

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.

This would be a more costly option that we are currently not looking studying. Perhaps it will be studied in the future. In 2020, a study was approved for Tatlock.

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 your comment.

We continue to hear that there is not enough field space for the existing sports teams to get adequate practice time. Why are you adding a 2nd grade field hockey team?

No team was added. We allowed 2nd graders last year.

Bernards District is exploring again, after litigation roughly 20 years ago, installing permanent lights their high school field vs their temporary lights that are installed 4 months a year. Summit DCP and council needs to look at the work they've done with a focus group

<https://www.tapinto.net/towns/bernardsville-and-bedminster/sections/education/articles/olcott-field-lights-interim-report-available-to-the-public> DCP and council need take to heart the below comments from their Superintendent in an updated April 16, 2024 The Bernardsville News article

https://www.newjerseyhills.com/bernardsville_news/news/olcott-field-lights-in-bernardsville-studied/article_88277386-bf10-11ee-af9a-c34eb1e5b634.html copied below: "With respect to drawbacks and concerns for LED installation, "first and foremost is the Olcott Avenue impact

and the surrounding roads that we share a neighborhood with," Brotschul said. "We need to be good neighbors in any initiative that we move forward with." He stressed that the "impact around Olcott Avenue is of the utmost importance to the focus group and certainly needs to stay at the forefront of any further examination." Looking ahead, Brotschul said the review "really needs to hone in from a policy perspective how Olcott Avenue would be impacted from the use of LED lights on the field." He also saw a need to assess the district's long-range facilities plan and its economics. Also, "how does it look, what is the end-user experience, how does it impact kids, how does it impact the neighborhood, and is there a balance there." There needs to be a deep and broader articulation of how the district intends to use this facility," he added. He said that work would take place within the board's policy committee. Brotschul made several recommendations. They included: authorizing work on a lighting installation plan solely for supporting the future work of the focus group; developing relevant economic variables for the board and ultimately the community "so there's a very clear understanding on cost."

Thank you for bringing the Bernards situation to our awareness.

Previously the city has not had to pay Union County for use of Glenside? What will the cost be to the city for time and use of lights? Does that cost reflect the quote the DCP has from Musco for lighting each pole? Will field user fees be increased for teams that use Glenside?

We have not received full information on what will be in place when the field is transferred to County scheduling.

The city needs to do a balloon test, as Bernards did, to simulate 80-foot-high lights to show where permanent stadium lights will be visible. I'm including context from a newjerseyhills.com article about Olcott field, "showed the balloons were visible coming down Mount Airy Road, they were visible up on Somerset Street, they visible all over Bernardsville, in places you wouldn't have even thought." The entire city deserves to see what this could look like in the fall, winter and early spring where you don't have the foliage.

Thank you for the suggestion.

When will people FROM Tatlock be included on the Lighting Committee?

Meetings were held with the community throughout the spring with the committee.

For Haunted Halloween - a night time event at Martin's Brook Park - Butler Parkway is closed off to traffic. So for night time events at Investors Field would it be logical to conclude that Butler Parkway will be closed to traffic? If not, can you explain why its different for one type of dusk-time event versus other dusk and nighttime events, both of which will presumably have droves of children present? Please keep in mind that there is no drinking occurring for the Haunted Halloween event, whereas night time games often invite alcohol, so if for Haunted Halloween,

Butler Pkwy is closed to traffic, HOW MUCH MORE SO would safety concerns require Butler Pkwy to be closed to traffic...

The event takes place at Martin's Brook Park, which has an entry way and exit on Butler Parkway. Tatlock is its own complex with many entries and exits.

Who or what groups were scheduled or permitted to use the tennis courts, as well as Upper and Lower Tatlock fields on Sunday 6/16 from 8 to 10pm?

Tennis courts were individual users.

Upper and Lower Tatlock were not formally scheduled by any groups.

Is the black box attached to a telephone pole on Lewis Ave that was noticed by residents June 23 part of the \$21,000 traffic study conducted at graduation? What did that graduation traffic study entail? If it's not, what is the purpose of the box that has been seen on Butler Parkway and Lewis?

That was a part of the study. Traffic study results have not yet been received.

Regarding the lining of the Wilson field. Please expand on why this is not an option. Who in 2016 decided that this was not an option and provide details explaining this position.

Council decided not to pursue Wilson field.

We've been residents in the Tatlock neighborhood, at XXX Greenfield Ave. for 19 years, with 2 boys active in Summit sports, music, and other community programs. Our family has participated in youth sports (soccer, baseball, football) and SHS football and volleyball, as well as the MS and HS band. Other community and youth programs involvement includes open gyms and clinics/camps/classes at the Summit Rec center, muni golf course, Summit Aquatic Center and Y membership, and camps at the Connection as well as activities with the scouts and church, with demonstrated volunteerism. We support and enjoy the sports programs and the activities at Tatlock field and other locations across town, but we DO NOT support the addition of lighting at Tatlock. Primary reasons for opposition of this project include: 1) costs outweigh benefits; 2) lack of control for hours of activity on the fields in future (i.e., impact on quality of life in the neighborhood, i.e., quiet time in evenings to enjoy our properties); 3) traffic and parking impacts in the area, with not enough parking to support events. Suggestion is to review the needs of field space again, with emphasis on looking at alternative options, rather than permanent new lighting at Tatlock stadium. In the FAQ's, it's mentioned that "Local Rec and Travel Teams" will benefit because of shifting usage of fields. If lighting is available, the working volunteer coaches will have preference for access to lighted space, a natural consequence of providing the scarce resource. There is no guarantee that future local authorities will refrain from revising the proposed local parks ordinance, and allow for the

expanded use, and the residents in the area will have to live with any impacts of expanded use of these fields for up to 7 nights/week.

Thank you for your comments.

It's stated in May 6 meeting notes regarding the grass field by the BOE office that "Small Size Grass Field at Wilson: Neighborhood Concerns - Council at the time chose not to pursue." Will council pursue this as low cost, low impact on neighbors to meet the goal to maximize field space option to paint lines so girls flag football, field hockey or a multiuse space can have an additional, more local place to practice with ample parking and burden to a neighborhood for afterschool and early evening practice?

Currently, we are reviewing the Tatlock proposal. We will continue to review other option for different sports.

Can the DCP confirm that this area will still be turf as stated in a March 24, 2022 email and council meeting? It states it can also be used for other sporting activities. This would add another practice area to the community. The "Practice Side" of "The Wall" will be 60' wide and 15' in height at its peak, and 12' high on the wings. A fenced in 60' x 60' area with 8' high black chain-link fence similar to the existing fences surrounding Tatlock Sports Complex will enclose the practice area for additional safety and protection of stray balls. The ground surface on the practice area of the wall will be asphalt, or turf, so it can be used for other sporting activities. It will be asphalt.

As spray paint lines have been put on the green space between the field house and tennis courts at Tatlock, what is the reasoning why can't this be done over at Wilson field?

Upon last review in 2016, Council did not want that to be a scheduled field.

1. When can we expect the field usage report? During the spring season, I noticed that neither field at Tatlock was used at all on Friday evenings, and that the fields had plenty of open time on weekends. I'd really like to see whether the data matches my observations. 2. In addition to current usage, do you have any plans to put together a projection on future needs over the next 5-10 years? It would be nice to be able to see the expected growth in participation as well as info on new programs that DCP is planning on spinning up. Along with that, it would be good to know if there are under-performing programs that may not be necessary. 3. We were told in the community meetings that someone from our neighborhood would be included in the field space advisory board. When can we expect that to happen? I'd be happy to discuss in person if you'd like to set up a meeting Thanks, -Myles

We will have a meeting on Thursday, November 21 to review all results.

In the candidate debate last week there was a question asked about lighting Tatlock. Don Nelson stated he was waiting for a feasibility study to help form his decision about lighting the fields. What does a feasibility study include and when will the traffic and environmental studies be completed?

Without knowing fully what was discussed – we have received a proposal from Musco and an electrician, which is posted on the site. We are awaiting the EIS and traffic studies.

Are there Indiana bats in Martins Brook park?

We are still awaiting results from the EIS.