Well, I suppose you're including the executive director Mr. King, he lives in Winthrop. I don't think there is any member of the port authority who lives in Chelsea or East Boston. May I ask Mr. Mooney if he would comment a bit on the nature of the use of this STOL general aviation runway, because I think it is important and if Mr. Mooney would relate it to Chelsea particularly?

00:28:58,960 --> 00:40:03,599

Mooney: I'm glad that it has been recognized and I'm sorry that I didn't point it out in more detail, the very great significance of the elimination of the long parallel 1533. Now, I can understand that any runway which is oriented somewhat in the direction of Chelsea why it might raise a question or possible concern in your minds. If--- I don't know, if you'll take a look, maybe that's the best way to do it, take a look at the photograph that's contained in the blue booklet, I hope everyone has picked up a copy of that if they haven't we'll be glad to have

someone bring it around to you, but you'll notice that the 33 end which is in the direction of Chelsea is oriented so that if you took off straight that you would essentially bypass Chelsea. Now, the people in the East Boston area have expressed concern in the Jeffries Point area, which of course is much closer. We've advised them and we're quite sure and we feel that the analysis by the FAA will be the basis for any ultimate decision on this, and we have incidentally experimented with the operation of aircraft so that we know that turns can be made by the type of aircraft that will be taking off and landing on this runway so that these aircraft on either approach or departure from the 33 end will make a procedural turn and go out over the water area. Now, I feel quite confident that they will in any case bypass Chelsea. Also, these aircraft are able to operate substantially differently than the type that you're familiar with day in and day out landing on the main runway 1533. They do climb at a significantly greater rate. They do not make anywhere near the noise, as a matter of fact we took some noise readings on these experimental flights that were conducted and the even in the Jeffries Point area the noise levels were low. Now this may not be a good comparison in your mind, but I think that it does demonstrate what we're speaking of. That even with flights that essentially would go, if they were to go, directly overhead, create about the same amount of noise as aircraft that are just taking off for instance on runway nine and in some cases even the noise of taxing aircraft. When listening to the tapes of the noise measurements of these takeoffs and landings, it was very difficult to discern anything at all in the way of any different noise than the ambient noise level within the area. Now, I'd like to point out that one of the very significant reasons for the need for this runway, now admittedly it provides additional capacity this we're not trying to deny, but it is very significant because we have a large segment of aircraft that are small. A good example of it is a twin otter, which is operated by several of the small commuter airlines. Now for your information, there's been quite a cut back in air service in the New England area and substituted for that service that had been provided by northeast primarily has been to a large extent serviced by such airlines as: Executive Airlines, Air New England, and several others. These aircraft operated by the small commuter airlines, can operate from a short runway. They can operate, as we have stated that they can. We're confident that they will, and it offers a very significant safety improvement. One of the great hazards in operation of these aircraft, at any major airport, is the problem of wake turbulence where the operation of a large jet aircraft either, well just prior to the either the takeoff or landing of a small aircraft set up, turbulence that can actually flip these airplanes over. Now this--- accidents of this type have been caused on airports where small aircraft followed the large aircraft, and as a result there have been accidents and there have been deaths. We want to obviously avoid that, I'm sure that you people do too, but I also understand your concern from a noise standpoint. But, I think that that we can demonstrate we and we have demonstrated to our own satisfaction. We've invited interested parties, possibly not in the Chelsea area because frankly we felt that they weren't that directly concerned, but have demonstrated that these aircraft can operate as we have stated that they will. The proposal will be subject to very close scrutiny by the FAA who will be the responsible agency to make this judgment and ultimately establish the traffic patterns and control the traffic in this manner. I'd like to mention very quickly if I could two of the points that had been raised by the first speaker. One was the, I believe, the objection to the instrumentation on runway 15 right. We have looked at this very carefully. I heard an objection by another party about aircraft that come in too low. Well the instrumentation really on this

runway received quite a boost due to action and interest by the governor's office and also some city representatives when they complained about pilots approaching too low, below the established glide path, and they felt, and we agreed, that the installation of a glideslope would permit the more accurate approach to this runway. Now it doesn't guarantee that an airplane pilot will not operate above or below, but the probability, and the ability to operate on the glide path, is much greater with this instrumentation. Also, and as you well know, when you increase the instrument capability on that runway there's an obvious reason. One is to make it so that aircraft can land at Logan during lower weather minimums. I would hasten to point out this doesn't mean that the airplanes will come in any lower, but it does give this additional operational capability. But, quite significant is the fact that in having this very high precision type of instrumentation, there's quite a safety factor involved. Also, the pilots and the equipment in the aircraft must be capable of operating under these conditions, operate the type of equipment that will permit more accurate approaches, so that we think that for the vast majority of the numbers of operations on that runway that it can increase the margin of safety. Now we're not saying that it's not safe today, but we feel that it can be safer. Now the next item, the taxiway turn off as you land on runway 4 right. Now since the main purpose really of this meeting is to exchange viewpoints, I would like to, so we can better understand in our evaluation, I'd like to better understand the objection to this because very frankly we felt that this was, we can understand the argument on some of the others and there are certainly judgment factors, but I am a little bit confused by how this run--- this taxiway turn off could be in any way objectionable and the only thing that we can see is an advantage. Now when you land on this runway it seems simple enough that if you can turn the airplane off of that runway before it gets down closer to the residential area it would seem to us to be the thing to do. Now I'm not saying that it's going to eliminate noise. It doesn't mean that every airplane is going to turn off at that point, but it means that more aircraft can and will turn off at that point. It means that there will be more aircraft, that are landing on that runway anyway, will be able to turn away from the residential area so that we think it'll be an improvement that way. Now also it's a convenience to the aircraft operator because it means that he can turn back to the terminal area quicker, so it we're not saying that it's an entirely a noise abatement item. There are operational advantages and there are noise abatement advantages, and we feel quite strongly that this has got to be a very definite plus and will be to the advantage of the people living in that area.

00:40:03,599 --> 00:42:04,079

Quigley: Excuse me Mr. Callaghan. Yes, I'm sorry, to trespass again, I have to go, I have another meeting. I only want to say one thing that I forgot to mention. I am in favor and I think the obviously the overwhelming number of people of Chelsea would be in favor of you giving some thought. I realize the implications to a curfew at the airport between 11:00 at night and 7:00 in the morning that is one of the great sources of aggravation needless to say of the entire area, but particularly here in the city in Chelsea. Another point is to at least give some have you people give some thought relative to acquiring, now that it's going to be abandoned, Otis Air Force Base. You have an area of about 22, just for your own information, at the present time you have an area of slightly over 2200 acres. We in Chelsea are slightly over 1200 acres, to give you the--- some idea, you're twice the size almost that we are. Otis Air Force Base is in the area

of 2200 acres. It seems to me that if the--- if the Port Authority could step in now, when this land is going to be available, using it for the same purpose for which it is now used, whether it be your cargo area there or some of your passenger or what, but at least to give some idea of diverting away from Boston some of the tremendous activity to which we have been subjected and to which you and a half hour have been subjected with these planes coming in. And to have this, what you've heard for the past hour with the windows close of course, is nothing comparison what we hear day in day out. No one can watch a television program in the whole area without constant interruptions and the summer time, it's unbearable because we're just not the type community that everybody has a place in cape cod for the summer, or any place else for that matter. Thank you, Mr. Callaghan.

00:42:08,000 --> 00:42:25,040

Callaghan: Thank you Mr. Quigley. Yes sir. Would you care to come up and give your name sir?

00:42:36,240 --> 00:44:15,280

Morris Minsk: My name is Morris Minsk and I live on Grove Street, Chelsea. I'd just like to get--- ask a question for informational purposes regarding aviation, I don't know maybe that's been covered before. But I've been, several times, I've been at Revere Beach and I noticed that the planes coming in seem to come in from a particular--- from a particular direction that is over the ocean side there's along the beach and then they go towards the, you know the airport. Now is that the general way in which the airplanes come in? Are they directed by their guidance system, that is from whichever direction they're coming into the airport, are they directed to come over the ocean's side that is first, that is more over the ocean side rather than over the land? And if so, I was wondering whether it could be so designed that the planes would be coming in and going off from the airport to first go over the ocean side and then if necessary turn around in the air and then go in the proper direction? I don't know whether I made myself clear.

00:44:17,920 --> 00:45:58,319

Callaghan: Well I think you are because we've heard the question before Mr. Minsk. If you're at Revere Beach and you see planes coming from the water in the general direction the beach and then turning south toward the airport, those are usually planes which are on a downwind leg, that is they're landing against the wind, but they're coming down over the ocean on a downwind leg and then they're making 180 degree turn and going back into the airport to land against the wind. Also I would mention that the air controllers of the federal aviation administration, who supervise the operation of the aircraft in flight, do try to have planes take off over the harbor waters during the hours between midnight and six o'clock in the morning when there is not a high volume of operations. A very large percentage of the aircraft, particularly during the summer months when the wind dies down during the night, do take off over the harbor waters and also land over the harbor waters. So, generally speaking, there is that effort to try to have the planes overfly the fishes rather than overfly people.

00:46:02,240 --> 00:47:02,480

Minsk: Well, the question is could that system be consider, you know, considered and improved so perhaps more of the flights, a fact may be, nearly all that the flights could fly over the water--- that is come in over the water most away and then come into the airport or and also go out, you know, go out towards the walk--- towards the water and then circle in the air in the proper direction in which they're supposed to go. In other words, the question in my mind is whether or not a system could be so devised that most of the planes coming in and going out would go over the water to the fullest extent, and to the min--- minimum over the land, coming in and going out.

00:47:05,040 --> 00:49:00,000

Callaghan: Well everyone feels as though we would like to see the Federal Aviation Administration air controllers reach that ideal of operation and aeronautical sophistication, but the fact is that when the wind is blowing with a certain force and direction then the aircraft have to take off against the wind and they have to land against the wind. What does happen is that when the wind is light and as I mentioned, during the hours when people are apt to be most disturbed by aircraft noise, the air controllers try to take as many planes as possible off on runway 15 right, this runway here out over the harbor, and to land them on runway 33 or runway 4-R which also avoids practically all homes. As a matter of fact when they're able to they take a plane off here, and if the other plane isn't apt to interfere because of the interim between the takeoff, then they have that plane land at the other end of the runway particularly during this period from midnight to 6 A.M. in the morning. So Mr. Minsk, they are trying to do their best to avoid overflights of homes, but for safety reasons they still have to overfly homes as is evidenced by the planes here tonight. Is there---? Would you mind giving your name just so we keep the record clear?

00:49:02,079 --> 00:49:14,559

[Marcia] Peters: I'm [Marcia] Peters, 78 Washington Avenue. I just wanted to know if the trial regulation about left-hand turns not being made over Chelsea is still in effect. It was on for 30 days and then it was extended.

00:49:14,720 --> 00:50:43,000

Callaghan: Well, I think what you're speaking of is take us from 33 left toward Chelsea and then take left turn up the river?

Peters: Yes.

Callaghan: Well, number one I think Helen received her minutes of the last Logan Airport noise abatement committee meeting at which she pressed for additional information and further beneficial action by the air controllers. Actually, what they are still testing is the procedure-taking off from runway 33 left and then when a plane reaches 1200 feet, which is presumably in this area here although I admit it doesn't always occur there, then they take a left turn up the river. Now this has been a matter of discussion in the Logan Airport Noise Abatement Committee, and the Federal Aviation Administration air controllers are still attesting this procedure as to whether or not--- if a plane reaches 1200 feet then its path will coincide on a left turn with the Chelsea River.

00:50:44,640 --> 00:51:03,000

Peters: The reason that I asked if it was in effect now is that they're not giving it much of a fair try. I counted 5 in 45 minutes yesterday that made very sharp left-hand turns right over downtown Chelsea, this was about from four to five yesterday, and I counted 5 in 15 minutes this morning.

00:51:05,000 --> 00:51:13,000

Callaghan: That made right turns---

Peters: Left.

Callaghan: Left turns, but they were over Chelsea when they made the left turn is that correct?

Peters: Yep, right over the center of Chelsea.

00:51:14,000 --> 00:52:09,280

Callaghan: Well, we indicated to the air controllers that there was dissatisfaction with this procedure. They said that they would test it further and make additional observations and I'm sure that if you transit--- transmit that information, if Helen doesn't already have it, that we will bring it up at the next meeting of the Logan Airport Noise Abatement Committee and discuss it further. This was a matter of considerable discussion but it wasn't resolved because people did say that instead of going up the river they were actually overflying Chelsea before they made the left turn which is what you're saying. Yes, Mr. Minsk.

00:52:11,440 --> 00:53:01,200

Minsk: This is also for informational purposes regarding aeronautics. Is there any development work being done to have planes rise rather vertically, that is the big type planes, rise vertically and then proceed upon their--- the proper direction? You know to avoid the runways? And if so, how--- there is development well, but how long would it, do you think it would take before it, that sort of work would go into operation, because if development is promising perhaps there may not be any need to have these longer runways now and change the runways.

00:53:03,000 --> 00:53:09,000

Callaghan: Well I could, I think, comment on that but I'd prefer to have Mr. Mooney commenting.

00:53:20,640 --> 00:56:22,500

Mooney: Yes there is work being done in this direction, but it very frankly has been slow in coming. They are talking more--- well personally I don't think they're going to have VTOL type of aircraft in the immediate future. They do have them, but I mean in commercial use and the main reason is, is that they are inefficient as far as the cost of operation and development, and there are also some other problems of operating during instrument conditions. I do think that we're going to see further developments in the STOL or short takeoff and landing, and now they're talking more about RTOL, or reduced takeoff and landing aircraft, and they feel that they can take an airplane similar to our, say the dc-9s that you see operating here every day, and increase the lift capability and thereby make it possible to take off and land on substantially

shorter runways. Now I don't feel that this has any bearing though on the proposal by the port authority for the two runway extensions. Certainly if these aircraft are developed they will be an advantage. It means that the aircraft will be able to take off in a shorter distance, be up at a higher altitude over residential areas so that, in any case, I think it would be a definite advantage and the Port Authority has endorsed this type of experimentation. In fact, during the very recent past, we've urged the appropriate congressional committee under congressman McFaul, urging that they restore some money in the experimentation budget to get into this and do more and try to come up with a solution rather than just experimenting on a basis where it is dragged out for many years. We think it ought to either be done or let's stop talking about it. But again, if these aircraft are developed, they would use the runways as extended and it would just mean that any time that you can start the takeoff role further away from a residential area it's just got to be better in our judgment, and that's with or without the new aircraft.

00:56:26,000 --> 00:56:27,000

Callaghan: Father Herlihy.

00:56:36,000 --> 00:57:42,000

Father Herlihy: I'm Father Herlihy, St. Rose Church in Chelsea. I'm a little amazed at the tactics of divide and conquer. The emphasis from the stage has been "This will not affect you people of Chelsea" or "This was not necessary to be done for the people of Chelsea". My association with the airport has been in three phases: Jeffries Point, Point Shirley, and now Chelsea. Once again, as I expressed myself in February I think it was '72, we recognize the fact that the airport is there and the airport is going to stay there, but we'd like to think that the people surrounding the airport will have the same opportunity of staying there. Now I think I heard someone from the stage this evening say we were buying more property.

00:57:45,000 --> 00:57:57,000

Mooney: Did you say, "Buying more property"?

Herlihy: You said buy private property on the north end of the airport.

Mooney: Oh, Yes.

00:57:57,440 --> 00:58:28:000

Herlihy: I think you were the gentleman said it.

Mooney: No, I said that we were deleting that from the plan. It's the so-called Roby Property, it's a warehouse facility which is next to the Allegheny Hangar. We have said that we've deleted it from the master plan wherein we had a notation on the plan that said to be purchased, I believe that was the terminology, and we're saying that we're no longer interested in purchasing it and so it's the status quo in that area.

00:58:32,160 --> 00:59:03,440

Herlihy: This is the same policy that was stated to us in '72.

Mooney: No, in '70, well I don't know.

Herlihy: In '72 the full board, it was the full board in this, Mr. Callaghan, wasn't it? The full board told us in Winthrop that there would be no further purchase of property. There would be no more sending out to buy up private homes.

Mooney: Well that---

Herlihy: And this was a promise that was made to us in February of '72.

Mooney: Well please---

Herlihy: Now--- I'm sorry.

00:59:05,839 --> 00:59:15,500

Mooney: Well I was just going to say that this is not residential property and this is not contrary to what the board said at that time.

00:59:16,000 --> 00:59:23,800

Herlihy: Oh, but--- It's not residential property, but every bit of commercial property that you push back, you're coming back closer and closer to the residential areas again.

00:59:24,000 --> 00:59:56,200

Mooney: Well do you understand that we're saying that we are changing the present plan to eliminate any reference to purchase. In other words, we're saying we're not going to purchase. That's what we deleted. We're saying that we're not going to purchase that property, we're not proposing to purchase it. Prior, or on the present approved master plan, it says to be acquired, and we're saying that we no longer have any intention of acquiring it.

00:59:56,500 --> 00:59:57,700

Herlihy: When did this change come about?

00:59:59,000 --> 01:00:15,900

Mooney: It was actually voted by the board at their March 1 meeting, to delete that from the master plan that had been approved.

Herlihy: Of 1973?

Mooney: That was in '73 yes.

Herlihy: But you were considering buying property between February of '72 and March of '73.

01:00:16,000 --> 01:00:54,000

Mooney: Well not since that board action. See this is to change an existing master plan. At the time that the board had these hearings and took a vote on this particular subject, the master plan document itself was not changed to delete that, and this is nothing more than an extension of that general philosophy. So there is no plan to purchase property there, nor is there any desire by the staff to include it on a master plan.

01:00:57,920 --> 01:00:19,640

Herlihy: Okay. The point is, again, that we can become so insensitive to the human factor. You mentioned tapes, and your tape said that you could not distinguish between the different types of planes that were flying am I correct on that?

01:01:23,200 --> 01:01:50,600

Mooney: I said that you couldn't distinguish between the ambient noise level and the aircraft that were actually going overhead, in other words, there was an indication as the airplane was taking off we knew it, we could coordinate it with the tape but it was, in some instances, you couldn't you couldn't tell it. In a couple of instances it was barely audible.

01:01:51,900 --> 01:01:57,520

Herlihy: No, I'm sorry. You mean you could not tell the difference between the type plane flying?

01:02:00,799 --> 01:03:33,800

Mooney: Oh yes what I was referring to---

Herlihy: You were talking, I thought, on the STOL flights at the time.

Mooney: Yes, they--- the aircraft operated was a, I believe it was, a twin otter. Well that was the largest of the aircraft and one was an apache. And these are the types of aircraft that are used by these commuter airlines, and we had them simulate a takeoff and a landing from that particular proposed runway orientation. And when they recorded the noise of this aircraft, they found it very difficult to even tell any difference between that noise and the ambient noise level in the Jeffries Point area. Now admittedly, a part of that noise level is total air noise created at the airport. It's buses in the vicinity, it's people talking, playing, and various other things that go into that, but it was very difficult as I say to discern that noise from those aircraft, the type that we expect to be operated, and from that particular runway heading.

01:03:34,240 --> 01:04:05,000

Herlihy: Right, now what do you mean by a STOL? I seem to have a misunderstanding on it because I thought you were already flying a tight plane out, which was taking off very sharply up into the air, attaining a good height within a short time. Is this what you would consider in the future to be a STOL flight or not?

01:04:05,000 --> 01:04:11,000

Mooney: Yes, that's a STOL airplane. It's a short takeoff and landing aircraft.

01:04:11,000 --> 01:06:07,900

Herlihy: Alright now, without the use of audio meters, tapes, and whatnot, just from the human factor, the most difficult plane to take on a takeoff, was that type plane which went immediately straight up and drove everything right sound right back into the ground. Now I'm speaking from three years of experience, of standing on Shirley Street and being able to identify different planes by the noises. And as I said to Mr. Callaghan earlier tonight, the 747 was one of the quietest that we experienced. From a human factor you felt you were being driven into the ground by this type that went directly up. It seemed to be driving everything right back down onto you. Now I don't know about your types, I don't know about your meters. I just know standing there many a time trying to talk to people on that street, and felt like I was being driven into the ground. Now this was what we got from or I got, I'll speak only for myself, that I got from this type plane's takeoff. We had a noise factor on the other planes coming and going and good lord they can't get any lower over Point Shirley or they're all through, but yet they

weren't as bad as that. Now what I'm trying to get at is you're saying that Jeffries Point is not going to be bothered, but if your plane is going to take off down the harbor right?

01:06:08,000 --> 01:06:15,000

Mooney: That's right.

Herlihy: He's going to go straight up. This same sensation is going to be driven back where? Into Jeffries Point.

01:06:15,200 --> 01:06:33,000

Mooney: Now we're saying that by the time it reaches the residential area that it will not be over Jeffries Point but rather over the water. That the flight path of the airplane will not be over the residential area.

01:06:33,400 --> 01:06:39,900

Herlihy: Yes that's very true, but what I'm getting at is that this same sound seems to come back to you.

01:06:42,000 --> 01:06:46,000

Mooney: Well I, you know, I don't know what you experienced I don't---

01:06:46,000 --> 01:07:11,000

Herlihy: I've had plenty of experience at noise, Mr. Callaghan knows that and the others know that. I mean I used to say mass eight o'clock on Sunday morning when we had some man in there, in the FAA whatever that place is, that evidently didn't like us and he sent them out at the rate about one every minute over the small church and if you really wanted a headache you should have tried that.

01:07:12,000 --> 01:07:19,500

Mooney: Could you describe the airplane? Maybe we could get an idea as to what one you're referring to.

01:07:20,000 --> 01:07:59,200

Herlihy: When I'm inside a building saying mass and the plane goes overhead, I haven't the slightest idea what plane is going except they were your regular commercial flights coming out of Logan heading out over the water. Now this is fine, but this is the point I'm getting at that your divide and conquer attitude is "This isn't going to bother you people in Chelsea. Oh no, we're going to send them out over up to Jeffries Point, out over Point Shirley, we're going to get them out over the water fast so we're not going to bother the people back here", but people are people no matter where you go to. I mean this whole sector out there is going to be eliminated sooner or later.

01:08:03,920 --> 01:08:06,000

Mooney: Well actually, when you speak---

01:08:06,000 --> 01:08:43,000

Herlihy: I mean if you lived on that, and I think Mr. Quigley's mother would tell you that same thing, if you lived out in that point. And I'm amazed to hear tonight too that the flights, Chicago flights, went out over the water at night after 11 o'clock. Geez, somebody didn't tell them. I heard them many a night coming right over the rectory after eleven o'clock. And that was one of the points that was brought up at that meeting in Winthrop wasn't that Mr. Callaghan? On the curfew? The Port Authority said they could not establish a curfew because they had to have the permission of the government to do it.

01:08:46,500 --> 01:08:47,500

Stage Member: Is that what the complaint was?

01:08:48,000 --> 01:08:57,500

Callaghan: In substance father, the Port Authorities belief is that it is a matter of interstate commerce which the federal government has to resolve.

01:08:58,000 --> 01:13:11,000

Herlihy: Right, okay. You know I just came tonight to sit here and listen, I'm new around here, but as I just told John I couldn't sit any longer. I think it was Mr. Quigley who brought up a point that I have brought up before and I still think it's feasible maybe it isn't, but what--- I have great respect for Mr. King. I believe that as a business executive that he is tremendous, he's done a tremendous job with this. And I think that he has the capabilities, once we--- once the Port Authority begins to consider the human factor, to do something. So keeping that in mind, and going back to the Otis, I have always felt that the port authority could take Otis over. I felt this even before the government gave it up. And with their capabilities, put in a rail from Otis into Boston, high-speed rail, which could even take some of the pressure off the with the charter flights that you've got in and out the passenger travel of that type. Everybody speaks of the possibility of Otis on strictly cargo, but a high rail--- a high speed rail I think would be the answer. And I think possibly the port authority might have the capabilities of doing such a thing as that because you can't go any further. Even within that little sphere of yours, if you keep building that up it's going to explode someday. As you yourself will say, and we've heard them say it before, we need parallel runways. Why do we need parallel runways? Well to take the pressure off the runways that are being used, see? Well we all recognize that you're going to keep building and building and building and finally the explosion comes and then what happens? What happens then is Jeffries Point is gone, Point Shirley is gone, and the backlash comes back to Chelsea and Beachmont well I mean they've suffered long enough. But my only point, I don't want to take any more of the time here, but my only point is that from my viewpoint the people of Chelsea cannot be sold a bill of goods "We did not perform this in your area because this does not affect you". Whatever affects the people surrounding the airport as a whole will affect the people of Chelsea as well as Cambridge, and Belmont, and Arlington, any place else. And to tell these people, "Well don't you worry it's not going to affect you that much we're going to send them out as one dispatch", whatever you call them over the control at the airport. One Sunday morning one of the parishioners called up and said to him "What's the idea of flying them all out over here there's no east wind this morning?", and his answer "Well you

want me to tell the people in Beachmont that you people have complained so we're going to switch them off to Beachmont now". Well that was a fine answer to get, but you just get some other nice answers out of that place too, but the point-my point is that we've got to work together. East Boston, Winthrop, Revere, Chelsea, South Boston. All of these people have to work together, and I don't think it's right to say in any, I don't know what you said in Winthrop, I don't know what you said in South Boston wasn't South Boston, or is that coming?

01:13:12,500 --> 01:13:50,000

Stage Member: Wednesday night

Herlihy: Wednesday, yeah so I don't know what you're saying in these different places but I think we should all feel we're all part of one big community, and we should solve this problem together. And I personally would feel awful if I thought I was instrumental in keeping the noise out of Chelsea, and yet making it unbearable for the people of Beachmont and Point Shirley at Jeffries Point or South Boston. So I think this is something on the human factor we must also take into consideration and I think I've taken enough of your time for tonight, but I'll be around again.

01:13:55,199 --> 01:14:22,000

Callaghan: Father I just want to say that we're telling the same story everywhere. We're not attempting to just point up one thing or another in different sections of the periphery of the airport, it's the same slide and the same story. Naturally there is a focus on the matters which do concern the particular community where we're discussing.

01:14:23,000 --> 01:14:43,600

Herlihy: Now I hope that, but the statement was made to the effect this does not affect Chelsea, it affected Winthrop or Southie, but the statement made up there tonight that this was not done because it did not affect Chelsea. I think anything to do with the airport affects all the surrounding areas. I made a note on that, that's why I brought that up.

01:14:46,640 --> 01:15:24,000

Callaghan: Thank you father. I'd just like to respond to a couple of other things and that is that as most--- as Mr. Mooney said the authority decided that there should be no more purchases of residential property after the hearings that you mentioned father, but unless there be any misunderstanding or any claim that we're trying to confuse, the board has authorized me to negotiate with the people on Neptune Road to determine whether there's some equitable program which can be developed.

01:15:24,000 --> 01:15:38,000

Herlihy: Anything on Saratoga Street?

Callaghan: No Father

Herlihy: Nothing Further than that area? You know the area I'm talking about?

Callaghan: No, I'm afraid I don't. You mean up---

Herlihy: It's that area of Saratoga Street in East Boston going into Winthrop.

01:15:39,000 --> 01:

Callaghan: No there--- no there isn't any negotiations there. Actually Neptune Road is a situation where there's an overflight of homes, about 2800 feet at the least amount of space from the displaced threshold. On Saratoga Street there is a clear area there's not actually an overflight of homes on landings on 22 left, but I just didn't want to fail to mention those two things. Perhaps the mayor Mr. Spellman has something to say and perhaps representative.

01:16:34,700 --> 01:19:21,000

Mayor Spellman: I'd like to thank you very much for giving the people the--- of Chelsea an opportunity to come here tonight and listen to the facts, and I'd like to thank father and the rest of the people for coming here tonight. I'm sorry the crowd is so few, but as you know tonight we have a Board of Aldermen meeting and the majority of the people from this area are up there. We have a bill up there for our day care center and I know that at least 50 mothers are up there listening to that and some of those mothers would have been down here. But as we sat here and you could hear the planes go overhead, I'm sure you're well aware of the problem we have in Chelsea and I can imagine how you would feel if you were a teacher in this particular school and these planes went over all day long at the same time you were trying to teach 20 to 25 pupils in one of these classrooms. And at the same time I must bring to your attention recently we filed an application with HUD for some low-class housing in this area and as [Marcia] Peters here will tell you, she's in the front row, that we was turned down because the plane--- the plans that we submitted was in the environmental flight patterns of the airplanes. Now I just haven't had the opportunity to study this plan in full but I'm glad to hear that I have such an expert now as Father Herlihy in the community, and I'll call upon him to do a lot of research if he would for me to assist me because he knows from what he speaks and that's about all. I have to get back to the Board of Alderman now because we're requesting that they appropriate money for fixing up our present high school, but I know that you have offered the services of your office Mr. Callaghan in trying to solve some of these noise problems in the school and you've met with groups from the city for that I'm appreciative, and I hope that we will continue in the future to work together as we must. I know that we talked in the past about the flight patterns particularly over this school and over the Shurtleff school, and we discussed what remedies that we could take to somewhat less noise in that area. Now as you know we're negotiating and submitting plans for the naval hospital grounds, and the environmental flight patterns of the airplanes will have a direct bearing on whether or not Chelsea's able to obtain this land or not and as you know, some of the area of that hundred acres up there is in the area of the flight paths of the Logan Airport, so it will help to present a good strong approach to this and no doubt that you'll be hearing from me as to how we can keep the airplanes from that area until such time as we get the plan submitted to Washington to the GAS office so that we can possibly get that land for the city of Chelsea. And like I said, I have to return to the Board of Aldermen and thank you for your time I'm sorry there's not more people here, but tonight is our Board of Alderman meeting. And I do wish to thank those people who did come Jack Larson, Father, and the rest of you, [Marcia], and thank you very much for your time and attention.

01:19:23,000 --> 01:19:24,000

Callaghan: Thank you Mayor Spellman.

01:19:29,520 --> 01:20:19,900

Robert Donovan: Representative Robert F Donovan, the City of Chelsea. I just have a few questions to ask Mr. Callaghan as far as the expansion is concerned. We got to the master plan, I wasn't here on time to go over it with you people, but at some time in the future I'd like to sit down and go over the situation and then I will voice my sentiments on the situation. I was looking over this sheet that was submitted by the Chelsea pollution people here and I was wondering if you people could verify these--- these facts that have been submitted by these people. Are these facts in fact true sir, that there will be some 2500 aircraft passing over the city of Chelsea during inclement weather?

01:20:27,199 --> 01:21:46:560

Callaghan: While Mr. Mooney takes a look at the figures I would just like to point out that as far as the Chelsea pollution group is concerned, we're very happy to have any information which it submits either now or in the future. I think that the only way that we're going to get at the basic facts, the only way that we're going to get, as Mayor Spellman says, at the problem of the schools is to get in and to really analyze exactly what the situation is determine whether the housing and urban development authority is talking on the basic facts of the situation. And as the mayor said, I've been ready to concern myself as representative of the port authority with the problems of the schools and perhaps Mr. Mooney has some comment on the situation here.

01:21:52,239 --> 01:22:14,500

Mooney: We don't have with us unfortunately the computations that were made, but I would say that it looks quite accurate as far as the numbers of hours and also the number of operations. I've used the figure of something under one percent and if my arithmetic is any good that would be pretty close to 2500.

01:22:16:639 --> 01:22:22,900

Donovan: Will the implementation of this new mechanical equipment, will it somehow alleviate these conditions?

01:22:23,000 --> 01:24:39,000

Mooney: No, I think that the main point that we would take issue with is the reference to the fact that it would permit these landings to make 2500 aircraft will be making dangerous approaches over the Chelsea community. Well I don't know how you can make the assumption that it's, that it's dangerous. We've got a gentleman here that I think might have something to offer on that, but I'd like to point out that this is less than one percent of the time. I mentioned previously that any time that you improve the instrumentation, it means that you improve it for the other 99 percent of the time and these air carrier aircraft are required to fly, when there's an instrument landing system to fly on, the instrument landing system so that it makes possible increased precision 100 percent of the time. And the degree of expertise, and the pilots training, the instrumentation in the aircraft and on the ground means that there's a comparable level of safety under category two weather conditions as it would be under category one with lesser equipment and lesser training so that they're equal as compared to today, but you have

the advantage of the improvement--- the improved precision for all other operations. Now I think one thing that's quite misleading here in the second paragraph that says "If the runway will now be effective in poor weather conditions, why won't it be equally as effective in excellent weather conditions?", well it is, I mean it is today.

01:24:40,500 --> 01:24:42,000

Donovan: Which runway are you referring to sir?

01:24:42,840 --> 01:25:41,900

Mooney: 1533. It is a good runway today. This isn't something that will be created by adding category 2 to make it so that it's going to be more enticing to the aircraft operator or to the FAA to control traffic in that particular manner. It just doesn't offer anything other than what we're saying, and that is increased capability during these weather conditions and increased safety conditions at all times and an increased opportunity to further assure that aircraft will fly at or above the glide slope. And this is good from a noise abatement standpoint. Dr. Doherty do you have something you'd like to add?

01:25:42,000 --> 01:25:44,800

Dr. Doherty: I'd like to answer that question if I could?

Mooney: Certainly

01:25:48,320 --> 01:27:42,000

Doherty: I'm here representing executive airlines and I won't propose that that people should see me in any other light, although my background when I answer this question comes from the fact that I was formerly head of the acts investigation branch in the Federal Aviation Administration. Now with regard to the safety change, and there would be a change in safety for Chelsea if this instrument approach were put in, it would be purely beneficial. And why do I say that? It would allow precision approaches to be made to runway 15, and I say it would be beneficial because in the entire history of jet aviation in American flag carrier airlines to my knowledge, and I keep up quite well in this area since I specialize in aviation safety, to my knowledge no passenger has ever been killed in an American jet flag carrier on a precision approach. Now Americans have been flying jet aircraft since 1958 there have been many many people killed on approaches to airports in jet airplanes since 1958, but to my knowledge so far the number up in the numerator is zero and there are millions literally millions of precision approaches and it upsets me very much when I see a statement made like that, because the facts are easy to get. Now there may be an exception, there was a jet carrier at midway within the last year. It was cleared for a precision approach I don't know if that aircraft had started it or not but if it were it would be a one for the first time in the numerator under millions literally millions of approaches. There is no doubt that the safest way to move traffic in and out of a runway is with a precision approach. Yes? [Inaudible] What? [Inaudible]. Yes.

01: 27:46,000 --> 01:28:32,000

Mooney: I'd--- while he's getting up here, I would like to re-emphasize this. There have been a number of accidents in the New England area, and if you take a look at the accident reports

invariably there's a problem of lack of instrumentation. The investigations always result in a an outcry, usually by the congressional representatives, as to why the FAA does not increase the instrumentation at various airports and usually it's at airports that are of a smaller category than Logan, but this is where most of the accidents have occurred and it's due to lack of instrumentation. Go ahead John.

01:28:32,880 --> 01:28:58,000

John Vitagliano: Thank you. My name is John Vitagliano, I'm the manager of the little city hall in East Boston. I would like to ask Dr. Doherty a question if I might. On that last figure that you came up with the millions of number of approaches to precision electronic approaches to airports and so forth. Are these being conducted now in category two type of operations in many instances or are these primarily category one? What's now exists at Logan?

01:29:03,280 --> 01:29:30,000

Doherty: Well they're conducted under a variety of circumstances and I couldn't tell you what the percentage was. When I speak of a precision approach I'm talking about on a pro--- I won't speak for any approach that doesn't include a center line and a glide slope. If a pilot has a center line and a glide slope and a jet airplane, those three things, to my knowledge no passengers ever been killed in an American flag carrier on such an approach.

01:29:31,500 --> 01:29:36,000

Audience Member: [Inaudible]

01:29:36,840 --> 01:29:54,000

Doherty: Well, There's been a number of plants that have landed in the water but to date no passenger has ever been killed, to my knowledge, in an American flag carrier on a precision approach, and adding to the best way to make any approach safer is to add to the instrumentation that's available on that approach.

01:29:55,000 --> 01:29:56,000

Audience Member: What other approaches are there?

01:29:56,639 --> 01:30:10,000

Doherty: Well, there are a variety, I think the worst is a circling approach and many of the fatal accidents in the last five years have been circling approaches. Cincinnati was an example of an airport that had had circling approaches and has had a very unfortunate accident experience.

01:30:11,920 --> 01:31:04,000

Mooney: This incidentally--- sometimes if there's inadequate instrumentation at an airport what they will try to do on occasion is to bring an aircraft in as close as they can under certain conditions using the instrumentation that's available and then one at these lower levels then they can make this, in some situations, a circling approach such as Dr. Doherty mentioned. And this in effect is trying to make use of an instrument--- instrumentation which is not set up for that particular runway and it causes maneuvering in the vicinity of the airport that is not as

good as a direct approach under instrument conditions or non-instrument conditions as far as that's concerned.

01:31:05,840 --> 01:31:17,000

Vitagliano: One further question. Are you people going to have any future meetings for these people to come and voice their sentiments? Say one big public meeting like we had before John Hancock or whatever it was?

01:31:18,000 --> 01:32:17,200

Mooney: Well our plan was to have the draft master plan study completed and distributed to those that are interested and then have one large hearing. Now, when we were in Revere last Thursday night it was suggested for the first time that we consider coming back to the same smaller groups, no decision has been made on it, but that recommendation was made it's the only one that we received on that subject though today this is the fourth one. [Inaudible] What's that? [Inaudible] No, no I think that there they were asking us to meet with the selectmen and with the planning board and that we plan to do, but it was not I don't recall it was suggested that after this that we go back and have another public hearing individually and went through.

01:32:18,000 --> 01:32:26,000

Vitagliano: All right, and sometime in the future then I'll sit down with you people and go over this master planner and we'll voice my sentiments later then, okay? Thank you very much.

01:32:26,500 --> 01:32:27,500

Mooney: Thank you very much.

01:32:36,320 --> 01:35:32,480

Jack Larson: My name is Jack Larson and extending a straight edge on this runway, it passes directly over my house, although in fact the airplanes don't fly absolutely straight apparently because they don't all go over my house, but the runway is directly in line with my house which is across from the Shurtleff School. And as the mayor has mentioned, it's impossible to operate that school when the airlines are operating on that runway. Now the state department of education has recently conducted a survey of the Chelsea schools and the conclusion of the state Department of Education is that all of the Chelsea schools need to be replaced now. However, the people of Chelsea are not of a like mind with the state Board of Education on that or practically any other issue of education. However, as you well know, the Supreme Court has established and the courts across the land have established that the airports are liable for the noise damage. However, we have a difficulty procedurally in this state and that the Port Authority in the city of Chelsea are both instrumentalities of the state and the Port Authority seems to be an instrumentality of the state with all kinds of privileges and no responsibilities so that we as yet have to obtain any practical means of obtaining redress for the noise damage created by the Port Authority. Now since we do need new schools in Chelsea and they will not be usable unless they are air conditioned, that is noise proof, and of course the only practical way to noise proof of building is to also air condition it. These buildings were to be air-

conditioned they could be used 12 months a year instead of nine months a year so that we would not require so many buildings. And if we were permitted to have air-conditioned buildings then the siting of the buildings could be indeed right under the flight path and the otherwise unusable property, so I do hope that the port authority will sooner or later face up obligations with respect to noise damage and quit kidding ourselves the port authority is going to be here and the people are going to be here and sooner or later the problem's going to have to be faced. Now I noticed that there is some discussion that there's no longer any intention of paralleling the runway that passes over Chelsea. I believe that that is clearly a strategic measure and that indeed that runway will be and must be parallel. Now as I understand it, it's not practical to have downwind takeoffs and upwind landings even on a parallel--- pair of parallel runways. In other words, if that were paralleled it would not be possible to have downwind takeoffs and upwind landings.

(Continued on Tape 2)