

Record Group TC6/Series 1995

Massachusetts Port Authority Public Hearing Files, 1970-1986

Preliminary master plan meeting in South Boston, [April 1973], Tape 1

00:00:00,160 --> 00:04:09,680

Thomas Callaghan: Gentlemen I think we might as well begin. If people arrive late I'm sure that they can pick up the trend of the discussion. First we want to thank everyone for attending this meeting. We welcome you all and trust that you will give us your reactions after learning of the initial suggestions of the staff of the Massachusetts Port Authority on the preliminary master plan. This is the fifth of a series of informational meetings in the communities near Logan Airport, and we've tried to hold these meetings in areas that are annoyed by aircraft flights. We have had meetings in Winthrop, East Boston, Revere, and Chelsea, and tonight we trust that you will give us your endorsement or criticisms or suggestions because this is the beginning of a process of trying to develop a master plan for Logan Airport that is going to take into consideration the responsibilities of the airport community to accommodate the volumes that are forecast over the next 10 or 15 years. And also, and very sincerely, to try to develop methods and means whereby the concerns and irritations of the surrounding communities are considered and, to the best of our ability, resolved. Over the course of time there's been considerable discussion of master plans at airports. The Port Authority has had numerous master plans over the years we have attempted to conform with all of the federal regulations; we are attempting to continue to conform and to develop the best possible master plan that we can. The airport as you probably know has a Noise Abatement Committee which meets monthly and which has representatives from not only this area but East Boston, Winthrop, Chelsea, and Revere so that there is an input from the community. And that's what we're seeking here tonight. We will begin by presenting to you the staff ideas of what should be part of the continuing development of the master plan. And I would now like to introduce Dick Mooney, the Director of Aviation for the Massachusetts Port Authority, who will present to you the staff ideas of what should be included in the master plan, and, belatedly, I would like to introduce Al Bratt of the Aviation Department. And my name is Tom Callaghan. I'm the Director of Community Affairs for Massachusetts Port Authority. Dick Mooney.

00:04:13,040 --> 00:08:27,840

Richard Mooney: As Tom Callaghan said, the blue book that has been distributed represents the staff's preliminary thinking of what principal projects should be incorporated in a master plan that is now under review and will be formalized and finalized during the next period during which we will review the comments that are made by each of the individuals that have participated in these informational meetings as well as the staff and various inputs from consultants and so forth. This will be then developed into a draft master plan study which will

be printed up and made available to all interested parties, and then, following this, will be a hearing on the draft master plan. Now keep in mind that this is not a master plan that is being presented tonight. It represents projects and the basic reasons for including these projects within the master plan. I would like to point out also that the master plan which the Port Authority has maintained—and it's been, to say the least, a bit controversial—has had a number of projects that were reconsidered by the Port Authority and action was taken the first of March to act on a recommendation by the staff to delete certain projects which we felt really were not feasible, and there was a question also as to the need for them currently is contrasted with their need primarily two or three years ago. Now the most controversial project included on our currently approved master plan is a parallel runway 1533. There are several other projects—or not exactly proposed projects, but master plan projects—included on that plan. In addition to this was a parallel runway 927 and an extension of runway 27. These have been deleted because we feel that the need has changed somewhat, but also we recognize the fact that the parallel runway 1533 had met with a great deal of public opposition, and so, based upon this, the Port Authority has withdrawn it from consideration. Two other items that have been deleted that were a bit controversial: one was the possible filling of an addition to the Bird Island Flats area in the direction of Jeffries Point and the other area was the potential acquisition of private property located on the north side of the airport. It's an industrial development that does not include any residences, but again this is a deletion, not an addition. Now I'd like to run through very briefly the projects that are included in the blue booklet and I'd like to start, if you will—am I going to be in the way of the...? I'd like to run through these. The first three involve two runway extensions and a short runway parallel to the 1533 runway, but the first item is the extension of runway 9, length of approximately 1,855 feet and the extension of runway 4 Left for an added length of 2,020 feet. Now I'd like to point out—

00:08:27,840 --> 00:09:08,000

Audience Member: I'm sorry. Sorry I don't want to interrupt, but you're talking figures and the people here do not understand unless someone is up there pointing out these runways to us for there's no figures on this map.

Richard Mooney: Well if you'll take—watch this. Can you focus that light a little bit better? Can you see that arrow?

Audience Member: No, but it's lost. You can't see it very well. The details are lost.

Richard Mooney: Well I wonder... I hate to bother you, but I wonder if you might come up? Maybe to the front row? It might help a little bit.

Audience Member: You got a pointer?

00:09:04,480 --> 00:16:38,959

Thomas Callaghan: Well we'd be glad to have somebody point it out. Is there a pointer here? Anywhere?

Richard Mooney: I'd like to again—let me mention these three projects. The first one is the extension of runway 9; this is an extension in the direction of the Boston Harbor. I should like to point out, in particular, that the landing threshold for this runway after the extension would be maintained at its present location; this means that the aircraft landing on this runway will not land any closer to the physical land, even after the extension is completed than they do currently. It will not bring the aircraft any closer in the direction of the Harbor. The next item is the second item, and that's extension of runway 4 Left, approximately 2,000 feet. Again the landing threshold would remain at its present location, and I'd like to point out that one of the main reasons, first of all we don't think that we need the added length for the landing, but also there are the instructions caused by the shipping in the harbor, and we do not anticipate changing the threshold of those two runways. The third project is the short runway 1533: approximately 3,830 feet. Next item is the Dual Peripheral Apron Taxiway System. This system, which wraps around the terminal area, is substantially completed. There's a small section which has yet to be completed; it's indicated in red. Item five is airfield taxiway system improvements the primary item there is a high speed exit when landing on runway 4 Right. We feel that this will have an advantage of permitting the exiting of traffic prior to moving down closer to the Winthrop and East Boston residential areas. Obviously also there's an operational benefit; it means that the aircraft will not have to operate as far in landing in that direction to move back to the terminal area. Item six is to fill the area between runway 22 Left and Right. This is primarily a safety matter; these ponds out there that exist today, we have had aircraft that have gone into that area. Fortunately, there has not been any personal injury but there have been some very serious aircraft accidents in this vicinity. Item seven: tidal flat fill for 15 Right glide slope. There are two components of a proposed instrument landing system or, rather, locations for the installation of an instrument landing system for runway 15 Right. The first is to fill an area which would accommodate the glide slope; the second item would be a pile and timber platform on which would be located the localizer. Item nine: south terminal. We will delete this from the plan from consideration because this contract, since first published or was first put together, action has been taken by the authority and that project is under construction. Item ten: Southwest terminal satellite. That will be a small addition to the so-called Southwest or Eastern Airlines terminal, increasing gate positions from the present 15 to 18 positions. Bird Island Flats, item number 11: this is an area that is currently being filled. It's substantially completed, but on this area will be located our cargo facilities and possibly aircraft maintenance facilities. Item 12 is an area that's available for the extension of Eastern Airlines hangar, and we currently haven't processed an air freight terminal in that location. That was property acquired from the Air National Guard. Item 13 would be the relocation of some of the fuel storage facilities from the south side of the field to the to the north side. Item 14 is what we call a sub-

terminal facility; this is somewhat out in the future, but the idea here is to develop a sub-terminal from which passengers could pick up and drop off their baggage, and it would also serve as a terminal for a people mover system which would operate throughout the terminal area. Item 15 is the possible addition to the central parking garage, if and when it is needed. Now this is a listing of all of the principal projects that the staff has under consideration, and, as pointed out, the blue book does not attempt to go into a great deal of detail as to exactly for instance the environmental impact or what have you. It states only the brief description of the project and the basis for the need, but as part of the master plan study, there will be a great deal of additional detail that has been developed over the past great many studies and will also incorporate new thinking that has been developed more recently and also will consider the comments that have been made by various private individuals in the hearing process and also with planned meetings with various elected and appointed representatives of the various communities. With this I would like to suggest that we're open to a comment, recommendations, or what have you. We'd like to hear from you as to what you think ought to be included, what should be deleted, anything that you'd like to know more about, or, in other words, it's available for you to say or ask whatever you wish.

00:16:43,279 --> 00:17:34,960

Thomas Callaghan: I'd just like to say that sometimes we've been accused of having the air controller shift the runway so that planes didn't interfere with meetings of this kind, but it so happens that over the course of these meetings every night the runway that has been used has been close to overflying the meeting. So, after dropping that note into the meeting I'd like to just say that if you'd come to the microphone and just give your name and any affiliation that you care to we would welcome whatever comments you have.

00:17:32,960 --> 00:18:00,080

Jean Willy: I have a question. My name is Mrs. Jean Willy. I'm president of South Boston Residence Group. I have a very—probably unintelligent, naive question. I know nothing about what you're talking about—it's too technical—but if you're not going to change the threshold, why, in the name of God, are you building the extension? If everything is going to remain the same on 9 and 4 then why are you building out more?

00:17:57,919 --> 00:20:26,000

Thomas Callaghan: Well, Mr. Mooney can answer in more detail, but just let me say simply that the extension of runway 4 Left, which is virtually in line with this auditorium—

Jean Willy: Yeah, I know.

Thomas Callaghan: —will provide a greater safety for takeoffs from the other end of the runway, which is 22 Right. As you know—or I trust you know—the takeoffs from runway 22 Right make a

left turn, and, we hope most of the time avoid this residential area and go out over Castle Island and then down to Dorchester Bay so they didn't take off from runway 22 Right there will be greater safety in case they had to abort a takeoff—that is they had to bring the aircraft to a halt rather than to continue the actual take off.

Jean Willy: Wait a minute now. In other words, 4L is being extended for the safety measures of 22.

Thomas Callaghan: To increase the safety standards of takeoffs on runway 22 Right.

Jean Willy: All right, and how about 9? What's your excuse on runway 9?

Thomas Callaghan: As far as runway 9 is concerned, Jean, the purpose of that is to get planes higher over Point Shirley. When they take off approximately 2,000 feet farther to the southwest then they will be two or three hundred feet higher over Point Shirley when they pass that strip of land.

Jean Willy: They won't be any higher over us though.

Thomas Callaghan: Well when they take off from 9 they don't come over in this direction.

Jean Willy: We get them down in the lower Broadway end.

Thomas Callaghan: That is when they are taking off from the 27 into the runway.

Jean Willy: 27 goes right over Thomas Park. I can almost touch the planes from my window.

Thomas Callaghan: I realize that, and if you'd care to, we put the slide back on so that you might have—and everyone else—a little clearer understanding of what we're talking about. Jean would you just move to one side? Just slide back?

Jean Willy: I'm not done anyway.

00:20:26,000 --> 00:23:35,760

Thomas Callaghan: I think it'd be helpful if Mr. [inaudible] and the airport planner—

Audience member: Would you point out South Boston to the people? We know where it is, the piers. And you said some people—you said physical land, you didn't mention toward South Boston. You said toward the physical land. I would say toward South Boston, and I'm sure they'd understand.

Thomas Callaghan: Let me just recapitulate, if I may, runway 4 Left, extended in the direction of South Boston comes pretty close to the auditorium—here. So just drop it down, Armand on the —to show where we are here. Now, the situation as it exists today, in so far as South Boston is concerned, will not be changed. What I was speaking of a moment ago is that the takeoffs from 22 Right will proceed in the same way that they have for the past few years. The pilot is directed to make a left turn as soon as practical which sometimes is before he has left the airport proper. That is he is in the air—say halfway down the runway—and as soon as he gains what he considers to be a reasonable altitude, he makes a left turn and continues for two miles, and then makes a right turn down Dorchester Bay. And the extension is to increase the safety standards on that runway. And on the landing on runway 4 Left the threshold will remain where

it is at the present time. The purpose of the extension is to increase the safety standards on the takeoff and the landings will remain at the same point that they are today. And then, as far as runway 9 is concerned, that extension will increase the height of aircraft on takeoff over Point Shirley and will alleviate the noise condition over Point Shirley. And on takeoffs from the 27 end of the runway, the Point Shirley end, there will be, actually, no change in so far as the noise level over South Boston is concerned. It's another matter of safety, of having a longer runway so that the pilot can bring the plane to a halt on the runway and not over the edge of the threshold. Do you have any other questions, Jean?

00:23:34,000 --> 00:24:22,000

Jean Willy: Well just for the record, the South Boston Residence Group wishes to go on records being opposed not only to these extensions but to this hearing in itself in the fact that we know that it's a foregone conclusion. This so-called plan we've heard so much about—we think we're sort of batting our heads against the wall—and I want this to be on the record that people have been contacted, people have been saying over and over, “What's the use?” That whatever Eddie King wants he gets and so forth and so on. So I want this to be part of the record that the South Boston Residence Group, of which I am president, is opposed vehemently to the extension of these two runways and we're most unhappy with the filling of the Bird Island Flats. Thank you.

00:24:22,000 --> 00:24:47,840

Thomas Callaghan: Thank you. Of course there is a sound record of the meeting and there will be a printed transcription of the meeting so that everyone's contribution will be recorded. Senator Bulger.

00:24:51,200 --> 00:33:55,840

William Bulger: Mr. Chairman I thank you for the opportunity that you're giving me to appear before the Massachusetts Port Authority again. And, as you know, it is a matter of vital importance to both the city of Boston and to the region as a whole: the future expansion of Boston Logan Airport which you will agree is really what we are talking about. The expansion of Logan Airport. Nothing less. I've read with extreme interest your document entitled “The Preliminary Airport Master Plan Review” and I must regrettably conclude it is nothing more than your original inadequate proposed runway layout blueprint except that you've given it a new title, a prettier cover, and a patronizing introduction—all of which I assume were recommended to you by your new public relations firm. Whatever you have done to package this layout plan, you are unable to hide the fact that Massport still cannot discern the difference between a runway layout plan and a true master plan that will conform to the FAA guidelines for preparation of such plans. Bearing in mind your claim that you are seeking data and information to generate such a comprehensive master plan which, if this first draft reflects the depth of your

sincerity and good faith in this pursuit, then I believe that we are all in for a prolonged confrontation. I shall offer just a number of observations and recommendations for such a plan. None of which I expect to be readily incorporated due to one important fact and that fact is simply that Massport is inherently unable to develop the kind of airport master plan that would make sense regionally as a result of Massport's institutionalized self-interest and single-purpose pursuit. Giving Massport sole responsibility for developing a rational and regionally compatible plan is very much like charging General Motors with the responsibility of devising a workable mass-transit plan for Boston. Or like asking the American Petroleum Institute to promote the research and development of solar energy. In other words, Mr. Chairman, Massport has a built-in corporate conflict of interest. It could no more contribute to a balanced and rational plan than could General Motors or the American Petroleum Institute conscience conscientiously contribute in my somewhat facetious examples. You know and I know, Mr. Chairman, but the charade continues. One of the so-called plans most glaring deficiencies, Mr. Chairman, is the obvious absence of any discussion or even mention of the problems of airport access which is not only required by the FAA guidelines but would certainly be compelled by common sense if Massport dealt in an ethically and intellectually honest manner with the problem. It hasn't, however. One of the more refreshing undertakings on this subject was made recently by the Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission. Its study has provided a separate voice, at least in the matter of Logan expansion, and I believe that that voice and that plan will be invaluable in the years to come. It certainly can serve as a counterweight to Massport's insistence and misrepresentation in promoting greater expansion of Logan. The commission's most valuable conclusion for the citizens of Boston, as it relates to the master plan is the following—and I'm going to quote from the Mass Aeronautics Commission's report. Quote, "Even if it turns out that Boston Logan alone can handle all future scheduled air transportation, it may be in the public interest, both for passenger convenience and to distribute the ground access load, to provide short haul service from Bedford or South Weymouth Naval Air Station or both when the level of passenger demand makes this economically attractive to the airlines." End of quote. I have publicly stated on a number of occasions on the airport access problem, the third harbor tunnel, an expenditure of over 250 million dollars, makes no sense because most of the passengers who fly to destinations in the Northeast Corridor, to Washington to New York, live or work along the route 128 access and therefore, to bring them into the city of Boston just to fly out of Logan is sheer folly of Rube Goldberg vintage which will eclipse I-93 as a debacle. It will add to the already nightmarish traffic congestion and air quality degradation of this city. I have also recommended that the short-haul flights particularly the introduction of STOL, short takeoff and landing, be moved to an already existing second airport. The Aeronautics Commission report is explicit in stating that the prime constraint on Logan activities and growth is the factor of ground access to that facility. Nowhere in its so-called preliminary airport master plan is the subject of airport access even broached which not only renders the Mass Port plan deficient, it

makes a mockery out of the entire procedure including tonight's hearing. Although Massport does not care to discuss publicly its plans for airport access, it has just floated a bond issue to construct a 3,000 car garage which, and without requiring much perception, reflects Massport's overt commitment to automobile and highway access to Logan Airport. Where, Mr. Chairman, does that development appear in your not-so-master master plan? Your public relations firm probably earned some of its excessive fees by acknowledging on page three of your plan that high-speed rail is a potential competitor of the short-haul Northeast Corridor flights and if I were concerned with the corporate well-being of the Massachusetts Port Authority, I'd give some serious thought, as a hedge against future development of rail service, to the exploration of innovative and imaginative means of bringing Massport into the high-speed rail business. If it would be possible to divert your executive director for only a moment from his personal road show, in misrepresenting, for instance, his offshore tanker terminal refinery venture, Massport might very well put its management acumen and bonding power to work exploring either direct involvement in high-speed rail or the support activities, such high-speed rail feeder lines and rail stations and terminals. If, as usual, Massport hides behind its convenient argument that it is prevented, statutorily, from functioning in such an area, I'll file a late file bill tomorrow to clear the way. A recent study by the federal government found that high-speed rail will be self-supporting almost upon implementation. Mr. Chairman I strongly feel that Massport needs new and enlightened leadership. The public will not stand for the corporate arrogance that Massport has come to represent nor are they going to stand for old, inadequate solutions and incompetent performances as they have had to in the past, not from Massport nor I believe from anyone else. Massport and the men who serve on its board of directors must come to understand the long-term implications of the decisions and must begin to examine where they are being taken through quick-remedy, myopic decision-making. And finally, the recent closing of several military air bases including Westover and Bedford has changed the political climate which surrounds the regionalization of air service, both freight and passenger. It is the local acceptability which will be crucial here, and I urge an immediate study be undertaken by the Massachusetts Secretary of Transportation to determine—I'll wait for one of your planes to go over—to determine the feasibility of using Westover and Bedford as limited use airports to relieve Logan Airport and its growing airport access problems and to prevent the construction of the calamitous third harbor tunnel. I'd be happy to respond to your inquiries.

00:33:58,960 --> 00:34:24,560

Thomas Callaghan: Thank you, Senator Bulger. Perhaps Mr. Mooney would care to make some comment. We do try to develop a dialogue so that we just don't sit and be unresponsive to some of the claims that, made at a meeting like this. Mr. Mooney would you care to respond?

00:34:20,879 --> 00:40:06,800



Richard Mooney: Well, I'd like to point out—without attempting to be argumentative—that, as I said to begin with, this is not our master plan. I realize what you're talking about; you're talking about our plan that we have had, and all I can say is that time will tell and we will—I'm absolutely sure that there will be a discussion of access and there will be a discussion of the various items that you have mentioned in this study. I think it will be a very thorough study and deal with many of the problems that have been mentioned not only in the process of these hearings but, very frankly, many times in the past on many other occasions, so that all I can say is that it will have these things in it a lot of work—as you well know—went into the access question as part of this three and a half million dollar Boston Transportation Planning Review. There have also been other studies made on this by Coverdale and Colpitts, so we are incorporating a lot of this in that in the study. Now I'd like to mention just one thing in particular: the possibility of using either Weymouth or Hanscom Field. I'm very much aware of the study that's been done by the Aeronautics Commission and also the Public Works Department because although we were not directly participants, we did work with them on this—and I hope that it doesn't make you too suspect of the results of that, but we were and did participate in every way except that they did direct the project. Specifically on Hanscom Field—as you know we operate Hanscom Field—the fact that the military plans to relinquish its control over the landing area we have had the unlimited right of use of the landing area and we, of course, have the civilian area. We own the landing area and we suspect, although we don't know if it's for certain, that the air force is going to terminate its agreement; they have the unilateral right to terminate, and time will tell. We would like to see the military stay out there. But, at any rate, a commercial airline service could have been provided, and, just to give you a little bit of background, and there hasn't been a great deal said about this in '64, '65, '66 we worked very diligently on what was called an "air service master plan." We determined, with a great deal of work by our consultants, where the market was. We do recognize that there is a market in the vicinity of the 128 area. We, the staff, felt that there was a potential out in that location. We met with each of the airlines that had the capability of providing service on a turnaround basis in the Northeast Corridor, specifically Eastern America and, at that time, northeast. Now at that time Eastern carried 85 percent of the traffic in the in that New York/Boston market and there was just no way that we could persuade them. We don't have the right I'm sure of that. I believe you're an attorney and could well understand the Civil Aeronautics Board regulations. They are certificated to serve the Boston area; the airport operator can't tell them what airport they must operate out of. We tried to convince them to do this, but they said "Why should we split up the market? We've got it anyway." American, likewise, was not interested. Frankly, we just about convinced Northeast Airlines to do this; in fact, they were going to start experimental runs and—we don't know exactly what happened but we assumed that they were scared off by the threat of competition. They were economically not in good shape at that time; they couldn't face the competition—presumably

from Eastern Airlines—so we did push for it. Today we are not pushing for it. We have said that the airlines continue their position that they don't want to operate out of there. As you quoted from the state study, it says “when it's economically feasible.” Well who's going to determine when it's economically feasible? If you go and follow the words very carefully in other words they're still leaving it up to the option of the airlines to make that decision, and that decision could be made today, but there is no interest in it. We've been asked by the people out in that area what our plans are, and we say that there is no interest on behalf of the airlines, and we continue to plan to use it as a reliever airport. Now, ultimately what there will be in the future? I don't know.

00:40:10,960 --> 00:40:21,680

William Bulger: I think ultimately—just so I could just stop you there for a moment—ultimately we can be assured that there'll be a second airport. Can we be certain of that?

00:40:19,520 --> 00:42:08,720

Richard Mooney: Well the governor has said that at least as long as he's governor there won't be one.

William Bulger: That may be abruptly ended.

Richard Mooney: Well, of course, we don't know anything about that, but I think—are you familiar with the argument that existed about two years ago? There was an airport system study —

William Bulger: The governor two years ago. Is this the study which would have cited the airport in the town of Dover? Is that it?

Richard Mooney: Well there was a recommendation by the Port Authority's consultant on Dover, and, of course, that created quite a hullabaloo. But that was initial input that went into a study that was sponsored by the—they used federal fund funds in it, but there was an agreement and it was under the direction of the Metropolitan Area Planning Council. And they, in the final study, came up with a number of alternatives. I think there were—I recall three or four different sites, none of which were Dover. The Port Authority staff made a recommendation to the board that a land bank be established and that land be acquired out in one of these sites—and they were further out than Dover—with the idea of the potential ultimate need for a secondary carrier airport. The governor came out against that, and the board made the decision that we were not to even study it any further. That was the end of the efforts in that direction. I think that the Port Authority's staff's recommendation, I think, still stands.

00:42:06,000 --> 00:42:49,680

William Bulger: We are fast becoming a city incidental to an airport. We really are, and the projected increases—I don't have the figures—but they're dramatic. 1980, how many passengers per year, now, in and out of Logan?

Richard Mooney: About 11 million

William Bulger: And what's projected for 1980?

Richard Mooney: It's on the sheet. I think the FAA recently anticipated an increase by '83 of, I believe, it was two and a half times.

William Bulger: Two and a half times. So now—

Richard Mooney: We're forecasting less than that.

00:42:46,880 --> 00:44:00,240

William Bulger: All right, but let's say two times. It's presently 11 million would be up to what? 22 million?

Richard Mooney: Yes, that's right. Now, excuse me, our consultants—

William Bulger: So we know we know that we're going to need another airport. It's unlivable conditions next to the airport now. You know, we know. You talk about the night flights, the freight flights. We have Westover; that should be examined. The people who—the freight flights I'm talking about, right, it's mostly freight going out of Logan at night, isn't that right?

Richard Mooney: Yes. They're, I think, probably the most irritating ones. Certainly the ones that are later at night or the cargo flights; they're generally the larger aircraft also.

William Bulger: It seems to me that there's no great inconvenience. It's Honeywell in most places, isn't it?

Richard Mooney: I think this—

William Bulger: That they can make the run to Westover, can't they? And shouldn't be developing in that direction?

00:43:56,720 --> 00:46:47,359

Richard Mooney: Actually, the problem is that—

William Bulger: Problem is that Logan Airport is interested in the expansion of Logan Airport. They don't give a damn about the general picture in this region. Very selfish attitude. Now they are probably locked in by the statutes and the bonding requirements and the rest to very narrow purposes, but they do nothing to seek to throw off the limited purpose.

Richard Mooney: Well I, of course, related what we had attempted to do in the past. I didn't mention the fact that we actually had a plan for a cargo development at Hanscom Field; we had an area that was set aside for it. We had some people that appeared to be interested in developing a cargo terminal up in that location, and frankly, we were not able to sell it to anyone. The fact is that the majority of the cargo is carried on combination passenger and cargo aircraft. And I suggest, at this point was raised at one of the prior meetings, consideration of

Westover Air Force base, and I feel that it should be given sufficient consideration and fine by somebody else. I think that in fact the state, under this 200,000 dollar grant, a study performed by Arthur D. Little, to which you referred: that's a statewide airport system plan and it should have—and I think that it did—consider it. Now, at the time that they were doing the major part of the study, Westover Air Force Base wasn't available; today it is and I would certainly feel that that it should be looked at very carefully. And in my opinion, let it be made by somebody else, someone that doesn't, as you say—although we certainly differ an opinion on this—have a vested interest. Because you know if it can be done, why not? But personally I have some reservations about it. But let's see if Secretary Altshuler and Crocker Snow would come up with an opinion and can it be sold to the people that would use it? I just don't know. I see nothing wrong with looking at it, I think it should be.

00:46:45,040 --> 00:47:25,280

William Bulger: Secretary Altshuler, I won't—I'm monopolizing the time here. My neighbors, I'm sure, would like to stand up here, but Altshuler says that the cost of land acquisition is just so prohibitive that, when we're talking about a second airport in any place it's practically out of the question. Well the costs are going to increase astronomically, and as areas have built up the costs.

Richard Mooney: Well let me tell you what—

William Bulger: A chance a chance at an airport that's already there, and that airport, that particular one, services the biggest planes in the world.

00:47:22,000 --> 00:49:41,920

Richard Mooney: Well I think, keep in mind that it's about 90 to 100 miles from the major market and it's about 15 miles from, I think, Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, or Hartford. It's very difficult to generate enough traffic. In other words, Springfield is really served by the Hartford Airport. Now personally I don't remember the secretary saying that. Personally I believe that, and we're not here to promote a second airport, we've been told by our board that we aren't to consider it, but at the time that the staff looked into it, we felt that there was a way of financing it. Admittedly it was costly as far as land acquisition was concerned, but we felt that it could be done on an incremental basis. It would start out as something that would be relatively small and if the demand is there, then it can pay for it. If it isn't there, then it then it won't, and if it isn't there then that's a moot question, too. So I think that that really is not the big issue; it's an issue of people not wanting an airport in their backyard, almost same as your position. I can understand it.

William Bulger: But you would agree, just finally, that that what we're talking about is expansion of Logan Airport? It does constitute expansion doesn't it? The so-called preliminary? You will agree on that; I'm sure you will. We'll agree on that, I'll sit down.

Richard Mooney: We say improvement because we're not going outside of the existing land. Yeah, you can call it expansion, but we like to think of it as improvement. It does increase capacity. The buildings are bigger. I think it's obvious what it is on the face.

William Bulger: I think it's obvious, too. Thank you very much.

Audience: [Applause]

00:49:38,960 --> 00:51:25,839

Thomas Callaghan: Thank you, senator. And we would welcome any further comments and writing that you might have over the course of the next couple of weeks, and if any of the 40 or 50 people in South Boston here would be interested in sending us written comments so they too can be incorporated in the analysis that will be made of all of the possibilities in the preliminary master plan. I would just like to point out one thing: that the Port Authority has a tremendous responsibility to make Logan Airport the safest possible airport that it can. And I would like to emphasize that even if the Port Authority does nothing at the airport, the forecast volumes will remain relatively the same so that it is not the air field improvements—or the expansion if you will—that is going to increase the volume of aircraft movements or the volume of passengers, but we will raise the safety levels by these improvements and hopefully we can do something, such as I've suggested, in terms of alleviating the aircraft noise. And,, as a final thought we certainly realize that noise here in South Boston—in this particular section of South Boston and also when runway 27 is used—quite infrequently I think people will admit, there is a serious neighborhood problem, and we certainly are addressing ourselves to it.

00:51:28,400 --> 00:52:15,290

William Bulger: I have to interrupt you, just respectfully. I don't like to be in—you made a remark for the record here of there being 40 or 50 people here, and I appreciate it. I'd like to also have you introduce into the record the fact that the few people that are here is only due to the fact that it seems hopeless to fight Logan Airport, and if they thought, if people out here ever thought that they could do something about it. They'd all be here tonight, but thus far they've lost every battle against Logan. Somewhere we're going to begin to win battles, and we'll fill the hall! But it's impossible to get people in here on what it seems to be a hopeless cause, so put that in the record too.

Audience: [Applause]

00:52:15,839 --> 00:53:07,440

Thomas Callaghan: If I may just add a respectful demurrer, Senator. Mr. Mooney mentioned that there was considerable influence exerted by you and other people against the parallel runway 1533 and that has been withdrawn, so perhaps you shouldn't be so modest as to your victories

in this issue and in others. Is there someone else that cares to speak? Mr. O'Neil? Just give your name, if you will and you're affiliation—

Joseph Kenneally: I want to apologize first of all to Councilor O'Neil, but I've been sitting here and he just came in.

Thomas Callaghan: He was quite respectfully waiting, if someone wanted to speak ahead of him.

00:53:06,400 --> 00:56:06,960

Joseph Kenneally: My name is Joseph M. Kenneally. I've lived in this district my entire life, which you can probably observe, is more than 39 years. I can remember when we didn't have an airport, and I can remember when we did not have Massport terminal which has resulted in the trucks going through this district all hours of the night. But that is not the subject here tonight, I know. First of all, I thank God that we have a senator like Billy Bulger because I know that our interests are being protected by him in the State House. The mistake that the people of South Boston made was that they trusted the people in public life. Those people come to us and say, "This will not hurt you. This will not affect you." We lost Governor's Island. How many people here know about Governor's Island? I can remember Governor's Island; I remember when they were going to take part of it! Now not only have they gone taken Governor's Island, but they've gone further now to remedy the situation. If I am correct that this so-called runway—I'm not familiar with the number, but I do remember them saying they're going to take off over Castle Island and up Dorchester Bay. They ruined our district by the noise going over our houses now they want to ruin our recreation by the noise that's going over the beaches when we're trying to get away from the airport nuisance. You mentioned at the start of your meeting you'll be interested in endorsement, which I certainly were not going to give, criticism, not being a technical man I will second what Billy Bulger has said, suggesting, I believe another airport should be established in the town of Dover. You did not mention objection, and I certainly wish to go on record as objecting to any expansion of the Logan Airport. Our mistake has been made before; we trusted you, I can remember at a meeting here not too long ago—maybe in the last couple of years where we get the same double-talk, "We are going to reduce the noise. The noise is worse now than it ever has been" A priest saying mass in the summertime cannot give a sermon because of noise that is coming over this place. You have not mentioned one bit that this expansion or the master plan that is not a master plan is going to reduce this noise. That's all you have to say, thank you.

00:56:02,640 --> 00:56:17,839

Thomas Callaghan: Thank you, Mr. Kenneally. We're very glad to take those matters into consideration. Other speakers? Especially those that might have been here early.

00:56:18,640 --> 01:02:00,720

Albert O'Neil: First of all, to Joe Kenneally, I was down the back for a while, but I've been I've been all day long at the State House and this racial imbalance thing, and been there since 9:30 this morning, and I'm so pleased to see that we're now turning in the other direction because the racial imbalance law, as you were probably told, was repealed today by 131-83.

Audience: [Applause]

Albert O'Neil: Mr. Callaghan, I simply want to say this to you, and I respectfully say it to you, but I would like to just give you some of the thoughts that I have on my mind relative to Logan Airport. Let's take Logan Airport for a moment; they don't pay one cent in taxes to this city. Then, when you have the advantage of being very near to the city of Boston, by a matter of 10 minutes you can be right in the heart of the city, that's a great advantage that Logan Airport has, and that's a great thing that Logan Airport sells to potential customers. And then, as you leave Logan Airport that pay no taxes, you drive through the Sumner and the Callahan tunnels and you pay, and they pay no taxes. So you now have Logan, the Port Authority, and now I'm talking about the Turnpike Authority. And then as you go along Commonwealth Avenue in Boston you have all the colleges; they pay no taxes. 56% of the property in Boston is tax-free. 44% of it is carried on the backs of what we've got left. You used to use the old expression that you're not against progress, but you know this city can take so much. If it isn't this, it's that. You know yourself. There's confusion in our churches, today, there's confusion in our schools. There's confusion with our civil service. There's confusion in our presence. There's confusion all over the place, and the person that has been the good citizen his or her whole life, that try to abide by laws and raise their families, a little savings on the side to have their home, it's always the big Port Authority, Turnpike Authority, Public Works, Highway Department, Boston Redevelopment Authority! Everything—believe me, gentlemen—is an authority, and the little guy is getting pushed around, and I've noticed all over the city—I go to meetings every night—people are getting fed up. So now what this is—as we discussed the other night—and I even landed myself in Revere with you because, under the title of the City Councilor of Boston, you're also the County Commissioner. Those people call you and you have to go. You said that there was 200,000 dollars for Arthur D. Little Company for a study. Now if we don't have studies in Massachusetts and in Boston, we have consultants on top of that. Now my point that I'm desperately trying to bring out is: dear God will you give us a rest? That doesn't apply only to you, but everybody else. Give us a chance to live normal lives. It's bad enough now with what's happening here. When I came in the door here tonight I thought I had to run for shelter. The biggest thing I ever saw went over this school. So let me say this to you. You're now on a study, and if you've taken the time to have a study and you've taken the time to have this money appropriated, this is in its infancy now to make something later on a reality. And I appreciate your public relations and your niceties by coming to the districts and so forth because we pay the taxes and the other authorities paid nothing. Now I file a bill religiously every year to make

Logan Airport and the turnpike to pay taxes, and the other day—my sixth year in a row—I said to the chairman, “I know that I waste my time here every year.” He said, “You believe it or not, Counselor O’Neil, we give you a favorable report every year.” But what kind of a statement to follow up by saying to me that somewhere along the line it gets lost. Now this is not fair to decent people that really mean well. So he was fair enough to tell me that so you don't take issue with him. So they were fair enough to give me a favorable report to get some revenue in here for this city so that we can stop being choked and driven out of here. I represent three generations here in this city, possibly four, so what I would like to respectfully say to you is that Otis Air Base is down the Cape, that's a nice area, good, sunny area for everybody, and the Yankees down there probably wouldn't want it, and Hanscom is nice, and Westover is nice, but could you give us a break? Honest to God, we've had just enough of this. So whatever the study is, give back the 200 and forget the whole thing, would you please? Be nice fellas.

Audience: [Applause]

01:01:58,400 --> 01:02:15,359

Thomas Callaghan: I thought—

Richard Mooney: Tom, let me say. Before you leave, the 200,000 wasn't ours; it was the state's. It's the statewide study.

Thomas Callaghan: Thank you, counselor. Father Toll?

01:02:13,760 --> 01:05:15,280

Father Toll: Just very briefly, gentlemen. My name is Father Toll and I live across the street at Saint Bridget's. I've just been in South Boston, this shift, for about 9 months. I spent 17 years down the other end, and the runways weren't turned that way, that much in those days, I guess. But since last June, when the time came to open windows, and again, about this time of the year things are hectic. The only good thing that comes out of this as far as I'm concerned might very well—and I speak facetiously, of course—Joe Kenneally's idea that the priests can't preach in the summer when the windows are open. It's probably just as well for the whole parish and the area, but we talk about plans and we can't go here, we can't go there. The human element is the thing that I'm concerned about, the almost intolerable line that you come to—a line of tolerance that that doesn't exist seemingly in any plans. People who have spent their whole lives working and owning homes and, which seem to be, headed in a downward direction. Property values are going to go down if noise and pollution—or whatever you will—gets any worse, and even though it's been said, and probably with a very good reason that other airports are not feasible in different areas to the west or to the south, I think it's high time that they have to be made feasible, but what's going to happen when we're gone after? After 1980? They'll have to have an airport someplace along the line out there, and I don't see why it can't begin now with this planning instead of letting it go to the next generation, and, in the



meantime—I think—help ourselves. I make these remarks with all respect but also with a growing concern in the last 10 months about the very high level of I suppose you'd call it "air pollution" is about the only thing that I can come. Noise! Nerve-frazzling and that's the way I feel about it. I can't see that any of the runway extensions on those plans are going to decrease, in the future, the level of the noise, and you haven't said that it would. I understand that, too. But to be very selfish, I think that we have to start to think about ourselves, and our area, and also our homes and families that are coming after us. Thank you very much.

01:05:18,160 --> 01:06:27,839

Thomas Callaghan: Thank you, Father. May I just say a word that the Massachusetts Port Authority was created by the legislature; it was commissioned to do certain things. Its area of activity is inside 128 in the metropolitan area. It was assigned the responsibility of developing the airport, seaport, and operating the Mystic River Bridge and Hanscom Field. I mention that just to have people understand, although Mr. Mooney has mentioned it, that the Port Authority has participated in numerous studies: of a second major airport system for Massachusetts, a Logan Airport travel study concerned with the ground travel to and from the airport, and numerous other studies. But we are not empowered to override a governor or do things of that nature in regard to a second major airport. Thank you. Yes, sir?

01:06:26,319 --> 01:12:09,440

Jim McCarty: My name is Jim McCarty, and I'm chairman of the Transportation Committee for the South Boston Citizens Association, and I would like to have you record in your tape, or your notes, that the South Boston Citizens Association opposes this proposed master plan for Logan Airport, particularly these runways that you relate to in your page 5 or runway 9 or runway 4L. I hear an awful lot of talk here about takeoff noises and about runways as they pertain to takeoffs and, having had some experience in the Air Force in World War II, I also know—and I think everyone in this room knows—that runways serve a dual purpose. That they are for both take off and for landing purposes. I would also like to relate to your booklet, that's here available to us this evening, on page 19 in which the Mass Port Authority forecasts airplane passengers and schedule airline and aircraft departures from the Boston Logan International Airport. And if I can just quote the item that you have here for the year 1975, in which you say there will be 111,950 departures. If my mathematics is correct, that means, if you figure a year in the basis of 365, days that's approximately 306 takeoffs. Now that's a lot of takeoffs for the people of South Boston and the areas surrounding Logan Airport to put up with. God only knows the number of landings that are going to happen in 1975. If we project ourselves, as you have, for the year 1985, we note that there will be 134,200 departures, which, in my mathematics, brings us down to 369 scheduled departures a day. And then again I say, "God only knows the number of landings that we're going to have." The noise on takeoffs and the landings has certainly affected

the health conditions of the people that live in East Boston, Winthrop, and South Boston. I think the ear doctors are having quite a field day in treating what the flight surgeon in the United States Air Force used to call as an otitis media, which is an inflammation of the inner ear and which causes deafness at a later time in the life of that person. So we all have a potential of suffering from hard-of-hearing in our later days. I can only relate what happened last Sunday while I had one of my youngsters out at Castle Island; the noise was so great coming from Logan Airport, from planes who have not even been airborne— these planes were on the land at the airport—that I had to take my son and go back into my car and drive away from the recreation area of Castle Island. So I'm only relating these subjects to you this evening, gentlemen. What are the plans beyond 1983 or 1985? Can we, as people of South Boston, East Boston, Winthrop, and so on, put up with the one plan, and that plan is Logan Airport? I can only corroborate what Senator Bulger and other speakers have said here tonight: there is definitely a need for another airport. Nobody is against progress. Nobody is against building a healthy and economic structure for our city, but let us consider the health of the people and the right the people have to live where they want to live, particularly the people here in South Boston who are a working class of people, who are not coming from a rich class of people but are living under ordinary means. If you think that I am without basis to this, read your 1970 census prepared by the Federal Census as to what type of people we are here in South Boston. So I ask you, gentlemen, to please consider this as a moral factor here as well as a factor which is going to supposedly contribute to the economic success of this city. Thank you very much.

Audience: [Applause]

Thomas Callahan: Thank you Mr. McCarty. Would people give their name, an address? Please. So we have the record.

01:12:06,960 --> 01:21:32,560

Georgia Morris: Mrs. Georgia P. Morris of 811 East Broadway, which is less than two blocks from here and we face the airport. We can see out our front window, if we look very carefully, Mystic Bridge on one—out the left eye as it were—and out the right, your airport. Can you hear me? From the top of our large, brownstone front house we can see quite a bit of the landing area. In the summer it really is very, very distressing to live in a house that was my husband's folks house, a family household, a family house, that is a tradition, and in the summer it's very, very difficult to live there and get any air. And if we're going to save energy by shutting off air conditioners, then what are we going to do when the summer comes and the noise of the airplanes is impossible? Most of the other things that I've thought of have been said by people and very ably, but I have a few questions that might sound trivial, but I, personally, would like the answers. One is: there was a reference to the day, or rather to the meeting, and the fact that the meetings were held on nights when flights were going over the area, but I wondered if anybody on your panel or at your front table here has ever been in this area on the Friday night

before a holiday weekend or on a Sunday night at the end of a three or a two-day weekend even? The beginning and the end of a three-day weekend is really a nightmare in this district. And I fly out of there out of Logan, and a good many people here may. But that's beside the point. I'll tell a story which is a bit amusing, and I'll try not to be too long. We had a visitor a short while back—you probably could guess what the three-day weekend was, I've forgotten—a stewardess on one of the airlines that uses your airport who came from the Sausalito or Tiburon area of California—I visited in Sausalito in a very high apartment up in a cliff there—and we met her. And back of us, back of the apartment was a road—this is going up and up and up—and the road is higher and when you looked out in the evening and the traffic was heavy, especially say on a weekend, light after light after light passed your eye coming on this high road. This stewardess was sitting in my kitchen having a cup of tea or coffee late one evening, and she looked out my kitchen window—we have large kitchen windows—they were not curtains because it's quite private out back—we have a big yard—and she said, “What's that? I didn't know you had a road out there?” Now this is the truth, “I didn't know you had a road out there,” and at first I didn't know what she was talking about, and then I said, “Oh, those are the planes.” Now I've tried to time them a couple of times and they've come in so fast I've kind of lost count, but I don't know, it looked to me as if they were coming in more than one minute. I think that story proves something about what we go through here. The windows were closed—it must have been a February vacation or something like that. Now the other thing I'd like to object to—and of course over here in South Boston we're supposed to be very sensitive and we are, and anybody who knows the history of Boston knows why. This map that you presented, as far as I can see, at no place has the name South Boston on it. If there's a cutoff, then you should have included that area. When you showed it on the screen there was no name of South Boston that I can remember. Now that is a little bit of a slight, and it may give a little bit of insight into why Boston and why South Boston and Chelsea and East Boston, who have often been slighted and are also sensitive, are not considered important enough for their feelings to be really considered. Another remark was made—and I think the gentleman on the right who made it sort of caught himself as he said it—and that was if you had these alternative airports out in the suburbs, those people would not want an airport in their backyard. Neither do we. We have it here. We probably can't wipe it out, but we certainly should not be inflicted with a further extension of it. We're just as sensitive and just as proud as these other people. And I have never been known as a person—like some people in the district—who don't even have one good word for Yankee; that isn't true of me, but I do think that you should stop imposing on these areas because you don't understand this, and you do slight us, and you do consider us people who do not have to have any consideration given to them. Now I'd like to have you have a meeting in some area—maybe here—at the end beginning or end of one of those three day holidays. The picture would be different. I'd like to ask a question which is of extreme personal interest to me, and it's not about the airport at all. It's about your Massport terminal and the trucking. Mr.

McCarty mentioned a little bit of that, I would like to have one of your panels stand at the corner of L Street and Broadway someday and see the trucks that come around the corner of Summer Street or L Street and go up Broadway. They are forbidden to pass my house by law, — and we do pretty well at reporting to the police any infringements—but these trucks are apparently coming from the King terminal, which I believe is under your jurisdiction. And if you have money to expand the airport, if you can float bonds to improve the airport, I beg of you, just out of sheer humanity and humaneness, put up some money to get some kind of a trucking route for all of those trucks that are loaded with oil, especially, to come through a crowded residential area! Even our merchandising areas in South Boston may be unique in that they are mixed in completely with residential areas. There may be a store with two apartments above it. So you are really endangering life. There are times when I have stood waiting for a car at the car stop there at L Street and Broadway—I may be a nervous old lady but even so—many things have happened in Wales and in our own country where people have neglected to watch out for these things and then children have been killed, families wiped out. Somebody should do something about the oil trucks that swing around with drivers who look—really—almost gun-crazy. They sometimes look as if they're—gun is the wrong word—they look as if they're in a race somewhere with no reference whatsoever to the fact that that's a narrow area that there's double parking there, which may or may not be your fault. Another thing is that I would like to reinforce this notion of the fact that you are not paying taxes on a very large proportion of your properties, and I think the city of Boston is correct—I don't know the whole story—but I think they are very correct in demanding or requesting that you pay some taxes on those things like hotels which are really not strictly necessary to your airport. Now one other thing that is very personal. There is a creek or a body of water that comes in from the Harbor by what used to be the old army base building. I would like one of you gentlemen, if possible, to name that creek and tell me to what extent your Massport Authority has control over. Can anybody do that? You know where I mean?

01:21:31,280 --> 01:23:22,480

Thomas Callaghan: Well, I think you're talking about Fort Point Channel. There is the narrow stream on the south side of Summer Street; I really don't know what that's called.

Georgia Morris: This would be the one that's on the side where the Edison Plant is, and Edison Plant uses it.

Thomas Callaghan: That's the Four Point Channel.

Audience: Reserve Channel!

Georgia Morris: Reserve Channel.

Thomas Callaghan: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I was mixed up. Reserved Channel.

Georgia Morris: Now, do you have any authority over that channel?

Thomas Callaghan: I don't believe we have any authority over it. We have facilities there—

Georgia Morris: That's what I want to know. Do you have facilities there?

Thomas Callaghan: We have, of course, the Castle Island Marine Terminal and we have had an operation at the army base.

Georgia Morris: Yeah, no. I'm talking about the side of the water which would be opposite the army base. I believe that would include Edison, wouldn't it?

Audience Member: After the entrance to the army base, where the yacht club used to be. Right at Summer Street bridge. It goes right up, way up, back of L Street—

Georgia Morris: No, excuse me. I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about the open water that goes right out into the ocean, and Edison has boats that come in there. I'll tell you—

Thomas Callaghan: We don't have jurisdiction over that channel, and we don't have any responsibility. We don't have any seaport person here, but I'm quite sure that we don't have any ownership of the King terminal, and we don't have any ownership of the property along by the Edison there.

Georgia Morris: What is the name of the area that's closest to the container and near Castle Island? What's that called?

Audience Member: White Fuel!

01:23:20,560 --> 01:24:12,320

Georgia Morris: No. As far as you're concerned, what is it called? You have jurisdiction over that area, don't you? Where all the Volkswagens and so forth are?

Thomas Callaghan: That's the one—

Georgia Morris: Oh Wiggins. Excuse me, I used the wrong word then when I said, King. Wiggins was what I meant. Does your jurisdiction go beyond that and back into this Reserved Channel that I'm speaking of?

Thomas Callaghan: No, our jurisdiction property lines ends at the white fuel.

Man on Stage: Which is 3,000 feet of air space that they have jurisdiction.

Georgia Morris: How close would this gentleman feel that White Fuel was to the area I'm speaking of? I'm speaking of the area between Edison and either white fuel or the open area?

Man on Stage: Ma'am, White Fuel adjoins their property.

Audience: MBTA property.

01:24:12,320 --> 01:24:51,120

Georgia Morris: Well this is what I'm seeking, and perhaps you can perhaps, you can't, perhaps somebody in the audience can help me. From my window, besides seeing your airport and Mystic Bridge and an almost treeless park—these things are all, you know, annoying people. We are beginning to see a veritable mountain of some kind of white substance which gets very dirty, and I'd like to know who's putting it there and why. It isn't you. I don't think it's for roads.

If it were, it would have been diminished during the winter, and it hasn't been. You don't know anything about it?

01:24:49,520 --> 01:25:13,040

Thomas Callaghan: Excuse me, perhaps this gentleman knows something.

Audience Member: The land is owned by the MBTA and they lease it to the salt [inaudible]. They just built a road in there. [inaudible] And as the woman says, the trucks coming out of there with about 50,000 tons and they spill it all over the place. Oh, and by the way your inspectors should know the area, [inaudible].

Georgie Morris: Which inspectors?

Audience Member: The Mass Port Authority.

Georgie Morris: Oh. To whom is he addressing?

01:25:21,840 --> 01:26:27,840

Thomas Callaghan: Well I don't know why any inspectors of ours would be on MBTA property.

Georgie Morris: Well you did you did make a statement that the legislature asked you—or gave you—the privilege and the duty of doing certain things with the Port. I strongly protest this, and I'm sure other people have noticed it, too. I am in a direct line, and it's a terrible eyesore, and you often wonder if it's explosive or if it's dangerous or whatever. To me it's mostly a very miserable, unaesthetic thing to do to a homeowner and to a family that have been in this area, as many people have said about their own groups, four and five generations. And just one last thing—I know I've taken an awful lot of time—to what extent will we be informed as your plan materializes and finalizes? Or is this the last time we'll hear anything? Before the final thing.

01:26:24,159 --> 01:27:26,320

Thomas Callaghan: There will be a draft master plan organized from the material that has been presented to you tonight, and from the input that we received here, and any other input that we receive in writing or orally from other groups, and then there will be a public hearing on that draft master plan which will be more comprehensive, more detailed than what we're presenting here tonight. There will be a public hearing on the draft master plan.

Georgie Morris: Just one more thing: if the gas rationing is as bad and if we really can find any credibility in government anymore, we may all have to stay home in South Boston and hear those planes this summer. You're welcome to visit my home anytime to see what it's like.

01:27:23,920 --> 01:30:31,760

Thomas Callaghan: I hope not, but I certainly thank you for your very pleasant and incisive comments. I didn't want to be argumentative in regard to taxes, but I would like to respond, just a moment, on the tax matter because I know it's in the minds of everyone who is paying the

high taxes of today. The Massachusetts Port Authority is a state-created corporation; it has taken over the responsibilities that the state has. It was created as a non-profit, non-taxable organization except where we take over property that has been taxable and where it is used for a business so that—contrary to what you may hear from certain sources in the city—our lessees, the people who lease property from us and who conduct business on it, not at the airport but along Summer Street and other places, pay over a million dollars in taxes so that all of the Port Authority

Georgie Morris: You have to qualify that, when you say “taxes.” Are you meaning to the city of Boston or the state or what?

Thomas Callaghan: Paid to the city of Boston. At the airport, our position is, of course, that we were created for the purpose of developing an airport there. We build the roads. The Port Authority builds the roads. It cleans the snow. It takes care of the fire department, except on a rare occasion when the city might assist us, and we try to assist the city in a reciprocal manner. We have the policing and all of that sort of thing. And our executive director, Ed King, has always told the mayor that where there is any service that the city provides then the Port Authority will be happy to pay for that service, so that, without belaboring the subject, I just do want to sketch in our position as a public corporation designed to do certain things in transportation that couldn't be done by a private industry and which cost the state, over the course of the previous 10 years, before the Port Authority came into operation, a total of 40 million dollars which had to be assessed on the taxpayers of the state. The Port Authority requires the user of the airport to pay for the construction and maintenance of the airport so that the person who is going through Logan Airport is paying for that particular airport through user charges. It's not the taxpayer. Yeah sure, Jim.

01:30:30,080 --> 01:32:05,600

Jim McCarty: I'd like to bring this to the attention of the people here tonight, and it's just a matter of—I think you know about this. The East Boston District Court, that court has jurisdiction over any criminal matters that affects Logan Airport. And, as you know, there is a drive on over there for people who violate the parking regulations of the Logan Airport. And I want this to be brought out to you tonight that any monies realized from the collection of fines in the East Boston Court are turned back to the Mass Port Authority. Now, I want this brought out to you tonight for the simple reason the East Boston Court is funded by the taxpayer's money from the city of Boston. It's a county expense because East Boston Court goes down into Winthrop as well as East Boston. And I want this brought out to you tonight the monies realized from those parking fines, because of parking violations at Logan Airport, the monies realized have turned back to the Mass Port Authority. So these are things that you should know. Thank you very much.

01:32:02,159 --> 01:33:06,159

Thomas Callaghan: Mr. McCarty, may I point out that the Massachusetts Port Authority pays for all the processing of these tickets through East Boston Court. We pay for the personnel over there that do this work, and we pay for the mailing, and yes, we do receive the fines. There was a court issue on this and the court decided that the Port Authority was entitled to the fines.

Jim McCarty: I know that there has been an administrative cost here, but it still takes the cost of that court—there's a billing to maintain and everything else over—and I do think that portions of this fine that you're collecting at Logan Airport should be realized in the county treasury or the city treasury of the city of Boston as well as in the treasury of the Mass Port Authority.

Thank you very much.

01:33:04,480 --> 01:35:43,840

Thomas Callaghan: Thank you, Mr. McCarty. I think we both realize that the state police are the ones that do tag the cars, and, of course, they are paid for by the Port Authority—I'm sure that we all realize that. Just a word on—it's Mrs. Morris, is it not? We're sorry that South Boston isn't on the map, I think we tried to point that out, but we should have the name on there and I thank you for reminding us. As far as First Street is concerned, we're all, in the Port Authority, and you people are particularly aware of the problem of those trucks on First Street. As a matter of fact, we took a little sound level reading over there the other day and it was fully as loud as the aircraft. Now I have heard from many people, and we have our share of responsibility in as much as we operate the Castle Island Marine Terminal, but those oil trucks are not under our jurisdiction and the problem of First Street, I trust, is being resolved in so far as the resurfacing is concerned, and the Port Authority has contributed—I think—it's 500,000 dollars because we have the responsibility of maintaining a rail track to Castle Island under an agreement with the Navy so that, in time of war, Castle Island can be served by the track that runs down First Street. We are taking care of that responsibility, but the city is the one that is rebuilding the street, and the city has the difficult responsibility, I agree, to find a truck route that is going to be satisfactory for the community. So, while not denying our share of the responsibility, we're not the primary administrator in this particular situation.

Georgie Morris: [inaudible] Could I just say, I emphasized the oil, but there are a lot of other things. The lumber that goes through there and so on and so forth.

Thomas Callaghan: I realize.

Georgie Morris: As I say, I'm senior citizen now to you know take advantage of the MBTA, I'm riding more that way than in a car, so I do stand there and see what's going on and those trucks come from all over the place. I will stay...

(Continued on Tape 2)