

Conservation Commission Meeting

Virtual (Remote) Meeting - Draft

May 7, 2020

Peg Arguimbau, Chair, Meredith Avery, Alan Westman, Keevin Geller, Jon Wasserman and Colin Barbera, were the members participating. Conservation Administrator John Thomas also participated in the meeting. Stephen Cremer joined the meeting at approximately 7:35pm

The remote meeting started at 7:30pm

Arguimbau opened the meeting by reading Governor Baker's Executive Order of March 12, 2020. Per guidance from the State, Arguimbau noted that all votes would be taken by roll call.

7:30 P.M - Approval of Meeting Minutes

Arguimbau recommended a few clerical changes to the minutes. The corrections will be forwarded to Administrative Assistant.

Motion: To approve meeting minutes as amended: March 5; April 2; April 16 (2020) Avery, Geller 6-0-1 (motion passed)

Roll call vote: Meredith – Aye; Westman – Aye; Geller – Aye; Wasserman – Aye; Barbera – Abstain; Cremer – Aye; Arguimbau - Aye

7:35 P.M - Presentation: Artificial Turf Moratorium

Arguimbau noted that at the Select Board meeting last week, they voted 2 – 1 to put the moratorium on the warrant for Town Meeting. However, since Town Meeting may be delayed until the fall, it is Arguimbau's recommendation to table this discussion. Further, depending upon the turf project hearing currently in front of the Commission, the Commissions stance on the moratorium may be moot and have no impact.

Motion: To accept motion to table vote on moratorium to a date prior to Town Meeting. Wasserman, Westman 7-0-0 (motion passes)

Roll call vote: Avery – Aye; Westman – Aye; Geller – Aye; Wasserman – Aye; Barbera – Aye; Cremer – Aye; Arguimbau - Aye

7:45 P.M. – Enforcement Order: 4 Solstice Way, Trespass onto Town Land

Thomas, Conservation Administrator, noted that there have been some issues with this property in the past. He discussed the status with Patrick McCarty, who was cordial and responsive to his request to erect the boundary marker. A Registered Land Surveyor visited the site to install the boundary marker to re-establish the Conservation Restriction boundary. McCarty asked if the Commission was set with the placement of the boundary marker. Arguimbau asked if the boundary marker placement could be noted on an existing as-built so the placement of the boundary marker is on file. McCarty informed Commission he would take care of, asking what the process to add to the as-built was. Arguimbau explained that there should be an existing as-built on file with the town. The surveyor can indicate on the Towns plan the placement of the boundary marker and then sign, verifying the placement of the marker.

Other Business:

127 Beach Street, John McGowan

McGowan, of 127 Beach Street, is interested in placing a platform deck at his lake front property. The platform will sit above the ground and will be erected within the existing lawn area. Thomas noted that the structure would be temporary, and could be easily removed. A Commission member asked if the platform would be removed at the end of each season. Thomas replied that he was not sure about the plans for taking down the platform, but explained that the platform would not be sitting on the ground. Other Commission members were concerned that with the erection of the platform, the vegetation would change. It was recommended that McGowan file a Request for Determination of Applicability (RDA).

2 Cobbler Lane, Jason Florio

Florio would like to put in a swimming pool. The location of the pool and associated work is within the buffer; however, the area identified is an existing lawn. Originally Florio had planned on putting in an in-ground swimming pool in another area, however his septic system failed and needed replacement. Florio is now looking to put in an above ground pool. Wetlands are about 75 feet away from the proposed installation site. Commission members believe that it would be best for Florio to file an RDA in order to get the project on record for limits of work, erection of fence and placement of the above ground pool.

291 Mountain Street, Etay Armon

Armon is interested in putting in a basketball court at rear of his property. Thomas explained that the area looked to be wetlands. He provided the name of a wetland scientist to have the area delineated and to provide a report to the Commission as to where the wetlands are located. The lot is approximately 1.2 acres so the proposed basketball court may fall within the buffer. Commission is recommending that Armon file a Notice of Intent (NOI).

3 Arboro Drive, Sam Aylesworth

Aylesworth would like to clean up his beachfront property. Work would entail minor grading and seeding. He is asking the Commission as to what type of filing they would like, an NOI or RDA. Commission members would like additional information on the work to be done, including the type of seeds to be used.

6 Massapoag Ave, Adam Giandomenico

Giandomenico would like to remove several trees. Thomas concern is roadway may be a scenic way. Proposed work would be at 6 Massapoag Ave. He is also looking to do work on the property across the street from his home, land which he also owns. Giandomenico mentioned he would like to stabilize some of the property in addition to brining in fill and see. Thomas will be meeting with him tomorrow to discuss in more detail the proposed work. Filing most likely will be an NOI.

**8:00 P.M. - Hearing Continuance, Notice of Intent - Prince Way Roadway
(DEP SE #280-0610)**

Steve Gioiosa, Site Tech Engineering, presenting for the applicant. He recapped the proposed project noting that he has been in front of the Commission several times. At the last meeting, Commission members requested placement of the proposed homes with driveways identified and anticipated grading. A contour plan was shown noting the proposed lots, the 100-foot buffer and 50 foot setbacks.

- Lot #1; All proposed activity is outside of the 100-foot buffer and 50-foot setback.
- Lot #2; The home, septic and driveway are mostly outside of the buffer. Applicant is proposing activity within the yard area which is about 50 feet from the buffer.
- Lot #3; Home is outside of the buffer. Driveway access would skirt around the development but proposed work would be approximately 55 feet from resource area; balance of proposed remaining work is outside the buffer.
- Lot #4; The home and most of the driveway (and grading) are outside of the buffer. Some grading will take place within the buffer; approximately 80 feet from wetlands.
- Lot # 5; Lot 5 is the least intrusive lot, with all activity outside of the buffer.
- The proposed roadway is located outside of the buffer, however, a portion of the cul-de-sac does fall within the buffer.

Phase 1 located on the Southeast side of the property. There is frontage along Bay Road. Working with the Town of Stoughton, the applicant and Stoughton were able to come to an agreement which allows the applicant to connect to Stoughton's water lines in order to bring water into the development.

The proposed roadway into this portion of the project falls mostly out of the buffer.

- Lot #6; most of the proposed activity for this lot falls outside of the buffer, though a bit of grading may be about 10 feet into the buffer.
- Lot #7 is one lot, with upland placement; the applicant is proposing a small wetland crossing with utilities. The house is located outside of the buffer, with the proposed driveway crossing a narrow band of wetland. The applicant is proposing one to one riprap in order to reduce any impact. Wetland replication is being proposed south of the crossing and adjacent to existing wetland. 800 square feet of replication is being proposed.
- Lot # 8 outside of buffer.

Gioiosa noted that for the most part, except for lot #7, the proposed project was a buffer zone project. A Commission member asked if lot #7 was in the original plan.

Arguimbau asked if there was a replication plan. Gioiosa explained that he wanted to present this evening and get feedback from the Commission. The applicant has hired a wetland scientist who has come up with a planting plan, but prior to officially filing, he wanted a sense from the Commission for what they wanted.

Wasserman asked if what Gioiosa presented tonight was part of the original plan. He also asked how utilities would be brought in. Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). Gioiosa explained that changes were made to the size of the homes and that Lot # 7 was looked over. Regarding directional drilling, he has been to the site numerous times during different parts of the year and has not noticed any significant water flow. Depending on the time of

year, the area can be stabilized with no need for HDD. The crossing is approximately 20 feet wide.

Arguimbau asked about the land located above Lot #6. Gioiosa explained that perc tests were performed and that area had the best soils, however, that parcel was unbuildable and has been incorporated into Lot #6.

With regards to Lot #7, the applicant will need to work with the Board of Health. This has not yet been done as applicant wanted to meet with the Commission to hear any concerns they may have.

Arguimbau asked if Parcel A was to be transferred to the Commission. Gioiosa said that parcel would be coming to the Commission, however there was concern with erosion of the 50-foot buffer, but as long as the 50-foot buffer could be maintained, the Parcel would be transferred to the Commission.

Arguimbau presented concerns regarding the drop-off grades south of the cul-de-sac. Gioiosa explained that the drop off was approximately five feet. They are proposing to install a guardrail in that area. Commission members expressed concern with the area settling. In addition, not sure if there would be enough distance between the buffer zone. Discussion ensued about moving the guardrail, putting up a decorative wall, and grading the area more. This has been done in another community and Gioiosa thinks can do something similar in Sharon.

Wasserman asked how the area mirrored the existing grade. A retaining wall may help, allowing for fifteen feet or so of leeway. The guardrail may need to be extended around the driveway, or there may be a need to shift the driveway.

Gioiosa will work on changes recommended by the Commission. He is asking for a for week continuance. This project will be continued to June 4th at 7:45pm.

Motion to continue hearing to June 4th at 7:45pm.

Geller, Westman 6-0-1 (motion passes).

Roll Call vote: Avery-Yes; Westman – Yes; Geller – Yes; Wasserman – Yes;
Barbera – Abstain; Cremer – Yes; Arguimbau – Yes.

8:15 P.M. – Hearing Continuance: Notice of Intent - 25 Tiot Street, Cape Club, DEP #SE280-0615

Paul Conti representing the applicant. When Conti presented at the last meeting there was concern with protecting the wetlands at Pond #1 and Pond #5. No treatments will be performed within the 100-foot buffer of those ponds. There was also concern from abutters regarding potential run-off of water and the potential impact of the herbicides used. Conti created a map of the area and identified how the water flowed from Pond #1. He noted that there was minimal flow and that not much water entered or left the pond. He is not too concerned with any downstream risk from the application of the herbicide treatment. Abutters will be notified when treatments to the ponds are scheduled. Arguimbau asked about the time frame for treatment. Conti responded that they would like to begin treatment as soon as possible. The growing season runs from May through September and they would like to begin monitoring to see how the vegetation is growing.

Abutter, Laura Nelson, had several questions. She noted that at the last meeting she asked about private water wells located within ½ mile of the proposed project. She is concerned with Phosphate used, check this out on page 8. And the impact this herbicide may have on private wells. She did not hear back from Conti if there were any private wells within ½ mile of any of the ponds to be treated.

She is also concerned with impact of the herbicide treatment to aquatic life, as well as turtles, deer and coyote who may drink out of ponds. Conti explained that they follow the regulations and guidance noted on the labels of the herbicide treatment, and that treatment, done correctly, poses no risk. Concentrations used will be minimal.

Regarding drinking wells, Conti explained that he was unable to locate maps of direct drinking wells. However, he explained that he does not see the herbicide treatment being used as penetrating the soils and does not believe the treatment will leach into the groundwater. Avery concurred with Conti.

Arguimbau told Conti that the Town Water Division would have information on private well locations within the Town and he might want to start his search there.

Motion to continue hearing to May 21st

Wasserman, Cremer (6-0-1 (motion passes)

Roll call vote: Avery – Yes; Westman – Yes; Geller – Yes; Wasserman – Yes

Barbera – Abstain; Cremer – Yes; Arguimbau - Yes

8:30 P.M. – Hearing Continuance: Notice of Intent - Sharon High School Fields; DEP #SE280-0617

Presenting for the applicant:

Will Scheefer, Nitsch Engineering

Ty Johnson, Mitch Engineering

David Warner, Warner Larson, Landscape Engineers

David Teter, David Teter Consulting

Steven Larosa, Weston Sampson (Town Consultant)

Chris Blesson, Tappe Architects

Matthew Gulino, PMA consultants. (Town Consultant)

Commission member Colin Barbera recused himself from the hearing as he wrote an email regarding the turf field, into the Commission in January, prior to being appointed a member of the Conservation Commission.

The presentation began with Schreefer, of Nitsch Engineering, giving a brief overview of the project – putting in a synthetic turf field where the current football field is. This project abuts the wetlands and borders an intermittent stream which enters into the lake.

The proposed project lies within the 100-foot buffer zone (due to the proximity to the lake and other noted wetlands). The School department would like to put in a synthetic turf field and resurface the existing track. All work to be performed will be

within a previously disturbed area. Trees and existing vegetation will not be removed.

In putting in the synthetic turf field, the consultants will try to replicate the natural conditions as much as possible.

The synthetic turf field will be approximately 88,000 square feet, and underlain by 12" thick stone layer for runoff storage. Schreefer explained briefly the hydrology of the soil and what will need to be done prior to installing the synthetic turf field. Water storage beneath the field will need to be significant. Schreefer noted that approximately three inches of rain water would need to build up before there would be any outflow (runoff) of water. The three-inch water storage capacity before outflow of water replicates a two-year storm. Records have been reviewed of storms over the past ten years and it was determined that perhaps twice per year water will flow out from the storage.

The overall design of the project meets all regulatory standards with respect to Stormwater, and the stormwater report was included with the Notice of Intent filing. Schreefer again reiterated that larger storms do not occur very often and the smaller storms should be able to be contained.

David Warner took over the presentation. He explained his role and pointed out that the landscape architect planned the football field to the specifications laid out by the school department. The school was looking at synthetic turf for its durability and the ability to meet the needs of the school department as well as town sports programs. The architects received information from the schools regarding their usage of fields during the school year. Not quantified is the Town's youth program usage and their need for fields. Actual reported school usage is 168 hours. Anticipated usage including both school and community is 1348 hours.

Warner showed Commission members 3 levels of natural grass fields (Native topsoil- the existing field; sand-amended rootzone with sand blanket underlayment; and sand-only rootzone.

A plan of the new field configuration was shown. There would be an 8 lane straightaway track on the schoolside, (6 lane on farther side of track); a paved D-zone for the High Jump; a Discus, Shotput and Javelin area.

Warner then explained to Commission members the materials used for an installation of a synthetic artificial turf noting that with a synthetic turf field, the water would drain through. The consultant went through the composition of the synthetic turf field: Synthetic Turf Carpet. Infill and Shock Pad.

- **Synthetic Turf Carpet:** consists of Polyethylene fibers stitched into a backing material. It is dual fiber with slit film and monofilament. This backing is permeable and has an 8-year warranty.

- **Infill:** there are several choices for infill. This is the artificial playing surface the players will be playing on. The infill recommended for the Sharon High School is engineered wood particles from sustainably grown and harvested pine trees. Warner noted that some concerns have been raised regarding the durability of the organic infill, but testing has shown over time the surface remains largely intact.
- **Shock Pad:** interlocking expanded polypropylene panels which are permeable. The Shock Pad preserves impact attenuation with limited infill grooming and is reusable with at least 2 turf life cycles.

According to Warner, it is his belief that synthetic turf is safe to play on. With regards to temperature heat of synthetic turf fields, Warner explained that spraying water on synthetic fields has a limited effective duration in lowering the surface temperatures and actually raises the heat index. He explained that it is better to reduce the temperature via other methods, including restricting use during summer mid-day, when the temperatures tend to be high. The use of BrockFill enables the reduction in temperature of synthetic fields and also increases usable hours as compared to other synthetic infill materials. The placement of drinking fountains adjacent to the fields also allows athletes to stay hydrated.

Safety and concussion risk of playing on synthetic turf is no more dangerous than playing on natural turf and closely resembles a pristine natural field, according to Warner. Playing on frozen synthetic turf, according to a 2004 Penn State report, showed that playing on frozen synthetic turf, though the surface may be hard, showed that the danger of getting a concussion is minimal.

Warner then discussed maintenance of synthetic turf as compared to a natural grass field and the associated costs over an eighty-year period. Estimated hours of play on synthetic turf is approximately 1,348 hours with an hourly cost of \$99.89. Estimated hours of play on natural grass (High sand root-zone) is approximately 500 hours at an estimated hourly cost of \$194.01. This does not take into account lost playing time on natural grass due to weather and other factors. At years 9 through 16, the cost per hour for synthetic turf per hour is \$58.79 as compared to natural grass at \$117.26 per hour.

Replacement of synthetic turf field typically occurs between 8 – 10 years after installation. At the time of replacement, the carpet is removed and is repurposed and recycled. Warner acknowledges that at this time there is not a lot of good options for recycling the carpet. He hopes that by the time the carpet needs replacement (8-10 years from now) there will be better ways to dispose of the carpet. The Shock Pad and stone base typically last at least two turf cycles.

With regard to the TURI 2019 case study (Springfield), Warner believes that the report overstated field use and understated the maintenance costs.

David Teter of Teter Consulting spoke about the concerns town residents had about what the synthetic field is made of.

- Teter supplied the Town with a written report of his findings
- He has presented to various Boards and Committees in town, along with a rebuttal report of his findings.
- He is a Civil Engineer from San Francisco
- He is considered an expert in synthetic turf fields
- He has been an advisor of installation of synthetic turf fields in locations of sensitivity. He has provided technical specifications for many projects and has been an expert witness called upon to defend installation of synthetic turf fields.
- He has worked on large projects, including a National Park located in San Francisco.
- Many of the projects he has worked on have not gone as far as the Town of Sharon and its design team has to ensure safety of the synthetic turf field to be installed.
- He believes that the design team hired has done a great job.
- PFAS – it is his professional opinion that there is nothing to be found in the proposed synthetic turf to be installed in Sharon.
- He has tested over 100's of samples and nothing has been found. He believes the science from PEER is bad and incorrect. It is his belief that the proposed synthetic turf is not a source of leachable compounds effecting into the Towns drinking water.
- It is his opinion that installation of a synthetic turf field at the proposed site will have no impact to the lake or surrounding groundwater wells
- It is his opinion that installation of synthetic turf will reduce nutrient load entering into the lake.
- He stated that high levels of fluorine found in SprintTurf and turf from other manufacturers, is not associated with PFAS
- Regarding recycling, many folks do not recycle now
- Key components regarding installation of the synthetic turf (wood infill, sand and shock pad) are all recyclable and reusable
- He does not believe that the carpet is that big of an issue
- He was hired and retained to discuss environmental impact
- He understands that due to the proximity of the wetlands, the burden of proof is on project proponents, and he does not believe that installation of synthetic turf will have any negative impact.
- The project is about the kids, providing playable hours and providing the best possible play surface available.
- He has discovered nothing potentially negative to the environment.
- The Town hired a third party to evaluate his work and found no problems.

Commission member Alan Westman commented on Teter's statement that issues with PFAS are not real and there should not be much concern. Westman has been

hearing lots of feedback from others in Town regarding the dangers of PFAS and was wondering if Teter had data that supported the statements he was making about the safety of the synthetic turf field and PFAS.

Teter responded that he has tested 100's of carpets and that he has found no leachable PFAS. This is of course his opinion. Teter mentioned the report published by PEER, mentioning poor quality control and cross contamination. He is not seeing that. When PFAS are mentioned, Teter noted that Teflon is also included in the list. In Teter's opinion, Teflon is inert and is safe to use. He believes there is no reason for synthetics to release bad compounds in product, the data does not support. Teter noted that the recommendation is not an issue; there are other issues.

Turf is really about the hours of play during wet and cold weather. Issues with synthetic turf are more with crumb rubber infill. If Warner Larson had spec'd out crumb rubber to be used as infill, then of course, would be saying no way. However, what has been proposed, in Teter's opinion, is safe. The consultants the Town have hired have gone above and beyond what typically occurs. Nothing has been detected through sampling. All findings have been presented to the Standing Building Committee.

Wasserman asked for copy of lab results. He asked if the actual carpet proposed for Sharon was tested. Teter responded that he was asked to test three carpets selected by Warner Larsen. Over his career he has been asked to test about 100 carpets. He has not found anything alarming. He understands there are problems with synthetic turf, but it is his belief that PFAS, in relation to synthetic turf fields is a red herring.

Avery expressed her concerns, noting that PFAS is an emerging contaminant. With over 3,000 chemicals, there is currently testing by the EPA for only 30 of the chemicals associated with PFAS. Concern is that as an emergent pollutant, with a wide variety of PFAS associated with synthetic turf, there is only limited testing. Avery proposed the question, "What is the assurance that the other chemicals which have not been tested will not pose problems?"

Steven LaRosa, Hydrogeologist with Weston Sampson has spent his career looking at contaminated waste sites and the redevelopment of such sites. He is considered to be an expert on PFAS and emergent contaminants. He was asked to review the report provided and prepared by Teter Consulting. He agrees with Teter's analysis and conclusions. LaRosa examined in detail lab methods and sampling of the carpet and padding which has been proposed for the site. He explained that he came up with the same general conclusions that Teter had. Of the PFAS that can be identified, he found no concern. He acknowledged however that there were issues with crumb rubber, but the proposal for Sharon's synthetic turf is BrockFill.

With concern of the nearby water supplies, LaRosa looked at potential water runoff which could enter the Town's drinking water supply, (Northwest of the field). As detailed earlier, the proposed design will capture water and run below the field.

Data generated in the 1980's looked at impacts of pumping wells. An earlier report was also commissioned regarding groundwater and Cedar Swamp. The reports have been reviewed and the water flows looked at. LaRosa noted that it is difficult to match up the two reports but the feeling is that it is a low possibility that groundwater from the high school will flow into the drinking water wells, and he does not believe the wells to be at risk. In response to Avery's comment regarding over 3,000 PFAS chemicals, and the process of manufacturing synthetic turf fields, LaRosa explained that Weston and Sampson designs the installation of numerous synthetic turf fields. And in the course of his work, he has spoken to many manufactures who have come up with modifications which address the concerns of PFAS. LaRosa spoke about Teflon and fluorine and agreed with Teter. Numerous studies on fluorine have been conducted and LaRosa noted that fluorine in itself is not associated with PFAS.

Arguimbau asked Commission members if they had any questions.

Geller: Responded that this was the first time the Commission has been presented with an in depth analysis and study of the type of materials to be used in putting in the synthetic turf. He thanked the consultants for their work and thought the presentation was great.

Commission members were asked if they had additional questions.

At the previous hearing, Arguimbau had asked folks to send in comments relating to the proposed synthetic field. The Commission received over 80 letters and emails. Those in favor (22) highlighted the additional need for fields in Sharon, the benefits a synthetic field hold, missed opportunities, and concern about Title 9. Those opposed to a synthetic turf field (60) all mentioned environmental concerns including concern for the lake. Some mentioned safety and others mentioned the costs associated with the project. All of the opponents are advocating for natural grass.

Emails received included those forwarded by Amy Garcia and Jon Hitter on behalf of the School Committee. Arguimbau noted that there is a sense of concern out there. As Avery had indicated earlier, the proposed location of the synthetic turf field and its proximity to the lake and the Town's drinking water is of concern to the Commission.

Arguimbau opened up the discussion to those watching the meeting remotely:

Debbie Tatro, Representing Sustainable Sharon. She noted there was a lot to comment on:

- There are over 4,700 known PFAS. She can't fathom how Teter can claim that none of those are bad. Burden of Proof is on the Manufacturers. There has been much that PFAS has been associated with; cancer, high cholesterol and other diseases.
- Concern of level of zinc leaching from Infill and Shock Pad.

- Sharon Sustainable member Helen Poynton regarding acceptable groundwater standards. She has indicated that 100 parts per billion leach out of the Shock Pad and this is of concern.
- There is concern of overall toxicity.
- Only that which is known can be measured.
- No toxicity test was not done. There is concern about toxins.
- The plastic carpet is not recyclable.
- Concern for the wetlands. Will the grass blades blow into wetlands?
- Wild life and plastic pollution.
- Drinking water, possible toxins going into the groundwater and the lake.

Helen Poynton – Eco toxicologist, PhD from UC Berkley, specializing in emerging contaminants, assess toxicity. Poynton noted that when she first began hearing about PFAS, she was concerned of the number out there and that many were deemed harmful and at low levels. In order to test, sensitive testing is required. She is concerned and would like to see biological assays of the compounds as these give a more holistic picture of all chemicals in combination that could be working synergistically, however, this is not yet in federal guidelines.

Julie Rowe, 101 Hampton Road. She noted that Sustainable Sharon has been proposing grass fields. But there has been no talk of the type of fertilizers that would be required to maintain a natural grass field.

Cheryl Schnitzer and Kathi Mirza met with DPW Superintendent Eric Hooper. His department currently tends to the high school fields. Hooper does not see fertilization as an issue. The grass is fertilized on an as needed basis. According to Schnitzer and Mirza, a natural grass field only requires that which is required by the soil.

Linda Orel, 53 High Street. She thanked the presenters. Her concern regarding artificial turf field is that it weighs over 400 pounds, is located next to wetland's which flow into a globally rare cedar swamp, has the potential to contaminate our natural resources and strongly opposes a synthetic turf field in this location. Her concern is not so much about the PFAS, but that the proposed project, a large artificial development, is located next to a resource area.

David Teter, Teter Consulting

- He noted that the testing Poynton out are correct. What he did for this project was to analyze what leached out and compared that to numerical standards. What should or should not be in product.
- He did chemical tests for project. Have done numerous tests. Have soaked the component in water, tossed in algae, minnows in water, and he has found nothing harmful. Teter explained that those tests he has performed are proprietary. If Town wishes him to redo the tests, he would be happy to comply, however the cost would be substantial.

- Noted that David Warner of Warner Larson spec'd the field and it is as clean as can get with synthetic turf
- Regards to other stuff. There are all kinds of things worse than what we are talking about. What is in the air and environment? This is not good use of community dollars.
- Linda Orel, concern about the lake. Teter explained that his job is to provide framework of risk analysis.
- In big picture, he does not believe it matters. Not getting paid for being here this evening. He is trying to fulfil his duty to the Town and to his client.
- Would like to say, that the folks which have been hired have gone above and beyond what he has ever seen. Questions have been answered and numerous data have been provided. It is his belief that the consultants have done an excellent job.

Judy Crosby, 6 Condor Road, member of school committee, speaking on her behalf spoke about Matt Conway and his role with BC and maintaining fields there. Crosby is concerned that as a member of the school committee, that there is a group opposing the turf fields, but what they are presenting is fairy dust field. In her opinion, the numbers presented in numerous presentations by the architect are based on what a natural grass field will be, not the type of grass field Sustainable Sharon is presenting. She does not believe we are looking at apples to apples. She deferred to Matt Conway and his experience at the cost would be to put in a grass field.

Matt Conway, Sharon Resident, works for BC and maintains their athletic fields. He explained that the challenge with maintaining grass fields, is allowing them time to rest. In Sharon, based on the number of fields we have in town, there is not an opportunity to allow grass fields to rest. That is the conundrum. Conway said he would love a high quality grass field. He wishes he could say, based on amount of field space, we should offer premium grass fields, but based on demand of high school field without the ability to rest the field, having a premium grass field is unattainable. Additionally, he noted, that based on Massachusetts statistics, there is approximately 11 days a month that fields will be unable to be used due to weather conditions. That translates into approximately 130 days a year fields will be unable to be used. Conway believes the Town needs a turf field so as to provide kids the opportunity to use fields regardless of the weather (raining or Snowing). Conway acknowledged that heat is an issue (during the months of June and July), as to discussed earlier but field use during the months of October and November are optimal.

Conway spoke to Tatro's statement regarding the turf blades blowing. He operates two fields at BC, one which abuts a protected wetland and another which is located next to a reservoir. There have never been any problems with blades blowing. He invites anyone to walk the Newton woodlands to find blades of grass which may

have blown into the area due to wind, and they will not find one blade. The blowing of blades does sound plausible, but those blades that do break remain on the turf.

Conway said the Commission should listen to the experts the Town has hired. An architect, a third party reviewer and a second third party reviewer. All three consultants have said the field will be safe. The Town Recreation Department and Town Field committee have all recommended a turf field at this location. If the current grass field was working, there would be no recommendation for a turf field. A natural field needs to rest. As previously discussed, this is not possible.

Conway believes the design for the turf field is excellent. He encourages the turf to be tested, if it does not include PFAS then put the field in. Turf products manufactured today do not have PFAS in them. At one time, yes, synthetic turf fields contained PFAS, however, manufacturers have made strides to eliminate.

He encourages all to walk from goal post to goal post on the current field and tell us the field is safe. New sod can be put in, however, six months from now the field will look like it is today due to the weather and the amount of use between the various sports (football, soccer, lacrosse and field hockey).

Paul Lauenstien, 4 Gavins Pond Road. Began by saying would like to bring to the attention of the Commission the lab report from Franklin. A turf field was tested that had been placed near wetlands. This turf was tested and PFAS were found. Lauenstien is concerned with the installation of a synthetic turf field at the high school. He is concerned about the health of the lake and the Towns wells. He believes a better location for the turf field as at the Middle School.

Arguimbau noted that from the Commission's standpoint, they have been privileged to an extensive amount of information. She asked members if they wished to make a motion on the turf fields or to continue the hearing to May 21st.

Westman indicated that he would be interested in reading the various reports. He also asked Warner about the three products referred to in the sampling reports and if those products are the same as that will be spec'd out.

A Commission member asked if the Standing Building Committee (SBC) had any issues with the three products that were tested. Gladstone, Chair of the SBC, explained that as far as he knows, the three samples which were tested will be the ones which will be spec'd out. He is not sure if the spec will allow for other manufactures to submit bids. Gladstone would like to say, that from all presentations, a synthetic turf field is advantageous and has the clear advantage in number of playable hours which exceeds that of natural grass, but as Teter mentioned in his presentation, this is matter of assumption of risk and what level of risk one is willing to entertain, and for what level of relief in terms of playable hours for the Town.

Warner explained that manufacturers could submit turf products for consideration. He noted that Shaw Industries is not one of the manufacturers which has submitted a bid on the project. Testing was performed on samples of the three manufacturers Whose product was being looked at. If another manufacturer wished to submit a bid, they must meet the chemical testing criteria showing that their product is safe. Alternately, the Town can make proprietary turf product which must be used, thus eliminating others from submitting.

Arguimbau again asked Commission members their thoughts on continuing hearing to May 21st. Wasserman would like to review and digest the information presented this evening and would prefer for the hearing to continue. Others agreed.

Motion: to continue hearing to May 21st.

Cremer, Westman 6-0-1 (motion passes)

Roll call vote was taken: Meredith – Aye; Geller – Yes; Cremer – Aye;

Wasserman – Aye; Barbera – Abstain; Arguimbau – Aye; Westman - Aye

Meeting on May 21st will begin at 7:30pm. Arguimbau thanked those who submitted comments. All comments received will be available for Commission members to review. She asked folks to continue to send in comments.

Motion: to adjourn

Cremer, Barbera 7-0-0 (motion passes)

Roll call vote: Meredith – Aye; Geller – Aye; Cremer – Aye

Wasserman – Aye; Arguimbau – Aye; Westman - Aye

Meeting adjourned at 10:33pm