

Conservation Commission Meeting
Sharon Community Center
January 16, 2020

Peg Arguimbau, Chair, Keevin Geller, Stephen Cremer, Meredith Avery and Alan Westman were the members present. Not Present: Jon Wasserman. The Conservation Administrator, Greg Meister, was also present.

A sign-in sheet is on file in the office listing other attendees of the meeting.
Meeting started at 7:45pm

Before the meeting began Arguimbau noted that this was Conservation Administrator Greg Meister's last official meeting as he is retiring January 17, 2020 after thirty years of service to the town.

7:45PM – Notice of Intent: Hearing Continuance – Prince Way/Bay Road

Representative for the applicant Steve Gioiosa emailed the office and requested an extension to the first meeting in February.

8:00PM – Commissions preliminary position regarding the turf fields at the high school as requested by the Standing Building Committee

Arguimbau explained to Commission members that the Standing Building Committee (SBC) was looking for a sense as to where the Commission stood regarding installation of turf fields at the High School. She explained that this was only a discussion among Commission members and that there would be no vote. Arguimbau also noted that to date, there has been no official filing regarding installation of a turf field at the high school. Gordon Gladstone, Chair of the SBC was present at this evening's meeting. He explained that the SBC will be meeting Tuesday, January 21st at which time a presentation will be given by the consultants and the opponents of the project. After the presentations members of the SBC will discuss and reach a conclusion on the proposed project. Gladstone is present this evening explaining that the SBC would like a sense as to which way the Commission is leaning based on their review of data analysis sheets provided and the 678 page report recently received from David Teter, of David Teter Consulting, LLC, a consultant hired by the architect of the Sharon High School project. This report provided the results of the sample(s) (proposed product) submitted to ALS Group USA, Corp. dba ALS Environmental on December 13, 2019.

Geller: manufacturers know why there is opposition to their product. His position is either the product will pollute or not pollute. Geller believes that this analysis will be shown on the data sheets provided by the manufacturer. If it is shown the product is dangerous, then the Commission should vote against.

It is Gladstone's belief that the data analysis received from each manufacturer came back clean and pristine. They are still waiting for additional reports, but according to what he has read, there is no indication of PFAS.

Arguimbau's opinion is that given the location of where the turf field will be located, and given the Commission's position on abiding by the Wetland Protection Act, there will be a significant burden on the applicant to show that installing a turf field will not be problematic from an environmental prospective.

Avery also noted that if the product were to pollute, then the Commission could not vote for the project. She also noted that part of the problem at this point is that they are only discussing a proposed project with no official filing. Part of the Commission's responsibility is to determine if the proposed project would pollute the resource areas and what the potential impact would be. When she looked at the cut sheets provided from the manufacturer, she did not see PFAS listed. Avery's concern is that even the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) is trying to wrap its head around PFAS and to develop and create limits which make sense. Avery believes that there is a heavy burden on the applicant to say that turf is better than a natural field and that it is not harmful.

Meister's concern was the statement "limits less than". He also noted that in other towns, contamination of water has been an issue, though he did note that there is no conclusive evidence that the contamination was from the fields. He did note however, that the cost to fix the contamination is huge. Meister believes that when it comes to the water supply in Sharon, we should err on the side of caution and do what is best for the protection of wetlands and water resources.

Westman noted that the Commission's position has nothing to do with the pros and cons of artificial turf vs natural turf, or on economics. The Commission's purview is environmental only.

Geller noted that our water supply should be tested so that we have a baseline.

Gladstone informed Commission members that the SBC hired Weston and Sampson to peer review the consultant hired by the architect.

Approval of Meeting Minutes December 19, 2019

- page 2, 5th paragraph: Remove "and which was sent to both Arguimbau and Meister"
- page 2, 5th paragraph: Remove "Bottomley suggested that perhaps this list should be read into the minutes".
- Page 3 at Geller – remove "an" and replace with "have"

Motion: to accept minutes as amended:
Cremer, Geller 4-0-1

Approval of Meeting Minutes December 5, 2019

Motion: To approve meeting minutes of December 5, 2019
Cremer, Avery
3-0-2

If no filings come in then may not need to meet on January third.

Motion to adjourn Cremer, Geller 6-0-0
Meeting adjourned at 8:15pm