

Investors Bank Field and Upper Tatlock Lights

1/25/2023 Meeting Notes

Zoom

Attendees

- Community Programs Advisory Board: Mark Ozoroski, Elaine Anderson, Scott Lenz, Sharon Clark, Delia Hamlett, Andy Minegar
- PPDI: Tom Miller; Musco: Dan Shalloo, Bob Zoeller

Discussion

The meeting's purpose was to have the engineers and consultants answer technology, design, and installation questions we raised based on the proposal in our ongoing effort to gather as much information we can to prepare for Council and public discussions. We would build on this and previous discussions (see notes summary prepared dated 1/25/2023 and attached here).

We note there are a number of renderings, etc., that will be very helpful in these presentations which the committee has identified, along with answering the "Why?" question (in 1/25/2023 prior meetings summary below).

Pole height and light diffusion

- The engineering/lighting consultants said that 100% of high school football fields are 70 ft. poles and above; 70 ft. is widely accepted as the minimum standard for playability and player safety; 80 ft. is not an overdesign for player safety and overall light level and illumination on the field.
- [Slide on Musco evolution since 1977 – can we get a copy (recollection this showed height and light diffusion and significant improvement over 50 years)]
- The lighting impact is at or below moonlight and provides good lighting on the field. Pole light = 0.02; Moonlight = 0.2. There is more light from a porch light than these lights.
- Looking at the section view of Investors: 150 feet to the closest home from one pole and 450 feet from the other
- For pathway lighting, we would include safety lights on every pole

Cost (initial and ongoing)/installation considerations

- Scott asked about uncertainties that could impact the estimate – Tom noted supply chain and labor and that Musco's estimates are on the high end
- Get geotech report in the design phase, but experience with tennis courts is groundwater was not an issue, more rock.
- While we could consider doing Investors Field first and then Upper Tatlock Field, it was recommended to do all the electric in first phase; but overall more cost efficient as well as installation and time and disruption to do both at the same time

- Note on Field House re: electric - need to understand and coordinate renovations there and if that will have any impact; talk to Board of Education
- Musco comfortable with lead time on poles based on the timing we were discussing
- Ongoing cost for running lights should be under \$10/hour per field; LED rated for 100,000 hours; Musco gives 25-year warranty
- LED technology comparison (Musco experience): reduction in KW of 30% - 70% based on what was on the field before replacement
- Scott – Getting optimum efficiency with best cost; state of the art
- Delia – On light pollution, loop someone in with that expertise
- Note: there is a big elevation difference between our two fields (100 ft.?)

Comparables

- Important to get a list of comparables -- must include pole height, LED only, and year of installation
- Also important to have similar setting (e.g., more neighborhood setting): Scotch Plains/Fanwood closest in context to Summit; Scott – suggested we do a video of Scotch Plains if possible
- Mark noted Chisholm/Springfield – 60 ft. poles

Follow-up

- Mark to talk to the Police Chief on any potential issues with increased activity, and to Aaron Schrager about traffic