

ENF public comments show widespread opposition to luxury jet Expansion Plan

Feb 18, 2023

A huge number of over 350 separate comments regarding the Environmental Notification Form for the massive hangar expansion project. This despite the extremely short timeframe after the unexpected plan was released. These included comments from citizens, organizations, and government representatives. The comments were consistently critical of the plan and the environmental disclosure.

The primary comment that specifically addressed the MEPA process was the complaint that there was no disclosure regarding the main environmental impact of the plan: the expected effect of the project on the number of flights, and associated noise, chemical pollution, and climate change impact. The plan simply pretended that no flights would be created by the tripling of the hangar capacity, but no citizen or organization found this credible.

The citizen comments consistently opposed a project that would expand airport jet operations. They rightly expressed confusion regarding exactly what the result of this project would be on jet operations, but uniformly expected they would increase substantially. Many expressed concerns with particular issues like the impact on their homes and family, the Shawsheen River, the Minute Man National Historical Park, Great Meadows, or wildlife. However, there was a commonly expressed concern that expanding private jet traffic was irresponsible in the face of climate change and our stated commitments to combat it.

The universal theme was that the project should not continue. There were no comments suggesting any compelling public purpose, nor any organization suggesting any business or educational need.

A sampling of excerpts from just a few of the citizen comments follows:

“This is an all-around BAD proposal and is driven once again by greed with no respect for the land or the people who live here.”

“To suggest there will be fewer flights and less noise is not backed up.”

“I am shocked by the scale of this endeavor.”

“Please do not allow this proposal to move forward. At a time when the state, towns and individuals are working to reduce climate causing pollutants, this project does the opposite with little benefit for the majority of the regional residents.”

“We have 138 names and addresses of Lincoln residents on our comment, indicating how deeply concern about the proposed development resonated within our community.”

“By Massport’s own admission previously, the goals of this project are to increase profitability of the airport and to provide private jet travelers a more luxurious and private travel experience. This expansion is a money grab catering to the corporate elite at the expense of local children, families and the environment.”

“The proposed airfield development will not provide an essential service, but will rather duplicate existing transit options while adding to a significant expansion of the Commonwealth’s carbon footprint.”

“More planes being stored at Hanscom means more planes in the air. No one purchases a \$30 million airplane just to store it.”

“Had my wife and I known that this project was going to take place, I can 100% guarantee you that we never would have moved here.”

“This project cannot proceed. It is amazingly out of step with Massachusetts being a leader in the fight against climate change.”

“I am surprised that so much money would be spent to serve so few people, to the detriment of our shared environment.”

“Profits over the future of the planet. Shame.”

“How quaint that they drive their Tesla S to the runway—as if that makes up for the carbon output of flying directly from Hanscom to St. Bart or the Super Bowl (true examples).”

“The solar arrays at the proposed site are a ploy to charm the residents.”

“It would be prudent to have a study done on what is contained in the exhaust that is produced by an aircraft taking off and or landing which falls to the ground in the surrounding communities. This is very concerning to us as we have seen this coating on the surfaces around our property.”

“This proposal is in no way consistent with Massachusetts policy for achieving climate protection goals.”

“Whose interests does MassPort represent? Its own financial interests at the expense of local Massachusetts citizens? The interests of speculative commercial businesses at the expense of local Massachusetts citizens, their families, and their children?”

“Characterizing this expansion as somehow supportive of sustainability and Massport’s Net Zero goal by 2031 by virtue of its infrastructure being built with energy efficiency, seems grossly misleading when the increase in private jet and aircraft operations will contribute hugely to

