

March 26, 2016

To: **Preserve Ross Valley**

In reading about Marin Catholic's proposal for additional lighting at the sports field/stadium, I have noticed the following:

1. If the justification is that these lights are "for the children" (presumably the students using the field), why is similar concern not expressed for the children who live in neighborhoods near to the sports field? Those resident children are likely more varied in ages, sleep needs, to inhabit the area longer, and to have reasonable expectation that they can enjoy their homes, yards and community without undue intrusion and disruption created as a result of this project.
2. I find the cost/benefit ratio utterly specious. Does Marin Catholic have such surplus funds that the costs of installation and maintenance for these lights *in any way* equate to the benefits claimed for the number of occasions the lights will be used? Even touted intangible assets need fiscal support. Will rentals and usage far, far exceeding the applicants' proposal will be the result of granting this permit? Proponents of Marin Catholic's plans should provide long-term funding documentation, including operating and maintenance budgets with accompanying balance sheets, to show they will not engage in future, permitted expansion of the proposal for stadium lighting and use.
3. Traffic in this area is obstructed and slow-moving. In my experience, Marin Catholic adds substantially to the burden on travel time for us who drive these roads now. Adding the above-anticipated density load to an already troublesome transit situation is unconscionable.
4. Comments supporting the lighting installation are almost entirely from areas outside the project impacts. Apparently these writers' residences are neither within sight, sound nor daily driving experience of Marin Catholic's sports field. Such comments are relatively worthless: political or obviously-solicited support for the proposal should not be weighted equally with comments by those who are demonstrably impacted by the project, most especially with those who will suffer negative impacts.

I urge the County and Marin Catholic to listen to those who will bear the consequences of this decision. The proposal is inappropriate, unsustainable, burdensome, unwelcome, and should not be approved.

Garril Page  
San Anselmo  
Marin County driver and voter