

Dear Mr. Ehlers and Ms. Freeman:

We are disappointed that MC is back in yet another attempt to provide four permanent 80-foot lighting poles on one of its athletic fields. We also wonder if there are undisclosed plans to attempt to add them to their other fields/facilities if they are successful with the pending application. While we appreciate that this private school is attempting to expand its already significant neighborhood footprint into the nighttime (and perhaps early mornings) for the benefit of its athletic recruiting and potentially commercial enterprises, I once again write to voice our opposition.

MC is certainly an esteemed private high school, regularly having its pick of Marin County (and beyond) male and female top athletes. MC is a small high school by local Marin standards, with a student body of approximately 775, yet it is a powerhouse regularly taking top honors across its numerous different sports programs. MC regularly competes and prevails in many of its programs against schools twice and even close to three times its size. To this point, MC's website proudly states: **"At Marin Catholic, our athletic program offers more opportunities than any school north of the Golden Gate Bridge. With 29 sports, 49 individual teams and over 85% student participation, the Wildcats traditionally finish at or near the top in the Marin County Athletic League standings."**

Successful sports programs are clearly a very high priority for MC. If they have more athletic programs "than any other school north of the GGB", perhaps as a small private high school they should drop a few of these programs to relieve some field demand. We understand that continuing to have winning sports programs completes the circular quest to attract better and better high school athletes and encourage larger and large donations. Having been Greenbrae residents for almost 35 years now, we have watched from our porch and various rooms facing the campus as bigger and better athletic fields and facilities have been constructed and record donations continue to roll in. The level and breadth of MC's athletic facilities rival many college facilities.

We have a significant number of objections to MC's latest campaign for four permanent 80 foot high field lights. It is important to understand that along with permanent lights comes permanent extra noise, permanent and extra traffic, and permanent extra neighborhood disruptions. The hills above MC essentially act like a giant funnel collecting and amplifying any and all noise on and around the MC athletic fields, parking lots, and common areas. We can literally hear the coaches yelling instructions, QB's calling the snap, and individual players and fans yelling to one another and cheering. It is also common during the various athletic events for MC to play extremely loud music between plays and have their sound and amplifications systems running during practices and other events. This is in addition to the announcer doing the play by plays. Ironically as I write this email at 7:12 pm on June 6, there is a baseball game/practice going where I just heard the coach tell his players that there was "a runner on first and to keep an eye out" coupled with the noise of aluminum bats regularly hitting baseballs in the practice cage(s). I am also watching what appears to be 60-70 lacrosse players crisscrossing the football field with lots of screaming and yelling

and shrill whistles of the various coaches. This is odd to me as I know school ends this week and I doubt any of the teams are still practicing.

At any rate, we understand that at this stage of the proceedings, that the only issue being addressed and evaluated is whether MC's application is proper and complete, and that the merits will be addressed at a later stage IF MC's submittal is deemed proper and complete. For those reasons, we only address the completeness of the submittal here, not the numerous and detailed objections we have based upon the merits. We will address the merits in later submittals if necessary.

We believe that the construction of four 80-foot light poles, each equipped with eight 1500-watt light bulbs constitutes a change of use for the MC fields and facilities. What MC seeks in the construction of these lights is a complete and different type of use for its campus, complete with a massive introduction of extremely high watt lights into the darkness of our community. Along with the lights, comes a very significant introduction of noise and disruption during the evening hours of our community. There will be disruptions of the quiet enjoyment of our homes, to the local wildlife, and the request would introduce significant traffic and neighborhood disruption. MC's submittal seeks to make these changed factors/conditions permanent without providing Marin County or MC's neighbors with import analysis and studies of the adverse impacts first.

We are not experts in analyzing these sorts of submittals but note that there are many references to MC's 2016 submittal. As everyone is aware, MC withdrew the 2016 submittal when the local communities pointed out shortfalls and significant adverse impacts not addressed in the 2016 submittal. Accordingly, MC is submitting its current application on its own and must provide for any and all necessary data and analysis in its current submittal, not reference a past submittal that was withdrawn before any real analysis or action occurred. MC's references to its 2016 submittal should be stricken.

We also note that MC references other schools/projects where lights have apparently been approved. This too is improper because every site is different with vastly different factors to be considered such as proximity of local communities, elevations, noise buffers, presence of wildlife, etc. Again, we believe that references to any other projects not sharing the same characteristics as the MC campus and surrounding communities should be stricken and not considered.

At this point we are concerned primarily with the additional noise and disruption of the night skies by MC's submittal. Severely lacking from the submittal is any reliable data from which we can apply data/evidence to these two main concerns. Where are the real-life noise and glare data/examples that we can review, see, hear, and consider. MC needs to go back to its development team and provide this type of detail to the local community. At a minimum, it appears that MC has applied the wrong noise standards in its submittal and needs to modify the submittal once the proper County plan is applied.

As far as the actual lighting is at issue, we understand that there is some sort of evaluative standard to determine whether the level of light contrast and light pollution resulting from the submittal is out of character with the neighborhood. Last night I sat on my porch and enjoyed the nighttime character of my neighborhood. I was able to make out the top of Mt. Tam with the available stars and sincerely enjoyed the view, the calm, and the quiet. That is the character of this neighborhood at night. It is easy to draw a comparison between what I saw last night and four massive light polls sporting 1500-watt lights at a height that is comparable to the elevation of our residence and that would dramatically and negatively change the character of our neighborhood. And this comparison only considers the light, not the related noise and disruption that comes with the lights. The noise and other disruptions would be significant and life changing for our community.

It is our hope and request that you deny MC's submittal and/or rule that it is incomplete and in need of substantial revision and additional data.

Thank you.

Mark & Janet Epstein

Mark W. Epstein
Seiler Epstein LLP

275 Battery St, Suite 1600

San Francisco, CA 94111

(415) 979-0500 Tel
(415) 979-0511 Fax