

Dear Ms. Drake,

I am a resident of Spyglass Hill condominiums in Greenbrae above Marin General. Previously, I resided at 77 Wolfe Grade in Kentfield. I've lived in this community since 2000, have raised two now grown sons and am now raising two young stepchildren.

I oppose the project because of light, traffic and sound impacts but my comment here is about the completeness of the application and appropriate level of environmental review. Regarding both the completeness of the application and level of environmental review that should be required, I really have two points or issues to raise.

The first has to do with the description of the project and stated rationale for it by Marin Catholic. Is the objective to play 10 football games on Friday nights--or is it about extending the hours during which the field is available to accommodate practice and game schedules without interfering with the academic schedule of the school? Fundamentally, from everything I have heard and read, I believe it is the later--and the school would really like those Friday football games, too. However the applicant or the county answers this question, I think Marin Catholic has yet to exhaust alternatives to the lights installation. Practice and game times can be curtailed--or the school could explore the availability of nearby facilities. In particular, I believe the College of Marin football field presents an opportunity for a reuse project that could create additional field capacity for Marin Catholic and the public. A model could be a version of the Branson-College of Marin agreement over investments in and use of the COM soccer, softball and baseball fields. Since that deal was struck, COM has terminated men's football as a sport--and, to my knowledge, the field is rarely if ever used for intercollegiate sports. I would be interested in a community-based partnership being explored to resurface that field with state-of-the-art artificial turf for soccer, lacrosse and perhaps football use. The field could be leased to MC for weekday use--immediately solving its field capacity needs. I think the application is incomplete until if and when all alternatives to the light project are fully explored. I think a full EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act should be required--in part to ensure that less impactful alternatives to the proposed project are explored and analyzed.

My second point is that, if Marin Catholic insists on pursuing the lights project, a full EIR is required so that the public and decision-makers have the benefit of impartial and complete study and analysis of all light, traffic and noise impacts. I am particularly concerned about light impacts. I look over that valley from my deck and spend a lot of time along Corte Madera creek at different times of day, dusk and night. I find preposterous the claims by the school that the light technology is such that there would be no light impacts behind the field of play.

Please include my name, email address and home address on contact of lists of interested parties to this project. I reside at 707 Via Casitas, Greenbrae, CA, 94904.

In closing, I want to say I am not unsympathetic to Marin Catholic's desire to extend the useful period of its field. My sons and stepchildren all are athletes. However, I believe strongly this project would significantly impact negatively the character and quality of life of our community--and that it is entirely unnecessary.

Sincerely,

Chuck Finnie  
Greenbrae, CA