

TATLOCK QUESTION FORM RESPONSES AS OF MAY 30, 2024

Adding to my previous question, please provide the months each team uses Summit fields. I am XXXX. The system signed me in by my google name. Send replies to XXXX

The current field use grid is posted. The more robust study is being completed.

I have heard many reasons for not installing lighting in Tatlock but yet to hear the rational for spending \$1.8mm of tax dollars to install lighting. We have a field in Tatlock with lights as well as Glenside. Why is a third needed. Tatlock is in a residential area and the glow from these lights will be disturbing for the community as well as bring in wanted pollution noise, light and litter pollution. Additionally, there does not seem to be a plan to provide the additional police and first aid support required for the increased access to Tatlock and surrounding streets. Tatlock does not have adequate parking and excess cars flow on to the side streets. This is dangerous and disruptive for the community.

There is no decision to allocate money to this project.

There are currently three lit fields, Upper Tatlock is lit but not safely.

There is a traffic study being completed to look at safety and parking.

There is no field being added – the fields wouldn't be used more densely or excessively, hours of use would be extended later.

GRACE food distribution was moved from Memorial Cornog field house due to neighbor complaints about safety not wanting to live across from a food bank. That was one day a week until maybe 8pm. How can the DCP and city justify continue to keep this project in the budgets given the publicly voiced Tatlock neighbors opposition?

There is no budget money yet allocated.

GRACE was moved because a mutual decision was made between the City and GRACE that the Community Center would be a better location.

The May 6 meeting notes state that the DCP met with Musco and the show lights are being taken out. Is there an updated cost of the project from the initial \$1.6 million just for install? Is it still \$10/2 hours for each light pole to run?

Musco has been asked to provide this update. They have not provided it yet. We have also asked for updated cost estimates as well.

Musco did confirm that the cost to run lights for the entire field would be approximately \$10 per hour.

Council Member Pawlowski and others across DCP and Council have specifically used the word "compromise" in discussing the lighting of Tatlock - asking the Tatlock community to compromise on the lights. Compromise is defined as: "an agreement or a settlement of a dispute that is reached by each side making concessions." A relevant example of a compromise would be that made between DCP/Council and the Tatlock community in 2004: Tatlock residents conceded to the turfing of TWO Tatlock fields SIMULTANEOUSLY (a big concession to the residents' peace and enjoyment of their homes) in exchange for DCP and Council conceding NEVER to install lights at Tatlock (an equally large concession because of the perpetuity of the promise). What is not a compromise: Tatlock community conceding to the lighting of Tatlock in exchange for ... nothing. This is not a compromise because DCP/Council HAVE NOT CONCEDED ANYTHING. DCP/Council need to stop asking for a compromise until they are ready to concede something that would be of equal value to the Tatlock community.

No decisions have been made. The lights may not be installed. We are waiting for professional studies to be done over the summer to work toward a compromise.

Jordan Glatt confirmed to Councilmembers that the agreement that there would be no lights installed at the time. No Council may ever make guarantees for what future Councils may do.

We are residents at XXXX and the lights until 10pm will cause a great inconvenience to our family. We have young kids with bedrooms facing the field and the lights and traffic due to that will be quite disruptive in night time routine for my kids.

Thank you for this valuable feedback. No decisions have been made on any timelines. If lights go in, we will work with neighbors on reducing impact.

With the fear of losing Glenside scheduling to the county publicly introduced at the Boosters Club May meeting, I called Victoria Durbin-Drake, Director of Union County Parks and Rec, to get some more information. She picked up right away at her office at 908-527-4910. Vicki explained Glenside is a county field (some people may not realize that) and under New Jersey Green Acres and they have to make the change. Instead of coaches/leagues going to the city to schedule, the county will do it but assured there will be no noticeable difference and most people won't even realize. She said she would tell anyone else the same. The Union County Director of Parks and Rec noted the good working relationship with Summit and no one wants to drive 8 year olds to the other side of the county. She oversees day-to-day operations and has been with Union County for roughly 26 years. Vicki ensured this is not unique to Summit and happened to Berkeley Heights and Scotch-Plains and we are the last one for the transfer. There is no exact timeline but will not impact any planned scheduling. ? ? ? Is any of this different than what's been communicated to DCP?

Please see posted meeting minutes from a May 22 meeting with the City and Mr. Durbin Drake that confirm that while yes, it is true that no changes are expected – flexibility in the scheduling will not be the same. With groups using it, the flexibility will be lost as blocks are assigned. Currently, the County does not charge the city, but going forward, the City will be charged for time and lights at night.

What were the neighborhood concerns about painting lines at the open field space by Wilson School and the Board of Ed office? It currently seems like it's used as an unofficial dog park and would seem like a perfect, flat space with lot of trees as buffer to the surrounding houses and parking to offer an adequate space for flag football, field hockey, maybe even soccer or lacrosse during daylight hours.

This was explored by the City in 2016 and it was decided this was not a feasible location to an official sports field.

The list of Tatlock neighborhood concerns listed on the Community Programs Web Site and Facebook page is incomplete and does not adequately describe the listed concerns. Attached is a list of 19 concerns or objections I have gathered from conversations with people in the neighborhood. I am requesting that you post this on both the Community Programs Web Site and Facebook page XXXXX

This will be uploaded to the end of this document as Attachment A. Many of these points are not factual or are incorrect/misleading. Many of these concerns have been addressed in other questions.

Attached is a letter to the DCP/Councilman Smallwood/Councilman Pawlowski regarding the PROPOSED project to light Tatlock Field.

This will be posted on the end of this document as Attachment B. We are looking into all concerns.

Why was the tiny forest area not considered for field space behind the community center?

There is currently already not sufficient parking at the Community Center. There is a dead end leading to area, not allowing for any traffic flow. Additionally, there are several trees that would be required to be taken down. This location was determined most feasible for the Tiny forest by the Environmental Committee.

At the 5/21 council meeting a resident commented that his graduating class of 1994 had 150+ kids and it's no double. I'd like to point out this regarding the numbers and population of the high school: "The class of 1975, which graduated 363 students, was one of the largest graduating classes to come through Summit High School." <https://www.tapinto.net/towns/summit/sections/education/articles/summit-high-class-of-75-plans-35th-reunion> Last year there were 270 graduates in the class of 2023. It's an inaccurate claim about the population we have not evolved in 30 years with 2 now 3 turf fields added and lights on at the high school, Jefferson and upper tatlock.

While this resident may have misspoke, class sizes for upcoming grades are growing. Sports variety and season extensions have also increased since 1975. We will be having the largest incoming Kindergarten class in the fall of 2024. Also, with mandated affordable housing requirements, our population will only increase.

I am requesting that the three documents (traffic study, environmental study, and field use assessment) be made available via the web prior to the meetings in the Fall. I am requesting this in the name of transparency.

These will be made available at the community meetings and posted online after.

The city is currently violating their own lighting ordinance by allowing the Tatlock tennis court lights to run until 10:30 pm. Now that the city is aware, will you remedy this by turning the lights off at 10 pm?

At the beginning of 2024, this change was made. This will continue to be discussed in the fall when the studies are reviewed, and lighting ordinance may be updated.

With regard to the current ordinance limiting lighting to 15 feet - we understand that councils have chosen not enforce this ordinance in the Washington school district. Are there any other school districts where council has chosen not to enforce the 15 foot lighting ordinance?

This Council did not make these decisions. However, the City is permitted to operate out of the scope of an ordinance. There are taller poles in the Jefferson District both at the Jefferson field and the Summit Family Aquatic Center. The 15 foot lighting ordinance is for private properties, not city owned properties.

Numerous neighbors who live by Memorial have now publicly stated their support for lights. Given their interest is higher than that of neighbors by Tatlock, DCP should turn its attention to turfing/lighting Memorial, especially since that would be significantly more equitable given how much lower of a sports burden they currently carry in comparison to the significant burden ALREADY carried by Tatlock with TWO turfed fields, lights at Upper Tatlock, and lights at the tennis courts (none of which comply with the lighting ordinance - not just in height but in their light emissions and being left on when not in use). And turfing Memorial would not even be violative of the lighting ordinance.

We have explored this as an option. At this point, the City decided the most feasible location to complete a robust study on is Tatlock. After this robust study, further may be done at other locations based on findings. In preliminary decisions, Memorial was deemed too expensive and not feasible. Also, please be aware that there are double the number of tennis courts (8 versus 4), basketball courts (2 versus 1); the same number of field houses (1), tracks (1), multi-use fields (2); and three more baseball/softball fields at Memorial compared to Tatlock. This should also be considered in neighborhood burden. Memorial serves as the home to varsity baseball, softball, tennis, JV and Freshmen Soccer, Middle School Cross County.

At the booster meeting, DCP posed to Tatlock - what if the business case that DCP will conduct later finds that they don't need stadium lighting at Lower Tatlock - what if just adding additional lights at Upper Tatlock would be sufficient. Please note that what the Tatlock community needs from DCP and Council is to take

action to **REDUCE** the current levels of traffic, noise, parking, and garbage that the usage of Tatlock currently brings. If DCP can provide a **REDUCTION** in current noise, traffic, parking, and garbage while simultaneously installing the additional light at Upper Tatlock, the Tatlock community would be more receptive. That would constitute a compromise: Tatlock neighbors would be asked to accept the blight of the lights, but in exchange there would be a (permanent and enforceable) reduction in the current blights of traffic, noise, parking, and garbage. However to the extent that lights would (more obviously) **INCREASE** traffic, noise, parking, and garbage, that is unacceptable. We carry far more than our share of those burdens and to ask us to take on **ANY** more is not right. It is not equitable - look elsewhere to even the burden across Summit rather than blighting one community above all.

Thank you for the comments. We are looking forward to working on the robust field study during the summer for presentation in the fall. Again, no decisions have been made to move forward with this project or on any proposed scope changes until all studies are completed and reviewed.

At the recent booster meeting, there was an outburst from a parent (who lives far from Tatlock in a different part of town) angry about the current lighting at upper Tatlock, stating that it is too dark and children are getting hurt practicing - suggesting this is why stadium lighting should be added to both upper and lower Tatlock. The concern conflates issues: adding lighting to increase field usage is very different from improving current field space for the purpose of making current use safer. And to add STADIUM LIGHTING to Tatlock for the purpose of improving safety of the current field usage is like swatting a fly with a sledgehammer. And let's all get very clear: COACHES hold responsibility for any injury that occurs when they permit or require practices in unsafe lighting conditions. At the booster meeting, Dan Healy even explained that the teams' preference for turfed fields leads teams to give up their grass field space at an earlier time in favor of a turf field available later when it is darker. If kids are getting hurt as a result, this needs to be addressed with the coaches immediately. That is unacceptable. Furthermore, while I cannot speak for the entire Tatlock community, I believe that the Tatlock community would be supportive of replacing the 20+ year old lights currently at Upper Tatlock with lights of **SIMILAR HEIGHT and with the new improved technology that DCP and Council have been raving about that will not only make Upper Tatlock safer for practices but also at least bring these lights - which are out of compliance with the height requirements of the lighting ordinance - to at least comply with the other part of the lighting ordinance requiring that "all light fixtures shall be designed, installed, and maintained to prevent trespass light." Please note that this is NOT THE SAME AS ADDING ADDITIONAL LIGHTS. And in fact, ALL of the lights (tennis courts, Upper Tatlock, at the high school) which are already getting a blind eye for their height violations should at the very least maintain compliance with the requirement to prevent trespass light.**

Coaches are trained through the Rutgers Youth Safety Clinic regarding safety. Unsafe practice conditions will be reiterated to them.

Thank you for the feedback regarding upper Tatlock. Again, no decisions have been made to move forward with this project or on any proposed scope changes until all studies are completed and reviewed.

I saw the response regarding the LAX wall - that a courtesy review will be conducted. As you have heard repeatedly, the addition of the pickle balls lines has added a lot of loud pickle ball activity to the Tatlock tennis courts and neighbors find it very disruptive. Homes all the way on the other side of Investors Field complain that they wake up earlier than they wish to on weekends from the loud sound of the pickle balls. Interestingly, there are no pickle ball lines at Memorial tennis courts and we understand that when asked about adding lines there, the response was very quick from DCP - they would have to get input and support from the neighbors - something that they did not feel was necessary prior to adding lines at Tatlock tennis courts, oddly enough. My first question is: what courtesy review was conducted prior to adding lines at the Tatlock tennis courts and why did it determine to proceed with adding pickle ball lines on courts so close to residences without any addition of measures to mitigate sound? Follow up: how will the courtesy review for the LAX wall compare to the courtesy review conducted for the pickle ball lines (if there even was such a thing conducted for the pickle ball lines)? If there was no courtesy review for the pickle ball lines at Tatlock, should they be removed? Finally, can you please help the Tatlock community understand why DCP

responded that the neighbors' input would be needed prior to painting pickle ball lines at Memorial (where homes are significantly further away than they are from the tennis courts at Tatlock) - but neighbors' input was not sought prior to determining to install a LAX wall at Tatlock? This is disparate treatment. Just like it is disparate treatment to push even more sports activity to Tatlock, which is already doing much more sports activity than Memorial is.

No courtesy review was required for the pickleball lines. There are no plans to remove them.

The DCP Advisory board has reviewed installing Pickleball lines at Memorial and the BOE has approved. They will be installed in the near future, following the same process as Tatlock.

It was explained that the reason to light Tatlock and not Memorial is because Memorial is not turfed, and turfing Memorial might be expensive (but no official quote has been obtained because DCP has no interest in turfing Memorial for unknown reasons, though we can only imagine it is for the same reasons why there are pickle balls lines at Tatlock which were added without neighbors' input and there are none at Memorial - where DCP explained they would need to get neighbors' input first). In turn, DCP and Council has asked the Tatlock residents what they might agree to in order to support the lighting of Tatlock. The only suggestion so far from DCP and Council was to have the lights go off by 9:30 PM. Hypothetically, let's say this is agreed to - lighting Tatlock in exchange for the lights being off by 9:30 PM. Setting aside how unfair such a "compromise" would be (and I think some members of Council need to look up the definition of compromise), what happens when DCP once again needs more field space? Wouldn't it be much cheaper (in fact, almost free) to simply break the agreement of cutting off at 9:30 PM than to turf and then light Memorial? And if past behavior is the best predictor of future behavior, and we all remember that an agreement was made not to light Tatlock in 2004 in exchange for support of the turfing, can't we all be certain that that's exactly what DCP will do? It kind of feels like DCP is punishing Tatlock residents for agreeing in 2004 to support turfing (which was in exchange for NOT EVER LIGHTING TATLOCK) by telling us that well now that it's turfed, the best way to further expand field availability would be to (break all promises made to Tatlock residences and) light Tatlock rather than explore anything to even the load at Memorial or other fields - and trying to buy our support with an agreement, but why would this agreement be respected anymore than the prior agreement made with Tatlock? (Pis don't tell me about putting the agreement into an ordinance - the suggested 70+ lighting of Tatlock is literally a 4x+ violation of the current lighting ordinance. If ordinances meant anything, this entire conversation would be moot)

It is the sports community that has made these requests for field improvements.

The 70' light poles are recommended for all sports and will eliminate the glare and spillage into the area.

Through this process the city has been transparent is acknowledging that ordinances can be changed.

However, Jordan Glatt has confirmed to Councilmembers that the agreement was to not put lights in at the time.

To be very clear, turfing Memorial Field would be exponentially more expensive and take more of our already limited green space.

Why is it that at Memorial, DCP said that they need input from the neighbors to consider putting pickle ball lines at the tennis courts, but such input was not needed prior to putting pickle ball lines OR A LACROSSE WALL up at Tatlock? Why is there more deference for the neighbors around Memorial than the neighbors around Washington?

The DCP Advisory board has reviewed installing Pickleball lines at Memorial and the BOE has approved. They will be installed on three courts in the near future, following the same process as Tatlock.

ATTACHMENT A

Objections to Tatlock Lights

Updated 04-16-2024

1. Safety – Narrow streets, no sidewalks, poor lighting make this neighborhood unsafe for children during night events. Street congestion hampers emergency vehicle access to some local streets. A frustrated or inattentive driver could create a tragedy.

2. Prove the Need – Private sports clubs and Community Programs have said more field availability is needed. Yet no supporting evidence has been provided. A four-season audit of field usage throughout Summit is needed to determine if added play time is really needed.

3. Minimize unnecessary demand – A per capita fee results in entitlement to use facilities without any restraint. A per use fee would incentivize teams to reserve and use fields only when needed. It is important to differentiate between private clubs needs and wants.

4. Cost -- \$1.6 million is just one cost. Increased use of fields will reduce the useful life of artificial turf while require increased taxpayer funding for maintenance and operating costs, such as turf brushing, cleanup, police presence at events and parking enforcement.

5. Private Club Teams Subsidy – A thorough budget analysis is needed to determine how much taxpayer money Summit spends in support of private club athletic teams during the course of a year. The cost evaluation needs to be done before deciding to make a decision to buy lights for Tatlock fields so that Council can decide if increasing the subsidy to private clubs by \$1.6 million to buy the lights, plus additional annual maintenance and operating expense is in the best interest of the entire Summit community.

6. Small Number Affected Approximately 20% (or 4,468) of the 22,342 Summit residents are between 5 and 18 years of age. Before allocating additional public funds to benefit members of private athletic clubs, it is important to determine how

many school-age children play in private club sports compared to the total school-age population. It is a question of whether all school-age children are treated fairly.

7. Impact on Tatlock Neighborhood Home Values –Tatlock Park already has a high-impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Adding lights will tip the balance and

result in lowering the quality of life and value of the homes in the surrounding area. (Can we get a real estate appraiser to determine whether lights will decrease home value?)

8.

9. Fix a bad deal Tatlock Park has two heavily utilized multi-use fields a track used by residents and students of Summit High School, Kent Place School and Oratory School, six tennis courts that are lit until ten o'clock and a playground used during the day by Washington School and after-school by residents.

10. Neighborhood quality of life Homes are within a couple of hundred feet of three sides of Tatlock Park. Adding lights to two fields in close proximity to homes would

change the dynamic and character of a neighborhood. The area surrounding Tatlock serves over 550 elementary school children, continues to face challenges and has tolerated living in "normal" conditions with heavily utilized municipal fields including the 2 turfed multi-use fields, 6 lighted tennis courts, and a playground .

11. Lights will create more night-time events Installing lights will result in increased field usage and night-time activities; will add noise, vehicle traffic, parking violations, littering and pedestrian traffic. Night-time events will also add to congestion on Morris Avenue as more people will cross over to Magic Fountain after night time activities.

12. The litter picked up from Martins Brook Park on Earth Day cleanup showed that Martins Brook is a hangout for teens to drink and have sex. Martins Brook borders on the lower open field of Tatlock Park. It will be a magnet for teens from Summit and other communities as a location for bad behavior after night events.

13. Loss of Control –Lighting other locations could follow lighting Tatlock fields. The municipal golf course, other public school fields, including the high school fields and middle school fields could be next. The revised sound and light ordinances could permit Oratory, Kent Place and Oak Knoll schools to light their fields as a source of revenue. Summit could lose the ability to preserve the quality of neighborhoods surrounding these facilities.

14. Educational Impairment – Numerous studies have established that fatigue impairs school performance. If our school-age children are routinely practicing and/or playing games till 10 pm, by the time they get home and to bed it could be as late as 11:30pm or Midnight. Academic performance would be impaired for many of them.

15. Renegotiate a Bad Deal – Oratory and Kent Place Schools have permission from Community Programs to use Summit's track for their practice, but there is no reciprocity for Summit teams to practice on Oratory or Kent Place fields. This is a bad deal for Summit.

16. Unequal Treatment of Neighborhoods – We have learned that when it comes to decisions about making changes in athletic fields that Memorial Field residents are

consulted before any changes are made and if they object, the changes are made in Tatlock Park without consulting neighbors. Examples: We were told that artificial turf and lights were not even considered for Memorial Field because the neighbors would object. We also learned that Memorial Field neighbors were consulted about installing pickleball courts and they objected because of the noise, so the pickleball court was installed at Tatlock without consulting neighbors. The influence of Memorial Field neighbors also can be demonstrated by their ability to have the Grace Food Bank moved out of the Cornaug Field House because the neighbors didn't want the traffic and people in their vicinity once a week.

17. Councilmember Conflict of Interest – Council Member Pawlowski must recuse himself from discussion and votes related to lights at Tatlock Park because he recently was on the Board of Summit Lacrosse. His close affiliation with Summit Lacrosse constitutes a prior bias in favor of the lights.

18. Want versus need Sports teams must adjust their timetable to the available facilities not the other way around. It is the same as with any other city service. I would like my garbage picked up twice a week with the containers left in my backyard not the street as it was when I moved to Summit. But the city does not have the resources to meet that want, so I accommodate to what is available. The

sports teams need to do the same.

19. Turf Memorial Field Mr. Ozoroski said turfing Memorial Field would be prohibitive because the ground would need to be leveled at great cost. The need to level the ground for the Upper Tatlock Field was not a deterrent as the attached photos show. Memorial Field should be treated like any other recreational facility in Summit. May 17, 2024

ATTACHMENT B

To the Department of Community Programs/Councilman Smallwood/Councilman Pawlowski:

I am a neighbor to Tatlock, and I do not support the proposal to install lighting at Tatlock Field.

My concerns were not adequately represented in the DCP's social media post summarizing the neighborhood concerns, so this letter serves to summarize my concerns. **My number one concern and the concern of virtually every neighbor** who has spoken at a council meeting, attended a small group meeting or provided written feedback is that ***installing 70 foot light poles in this residential area will degrade the quality of life in this neighborhood.***

How these light poles would degrade the quality of life may differ for each resident. Some residents are more sensitive to concerns about the health effects of lighting, or the increased noise or light pollution or trash or potential for crime; others will cite the anticipated reduction in property values as a result of having giant light poles visible for so many, or the possible negative impacts to wildlife, or the issues with crowding or safety or parking. Those concerns have been noted. **The key issue for the neighborhood is that the lights will degrade the quality of life in this neighborhood. This overriding concern is not noted in your summary of neighborhood concerns.**

In addition, residents of this neighborhood have the same rights to peace and tranquility that other residents of Summit enjoy. Putting up these lights will directly and negatively impact that ***right to peace and tranquility*** that residents outside this neighborhood would continue to enjoy. I stated this concern in a letter sent to the DCP in April. **This concern is not noted in your summary of neighborhood concerns.**

Further, **your summary did not note the neighbors' concern that the DCP and Councilmen have not demonstrated the need for these lights with data.** As citizens of Summit, we are asked to believe that a lack of field space is a pressing issue, and the lights at Tatlock are the answer, yet *no one in the Rec Department or on Council have presented data to support this assumption.* If there is truly a shortage of field space, then it should be documented, and a full assessment of our City's options should be analyzed as was done in the 2006 Recreation Master Plan. Before recommending an expensive, short term, and controversial solution to a "problem" the City has not recently proven, perhaps it is time for the City to revisit and update its own Recreation Master Plan.

In the meantime, the 2006 Recreation Master Plan is all we have, so I read it. Upon reading it, I'd like to raise an additional concern. That is, ***lighting Tatlock Field is not a priority in the City's Recreation Master Plan.*** This plan is the only in-depth study addressing our City's recreation needs that I have found on the DCP website. Some highlights of this 2006 Recreation Master Plan include:

- A recreation survey:*** The results of the recreation survey are in Addendum C3. Of the desired recreational improvements, **Summit residents' most desired improvements were bike trails (67%), walking and jogging trails (63.9%) and then athletic fields (56%), followed closely by symphonies, parks and concerts (55%).** A logical

question might be: what is the DCP/Council doing about bike trails and walking trails? Shouldn't *those* be the priority over fields? Our recreation budget should be allocated to the items that are most desired by a majority of residents. The only data we have supports trails over fields.

- **Turfing Franklin Field:** The consultants recommended (with data about usage) the need to convert some fields to synthetic turf. In addition to recommending that the City use synthetic turf on upper and lower Tatlock fields (done), turfing the HS fields (underway), and renovating Glenside fields (done), the consultants also strongly recommended **turfing Franklin Field (p.87)**. Assuming that the DCP/Council are able to support (with data) a need for more field space, then logic would dictate that having an additional turf field would be preferable to having a few extra hours of practice time on an existing turf field.
- **Transfer Station:** The consultants also noted (with data) that the **transfer station property contains “an area that would be suitable for construction of multiple regulation sized fields.” (p.80)** Again, assuming that there is data to support the need for additional field space, why is that not an option under consideration? Having **multiple** fields available to expand usage would be a longer term solution preferable to having an additional few hours of practice time on a single field. It is a key recommendation of our Recreation Master Plan — lighting Tatlock Field is not.

In summary, I would ask that your consideration of this **proposed** project and your summary of neighborhood concerns be amended to include the following:

1. **The general consensus among neighbors is that installing 70 foot light poles at Tatlock would degrade the overall quality of life for residents of this neighborhood.**
2. **The general consensus among neighbors that the installation of the lights would infringe upon residents' right to peace and tranquility on their property.**
3. **The residents' concern that the DCP/Councilmen have not presented current data to support a demonstrated need for this proposed project.**
4. **The concern that lighting Tatlock Field is not a documented priority in the City's own Recreation Master Plan.**

Should you have questions or wish to discuss, please contact me at XXX. In the meantime, I look forward to your thoughtful consideration of these concerns, and indeed all the concerns raised by residents who would be most affected by this proposed project.