Tech Reports Valueless

Celebrity Story

In looking through the World and Nation section of Tuesday's Tech, we were surprised to discover that not only is Sharon Stone a homeomegaer ("Sharon Stone Is Homeomegaer, fiancé's Enraged Wife Says," April 6), but that this is an issue of national (and insti-

tude) concern. Maybe you should consider a section titled "Tabloids Headlines You May Have Missed." Surely even another update on the Waco siege would be more newsworthy.

We hope that this letter will help to alleviate the apparent shortage of material available for filling columns inches.

Erika Schuttie '95
Cora Dancy '93
Jeanne Thiemann '93
Melissa Hayes '95

Parking Authority

Out for Profit

To those of us who live, work, or park in Cambridge, it appears that the parking bureau is operating on one step above legitimized cor-

ruption. As a model city acting under the guise of protecting the environment and adhering to the Clean Air Act, the City of Cambridge imposes parking "restrictions" to reduce air pollution by reducing the number of cars driving into and out of its boundaries.

But what if these "restrictions" increase air

pollution while raising revenue? Last Wednesday MIT heard the city's proposals for Zone 2, the area surrounding MIT. It was sur-

prising to learn that these proposals were drafted without consultation with the MIT community, a community binding well to environmental standards by using only 4,500 parking spaces for a population of scientists, students, and staff numbering 18,000.

Basically, the city is calling for putting time meters wherever there is unrestricted parking and where no residential parking permit is

needed. Imposing time restrictions where there are currently none means that there will be five or ten cars a day pulling in and out whereas now there is only one. This doesn't reduce air pollution. Using the Clean Air Act as a political leverage to impose these "restrictions" makes a mockery of this legislation.

The parking bureau's main reason for the three "restrictions" isn't clean air at all. Maybe the underlying motivation is raising revenue. According to Cambridge's assistant director of traffic and parking, the parking clerk raised $46 million last year on parking tickets.

A number that he should know well, but which my calculations indicate could be a lot higher.

It has been my perception that things have been getting out of hand. Tickets are being issued more and more irresponsibly and with-

out consequence or accountability on the part of the parking clerk. This past winter I received two tickets for storing my vehicle on Amherst Street, which was highly unlikely since I drive to and from my home in Chelsea every day. What's more, I had to go through a protracted and very stressful series of argu-

ments with officials in the clerk's office before turning to the mayor's office to get them dismissed. In the parking clerk's charac-

teristic fashion, verbal responses to tickets are adhering to the Clean Air Act, the City of Cambridge imposes parking "restrictions" to reduce air pollution by reducing the number of cars driving into and out of its boundaries. But what if these "restrictions" increase air pollution while raising revenue? Last Wednesday MIT heard the city's proposals for Zone 2, the area surrounding MIT. It was surprising to learn that these proposals were drafted without consultation with the MIT community, a community binding well to environmental standards by using only 4,500 parking spaces for a population of scientists, students, and staff numbering 18,000.
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