

Project: Renovations to Daisy Field

Meeting Location: Virtual Zoom Call

Date of Community Meeting: November 5, 2025

Time: 6:00PM – 7:30PM

Date of Meeting Notes: December 8, 2025

Presenters:

| Name | Company / Role | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Nellie Ward (NW) | BPRD, Project Manager | |
| My'Kel McMillen | BPRD, Community Outreach Coordinator | |
| Shane Lougee | Stantec, Design Consultant | |
| Adam Fearing | Stantec, Design Consultant | |

Daisy Field Community Briefing, Wed. 11.05.25 - Meeting Notes**Intro and Welcome:**

The meeting started at 6:00PM and was held via Zoom. Nellie Ward (NW) of Boston Parks and Recreation Department (BPRD) welcomed participants and briefly mentioned the meeting would be recorded. NW described the etiquette of virtual public meetings, presented the meeting's agenda and introduced the project team.

The project team consisted of:

Nellie Ward, *Project Manager with Boston Parks and Rec. Department (BPRD)*

My'Kel McMillen, *Community Outreach Coordinator with BPRD*

Caroline Peters, *Jamaica Plain Liaison with the Office of Neighborhood Services*

Shane Lougee, *Design Consultant with Stantec*

Adam Fearing, *Design Consultant with Stantec*

Project Presentation Slide Show:

NW then began a project overview which started with the project's overall schedule. It was noted a Community Survey would be available for additional feedback. The survey would be open to the public and available until 11.26.2025.

****Note* A total of (2) Public Survey Responses were received. Their responses are included in this document.***

NW gave a brief intro on BPRD's overall goals and described the priorities for every Parks project.

NW then passed the slide show to Stantec to present their Site Analysis and Preliminary Design for the park.

Shane Lougee (SL) and Adam Fearing (AF) of Stantec presented the Site Analysis and Design Materials.

A Questions and Answer Session followed the presentation. This session was open to all the meeting participants. Community members asked questions verbally or in the chat feature of the Zoom call.

The following section describes the conversation between the Community Participants, The City (BPRD) and the Design Consultant (Stantec).

Question and Answer Session:

The following notes attempt to best describe the questions and comments that came up in the Q&A Session. Questions and answers may be paraphrased or shortened for the purpose of these Meeting Notes. For the full meeting recording and to hear all questions and comments in their entirety, please refer to the Meeting Recording posted on YouTube.

Link to Meeting Recording: [Community Briefing - Meeting Recording](#)

Discussion...

Question/Comment: Right now, you are showing a softball/little league combination field with a skinned (sand) infield. If the field were to be little league only, it could have a grass infield. Wouldn't it be helpful to make the lower field little league only, so there would be less infield clay, and therefore less erosion?

Response: We did study making both fields little league only, but because of permit holder logistics, we have to keep both fields as hybrid softball AND little league fields, meaning they need to have skinned (sand/clay) infields. There is nowhere else to put the current softball permit holders.

Question/Comment: Is there an opportunity for permanent restrooms?

Response: Permanent restrooms are not in this current scope of work. However, there will be space that accommodates (2) portable restrooms. There will be a concrete pad that the restroom units sit on.

Question/Comment: A participant mentioned they work for Emerald Necklace Conservancy - They mentioned they would like to look for funds for restoration work at the pond's edge. The participant specifically asked, "Is there a city budget for the overall project?"

Response:

Part 1: (in response to the budget for the project) – BPRD "Yes, we do have some construction funding set aside for the project, but we currently have a gap in funding, which is why the parking lot renovations is TBD. Once we have a more developed design, we will have a better understanding of the gap in the construction budget and whether we will be able to close it."

Part 2: (in response to question about restoration) – "Riparian restoration / woodland restoration is not in the existing project scope, but we do understand that there is a need for this scope of work, but we currently do not have a solution for that."

Question/Comment: There was a note on the location of spectator seating. It was mentioned the current location shown on the plans may be a bit too far away from the playfield.

Response: It was mentioned the location shown is not finalized and the design team will study offsets and locations and confirm it is properly located with sport field standards in mind.

Question/Comment: A participant mentioned the schedule seemed a bit ambitious.

Response: BPRD noted this project schedule is generous in comparison to projects of similar scope. There is a good amount of time given between Permitting, Design Documents and the Construction of the Park. The final schedule and timing are still TBD, but overall, there should be plenty of time to finish by the end of 2027.

Question/Comment: Is there data on how bad the erosion from the field is and how it currently impacts the Muddy River and/or Leverett Pond?

Response: BPRD mentioned there has been no formal/comprehensive study on water quality or impacts of erosion on this site. But the project aims to greatly improve the current condition. The improvements will inevitably improve the water quality and greatly *reduce*/eliminate the sediment eroding into Leverett Pond

Question/Comment: In response to the 'No-mow' areas shown on the preliminary design plans... these areas are great in concept, but they can be hard to maintain and are a bit of a new concept for Park's maintenance teams. Is there signage at these areas? It can help with maintaining these areas and expressing the intent of the 'no mow' zones and can be interpreted as 'unkempt'...It was noted these areas are supposed to look a little 'messy' as they're native meadows and have a 'natural' look to them.

Response: *It was noted the project will likely include signage related to the green infrastructure system. The signage would describe and/or illustrate how the system works and the environmental benefits of surface-level storm-water infiltration systems and pollinator gardens. The team agreed that signage related to 'no-mow' or 'meadow areas' is helpful in describing the aesthetics of these systems. It is likely if these elements are included in the final design they will be accompanied by signage.*

Question/Comment: There was a comment regarding the stabilized stone dust. It was noted that it may erode over time. It was asked if it will erode like it has in other park applications...

Response: It was noted that the team would review the condition of stabilized stone dust in nearby locations and determine their condition.

There were also general comments that the participants expressed during the Q&A Sessions. The comments included the following:

General Notes/Comments:

-Out of all the preferred little league amenities...a permanent score board is lower on the priority list

-There's a general appreciation for the use of stabilized stone dust paths...they match the current aesthetic of the park and don't increase the amount of paved hardscape.

-There was a participant who identified themselves as the president of the Emerald Necklace Conservancy (ENC). They expressed enthusiasm in finding ways for ENC to help with funding for some improvements to the park.

-A representative from the Emerald Necklace Conservancy (ENC) shared that they have secured funding for water bottle filling stations and drinking fountains through a separate grant. While they acknowledged this is a small contribution compared to the overall project cost, they noted that additional funding sources may be available for certain park amenities. ENC also has a lighting grant that could potentially support upgrades to the park's lighting, including the addition of pedestrian lighting. (Currently, the park has no pedestrian lighting—only roadway lighting along Jamaica Way.)

-A participant noted they're a local resident and head coach of youth Ultimate Frisbee team(s). They expressed they're "thrilled on the city's investment in the park". For Ultimate Frisbee...the flexibility in the field is greatly appreciated. They mentioned fences and walkways cause challenges for people playing Frisbee as they impede run-out spaces. The participant noted that they often fill the multi-use field with multiple Ultimate Frisbee games.

Questions and Comments from the Zoom Chat Feature:

The following notes are taken from the chat feature. There were both questions and general comments posted to the chat...

Q: "Are you planning any pedestrian access on either side of Willow Pond Rd.? (I realize there are constraints on both sides.)"

A: The project plans to include new path along Willow Pond Road. The path will replace the current dirt path that has formed over time.

Q: Will the washout along the backstop into Willow Pond be addressed in this project?

A: Yes, the project plans to include a green infrastructure system that will greatly limit/eliminate the erosion of the infield clay onto the path, the vegetated slope, and into the pond.

Q: Will lights be turned off when the park is not in use?

A: Lighting technology has come a long way...the lights are on a schedule that is associated with the sports seasons and the timing of the permit holders. The lights are typically off by 10:45pm in summer months. However, if the field is not permitted for a specific time, the lights are off. It was noted with the new lighting system. BPRD can control lights remotely.

Q: Would the park be open to hosting flag football games and leagues?

A: The park is open to all sorts of programming. The Recreation/Permitting sector of BPRD would be the one to contact to reserve a field for a specific time and activity.

Q: Can there be a dog fountain in addition to a water bottle filling station/drinking fountain?

A: BPRD noted that dog fountains are typically installed only in designated dog parks. Since dogs are not permitted on sports fields, adding a dog fountain here would conflict with existing park rules.

Q: Are there any tree impacts? New Plantings? Removals?

A: The design team will take measures to protect the existing tree canopy and root systems. All current trees will be preserved, with any removals limited to safety concerns or preventive care as determined by an arborist. The plan also includes new plantings and designated 'no-mow' zones to support pollinators and create habitats for local wildlife.

General Comments Via Chat:

-A participant was specifically excited about the slide illustrating the approach to lighting the fields. It shows how the light is concentrated on the field and minimizes spillage into the wooded areas.

-A participant asked if there would be power accessible for special events and sporting events. It was mentioned that there would be a power outlet (or multiple) available to these event-holders and would be accessed via the light poles.

- A participant expressed enthusiasm about the new sports lighting, noting that it will significantly reduce light spillage and better align with Dark Sky standards

- A participant expressed appreciation for the efforts of the Regan Little League organizers, stating: As a 20-year JP resident and a recent addition to the Regan League with a tee-baller, I fully support the slate proposed by Walter and the league. This park is a true neighborhood gem and an essential part of our community fabric.'

At the end of the Q&A Session BPRD thanked all participants for their attendance and feedback.

It was noted the presentation would be available online at the following link:

[Community Briefing - Meeting Recording](#)

Meeting ended at 7:30PM.

Survey Responses:

The survey closed on 11/26/25 at 5PM. The project team received (2) responses. The following summarizes the responses:

Q: Did you attend the Community Briefing?

1 Response: Yes

Q: Is there anything missing from the proposed design?

Response 1: Would like to see more detail on what is proposed for the green infrastructure system. How will the erosion be addressed?

Response 2: Dog Water Fountain

Q: How do you use Daisy Field?

Response 1: Walking on the paths

Response 2: I bring my dogs here

-Respondents use the field intermittently (weekly/monthly)

-Respondents identified the sports field and the open lawn/picnic area as their favorite features of the park.

In the open response section, one respondent requested the addition of a drinking fountain for dogs.