

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

Time	Topic on Which You are Submitting Your Comment	Comment	Name (First)	Name (Last)	City	State
9/29/20 9:05 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>As a professional urban planner with training in parking and transportation policy, and as a resident of Watertown until very recently, I wish to make the following comments on DCR's parking proposal as described in the email. Without even hearing the full presentation of the plan, two things immediately stand out that are at odds with best practices in parking and public space management.</p> <p>Firstly, it appears that DCR proposes to charge a flat rate of \$1.25 per hour at all parking spots. This rate appears to be based upon nothing other than the fact that it already is authorized in DCR's regulations. As a matter of public policy, however, the purpose of charging parking fees is not simply to raise revenue for the agency managing meters. The purpose is generally to ensure that users of those parking spaces will not leave their vehicles longer than a reasonable period of time, to ensure that those spaces turn over regularly. Since many of DCR's parkways are in highly urbanized areas with parking shortages, DCR should be wary of under-pricing this public space, as \$1.25 per hour in Cambridge and Boston is likely insufficient to ensure reasonable turnover. Pricing, in other words, should be based on demand. Experts recommend pricing them high enough to ensure that there is one space on each block available at all times.</p> <p>Secondly, the agency states that funds will be dedicated to DCR's parks, which implies they will go into the agency's general operating funds. Parking management experts generally advise that fees collected from parking meters should be used for the direct maintenance of the areas in which they are collected, so that users can see the benefits of their fees. If our parkways are more beautiful, functional, and user-friendly as a result of parking revenue, people are more likely to accept those fees as reasonable. The Commonwealth allows for the creation of "parking benefits districts". I would urge DCR to dedicate these funds to the urban parkway system specifically, not the parks system as a whole. The urban parkways system is in dire need of critical quality-of-life improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian experience. Such parking revenue could support these projects.</p>	Sam	Scoppettone		

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal
Public Comments
deadlne 11/2/2020

9/30/20 9:16 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadlne 10/29/2020	<p>To Whom it May Concern,</p> <p>I am a resident of Revere Beach Blvd and oppose parking meters installed along the residential portion of the Blvd. This will negatively affect the residents and guests of residents.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Amanda Burroughs</p>	Amanda	Burroughs	Revere	MA
-----------------	--	--	--------	-----------	--------	----

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

9/30/20 11:43 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>Q3</p> <p>What provisions are planned to mitigate the impact of vehicle parking throughout the neighborhoods in Revere in order to avoid parking fees?</p> <p>Q4</p> <p>Have you done an analysis of the economic impact on typical working class families who regularly park along Revere Beach Blvd while visiting the beach?</p> <p>Q5</p> <p>What provisions are planned to help with the increased costs of services to the populations negatively affected by reduced access to recreational opportunities caused by the financial burden you propose to impose? Will DCR provide funding to community mental health services who will be needed to handle the consequences of the additional pathologies resulting from reduced access to recreational outlets.</p> <p>Comments</p> <p>It is likely that the impacts of displaced vehicles parking in Revere neighborhoods will be significant. It is immoral for DCR to engage in a money grab by placing parking meters along the boulevard while leaving the neighborhoods and government of Revere to manage the consequences. Perhaps those who would be impacted should petition the legislature to remove jurisdiction over the proposed roadways from DCR?</p> <p>It is likely that the need for community mental health services will increase as a result of the naked money grab these proposed policies represent.</p>	Richard	Kramer		
10/2/20 11:32 AM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	<p>Hi</p> <p>I am very glad to see the DCR is considering to charge for parking on DCR roadways. \$1.25/hour is much too low. Please charge a higher price that will raise more revenue for DCR. Please also charge for parking at more locations such as the parking lots at Herter Park in Allston/Brighton.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Harry</p>	Harry	Mattison	Allston	MA

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/5/20 4:12 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	test	test	test	Quincy	MA
10/16/20 8:47 AM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>I am a Revere resident who lives on Revere Beach Blvd and I have several questions regarding your plans to put parking meters on Revere Beach.</p> <p>1. As you may know, there are many residents who live on Revere beach who need to park on the residential side. My understanding is that there will be meters on both sides of the street. Will there be some kind of permit parking for residents or are we expected to pay for meters outside of our own homes?</p> <p>2. It is my understanding that meters are being placed in Boston, Cambridge and Revere. Why aren't you placing meters in other beach areas under your control such as Lynn, Swampscott, Marblehead and Salem?</p> <p>3. Can you answer why none of the revenues collected in Revere are being used for the improvements on Revere beach or for the benefit of Revere residents? As you know Revere is very much a blue collar city. Why should meter collections in Revere go toward the betterment of other more affluent cities? It seems like you are robbing from the poor to give to the rich.</p>	John	Viarella		
10/16/20 2:33 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	I support the proposal to price/meter parking on DCR roadways, both to generate revenue and to help manage demand and ensure that people can find a parking space when they need it, rather than parking in popular areas being taken up by long-term parkers. Rather than pricing a flat rate of \$1.25 an hour I would like to suggest demand-based pricing in high demand areas, where rates might vary by time of day or location, to help ensure that a spot is always available.	Chris	Porter	Arlington	MA
10/19/20 5:29 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Thomas	Jones	Boston	MA

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/19/20 6:29 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	<p>I support the installation of parking meters in the proposed locations. It is encouraging to see DCR explore new revenue options while also putting a much-needed price on a scarce asset currently given away for free to motorists.</p> <p>I also think that \$1.25 may not be the best price for all meters/locations. I know that hourly rate is set by DCR regulations, but I would encourage DCR to consider a formal rulemaking process to give the agency more flexibility with how it sets meter rates in the future. Boston's dynamic on-street parking pilot in Back Bay and the Seaport is a good example to draw on. Ideally, hourly rates should fluctuate with demand to ensure sufficient turnover of curb space.</p> <p>Finally, as other commenters have pointed out, if DCR also has the ability to return some of the new revenue to the impacted communities / DCR property, that would certainly build political support for the project so local residents and visitors see the benefits firsthand.</p>	Sam	Burgess	Boston	MA
10/20/20 6:55 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. I strongly support the implementation of metered parking on DCR parkways. I think the only shortcoming of this proposal is that it does not go far enough. An annual fee for a resident parking permit on the applicable parkways would also be a worthy step to take. DCR parkways are public space, and should not be used for the storage of private property unless it is facilitating use of the parks themselves. For short-term metered parking, access can be most effectively guaranteed by allowing price to fluctuate with demand. This can help smooth out demand, so people who are price-sensitive can park in spaces that are slightly further away, freeing up the prime spaces for people who are willing to pay a higher price. Actively managing parking demand with price signals makes it much easier to balance demand for parking with other demands on the public right-of-way, including bus lanes, bike lanes, and expanded parkland.</p> <p>Thank you, Jessica Robertson</p>	Jessica	Robertson	Allston	MA

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/20/20 8:27 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	<p>Please put aside the DCR parking proposal, start from scratch and do the process right. I am sure DCR notified and took planning advice from the Longwood Medical Area businesses, Simmons, Emmanuel, the MFA, the Gardner Museum, even Wentworth and Northeastern. Only the area residents, resident associations (Fenway Civic Association, Fenway Community Center and the Audubon Neighborhood Association) and government officials (Boston City Councilors, State district representatives and the State senator) were ignored. That is not only insulting but counterproductive for DCR. Our input from the start would have saved effort and produced a better proposal at this late stage. Apparently Revere was similarly mistreated. I hope DCR will restart the process and correct the process for future proposals. The negative reaction that DCR rightfully received on October 14 and 15 would have been avoided. It was embarrassing to listen to and this is not the first time this DCR mistake has been made.</p> <p>We love the parks that DCR maintains and advocate for sufficient funding but DCR has repeatedly disrespected its strongest supporters. Please put aside this proposal and start the process over by consulting the area residents first rather than last.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, John Bookston, long time Fenway resident.</p>	john	bookston	Boston	MA
10/21/20 9:48 AM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Curbside Parking Meter Proposal. Please note the following: 1. Equity of impact has not been properly considered as inner-city and minority residents will be disproportionately burdened by the imposition of parking fees directed to the general fund, in addition to existing tax obligations which support DCR. This is particularly concerning during a pandemic when DCR property is an important contributor to the health of minority communities most impacted by CV-19. Any revenue project should apply equitably to all citizens across all DCR property. 2. The dramatic impact of Fenway Park events in undermining DCR's project goals has not been properly considered. With a low \$25 cost of violation, DCR will financially incentivize Fenway Park event commuters to drive and park for extended periods at meters, as it represents a significant savings vs. private Fenway event parking. Regardless of fine, the increased traffic will cause negative impact including congestion and air pollution. Importantly, because Fenway Park events often extend beyond the time meters cease operation, residents with Fenway parking stickers will be unable to access the metered spots occupied by evening event patrons. The proposal will also invite the security and noise concerns of Fenway events across several residential neighborhoods. 3. The Audubon Circle reconstruction project has not been properly considered and the Audubon Circle Neighborhood Assoc. has been inappropriately excluded from planning. The proposal, including the installation of parking equipment, will negatively impact the recent investment in green infrastructure and fails to respect the history of the Olmstead design of the Emerald Necklace. Even without being provided the Harvard study which is the basis of the plan (which must be made available publicly), it is difficult to imagine that the proposal could be implemented in a justifiable manner.</p>	Steven	Goldblatt	Boston	MA

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/21/20 2:04 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>I live on the Boulevard and was very upset to read the article in the Revere Journal regarding parking Meters end to end on both sides of Revere Beach Boulevard.</p> <p>I have parking for 1 vehicle at my Condominium and no guest parking. Will family and friends now have to PAY to visit me?</p> <p>I could maybe understand from Eliot Circle to Revere St where there are no homes but end to end does not seem at all fair for the people who live here and pay taxes like the rest of the community and not have any parking available for visitors!</p> <p>I honestly cannot believe I would ever have to concern myself with something like this! It's just so...ridiculous. Is there not another plan the DCR can come up with that would not so detrimentally affect the lives of so many people???</p>	Debra	Anemoduris	Revere	MA
10/21/20 2:34 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	<p>I live on the Boulevard and was very upset to read the article in the Revere Journal regarding parking meters end to end on both sides of Revere Beach Boulevard.</p> <p>I have parking for 1 vehicle at my Condominium and no guest parking. Will family and friends now have to PAY to visit me?</p> <p>I could maybe understand from Eliot Circle to Revere St where there are no homes but end to end does not seem at all fair for the people who live here and pay taxes like the rest of the community and not have any parking available for visitors! Not to mention what it would do to the value of my home. Can you imagine trying to sell your home and have to tell people that 6 months out of the year visitors would have to pay to visit!</p> <p>This is very unfair; is there not another plan the DCR can come up with that would not so detrimentally affect the lives of so many people???</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Debra Anemoduris</p>	Debra	Anemoduris	Revere	MA

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/22/20 3:08 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	<p>I am unlikely to be personally impacted by the parking meter "proposal." I am moved to submit these comments by my concerns about the blatant abuse of defective process which is in evidence.</p> <p>This entire plan is clearly a naked money grab to increase DCR's general funds beyond what is appropriated by the Legislature by an illegitimate form of taxation masquerading as user fees. As such it has no legitimacy.</p> <p>Abuse of process</p> <p>As DCR has disclosed, this plan has been in development for some five years. Yet the two, brief, public sessions, October 14 and 15, have been the first opportunity for general public input. As DCR's Mr. Mike Nielson admitted during the October 15 session, DCR is not presenting a proposal for public input, but instead disclosed plan which is scheduled for installation during spring, 2021. DCR has already decided to implement the plan prior to soliciting any public input. He admitted that the only purpose of the two public sessions is to consider "details of how to implement" [the Plan].</p> <p>It became apparent during the course of the October 15 session that DCR has failed to meet even once with stakeholders and affected parties during the five plus years of plan development, nor has it sought any public input during that entire time. This is a gross abuse of process and a complete failure to respect the legitimate interests of stakeholders, affected parties, and the public in general.</p> <p>Current plan should be abandoned</p> <p>Given DCR's abuse of process and illegitimate attempt to misuse its powers to assess user fees as a means of taxation in place of the constitutional legislative appropriation process, implementation of this plan should be immediately abandoned. If DCR should believe that assessment of user fees by means of parking meters should be pursued, it should begin, ab initio, a proper process to explore a legitimate, equitable program to accomplish that. Clearly, the current plan is neither legitimate nor equitable.</p>	Richard	Kramer	Sharon	MA
------------------	--	---	---------	--------	--------	----

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/22/20 3:18 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	<p>I am unlikely to be personally impacted by the parking meter "proposal." I am moved to submit these comments by my concerns about the blatant abuse of defective process which is in evidence.</p> <p>This entire plan is clearly a naked money grab to increase DCR's general funds beyond what is appropriated by the Legislature by an illegitimate form of taxation masquerading as user fees. As such it has no legitimacy.</p> <p>Abuse of DCR user fees as a substitute for legislative appropriation of tax revenues</p> <p>AS DCR itself makes clear, revenues from the parking meters will not be dedicated to providing fees or services to those who will be paying them. Instead, the revenues will be placed in DCR's general fund for unrestricted uses. There is no pretense that those paying these so called fees will receive any commensurate benefit whatsoever. Moreover, those who choose to pay DCR user fees by purchasing a DCR Annual Pass, will still be required to pay these new alleged fees. This proves that these revenues have all the properties of a tax and none of the properties of a fee.</p> <p>DCR projects that these revenues, estimated at four to five million dollars annually will comprise a supplement to the legislative appropriations amounting to around four percent of its annual budget. This is a gross abuse of DCR's ability to charge user fees, and is accordingly of questionable legality.</p> <p>Current plan should be abandoned</p> <p>Given DCR's abuse of process and illegitimate attempt to misuse its powers to assess user fees as a means of taxation in place of the constitutional legislative appropriation process, implementation of this plan should be immediately abandoned. If DCR should believe that assessment of user fees by means of parking meters should be pursued, it should begin, ab initio, a proper process to explore a legitimate, equitable program to accomplish that. Clearly, the current plan is neither legitimate nor equitable.</p>	Richard	Kramer	Sharon	MA
10/22/20 5:07 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Richard	Giordano		
10/22/20 5:07 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Genevieve	Day		

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/22/20 7:20 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	Yes to increasing the cost of parking. A lot of good will come to the city if car owners have to pay for the space their vehicles take up on our roads. Their cars exert costs on us all - from air pollution, noise, traffic delays, and danger to pedestrians. Charge them. I'm very supportive of charging for parking.	Stephanie	Galaiti	Somerville	MA
10/23/20 10:20 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	<p>Memorial Drive is a beautiful linear park that is my favorite running route in the whole world. My first preference would have been to remove the parking directly; the DCR manages many beautiful green spaces across Massachusetts. Unfortunately, many of these green spaces have roads running through them.</p> <p>Charging for these parking spaces is a great idea! This space is a precious resource, and it is wasted if the DCR gives it away for free. Free parking encourages people to drive, which brings more traffic to all of these roads. In the future, I would encourage DCR to think about putting a price on parking for all of its parks, forests, parkways, and reservations. Conservation and Recreation should be about the outdoor activities, not the cars we use to get there.</p>	Jason	Brown	West Roxbury	MA
10/26/20 7:53 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	I am a resident of boston and I would like to voice my support for adding meters to parking that is currently unmetered.	Declan	Devine	Roslindale	MA

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/27/20 11:38 AM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	<p>I am unlikely to be personally impacted by the parking meter "proposal." I am moved to submit these comments by my concerns about the blatant abuse of defective process which is in evidence, and by the manifest disregard for the severe impact on neighborhoods and working people.</p> <p>This entire plan is clearly a naked money grab to increase DCR's general funds beyond what is appropriated by the Legislature by an illegitimate form of taxation masquerading as user fees. As such it has no legitimacy.</p> <p>Meters will cause extreme hardship for many working people</p> <p>Ordinary working people living in the Fens area will be forced out of the neighborhood. In all likelihood Covid will still be a serious issue when the parking meters are planned to begin operation. People working from home who have to commute to work by automobile, and unemployed people with cars will still need a place to park their cars during the day. The meters will cost them \$15 per day, 6 days a week or \$4,680 per year. People who work the night shift will be similarly impacted. Saturday only parking will cost residents \$780 per year plus another \$325 +/- per year if they get home from work at 5PM on weekdays. This is grossly unfair. People will have no choice but to move out of the neighborhood. In many cases they will be forced to sell their homes.</p> <p>Current plan should be abandoned</p> <p>The parking meter plan is grossly unfair to homeowners in and residents of the affected areas. Given DCR's abuse of process and illegitimate attempt to misuse its powers to assess user fees as a means of taxation in place of the constitutional legislative appropriation process, implementation of this plan should be immediately abandoned. If DCR should believe that assessment of user fees by means of parking meters should be pursued, it should begin, ab initio, a proper process to explore a legitimate, equitable program to accomplish that. Clearly, the current plan is neither legitimate nor equitable.</p>	Richard	Kramer	Sharon	MA
-------------------	--	---	---------	--------	--------	----

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/27/20 11:57 AM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	<p>I am unlikely to be personally impacted by the parking meter "proposal." I am moved to submit these comments by my concerns about the blatant abuse of defective process which is in evidence, and by the manifest disregard for the severe impact on those struggling economically.</p> <p>This entire plan is clearly a naked money grab to increase DCR's general funds beyond what is appropriated by the Legislature by an illegitimate form of taxation masquerading as user fees.</p> <p>Meters will deny those struggling economically essential opportunity for passive recreation</p> <p>The timing of DCR's parking meters plan incredibly tone deaf. It evidences no though whatsoever to the extreme negative impact on individuals and families who are struggling with the economic disruption due to Covid. The opportunity to spend an hour or three at the beach or walking through the parks or along the Charles River is an extremely important remedy for the Covid induced stresses. For a great many of these people, the parking meters will push this recreational opportunity out of reach. A family wishing to spend a few hour a day outdoors to exercise and destress would have to shell out upwards of \$800 per year for parking. Where is that money supposed to come from? These parking meters will impose a severely regressive tax on a great many people who cannot afford it.</p> <p>Current plan should be abandoned</p> <p>The parking meter plan is grossly unfair to those who are struggling economically. Given DCR's abuse of process and illegitimate attempt to misuse its powers to assess user fees as a means of taxation in place of the constitutional legislative appropriation process, implementation of this plan should be immediately abandoned. If DCR should believe that assessment of user fees by means of parking meters should be pursued, it should begin, ab initio, a proper process to explore a legitimate, equitable program to accomplish that. Clearly, the current plan is neither legitimate nor equitable.</p>	Richard	Kramer	Sharon	MA
10/28/20 9:51 AM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	<p>The curbside parking meter proposal for the Audubon Circle and Fenway area would create havoc for those residents living adjacent to those parking spots. These are residential neighborhoods where locals depend upon those parking spaces 24X7.</p> <p>Please do not do this</p>	Richard	Andreucci	Boston	MA
10/28/20 11:18 AM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Roselee	Vincent		

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/28/20 12:21 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Tim	Horn		
10/28/20 1:56 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Peter	Wilson		
10/28/20 9:38 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	<p>As stated at the Oct. 15, 2020 public meeting, I believe that DCR's historic parkways should feel different from other City & State streets & roads. Things like parking meters would change the parkway character, and the feeling of arrival at a park would be diminished. We have seen the importance of access to nature, especially during COVID-19.</p> <p>I also referred to Olmsted, who believed it was our duty to safeguard some natural treasures to be accessible to the public. He said that the wealthy had always seized for themselves the best places: "The enjoyment of the choicest natural scenes in the country and the means of recreation connected with them is thus a monopoly, in a very peculiar manner, of a very few, very rich people." It was the duty of a republican government, he argued, to safeguard some natural treasures for the benefit of all: "For the same reason that the water of rivers should be guarded against private appropriation . . . portions of natural scenery may therefore properly [be] guarded and cared for by government . . . [to be] laid open to the use of the people." Olmsted marveled that such an accomplishment had occurred "during one of the darkest hours" in the country's history.</p> <p>https://www.sierraclub.org/sierra/2020-4-july-august/feature/public-lands-preservation-republic</p> <p>The idealistic statements above are based on the strong belief that the State (Governor & Legislature) should provide adequate funding to DCR so that fund-raising measures such as parking meters would not be necessary.</p> <p>There were several practical questions & comments from attendees expressing that if meters are installed, the funds raised should benefit the local resource.</p>	Sarah	Freeman	Jamaica Plain, MA 02130	MA
10/28/20 11:28 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Jeffrey	Turco		
10/29/20 1:03 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/29/2020	I oppose meters on the residential and business side of the Blvd as well as the beach side in front of houses. There are handicapped residents that use these spaces and spaces on the house side are used by visitors to the residences as well.	Amanda	Burroughs	Revere	MA

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/29/20 1:52 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 10/30/2020	<p>I strongly oppose parking meters on Revere Beach Boulevard. It is America's first public beach and it's ease of access is for all to enjoy. Putting in parking meters serves no purpose to change traffic flow or make more parking available. It has everything to do with the DCR being greedy and trying to take advantage of families who can enjoy a beach without having to pay for parking. Budgets are tight right now. This is the wrong way to go about making up revenue. And what about the residents who live on the boulevard- they are now being penalized for parking their car on the street- many times because they don't have a space at their home or because they're in/out of their house so much every day it's easier to park it on the street.</p> <p>This should not move forward. It must stop. Revere Beach is a historical landmark and should remain free to access for everyone- including for the parking. Period.</p>	Robert	Sawyer	Revere	MA
10/29/20 3:35 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>As a resident of Revere Beach I object to the metering plans for two reasons.</p> <p>1) as America's first public beach, I see many low income citizens enjoy the easy access to their beach and feel putting a financial barrier in their way (particularly now with public space so important to us all) is unfair.</p> <p>2) the design of the beach by Eliot was meant to honor the uninterrupted clean vista of the beach. Putting up individual meters will impede the beautiful site lines of the gorgeous public space. Ticket kiosks means the same thing and I've seen families leave children unattended while they wait in line to get a ticket. Then there is ticket related trash blowing about.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration to keep one of our major beaches beautiful and open to all. Sincerely, Janet Long</p>	Janet	Long	Revere	MA
10/29/20 4:11 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>Please I do live on the beach. It is absolutely horrible here in the summer from 8 am to 10 pm. That's if the tow which they stopped this summer so the noise was till at least 3 am loud music and as I resident you can't say anything to anyone because them they will come after you. I have had my house destroyed by an drug addict thing it was her house. With the beach house it's changed the dogs go on your lawn you put signs out they don't care. Dogs on the beach all year no one does anything. People today don't care at all. Trash is left on the walls. If you have meters here on the beach it may stop. Please for the people who spend a lot of money to live here help us put those meters on. The city of revere lost their rights to the beach when they gave up the beach to d c r. It's never been the same. It's one tough place to live. Most people who come here have no respect for the residence that live here. Iam all for the meters I want some peace</p>	Terese	Chiuve	Revere	MA

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/29/20 4:26 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>I am unlikely to be personally impacted by the parking meter "proposal." I am moved to submit these comments by my concerns about the blatant abuse of defective process which is in evidence, and by the manifest disregard for the severe impact on those struggling economically.</p> <p>This entire plan is clearly a naked money grab to increase DCR's general funds beyond what is appropriated by the Legislature by an illegitimate form of taxation masquerading as user fees. This fact is made very clearly evident by the title of the study by the Harvard Kennedy School: "MA Department of Conservation and Recreation Parking Revenue Generation."</p> <p>THE DEFECTIVE PROCESS FOLLOWED AND THE RESULTING PLAN EXHIBIT A GROSS DISREGARD OF ITS SEVERE IMPACTS ON THOSE AFFECTED</p> <p>The Harvard Study reports on expected political consequences and citizen push back, but nowhere does it consider the financial and quality of life impact on those who will be directly affected by this plan. This is unconscionable and a gross abrogation of DCR's responsibility to appropriately serve the public.</p> <p>Current plan should be abandoned</p> <p>This complete disregard for proper process and complete disregard of impacts requires that this ill conceived plan be immediately abandoned in its entirety.</p>	Richard	Kramer	Sharon	MA
10/29/20 4:41 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Richard	Serino		

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/29/20 5:42 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>I have lived and run a small business in the Fenway for 27 years.</p> <p>I have also been a long time member of the Fenway Civic Association and I wholeheartedly agree with their letter of Oct. 25, 2020 to Commissioner Montgomery.</p> <p>In addition I would like to add the following comments.</p> <p>The area of Charlesgate to the South of the Mass Pike is currently signed as residential permit parking and should be excluded from the meters.</p> <p>While there may be some issues with the current parking regulations, changing to meters will benefit the local institutions and businesses to the detriment of the residents. The pricing, convenience and increased availability of the proposed metered spaces will make them the #1 most desirable parking for Red Sox and Fenway Park events as opposed to essential parking for the residents.</p> <p>I believe the public process for this change, conducted in a relatively short period of time, during the pandemic, with no additional information presented or followup public meetings scheduled to be less than forthcoming or transparent.</p> <p>I urge you to not add metered parking on the Fenway.</p> <p>If DCR must add the meters then I believe that the public approval process should be extended and more detailed.</p>	Thomas	Bakalars	Boston	MA
10/29/20 5:46 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>I am opposed to this plan in it's current format for several reasons.</p> <p>Philosophically, I am not in favor of adding such a charge in a low-to-moderate income community to enjoy America's first public beach.</p> <p>Such a plan would place meters in front of our beachfront residences homes further constraining parking. This would lead to beach visitors exploring meter-less parking and burdening the already tight parking situations in Oak Island and the Point of Pines</p> <p>60% of the program revenues would come from Revere Beach meters, estimated to be at a minimum of 4 million dollars yet none of those dollars are guaranteed to be reinvested in Revere.</p> <p>While I understand and appreciate the desire of DCR to increase revenue generating channels, they need to collaborate with the city of Revere to make such a program work for Revere Residents.</p>	Eric	Lampedecchio	Revere	MA

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/29/20 7:11 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Being a resident of the Point of Pines for 60 years I'm against this proposal. We are struggling to get resident parking as it is. The barrels this summer has proven the point that our streets will fill up quickly. It already is a tense situation when you come home and have no place to park. Your need for money should come from all the building on the beach. From what I'm told Revere doesn't get any money it goes to the DCR. Don't turn your greed into our problems. I would love to know where the money from these buildings is going? No parking meters please.	Ronald	Clark	Revere	MA
10/29/20 11:10 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Instead of installing parking meters, establish paid beach parking elsewhere. Provide free shuttles to and from the beach. This will provide revenue without negatively effecting local residents with increased congestion on Ocean Ave.	Jessica	Cameron	Revere	MA
10/29/20 11:19 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	I oppose your outline for placing parking meters along Revere Beach.	Chris	Masiello	Revere	MA
10/30/20 2:16 AM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	I write in strong opposition to the DCR's proposed parking meters along Revere Beach. For the first time in decades, the City of Revere has made significant strides to develop the coastal community, bringing in new business owners, luxury apartments, and connections to public transit. Nonetheless, the City is still undergoing a period of tremendous growth. I implore the DCR to give Revere the time to work through its growing pains, rather than place yet another barrier to entry for the largely working-class population of the city.	Gianni	Hill	Revere	MA
10/30/20 5:06 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	All for it!!! Put meters on the beach please!!! Great idea!!!!	Robert	DeBole	Revere	MA

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/30/20 5:44 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>I am a 30+-year member of the Fenway community and I am opposed to the parking meter proposal. While I am deeply appreciative for all the work DCR does in keeping our parks and parkways healthy, and understanding that there are significant costs involved, I do not believe that a parking meter system is an equitable solution. I was deeply offended when, during the recent virtual meetings, members of the communities were referred to as DCR “customers.” I also took note that the overall presentation was not conditional on community support or feedback; instead, the plans were presented in the future tense (what “will” be done, as opposed to what “might” or “could” be done). Furthermore, there was no plan for continuing dialogue. It was very clear that DCR was presenting a fait accompli.</p> <p>As residents who treasure our neighborhoods, we are continually squeezed and treated as after-thoughts. Parking has come to epitomize the way our quality of life issues are ignored. Deference is always paid to the institutions. Fingers point in all directions. We are not consulted or heard.</p> <p>Those obtrusive, unsightly meters don't belong in our historic, Olmsted-designed parkways or neighborhoods. They signify disrespect and a lack of thought about their disruptive impact.</p> <p>Please read the excellent letter from the Fenway Civic Association and know that the FCC is speaking loudly and articulately for us all.</p>	Carol	Lasky	Boston	MA
10/30/20 7:20 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>Regarding Revere Beach..I hope you are keeping in mind that this is the first Public Beach and we are proud of it. Putting up meters all along the beach it would look horrid. Parking stations were you can put cash or card would be so much nicer to the eye of our Historic Beach. People can then decide hourly time which would give you the option to come enjoy the beach for the day and not worry about babysitting a parking meter. I sincerely hope you take this idea into consideration. Thank you, Sincerely Marilyn Bruce Symmes</p>	Marilyn	Symmes	Winthrop	MA
10/30/20 7:37 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>Definately for meters</p>	Bonnie	Curran	Revere	MA

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/30/20 8:12 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	As a life long Revere resident I am not in agreement with parking meters on the beach. It is America's first public beach and should be cherished and maintained for all to enjoy. If you implement the parking meters you will be taking that away from a lot of families. Also the revenue will not go directly back to the beach which is in dire need of some maintenance work. Thank You	Danielle	Day	Revere	MA
10/30/20 9:11 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	I live on 71 revere beach boulevard and it's condo building 14 apartments Building don't have parking lot so we the owners paying property taxes to city of revere but our property is on DCR land We need resident sticker for parking to park on ocean Avenue and if we get them (only 14 resident parking sticker)we will support parking meters on revere beach boulevard Jus to let you know that we're only Condo building on revere beach boulevard that have no parking lot rest of buildings are have their parking lots I believe some areas in Boston and Cambridge that are on DCR roads have their resident parking stickers why Revere can't have only 14 of them	Emir	Zuhric	Revere	MA

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/30/20 11:07 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>I am a resident of revere and have resided here for the past 12 years. Unfortunately I think the beach has become an unsafe eye sore, and charging for parking could very well be a step in the right direction. Every year at our city's only attraction, the beach, we are guaranteed to hear if some type of large altercation happening involving lots of out of town era and lots of police officers. I believe in order to gain the residents approval offering revere residential parking with sticker only for a free or reduced price depending how long they are parked and at what type of year, if it's a peak season like summer offer free parking first hr half price all additional hrs. That way people will not park all day. Also offer overnight parking free to residents living in the beach without access to a parking space. Using all funds obtained by residents throughout the year to benefit the beachfront sounds more appealing then using all proceeds towards DCR owned parks. How about using the funds collected from out of town parking fares for that benefit. Allow residents to pay less and to know their money is staying within the city lines and going towards the beach. Only using out of town era fees for out of town related work. The people of revere hold this city near and dear and feel as though it is theirs. Offering a compromise will work very smoothly in everyone's favor. DCR will be happy because the residents will respect your beach and respect your decision and the residents will be happy to know their input meant something and that their money is benefiting their hometown.</p> <p>Nah any beach did an amazing job with turning over the public free parking into paid parking. It is very inexpensive, not meter parking, and it made a world of difference. I believe the same can be done with revere beach. Please do not place meters and make it a closed off one way in one way out parking lot just like the Nahant parking spaces. I look forward to seeing the outcome</p>	Kristen	Perez	Revere	MA
10/31/20 7:55 AM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>I am writing in opposition to DCR's plan to install parking meters on certain DCR parkways in the City of Boston. Specifically, I am opposed to the installation of parking meters in the Fenway neighborhood.</p> <p>Unlike some of the other proposed locations, such as Revere Beach, the Fenway streets are not parkways or throughways, but are neighborhood streets where residents live. Charlesgate East, Park Drive, and the Fenway are residential streets where there is limited parking to begin with. Fenway residents have few choices of parking spaces, and during Red Sox games, this gets worse.</p> <p>As a longtime Fenway resident who has seen parking become more difficult over the years, I object to the inclusion of residential abutting parking spots in this plan.</p>	Ruth	Khowais		

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal
Public Comments
deadline 11/2/2020

10/31/20 9:01 AM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	I oppose the installation of parking meters along Revere Beach. The installation will place a financial burden on the families and senior citizens who visit the beach for recreation. We need to preserve some complimentary services, and I feel this is one of the most important ones. Thank you.	Laurel	Costello	Revere	MA
10/31/20 11:06 AM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	I am not in favor of this and as a resident and Homeowner and taxpayer,I do not want any meters on beach. Enough is Enough Towing,hard to have visitors now. No to METERS	LouAnne	Meola	Revere	MA

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

10/31/20 1:29 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>I'm writing with two friendly amendments to the DCR's plan to install parking meters.</p> <p>People who have Fenway resident parking stickers should be allowed to park at the meters for free, with no time limits. Residents in my neighborhood are uniquely pressured by the constant expansion of nonprofit institutions, and parking is already extraordinarily difficult here.</p> <p>It is now a matter of record that DCR failed to consider its own history of reducing parking for residents of the East Fenway prior to creating this plan. Nor did it consider the reductions in parking spaces made by Boston, which controls the rest of the parking in the neighborhood. Nor was any examination made of the number of resident permits issues in relation to the number of available spaces. Nor was there any study of the number of construction and moving permits issued annually by the city for the neighborhood, which is truly significant.</p> <p>Most importantly, there is not a single governmental effort looking at the collective impact of the combined parking reductions by the two controlling entities. That is just shocking.</p> <p>For years DCR has been removing parking spots from tax paying residents in the East Fens and handing them over to tax-free institutions. None of these decisions is ever in favor of residents. These decisions are hard to understand and the stress upon residents is enormous.</p> <p>If the DCR allowed Fenway residents with stickers to park at the meters it would really help.</p> <p>My second friendly amendment is that DCR should engage in the necessary campaign to change the regulations to allow it to charge a more reasonable, equitable fee for parking during ballgames and special events. It costs \$45-90 to park a car at a ballgame. \$1.25/hr/meter isn't fair to DCR.</p> <p>DCR income isn't the only issue this second suggestion seeks to address. Traffic is already gridlocked during ballgames in the Fenway. The further increase in traffic as people circle around trying to score a meter where they can park for \$1.25 an hour will render the roads largely unusable for other purposes in the times preceding the games. From a public safety perspective, ambulances and firetrucks and police will find it difficult to get around.</p> <p>It would be greatly appreciated if the DCR could factor in these Fenway resident concerns. Thank you for your consideration of my commentary, and my community.</p>	Brian	Clague	Boston	MA
10/31/20 5:40 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Dolores	Boogdanian		

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

11/2/20 11:20 AM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Timothy	Ney		
11/2/20 11:47 AM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Elizabeth	Bertolozzi		
11/2/20 12:40 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>The addition of meters as a strategy to manage demand at a location is inline with best practice strategies in cities around the country. Particularly when abutting areas that have existing paid parking and time-bound restrictions, the exclusion of the meters feels like a mismanaged resource. The pressure at the curbs in our neighborhoods around Boston are growing steadily as commercial deliveries and ride-hailing have emerged. Providing free personal vehicle storage is no longer a subsidy that we can afford to provide in urban areas. The meter program addresses an inequity in our region and is aligned with the current climate crisis. As a frequent visitor to many of these areas on foot, by bicycle, by transit, and by car with my family, I'm in support of the meter proposal.</p> <p>I would request that the meter pricing be tied to either an annual parking occupancy study or to the adjacent meters under municipal control so that we do not end up with the issue in the Seaport where MassDOT and City of Boston meters on consecutive blocks have different prices. That creates confusion for the driver and opens up an opportunity for critique on how pricing is derived. An annual occupancy study and demand-based parking policy would bring DCR into the current practice of dozens of cities around the nation and result in a more equitable approach to pricing.</p>	Kris	Carter	Roslindale	MA
11/2/20 1:24 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Andrew	Bettinelli		
11/2/20 1:24 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Andrew	Bettinelli		

Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Public Comments

deadline 11/2/2020

11/2/20 3:12 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	I write in opposition to the proposal for curbside metered parking in the Fenway neighborhood. This neighborhood is being unreasonably squeezed by excessive development, especially around Fenway Park and Boylston street. This proposal will eliminate existing parking spaces along Park Drive and The Fenway which are currently available for residents. The proposal to convert these spaces into metered spaces places an undue burden on residents of a neighborhood which has experienced unprecedented growth and reduced parking availability as a result of that growth. The number of "resident only" spaces is already insufficient to meet the existing need. Increased development is bringing additional residents to the neighborhood and the need for parking will only increase. Restricting the street parking along Park Drive and The Fenway will make matters worse!	CJ	Ferrara	Boston	MA
11/2/20 5:47 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Laura	Jaskinski		
11/2/20 9:06 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	Letter follows	Julie	Damiano		
11/2/20 10:57 PM	Curbside Parking Meter Proposal - deadline 11/2/2020	<p>I would like to lend my support for the curbside parking meter proposal. My biggest complaint is the flat rate pricing that DCR has proposed. The parking rate should be matched to the surrounding area and municipalities, particularly when Boston has been testing demand-based pricing throughout the city to encourage more turnover.</p> <p>I would also recommend that the chosen meter program integrates with some of the digital parking programs that already exist in these areas. Park Boston/Passport Parking are in use nearby and would simplify the process of paying for users.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Brandon	Cardley	Boston	MA



**Fenway Community
Development Corporation**
Improving Lives and
Building Community

October 22, 2020

Jim Montgomery, Commissioner
Department of Conservation and Recreation
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
251 Causeway Street, 9th Floor, Boston, MA 02114

Re: Fenway CDC opposition to Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation
Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Dear Commissioner Montgomery:

Fenway Community Development Corporation (Fenway CDC) writes to express our strong opposition to the ill-conceived proposal of the Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) to expand the use of parking collections to include curbside meters along certain parkways and parking areas in the Metropolitan Boston area. We were not able to attend the public virtual meeting and are now sending in our letter of opposition to this proposal.

Fenway Community Development Corporation (Fenway CDC) is a 47 year old community based non-profit organization that builds, owns and preserves over 400 units of affordable housing. We promote projects that engage our full community in enhancing the neighborhood's diversity and vitality. We oppose the DCR parking meter proposal.

The specific locations at which DCR proposes to install parking meters include:

- The Fenway, Boston Boylston Street to Avenue Louis Pasteur
- Park Drive, Boston Peterborough to Beacon Street
- Charlesgate East, Boston Boylston Street to Newbury Street
- Memorial Drive, Cambridge 1 Memorial Drive to Fowler Street
- Cambridge Parkway, Cambridge
- Dealtry Pool, Watertown
- Revere Beach Blvd, Revere Eliot Circle to Carey Circle

The DCR proposes to set parking rates consistent with the existing parking fee in the agency's regulations, \$1.25 per hour, which is equal to or less than the rates charged for on street parking in the respective municipalities which currently collect revenue via meters. DCR intends to honor existing municipal overnight resident parking sticker programs, and no revenue will be collected for overnight parking in locations where overnight parking is allowed.

The DCR states that a significant portion of revenues collected under DCR's curbside parking meter collections program, which DCR aims to implement in late spring of 2021, will be dedicated for use by the agency to support the statewide park system. This is in fact punishing a captive

audience of residents of the Fenway and Audubon Circle who have no daytime parking options. The DCR will use their money to help make up for budget shortfalls that should be spread evenly throughout all residents of the Commonwealth.

Some of the sites that are listed may make sense (parking lots for park facilities, for example, or Revere Beach Parkway). However, the only roads that are proposed for parking meters in dense urban neighborhoods appear to be in the Fenway. We strenuously object to this portion of the proposal as large numbers of the Fenway and Audubon Circle residents do own cars, need them for work or errands and have very limited or no parking options.

The DCR needs to understand the conditions on the ground in the Fenway and realize that more than 2,000 new apartments have been built just along Boylston Street in the last ten years. Literally thousands more apartments are already proposed and in the development pipeline. Parking facilities are not keeping up with this building boom. Residents who have cars must park on the street. Unfortunately, due to the COVID 19 crisis many residents are avoiding mass transit and returning to using cars for safety reasons.

The DCR must listen to the unanimous opposition of all those who attended the public hearing. The DCR has also earned the strong opposition of all of our state elected officials – Senator Brownsberger, Representatives Livingstone, Santiago and Tyler – who sent their own letter of opposition. As they suggested, the DCR should also revisit the already instituted reduction and reallocation of resident spaces in the vicinity of 8 the Fenway.

The DCR would be better off to scrap this proposal and start the process anew. Ultimately if the parking meter proposal is implemented in any form, the DCR must exempt all residents of the Fenway and Audubon Circle who have cars with resident parking permits.

Sincerely yours,

Richard Giordano

Fenway Community Development Corporation
70 Burbank Street
Boston, MA 02115
P. 617 267 4637 x 19
E. rgiordano@fenwaycdc.org
W. www.fenwaycdc.org

Cc:

Jennifer Norwood, DCR public comments
State Senator William Brownsberger
State Representative Chyna Tyler
State Representative Jay Livingstone
State Representative Jon Santiago
Boston City Councilor Kenzie Bok
Shanice Pimentel, Neighborhood Liaison, Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services
Steve Wolf, Fenway News



October 19, 2020

Department of Conservation and Recreation
Commissioner Jim Montgomery
251 Causeway St.
Boston, Massachusetts 02114

Re: the proposed **DCR Curbside Parking Meter Proposal**

Dear Commissioner Montgomery,

The Fenway Alliance is writing to express our strong opposition to the new metered parking spots that the DCR is proposing along the DCR parkways in the Fenway neighborhood of Boston.

The Fenway neighborhood is already one of the most under-resourced neighborhoods in Boston when it comes to available parking for our residents. We believe that the proposed new meters will further reduce the number of parking spots for Fenway residents, particularly since the bulk of Fenway residential neighborhoods abut the DCR parkways, including Charlesgate East and the areas east and north of Forsyth Way.

In addition we oppose the allocating of funds from the meters into the DCR general fund, when ongoing funding of assets in the Fenway owned and managed by DCR are not fully funded.

As an advocate for and steward of the Frederick Law Olmsted Muddy River Park and Parklands over the decades, we are concerned about placing meters on a historic Parkway intended as part of the wholistic Park design.

We stand with our Fenway elected officials and Fenway community organizations all of whom are opposed to this plan as it has been laid out.

Sincerely,

Kelly Brilliant
Executive Director, The Fenway Alliance

Genevieve Day
Assistant Director, The Fenway Alliance

The Fenway Alliance: Boston Arts Academy; Berklee College of Music; Boston Conservatory @Berklee; Boston Symphony Orchestra; Emmanuel College; Fenway Studios/Friends of the Fenway Studios; The First Church of Christ, Scientist; Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health; Huntington Theatre Company; Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum; Mary Baker Eddy Library; Mass College of Art & Design; Mass Historic Society; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; New England Conservatory; Northeastern University; SMFA at Tufts University; Simmons College; The Winsor School; YMCA of Greater Boston



Commonwealth of Massachusetts

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STATE HOUSE, BOSTON, MA 02133-1054

ROSELEE VINCENT
STATE REPRESENTATIVE

REPRESENTING THE PEOPLE OF THE
16TH SUFFOLK DISTRICT
REVERE • CHELSEA • SAUGUS

ROOM 473F
TEL: (617) 722-2210
FAX: (617) 722-2837
RoseLee.Vincent@MAhouse.gov

VICE CHAIR
Bonding, Capital Expenditures
and State Assets

Joint Committees on:
Revenue
Cannabis Policy

October 28, 2020

Ms. Jennifer Norwood
Department of Conservation and Recreation
251 Causeway Street
Boston, MA 02114

Sent via E-mail

Dear Ms. Norwood,

I write to you today to offer comment on and to express deep concerns with the Department of Conservation and Recreation's (DCR's) Curbside Parking Meter Proposal. As Revere's State Representative and as the House Chair of the Metropolitan Beaches Commission, I have to admit that when I initially heard that DCR was going to install metered parking on Revere Beach Boulevard, I was actually elated. However, after attending the public hearings of October 14th and October 15th in which the proposal was presented, **if funds cannot go back to investments in Revere Beach, I am totally opposed to placing metered parking on our beach**, and I share many of the same concerns expressed by local Revere officials.

First and foremost, from past conversations with DCR officials and previous public hearings of the Metropolitan Beaches Commission, I was under the impression that most, if not all, of monies generated from parking at Revere Beach would go back directly to maintaining the Revere Beach Reservation's day-to-day operations and for capital improvements to the Reservation, as well as perhaps an opportunity for some revenue sharing with the City of Revere. I was appalled when I learned otherwise. It seems unfathomable and unjust that these revenues generated from people who live on and visit America's First Public Beach, which is located in a Gateway City, would be placed into DCR's general fund to be used for parks as far away from Revere as the Berkshires. In essence, the revenues generated which will be shared throughout the state, by and large, will be paid for on the backs of urban working families and seniors who come to Revere Beach due its affordability and ease of access from Greater Boston. Also, we must be cognizant of the northern end of Revere Beach, which is the residential section of the reservation. It seems unfair that the people that I represent would have to pay to park in front of their own homes.

As a resident of the Boulevard, I see every day the critical need for more investment in Revere Beach because our beloved beach has begun to slip backward in recent years. The sidewalks are cracked. The seawalls are literally crumbling. The historic pavilions are falling apart. The period lighting fixtures are rusting away. All this through no fault of the local DCR staff who do yeoman's work with the resources they have. We have a serious need for tangible investment in our Reservation, and raising funds through metered parking would have been a logical way to make these improvements a reality in the near future. This is why I was excited and supportive of the idea of metered parking, even with the thought of 100 non-aesthetically pleasing parking kiosks up-and-down our beautiful Boulevard. Now, as it currently stands, we will have to look at these unsightly kiosks, pay for parking, and then not be able to reap the benefits of this significant revenue.

In my position, I understand the revenue challenge DCR is confronting as it looks to the future. I know this because each year during my tenure in the Legislature, I have sponsored language in the annual state budget to provide funds for the maintenance and operation of our urban beaches, which includes Revere Beach. However, though we have been fortunate enough to be able to provide appropriations in the budget these past six years, funding the Revere Beach Reservation by the budget alone is unsustainable. Due to volatile economics, amounts appropriated for the beaches line item tend to increase or decrease based on whether or not it is a good fiscal year. Further, monies that are appropriated in the budget tend to go strictly to the day-to-day operations of the beach – not capital improvements.

For these reasons, as you might recall, the Metropolitan Beaches Commission convened a hearing last year to discuss the possibility of metered parking on DCR beaches. My takeaway from the discussion was that inexpensive metered parking on our beach in which the returns go back directly to our beach can generate real, substantial revenue to ensure that Revere Beach is returned to its pristine condition we saw some time ago. **Accordingly, I would strongly urge the DCR to reconsider putting all monies raised from this metered parking program into the general parks fund, and that the agency instead really dig deep to find a way to make it possible to distribute the revenues raised to the appropriate areas where they were generated from.**

Additionally, I would also ask and encourage that DCR keep the four-hour parking limits that currently exist on Revere Beach Boulevard. Over the last couple of years, as parking lots around the Wonderland MBTA station have been gobbled up by large-scale residential developments, prior to the pandemic, the Wonderland Garage was becoming full by 10 AM on most mornings. I have serious concerns that commuters will pay the full price to park all day on the Boulevard, taking up spaces that should be utilized by those who are visiting the Reservation, not by those going into Boston.

Ms. Jennifer Norwood
October 28, 2020
Page 3 of 3

Finally, if after this process it is determined that revenues raised from parking on the Revere Beach Reservation cannot be invested back into America's First Public Beach, either through legislative action or DCR regulation changes, I would **strongly request** that DCR implement metered parking at any and all DCR beaches, parks and facilities across the state. If these funds are going to be shared throughout the Commonwealth, it is only equitable and just if everybody visiting each and every DCR property around Massachusetts is contributing their fair share.

The DCR and the City of Revere have always had a wonderful working relationship, and as an elected official from Revere, I thought this was going to be another true partnership that would benefit both Revere and the DCR. If the matters in this letter are addressed and worked out in a final plan, I would certainly be supportive because it has always been my hope that metered parking on Revere Beach would imply concrete action steps to restore the Boulevard to being the polished gem of our community that it so rightly is, as well as give the DCR and the City of Revere more resources in their toolboxes to maintain the day-to-day challenges the Revere Beach Reservation faces. However, for right now, I am opposed to the proposal currently before your agency. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



RoseLee Vincent
State Representative
Sixteenth Suffolk District

CC: *Jim Montgomery, DCR Commissioner*
Brian Arrigo, Mayor of the City of Revere

City of Revere, Massachusetts



City Hall

Office of the City Council
281 Broadway
Revere, MA 02151

October 29, 2020

Ms. Jennifer Norwood
Department of Conservation and Recreation
251 Causeway Street
Boston, MA 02114

Sent via E-mail

Dear Ms. Norwood,

We the undersigned members of the Revere City Council write to you today to express our concerns with regard to the Department of Conservation and Recreation's Curbside Parking Meter Proposal for Revere Beach.

Our disappointment with the current proposal is twofold: first and foremost, none of the funds generated from these proposed meters on our beach will be reinvested in our community and at the Revere Beach Reservation, and second, the agency did not take into consideration the residents of Revere who not only live on the beach, but who also go to the Boulevard 365 days a year to walk and recreate.

The City of Revere is a Gateway City, and America's First Public Beach has always been an oasis for urban families. Summer, Fall, Winter and Spring, residents of our community who might not be able to afford vacations to the Caribbean go down to the beach to enjoy its magnificent brilliance and beauty. Placing parking meters on Revere Beach Boulevard is distasteful in itself, but then to take those revenues that are raised on the backs of working families and investing them into the DCR's general parks fund is a real slap in the face. To put this proposal forward to the City of Revere in the midst of a pandemic in which our community is currently suffering an unemployment rate of twenty-five percent seems rather insensitive to the population that America's First Public Beach serves.

Essentially, the way the proposal currently is, parking revenues generated from Revere Beach going into the DCR general parks fund could help to improve parks as far away from Revere as the Berkshires. That is appalling and unjust to us as leaders in the City of Revere and to the constituents we represent. To install parking meters on Revere Beach only to take the funds for your own general fund, and to not install them on every other DCR property across the Commonwealth's park system is truly prejudicial and offensive to our community.

Although we consider it to be the gem of our community, the Revere Beach Reservation is in need of some serious tender loving care. When walking the beach, one cannot help but notice how cracked and dangerous the sidewalks are; or how cracked and unsightly some of the sea-wall has become; or how rusted the lighting fixtures are; or how dilapidated our historic pavilions are becoming year after year. **If all of the monies generated from parking meters were going to be invested in a major capital improvement project for Revere Beach that would benefit the Reservation and the people of this city, perhaps this proposal would not seem so detestable.** However, it is perceived that the DCR is exploiting America's First Public Beach to fuel its own general coffers.

We also are extremely dismayed that the DCR's proposal for metered parking does not take the residents of Revere into consideration. Revere Beach may be a state beach that is under the jurisdiction of the DCR, but it is our residents who bear the brunt of hosting America's First Public Beach in our community. From increased traffic due to North Shore residents riding the Boulevard to and from Boston for the scenic views on their daily commute to hordes of people from all over the region during the warm summer months, it is our constituents' quality of life that is impacted as a result of having one of the largest, accessible beaches from Boston in our backyard.

From those of us who represent the people who live right on Revere Beach who might have to pay to park in front of their own homes to those of us who represent other parts of the city where people drive to the beach every day for their evening walk or morning run, our residents have made clear that any installation of parking meters on America's First Public Beach should not be paid for by Revere residents. Furthermore, residents who live in neighborhoods surrounding the beach have expressed concerns, which we share, that metered parking could deter visitors from parking on the Boulevard, and drive them to park on our city streets instead. We must not allow this to happen.

We must also be cognizant that metered parking on the Boulevard could deter patrons to restaurants that are currently up and down Revere Beach Boulevard, some of which are minority and women owned businesses. Again, in the midst of the COVID pandemic where many of our local restaurants have already suffered tremendously, it seems that now, of all times, is not an opportune moment to propose metered parking on our urban beach.

What we would respectfully ask and advocate for is that all Revere residents be eligible for either free or very, very reduced parking rates on Revere Beach Boulevard. If the Commonwealth can offer discounts to residents of East Boston and Chelsea for the tolls, so too should the technology be there for the state to extend the same type of courtesy for Revere residents who wish to park on Revere Beach Boulevard. At the very least and bare minimum, Revere residents deserve that. We would also request that if this plan moves forward, that there be no parking meters on the residential side of Revere Beach Boulevard, as this would allow residents who live on the Boulevard to park in front of their own homes.

Ms. Jennifer Norwood
Department of Conservation and Recreation
Page 3 of 3

In addition to the two major concerns outlined in this letter, we would also encourage DCR to keep the four-hour parking limits that currently exist on Revere Beach Boulevard. Prior to the pandemic, the Wonderland Garage was becoming full by 10 AM on most mornings. We have serious concerns that if the four-hour parking limits are lifted, commuters from the North Shore will pay the full price to park all day on the Boulevard, taking up valuable spaces that should be utilized by those who are visiting the Reservation, not by those going to work into Boston.

The City of Revere and the Department of Conservation and Recreation have a long history of collaborating when it comes to matters involving the Revere Beach Reservation. It is our hope that you will hear the concerns and feedback brought to your attention by the undersigned members of this City Council, as well as points raised other city leaders who have weighed in on this topic, and that you seriously adjust this proposal to accommodate the people and the beach whom this impacts the most. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. SERINO
Revere City Councillor – Ward Six

JOANNE McKENNA
Revere City Councillor – Ward One

PATRICK M. KEEFE, JR.
Revere City Council President – Ward Four

IRA NOVOSELSKY
Revere City Council Vice-President – Ward Two

JOHN F. POWERS
Revere City Councillor – Ward Five

ARTHUR F. GUINASSO
Revere City Councillor – Ward Three

STEVEN MORABITO
Revere City Councillor – At-Large

JESSICA A. GIANNINO
Revere City Councillor – At-Large

GEORGE J. ROTONDO
Revere City Councillor – At-Large

GERRY VISCONTI
Revere City Councillor – At-Large

CC: *The Honorable Jim Montgomery, DCR Commissioner*
 The Honorable Brian M. Arrigo, Mayor of the City of Revere



VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL TRANSMISSION

October 31, 2020

James Montgomery, Commissioner
Department of Conservation and Recreation
251 Causeway Street, - 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02114

Dear Commissioner Montgomery:

The Board of the Audubon Circle Neighborhood Association (ACNA) offers these comments regarding DCR's plan to install parking meters on DCR roadways in the Fenway area of Boston, as well as in Cambridge, Revere, and Watertown. ACNA is particularly concerned about the meters proposed in Audubon Circle, which would be in the 400 block of Park Drive between the bridge over the MBTA Fenway T station and Beacon Street, but considers its objections to be applicable to other DCR roads where similar conditions exist.

The ACNA Board is opposed to installation of curbside parking meters on DCR roadways. The project suffers immediately from being presented as a means to make Massachusetts parks, forests and beaches "self-sustaining." Monetizing our open space resources calls for an entirely different level of scrutiny into the Commonwealth's priorities and expectations, and underscores the pernicious underfunding of EOEEA's line agencies. That DCR has had five commissioners in nine years has undermined the agency's efficacy and reveals the low status assigned to this vitally important public agency, an importance that was put in high relief when the public turned to its parks and beaches to seek respite from the constraints imposed by the COVID pandemic. For the purposes of this letter, however, these comments will focus on the parking meter proposal standing alone.

1. DCR's curbside parking meter project has been presented as a *fait accompli* without any prior inquiry being made of the affected communities. This presents a further mark against the proposal. The Harvard Kennedy School of Government's report upon which the meter project relies is dated December, 2014, in which case DCR and the Baker Administration have had almost six years to share information about the report and its recommendations with municipal officials and community representatives and to solicit input from them. That this did not occur requires The Commonwealth to move forward from this point as if DCR were soliciting that input now and without the presumption that it will go forward with the plan as presented.

P. O. BOX 15354 KENMORE STATION BOSTON MA 02215
contact@auduboncircle.org
www.AudubonCircle.org

2. Whether due to lack of funding or attention, DCR has not adequately addressed significant public safety issues in the Fenway area. Broken or unlit street lights, missing lane striping and poor road conditions have put pedestrians, bicyclists and drivers in jeopardy. Untended, unhealthy and missing street trees blight the neighborhood. The unfortunate result is that DCR has generated very little good will in the community and the meter proposal puts the cart before the horse. This is made worse when the cart in question contains very little of value to the community.

3. Meters undermine the parkways' aesthetic, historic and open space values, assets that should not be squandered or further degraded. It also detracts from the architectural and historic value of the abutting residential buildings on Park Drive and The Fenway, and impart disassociation from and contradiction to the residential character of the neighborhood. Meters connote commercial areas and uses, or nondescript areas unrelated to a neighborhood. None of these impacts is positive or welcome.

4. Most of the reasons put forward in support of the proposal are not persuasive. First, DCR should not be relegated to collecting parking fees to generate funding. As for the problem of long term "storage" of cars, this has not been apparent on Park Drive in Audubon Circle, and the monthly street sweeping program (for which DCR tows) prevents long term stragglers. "More on-street parking for visitors" translates into more coming and going on the street, which means more traffic, which is a bad result. Using Park Rangers to monitor and enforce meter usage is a poor utilization of their services, which are much more needed in the parks and forests, and whatever data that might be collected by virtue of meter usage could be adequately accounted for with valuable but so far unsought input from the community, as well as by other means of monitoring and analysis.

5. But for the unrestricted spaces on Park Drive, there are exceedingly few spots in Audubon Circle or in the Fenway generally where visitors can legally park. There are too few spots to park, period. The risk and cost of tickets for violations impose a hardship on residents and homeowners who are as likely as any other resident of the state to have family or friends to their homes, need the services of repair personnel, or rely on caregivers or home health care providers. These spaces are needed for residents and residents' needs, and parking meters would impose an undue burden on what is essentially a captive audience. We live on these streets.

6. The meters and parking fees will impose a substantial burden on residents and their guests and invitees, but will be a significant boon to those seeking parking options during Fenway game and concert events. By setting meter rates and violation fees far less than the parking rates charged in commercial lots and garages in the area, the state's proposal is in direct conflict with the City of Boston's parking rules implemented to curtail event parking in its residential neighborhoods. Free parking on DCR roads does not deter event parking, either, but residents at least have as good a chance to find a space on Park Drive or The Fenway as a baseball or

concert fan and can reclaim street parking when those events are not in play. With the meters, however, residents pay either way, and pay much more dearly than the out-of-towner just in for a few hours of the day or night. The meter proposal imposes an unequal and greater burden on a subset of Commonwealth taxpayers living in the affected communities, which makes it a burden that is unfair and therefore inappropriate.

7. The proposed change in overnight hours is a step in the right direction, but does not go far enough. Even assuming residents or residents' guests and invitees do not need daytime parking (which is not the case), collecting fees until 8 p.m., means that residents returning home from their jobs or daily activities will be obliged to pay to park. To the extent Park Drive in the Fenway and Audubon Circle is a non-commercial area, there is no reason to extend the fee period until 8 p.m. If installation of meters is indeed a *fait accompli*, then free overnight parking should start at 5 or 6 p.m.

8. The best result to this discussion would be to devote all of the parking spaces on DCR roads in the Fenway and Audubon Circle to resident parking, with an adequate number of spaces set aside for visitors who need to come and go and on which local residents heavily rely to conduct their lives. DCR and City officials should work together to make this happen.

Thank you for taking these comments into consideration as you deliberate on this matter.

Sincerely,

s/ Dolores Boogdanian

ACNA President

cc: Jennifer Norwood, DCR Director of External Affairs
State Senator William Brownsberger
State Representative Chynah Tyler
Kathleen A. Theoharides, Secretary of EOEEA
Mayor Martin J. Walsh
City Councilor Kenzie Bok
Chris Osgood, Boston Chief of Streets
Jerome Smith, Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services

Norwood, Jennifer (DCR)

From: tjonesbari@aol.com
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 5:29 PM
To: Norwood, Jennifer (DCR)
Cc: William Brownsberger; kmobilia@gmail.com; kenzie.bok@boston.gov; everwoodpark@gmail.com; grafikos2@gmail.com
Subject: Parking meters on DCR Parkways

CAUTION: This email originated from a sender outside of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts mail system. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms. Norwood,

I am writing to express my adamant opposition to the installation of parking meters on the DCR Parkways specific to the concerns that directly affect our Fenway neighborhood. I have lived in the Fenway since 1982 and we have owned our condo at 11 Park Drive since March 2002. The named thoroughfares about which I would like to speak are The Fenway and Park Drive.

Since our residence is on Park Drive, I will address those concerns first. As you know, the left side of Park Drive from Peterborough Street to Holy Trinity Orthodox Cathedral allows for visitors until 10:00 PM. What that means is that every weekday morning there is a line of cars waiting like vultures to take those "free spots" in order to circumvent the parking fees of downtown Boston. Those people then walk to the T and go on to work for the day, leaving residents to fend for themselves. There have been countless days in the past 18 years when I have come home from work at 4 PM and have been unable to find even one parking space in which to park my car which has a legal Fenway/Kenmore parking permit. I have counted the possible parking spaces in that length of Park Drive and depending upon how closely the cars are parked, it can mean as many as 150 parking spaces. As the neighborhood continues to develop and the population expands, these parking spaces are now in even greater demand for the residents. We cannot afford to have fewer spaces in this neighborhood. The idea of actually losing those spaces to parking meters, meaning that we would not be able to park there at all until 10 PM even if the space were to be available, is simply unacceptable. That change to that stretch of Park Drive in particular would be a devastating blow to our residents. I urge you to reconsider and to understand the parking challenges we already face.

As for the Fenway, I can say that it might be an acceptable idea to place parking meters in the area of the Museum of Fine Arts and the Gardner Museum. While I understand that the MFA has a parking facility, those meters might actually be helpful to those who wish to visit the park. That stretch of The Fenway does have some residential needs but a large portion of the street is located along parkland. Perhaps a compromise similar to the one I outlined above could be reached which would not impact those residents who depend upon the availability of parking spaces near to their homes.

This is not unreasonable. I certainly understand the need for funding for the parks and I understand that this may seem like a logical answer to revenue shortages, but I assure you that the impact on the quality of our lives would be significant. That being said, may I propose some alternative ideas to consider?

What if all of the current visitor spaces on the left side of the "inner loop" of Park Drive were converted to resident spaces (all visitor spaces eliminated) and the DCR placed a single row of parking meters on either the left or right side of the "outer loop" of Park Drive? It would be create a potentially large number of metered spaces that could be in use from perhaps 8 AM until 8 PM, for example. This would generate the income, reduce the impact on resident parking and it would serve a

third very important purpose.... It would slow down the traffic on that "outer loop", which MANY use as an expressway or bypass to the traffic lights and congestion on Boylston Street. The speed on Park Drive at times can be dangerous. Few, if any, stop at the crosswalks and without speed bumps or regularly timed traffic signals, the traffic barrels through as if on Storrow Drive. The addition of a parking lane along with speed limit signs and perhaps a speed bump or two would certainly reduce the speed and make Park Drive a safer road.

Thank you for your time and for your consideration.

Most respectfully,
Thomas Jones
11 Park Drive, #33
Boston, MA. 02215
617. 959-4009

•



Department of Conservation and Recreation
Commissioner Jim Montgomery
251 Causeway Street
Boston, MA 02114

Re: DCR Metered Parking proposal

October 25, 2020

Dear Commissioner Montgomery:

Fenway Civic Association (FCA) is the Fenway's oldest all-volunteer neighborhood organization that accepts no public or developer funds. Formed in 1961, our mission is to promote a vital and livable neighborhood. We have read the 2014 Kennedy School report that informed the proposal for metered parking, records regarding the creation of parkways parking in the Fenway, and met with our local and state representatives. We are writing to voice our firm opposition to the DCR metered parking proposal presented on October 14 and 15, 2020, and to request your exclusion of the Fenway neighborhood in these plans.

Our reasons for opposition include the following:

1. Fenway Parkway and development for resident parking

Parkways bounding the Back Bay Fens were intentionally improved through a long-term, collaborative, community-involved process that narrowed travel lanes and relieved congestion, improved their residential character, and reduced traffic, and in the process, created parking which was recognized by the MDC to be used by residents. The Commissioner of the MDC in 1980 weighed in on the proposal for the Fenway Area Parkway System with the statement that such a use, which might in effect become exclusively resident parking, was fitting at this location.

Fenway residents, especially those in the numerous residences bounding the Back Bay Fens, are limited in their parking options, with lack of available space and parking, a highly taxed road system, and added parking pressures from institutional and business use further compounding challenges, including regular concerts and ballgame events that bring 35,000 attendees on any given day. To enact metered parking along these areas is against the intent of the creation of this section of parkways. We believe this specific history was overlooked in Harvard's assessment. Modern meters by their very nature and design are out of context on the Historic Parkway and will degrade the experience for park users. Of note, the Harvard study included recommending assessment of contextual appropriateness, stating as an example that "in residential areas where DCR owns spaces, it is less appropriate to install parking meters, even though that might maximize revenue."

2. Proposed scope, revenue model, and assessing state revenues for city parks

We object to the model that limits metering to impacted properties in your proposal, the conveyance of revenues to the state fund, and the premise of metering visitors to city parkland in the Back Bay Fens. The Kennedy School study limited its scope to Boston, Fenway, and Cambridge, and included highly residential areas like the Fenway, while excluding numerous areas with no residential abutters, high visitation rates, and large parking areas. To exclude DCR owned properties with high investment and use unfairly encumbers a select group of constituents with revenue generation for the state.

Further, the plan for the revenue to directly serve the state while ignoring investment in the assessed/impacted areas is uniquely unfair. Finally, while the premise of the project serves to generate visitor revenue from those seeking to visit its assets, the Back Bay Fens is city-owned, operated, and funded, save for the parkways and portions extending to their limits. This means the program seeks to extract state revenues from visitors to city-owned and funded assets.

3. Fees, enforcement, and Fenway parking pressures

We do not believe the proposal has adequately considered parking conditions specific to the Fenway, the way that parking rates impact those conditions, and the need for enforcement that has been a longstanding issue with Fenway residents. The City of Boston and Fenway representatives have recognized that city-metered parking spaces are subject to abuse by drivers attending game and entertainment events at Fenway Park, with visitors using resident parking spaces during restricted hours because the ensuing fees and penalties were still less than commercial event parking rates. The \$1.25/hour model proposed by the DCR and the lack of meter enforcement from 8:00 p.m. Saturday through to Monday morning will only exacerbate existing issues, with visitors who seek entertainment parking expanding their use of city owned spaces throughout the parkways. Parking fines for City spaces in the Fenway were raised to \$100 in order to discourage Red Sox fans from parking in residential spaces and simply paying the \$25 fine. Such a low fine is far cheaper than making use of the private car parks which have plenty of parking spaces available from \$40 - \$50 per event.

4. Historic appropriateness and parks quality

This proposal for 399 metered spaces and 40 meters placed throughout the Fenway, Park Drive, and Charlesgate areas is 23% of the entire proposal. The visual intrusion of pay station meters on parkway medians along an Olmsted-designed and historically landmarked parks system is visually inappropriate, sets a precedent that may further degrade the Necklace, and however well-intentioned, increases congestion and degrades the quality of limited and valuable parkland for users - primarily the 40,000+ residents who live in the Fenway.

The above reasons are too numerous to consolidate into a single statement that encompasses our objection to this proposal, but ask that you consider the historic provenance of DCR parking in the Fenway, the inequity of the proposed model, the logistical and enforcement challenges for the Fenway, and the negative impacts it poses to the community and its parkland, and remove the Fenway from further plans for metered parking. We appreciate the need for the DCR to generate revenue and remain willing and committed partners in helping to steward these properties but do not believe this is the correct vehicle to meet those needs.

Sincerely,

Tim Horn, President
Fenway Civic Association

CC: City Councilor Kenzie Bok

State Representatives Jay Livingstone, Jon Santiago, and Chynah Tyler
State Senator William Brownsberger
Commissioner Ryan Woods, Boston Parks and Recreation
Chief Christopher Cook, Energy and Environment



*The mission of the Revere Beach Partnership
is to preserve and enhance America's first
public beach for the enjoyment of all.*

October 27, 2020

Commissioner Jim Montgomery
Department of Conservation and Recreation
251 Causeway St., #900
Boston, MA 02114

RE: Revere Beach parking fee plan

Dear Commissioner Montgomery:

The Revere Beach Partnership is proud of its nearly twenty-year partnership with the DCR and the City of Revere. We have collectively worked to revitalize and promote the crown jewel of the Commonwealth's public beaches: Revere Beach, America's First Public Beach.

In previous years, we have taken a public position in favor of fee-based parking on Revere Beach Boulevard and Ocean Avenue as a way to supplement chronically limited state resources. To our collective mind, new retained revenues would serve to augment, not supplant, existing funding of maintenance, capital improvements, and recreation programs on Revere Beach. For these reasons, we were happy to hear of DCR's public meetings on October 14, 2020, and October 15, 2020, to discuss a proposed parking program. Unfortunately, our happiness with the proposed plan ended with the presentation.

The parking program, as presented, fails to provide many benefits to Revere Beach. As presented, all parking revenues will simply become part of DCR's budget without any requirement that these funds be retained to benefit Revere Beach. Regrettably, the plan was presented as a fait accompli and failed to solicit and account for the feedback of partners like the Revere Beach Partnership and the City of Revere.

In order for a parking program to be effective, and have the support of DCR's partners including the Revere Beach Partnership, the program must:

- 1) Keep revenues generated on Revere Beach on Revere Beach;
- 2) Implement a parking enforcement program in conjunction with the City of Revere's already established program; and,



*The mission of the Revere Beach Partnership
is to preserve and enhance America's first
public beach for the enjoyment of all.*

- 3) Solicit feedback and recommendations from partners such as the Revere Beach Partnership and the City of Revere on the program hours, costs to consumers, location of parking stations, and neighborhood-specific concerns.

We respectfully urge the Department to pause the program, re-evaluate it in light of our concerns, the concerns of the City of Revere, and numerous citizens on your two webinars. We look forward to working with you to make adjustments to the proposed program and to make the modified program a success.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Jeffrey Rosario Turco
President

xc.: State Representative Robert A. DeLeo, Speaker of the House
State Representative RoseLee Vincent
Senator Joseph A. Boncore
Mayor Brian Arrigo
Robert Marra, Esq., Chief of Staff to Mayor Arrigo
City Councilor Jessica Giannino

James Montgomery
Commissioner
Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation
251 Causeway Street
9th Floor
Boston, MA 02114

October 29, 2020

RE: DCR Parking Meter Proposal

Dear Commissioner Montgomery,

We write to you in support of the proposal by the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) to install parking meters on DCR parkways in and around the Boston Metropolitan Area. As you know, providing safe and equitable access to green spaces and parks is more important than ever. Metered parking is one tool that can help ensure that vehicles aren't being stored long-term by people not using the parks, making it easier for people who have mobility challenges, families with children and many others to find a space to park when they need it. It is also an important policy lever to encourage people to use more sustainable modes (other than driving) when they have the option. To strengthen this effort, we hope you will consider the following recommendations as you finalize your proposal:

1. **Prioritize potential bike lane and biking infrastructure when placing meters and other equipment.** We ask that DCR take a holistic approach to the placement of the parking meters/pay stations to include potential future infrastructure for walking and biking including cycle tracks and protected biking/pedestrians paths. The placement of parking meters/pay stations should not preclude the future installation of protected bike infrastructure on the roadway.
2. **Take the opportunity of changes in parking management to ensure that crosswalks are daylighted to increase safety for people crossing the street.** This may include strategically removing certain parking spaces to make crossings safer for pedestrians and mitigate crashes and fatalities on DCR roadways.

- 3. We recommend exploring variable parking rates or other flexible rates/policies to ensure the appropriate fees to encourage turn over.** Using variable rates for time of day and days of the week based on parking data will ensure efficient use of the meters to ensure that parking access for people using DCR properties. To ensure that the new meters do not undermine local parking pricing policies, the new meters should align to at least match the meter rate in the surrounding areas. Boston's Mayor's Office of New Urban Mechanics (MONUM) conducted a performance parking pilot in 2017 that demonstrated the effectiveness of this approach. For example, during the pilot there was an 11 percent increase in available metered spaces, and a 14 percent decrease in double parking in the Back Bay. Additionally, the performance parking pilot also increased parking availability for neighborhood residents. Illegal parking in a resident spot declined by 12 percent in the Back Bay and by 35 percent in the Seaport.
- 4. The funds raised should go to support DCR and the Statewide park system and not to the General Fund.** In addition to investing in our Statewide park system, we also recommend dedicating at least half of the funds to improving walking, biking, and transit access to and through the parks on DCR parkways.
- 5. Consider working with local municipal partners who already have civilian (not police) parking enforcement entities.** If municipalities are already enforcing parking regulations surrounding the areas where the new DCR meters will be placed, DCR should work to ensure to increase efficiencies in enforcement and not overburden staff.

We look forward to working with you to implement your parking meter proposal that will improve the use of DCR lands and parkways for the enjoyment of all Massachusetts residents. Thank you for your time and please contact us with any questions.

Sincerely,

Stacey Beuttell, WalkBoston

Chris Dempsey, Transportation for Massachusetts

Galen Mook, MassBike

Becca Wolfson, Boston Cyclists Union

Stacy Thompson, LivableStreets Alliance



Fenway Garden Society
P.O. Box 230038, Astor Station
Boston, MA 02123-0038

November 1, 2020

Commissioner Jim Montgomery
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Conservation and Recreation
251 Causeway Street, #900
Boston MA 02114

RE: DCR Curbside Parking Meter Proposal

Dear Commissioner Montgomery:

We are writing on behalf of the Fenway Garden Society, Inc. (A/K/A Fenway Victory Gardens), a Massachusetts non-profit. Started in 1942, we are the oldest continuously-operating Victory Gardens in the US located in the historic Back Bay Fens, a part of the Emerald Necklace. Our mission is:

- to encourage the interest and cooperation of all gardeners in the Richard D. Parker Memorial Victory Gardens,
- to represent FGS in all dealings with third parties involving the gardens,
- to promote gardening techniques and principles to gardeners and the public, and
- to act as stewards of the parkland on which it operates.

Our organization's Board members and members have attended the DCR's Public virtual meetings on October 14 and 15 and obtained feedback from members on this proposal. **We are writing to strongly oppose the DCR Curbside Parking Meter Proposal which affects the 399 spaces in the area surrounding the Gardens:**

<u>Parking Location</u>	<u>Number of Spaces</u>
Boston: The Fenway	136
Boston: Park Drive	231
Boston: Charlesgate East & Boylston St	22
Boston: Charlesgate East & Newbury St	10

In light of our mission, we oppose the proposal as it negatively impacts the Gardens and our gardening community in 2 significant ways:

1. Access and Participation by Gardening Members

We are an extremely diverse, 400-member organization, with member gardeners from every neighborhood in the City of Boston.

Our diversity has always been a strength of this organization, and we had a unique opportunity this year to re-examine how different members travel to the Gardens and participate in gardening. The Gardens are a special place of solace and community for all members regardless of age, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, physical abilities and experience, and our goal is to foster and promote this diversity. Gardeners are responsible for maintenance of their own gardens as well as maintenance of common areas in this parkland, and we are committed to supporting all gardeners, regardless of their unique circumstances, who volunteer their time in this endeavor. There is an overwhelming interest in community gardening coupled with limited available gardening space in the City of Boston; we can only support inclusivity and interest from a diverse group of gardeners by ensuring everyone is able to visit the gardens on a regular basis and without additional hardship.

The recent reduction of service on the 55 bus by the MBTA has already had an adverse impact on access to the Victory Gardens and the Fenway neighborhood. The bus no longer goes to Park Street, and service has been reduced. There is no parking allowed in the Gardens. Metered parking on Park Drive and Fenway will cause further hardship to residents and gardeners who drive from other neighborhoods in Boston.

2. Historic Back Bay Fens/Emerald Necklace

Stewardship of this parkland, a part of the Emerald Necklace, is a core value of our mission. In the words of Frederick Law Olmsted (1870), "We want a ground to which people may easily go when the day's work is done, and where they may stroll for an hour, seeing, hearing, and feeling nothing of the bustle and jar of the streets where they shall, in effect, find the city put far away from them..."

We feel strongly that the plan's environmental impact disturbs the aesthetic of the parkways as “pleasure roads”, and increases vehicular traffic, car pollution and the buildup of greenhouse gasses.

Encouraging automobile use and monetizing short-term street parking in Boston goes against other public initiatives to decrease the use of cars in the city.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on behalf of our Board, our membership and all of our community as we work to protect, promote and enhance this historic green space in the Fenway.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Bertolozzi, President
Fenway Garden Society, Inc.

cc: City Councilor Kenzie Bok
State Representatives Jay Livingstone, Jon Santiago and Chynah Tyler
State Senator William N. Brownsberger
Commissioner Ryan Woods, Boston Parks and Recreation
Chief Christopher Cook, Environment, Energy and Open Space
Mayor Martin J. Walsh



COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
THE GENERAL COURT
STATE HOUSE, BOSTON 02133 1053

September 30, 2020

Department of Conservation and Recreation
Commissioner Jim Montgomery
251 Causeway St.
Boston, Massachusetts 02114

Dear Commission Montgomery,

We are writing in opposition to the Department's plan to expand the use of parking collections on certain DCR parkways in the City of Boston. We believe the residential nature of parts of the Fenway neighborhood warrants special consideration in this plan.

It is our understanding that the Department intends to install parking meters on several legacy Metropolitan District Commission (MDC) parkways in the Greater Boston area. We think it is important to distinguish the Fenway neighborhood from the other locations included in this plan. The proposal includes the installation of metered parking at Dealtry Pool, Revere Beach, Memorial Drive, and Cambridge Parkway. Nearly all, if not all of the Revere Beach Boulevard residential properties offer off-street parking, and most users of parking spots along the Boulevard are reasonably expected to be park users. The Parkways in Cambridge primarily abut educational institutions and industrial facilities.

By contrast, many segments of the parkways in the Fenway abut residential property, without off-street parking. Individuals parking in the spots are almost certain to be residents, who are not park users but are merely trying to park close to home. In particular, the segments along Charlesgate East, and The Fenway east and north of Forsyth Way, abut primarily residential property. The plan states that "DCR intends to honor existing municipal overnight resident parking sticker programs..." However, institutional expansion with DCR's approval has already reduced the number of resident spots available in the neighborhood. Further deprivation of parking options for these residents is simply unacceptable.

We strongly object to the inclusion of residential abutting parking spots this plan. Additionally, we request that the Department revisit the parking changes which occurred in the vicinity of 8 The Fenway, which reallocated seven resident spaces to other uses. We appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely,

Senator William N. Brownsberger
Second Suffolk & Middlesex

Representative Jay D. Livingstone
8th Suffolk

Representative Jon Santiago
9th Suffolk

Representative Chynah Tyler
7th Suffolk



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
MASSACHUSETTS SENATE

SENATOR WILLIAM N. BROWNSBERGER
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

STATE HOUSE, ROOM 319
BOSTON, MA 02133-1053
TEL. (617) 722-1280
WILLIAM.BROWNSBERGER@MASENATE.GOV
WWW.MASENATE.GOV

October 13, 2020

Department of Conservation and Recreation
Commissioner Jim Montgomery
251 Causeway St.
Boston, Massachusetts 02114

Dear Commission Montgomery,

On Friday, October 9th I, along with my colleagues representing the Fenway, met with several residents to discuss DCR's proposed parking changes for the neighborhood. In this conversation some issues surfaced, which should be addressed at the upcoming public meetings:

- On the public meeting notice, it says "*DCR intends to honor existing municipal overnight resident parking sticker programs...*" Does this mean DCR will not put pay parking in areas currently designated for resident parking, does this mean that all parking will become pay parking but residents will not have to pay to park *overnight*, or does this mean that all parking will become pay parking but a resident sticker will exempt residents from paying? Any alternative is problematic and will result in fewer parking options for residents.
- On the public meeting notice, it says pay parking will be installed on Park Drive from Peterborough to Beacon Street. Peterborough intersects with Park Drive in two places, which is the start of the proposed pay parking?
- There were several requests for a map of the proposed changes as well as an accounting of the numbers of spots of each designation and how their designation would change under this proposal.
- My staff was told by the DCR legislative liaison that this plan has its roots in a Kennedy School study regarding opportunities for DCR to increase its own-source revenue. Will DCR make that study and its projections available?

I remain opposed to this plan. The parking near residential buildings should remain residential parking and in fact residential parking should be increased. Requiring residents and their guests to pay to park near their homes is not an appropriate way to fund our state park system.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "W. N. Brownsberger".

William N. Brownsberger
STATE SENATOR



43 THORNDIKE STREET, S3-3
CAMBRIDGE MASSACHUSETTS
0 2 1 4 1

617 608 1410 t

crc@thecharles.org
www.thecharles.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Laura Jasinski
Executive Director
Craig Bida
Virginia Foote
Nathan Gauthier
Taurean Green, *Fellow*
Debra Iles
Lonsdale Koester
Steve Kropper
Frans Lawaetz
Joan Pickett, *Chair*
Gautam Sundaram

BOARD OF ADVISORS

Renata von Tscharnern
Founder
Ronald Axelrod
Jeffrey Bilezikian
Dennis Carlone
Philip W. Crutchfield
John DeVillars
Catherine Donaher
Hon. Michael S. Dukakis
Michael Epstein
Paul Fremont-Smith Jr.
Jennifer Gilbert
John Isaacson
Mark Krackiewicz
Daniel Langenthal
Henry Lee
Edward G. LeFlore
Linda Lerner
Harry Mattison
Geraldine Pangaro
Randy Peeler
Matthew Petrie
Bruce Schwoegler
Amy Segal
John Shields
Ann Tikkanen
Paul Walker
Ania Wieckowski
John T. Williams
Michelle Wu

Jennifer Norwood
Director of External Affairs and Partnerships
Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR)
251 Causeway Street, Suite 900 | Boston, MA 02114

10/30/2020

Dear Ms. Norwood,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DCR Parking Meter Proposal. As stewards of the Charles River parks who partner with DCR along the river from Watertown to Boston, we are writing to express our support for the installation parking meters along Cambridge Parkway and Memorial Drive in Cambridge.

The DCR Parking Meter Proposal will provide needed funding to support DCR operations, which are critical to protect, promote, and enhance the Charles River Reservation. This year has reminded us of the essential role parks play in our health and well-being and we support exploration of reasonable, park-appropriate revenue generation methods to enable DCR to care for this valuable resource.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Laura Jasinski
Executive Director
Charles River Conservancy



Connecting People and Parks and Conserving the Emerald Necklace

CHARLESgate PARK • BACK BAY FENS • RIVERWAY • OLMSTED PARK • JAMAICA POND • ARNOLD ARBORETUM • FRANKLIN PARK

Karen Mauney-Brodek, *President*

October 28th, 2020

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Benjamin Taylor, *Chair*
John R. Cook, Jr., *Vice Chair*
Martin Hall, *Treasurer*
Susan Helms Daley, *Clerk*
Louis Bailey
Peter Barber
Sonya Bhabhalia
Constance Cervone
Ellie Cornish Chu
Christine Cusick
James K. Cornell
Chris DeSisto
Courtney Forrester
Sarah Freeman
Julie Hume Gordon
Marjorie Greville
Lois R. Kunian
Ted Landmark
Sofia Lingos-Papaliadis
Barbara Millen
Lee Moreau
Allison O'Neil
JoAnn Robinson
Chair, Park Overseers
Peter Sougarides
Leo Swift
Linda Edmonds Turner
Kate Velásquez-Heller
Carroll Williamson

Life Trustees

Michael Dukakis
Wendy Shattuck

PARK OVERSEERS

Arboretum Park Conservancy
Arborway Coalition
Arnold Arboretum
Boston Committee of the
Garden Club of America
Boston Society of
Landscape Architects
Brookline GreenSpace Alliance
Charlesgate Alliance
Emerald Necklace
Greenway Project
The Fenway Alliance
Fenway Civic Association
Fenway CDC
Fenway Garden Society
Franklin Park Coalition
Franklin Park Zoo /
Zoo New England
Friends of Jamaica Pond
Friends of Leverett Pond
Friends of the Muddy River
Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum
Jamaica Hills Association
Jamaica Pond Association
MASCO
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

RE: DCR Parking Meter Proposal for various areas, including the Fenway Emerald
Necklace Conservancy Feedback

Dear Commissioner Montgomery,

First and foremost, on behalf of the Emerald Necklace Conservancy, I would like to thank the Department of Conservation and Recreation for their strong partnership and investment in the DCR portions of Emerald Necklace, particularly the parkways. Additionally, Conservancy is aware of the hard-economic times that are upon us and may impact the Commonwealth's budget, and we fully understand DCR's desire to generate revenue to support park improvements and care. We have noticed that many of the parkways now have sections with unregulated parking, even without neighborhood permits, and are at times used for storage for out-of-state licensed cars parking for a week or more, and sometimes of the years, for months. However, as the proposal for parking changes have been communicated so far, it is not in line with the needs and specifics of the Fenway community and context.

Here is a summary of our principle concerns:

1. **Adjacent Land Use Analysis Needed: residential or institutional - requires more detailed approach.**

Although parking management could be beneficial in some of the proposed areas, overall, we do not believe that the current proposal has adequately considered parking conditions specific to The Fenway area. In some contexts, parking management could promote increased visitorship for local institutions and businesses. However, right now, the majority of the proposed new spaces are along residential buildings. For example, parking management along the Fenway frontage of the Museum of Fine Arts may be beneficial and provide more visitor access and parking, but in front of the residential blocks they will be challenging to the residents that have come to use these areas for "defacto" residential parking. Additionally, while evaluating current parking restrictions in the area, the presence of "resident only" parking zones appears arbitrary; along The Fenway, for example, resident parking exists for one block outside of the Conservancy's Visitor Center which is often empty. However, a mere 100 yards away, for several blocks which front exclusively residential buildings, has no residential priority parking. "Swapping" some of the resident-only parking zones with unrestricted/metered zones in appropriate locations may aid in a parking management program that is more beneficial to the residential community and promote a higher rate of park usership and visitors to our other local institutions and businesses.

Karen Mauney-Brodek, *President*

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Benjamin Taylor, *Chair*
John R. Cook, Jr., *Vice Chair*
Martin Hall, *Treasurer*
Susan Helms Daley, *Clerk*
Louis Bailey
Peter Barber
Sonya Bhabhalia
Constance Cervone
Ellie Cornish Chu
Christine Cusick
James K. Cornell
Chris DeSisto
Courtney Forrester
Sarah Freeman
Julie Hume Gordon
Marjorie Greville
Lois R. Kunian
Ted Landsmark
Sofia Lingos-Papaliodis
Barbara Millen
Lee Moreau
Allison O'Neil
JoAnn Robinson
Chair, Park Overseers
Peter Sougarides
Leo Swift
Linda Edmonds Turner
Kate Velásquez-Heller
Carroll Williamson

Life Trustees

Michael Dukakis
Wendy Shattuck

PARK OVERSEERS

Arboretum Park Conservancy
Arborway Coalition
Arnold Arboretum
Boston Committee of the
Garden Club of America
Boston Society of
Landscape Architects
Brookline GreenSpace Alliance
Charlesgate Alliance
Emerald Necklace
Greenway Project
The Fenway Alliance
Fenway Civic Association
Fenway CDC
Fenway Garden Society
Franklin Park Coalition
Franklin Park Zoo /
Zoo New England
Friends of Jamaica Pond
Friends of Leverett Pond
Friends of the Muddy River
Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum
Jamaica Hills Association
Jamaica Pond Association
MASCO
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

Generally speaking, the addition of parking time limits, in theory, can promote a higher turnover of parking spaces, allowing greater access and park usership along the Back-Bay Fens and in other areas, and increase access to those with who have strollers or require ADA-accessible spaces. However, this would not work without sufficient enforcement, or without time limits on the metered spaces. Numerous studies have shown that time limits increase parking space turnover, which would increase options for access and could lead to greater park usership, as well as patronage of local institutions and businesses. In a time when parks are more important than ever, it is essential that we increase access for those who would like to visit our open spaces, and there are ways that time limits can do this, when properly, thoughtfully designed and implement

2. Use modern methods within an historic context to avoid visual impact

As described, the proposed plan would be visually harmful to the Emerald Necklace park system as Fredrick Law Olmsted envisioned. As we understand it, the proposal for over 350 metered spaces would require 40 pay stations throughout The Fenway. These historically landmarked parks and its parkways must to protected and we must consider how to achieve goals with the least impact to the historic resource possible.



Example of parking payment instructions from the University of Missouri-Kansas City

We request that DCR develop an approach using signage instead of all or almost all pay stations to significantly reduce or eliminate pay stations. This has been done elsewhere – see photo on the right. Pay stations and parking meters are expensive to buy, install and maintain and they will become a thing of the past at some point in the not-too-distant future.

3. Need to ensure new revenues support DCR and are truly “additive”

While we have heard that “a significant” portion of the revenue generated by this proposal would be applied to DCR properties and needs, it is not clear what that is, 75%, 85% or 100%? Moreover, it is important that these new revenue-generating tools, if better developed or planned, be targeted to specific needs. If they are not, they will likely displace other budget cuts, resulting in no new support for a drastically under-resourced agency charged with meeting essential public goals.

Furthermore, the study completed by graduate students at Harvard’s John F. Kennedy School of Business focused on revenue generation only did not consider community context, how funds would be managed to provide public stakeholder support and



Connecting People and Parks and Conserving the Emerald Necklace

CHARLESgate PARK • BACK BAY FENS • RIVERWAY • OLMSTED PARK • JAMAICA POND • ARNOLD ARBORETUM • FRANKLIN PARK

Karen Mauney-Brodek, *President*

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Benjamin Taylor, *Chair*
John R. Cook, Jr., *Vice Chair*
Martin Hall, *Treasurer*
Susan Helms Daley, *Clerk*
Louis Bailey
Peter Barber
Sonya Bhabhalia
Constance Cervone
Ellie Cornish Chu
Christine Cusick
James K. Cornell
Chris DeSisto
Courtney Forrester
Sarah Freeman
Julie Hume Gordon
Marjorie Greville
Lois R. Kunian
Ted Landmark
Sofia Lingos-Papaliadis
Barbara Millen
Lee Moreau
Allison O'Neil
JoAnn Robinson
Chair, Park Overseers
Peter Sougarides
Leo Swift
Linda Edmonds Turner
Kate Velásquez-Heller
Carroll Williamson

Life Trustees

Michael Dukakis
Wendy Shattuck

PARK OVERSEERS

Arboretum Park Conservancy
Arborway Coalition
Arnold Arboretum
Boston Committee of the
Garden Club of America
Boston Society of
Landscape Architects
Brookline GreenSpace Alliance
Charlesgate Alliance
Emerald Necklace
Greenway Project
The Fenway Alliance
Fenway Civic Association
Fenway CDC
Fenway Garden Society
Franklin Park Coalition
Franklin Park Zoo /
Zoo New England
Friends of Jamaica Pond
Friends of Leverett Pond
Friends of the Muddy River
Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum
Jamaica Hills Association
Jamaica Pond Association
MASCO
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

controls. Additionally, the scope of the study excluded other DCR-owned properties not in residential areas with high visitation rates and large parking areas. Parking management should not only be considered for “high-cost” areas such as Boston, but for other locations as well (perhaps for a much lower cost) as it is not fair to burden only one park or area with revenue generation needs for the entire state.

The Emerald Necklace Conservancy, as always, aims to protect and restore and enliven the Emerald Necklace. Spanning and supporting our three separate landowners/public partners, Boston, Brookline, and DCR, the strong partnership that we have with DCR is exceptionally important to us. We appreciate the investments that DCR has made to the Necklace, including the recent tree planting and sidewalks along Park Drive and the new pathway work in Olmsted Park. As we continue to partner with DCR, we hope to continue to assist in the upcoming challenges as we work together to fulfill our common goals in these unique times.

Sincerely,

Karen Mauney-Brodek, President

Norwood, Jennifer (DCR)

From: tim -- <ney.tim@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 2, 2020 11:20 PM
To: Norwood, Jennifer (DCR)
Subject: DCR Curbside Parking Meter Program

Categories: Blue category

CAUTION: This email originated from a sender outside of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts mail system. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

DCR Curbside Parking Meter Program

I wish to add my voice to those of my fellow neighbors, my elected state and city delegation, and that of the 400 member Fenway Garden Society in the Fenway neighborhood of Boston.

I am writing in opposition to your agency's proposed plan to install meters for paid parking, specifically along The Fenway from Boylston to Avenue Louis Pasteur and on Park Drive from Peterborough to Beacon.

This plan goes against initiatives to discourage vehicle traffic to the area of Olmstead's Emerald Necklace, home of the Victory Gardens and the James P. Kelleher Rose Garden. The plan denies equity of access to low income families and handicapped individuals who, with cutbacks in public transit, may need to drive to enjoy these gems of greenspace, participate in recreational activities on Roberto Clemente Field or visit the Boston Arts Academy.

In their *MA Department of Conservation and Recreation Parking Revenue Generation* proposal, the Kennedy School students' terminology for the parking spaces describing them as assets in a DCR portfolio is a misnomer. The spaces belong to the public and the public was not asked for input into the formulation of this plan. Interviews about the monetization of public parking space were only conducted with employees of the Commonwealth, even though the students visited the Fenway neighborhood.

DCR's mission: connect the public to the environment

The student team, in their report, asked DCR to consider how their plan impacts the agency's mission to connect the people with nature. The students aptly point out that "a plan to maximize parking revenue effectively makes parking available to the highest bidder" and "precludes residents with less disposable income from utilizing parking spaces that are currently a public good." They point out that DCR has already allocated public space to private, non-profit institutions in the Fenway removing these parking spaces from public use.

The installation of meters only contributes to the commercialization of public space in the Fenway and breaks the historic aesthetic of parkland in a neighborhood that struggles with tremendous growth and the displacement of families, the elderly and other low to middle income residents.

I urge DCR not to impose this plan on the Fenway and to explore other revenue generating activities such as underwriting partnerships with corporations and associations.

Sincerely,
Timothy Ney