

**TOWN COUNCIL MEETING: JANUARY 17, 2024 CIP WORKSHOP**

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

First Name	Last Name	Street Address	Comments: Per Council rules and procedures, please limit comments to what can reasonably be read to the meeting record in three (3) minutes or less. Please be mindful that this form is for public comment only. Please direct questions/general inquiries to Council members directly.
Erica	Thrall	10 Abbey Road	In support of NOT adding artificial turf to the high school fields, please consider: Glastonbury is already ranked #1 in CT for athletics and #2 nationwide in over 10,700 schools. Studies show turf increases the risk of injury for our students. • The artificial turf fields are made up of 40,000 pounds of PFAS-containing plastic. Because they are non-recyclable, they are sent to landfills or dumped. Turf field layers are bonded together which means they are not recyclable. This goes directly against the town's sustainable purchasing policy agreement. • Plastic is made from fossil fuels, the fabrication of which contributes to greenhouse gases. • Fields have a very short span of utility of only 8 – 10 years before needing replacement. • It is fiscally irresponsible to spend 1.5 million dollars per field. Raking and maintenance equipment runs anywhere up to \$85,000 and turf field surfaces need replacing every 8-10 years at a cost of about \$800,000 each time. If these two new fields are approved, that means the town will be maintaining and resurfacing three. • AT fields off-gas greenhouse gases. • AT fields degrade and generate microplastics that are released into the environment. • AT fields have many other toxins that are released into our waterways too. • You support the use of natural grass fields. The town should invest this money in upgrading the grass fields that we already have. They can add lights to existing fields to expand playing time. • Injury rates are higher on AT. Professional sports institutions are becoming more and more vocal about removing artificial turf fields and reinstalling natural grass fields. • AT fields are not environmentally sustainable.
Christina	Mukon	4 Candlewood road	To members of the board of education, My name is Dr. Christina Mukon and I work in both mental health and public health. I am writing you regarding the consideration of adding Astroturf fields in Glastonbury. I am firmly against these fields being installed in Glastonbury. In the midst of both an environmental crisis and a mental health crisis, these fields are sending Glastonbury in the wrong direction. The Astroturf fields are massively harmful to the environment for decades even after removal and send the message that we do not use our resources in a sustainable way. They are linked with numerous health concerns. The plastics enter both the soil and the water supply. Please see the CDC's and the EPA's information regarding PFAS for additional information on the harmful effects of these substances and the long-term impacts. ( <a href="https://www.cdc.gov/biomonitoring/PFAS_FactSheet.html">https://www.cdc.gov/biomonitoring/PFAS_FactSheet.html</a> , <a href="https://www.epa.gov/pfas/meaningful-and-achievable-steps-you-can-take-reduce-your-risk">https://www.epa.gov/pfas/meaningful-and-achievable-steps-you-can-take-reduce-your-risk</a> ) Additionally, we are currently in the midst of a pediatric mental health crisis that has been worsened by the pandemic and the resulting changes in our society. Not only does the installation of these fields send the message that adults do not care about the climate anxiety that is present in future generations, it is also a misappropriation of resources that could be used more meaningfully to improve mental health. Thank you for your consideration. Dr. Christina Mukon
Denise	M Weeks	334 Hollister Way W	Re: Proposed Synthetic Turf I wish to express my concern regarding the proposed CIP plan to move ahead with a new artificial turf field. Considering the multitude of environmental impacts that new artificial turf fields present and the town's stated commitment to sustainable practices, the adverse impacts of artificial turf on athletes' health, and the availability of sustainable alternatives, this project should not go forward.

Debbie	Hickey	Chestnut Hill Road	<p>Regarding the animal control shelter that was approved last year, I strongly support the need for a new shelter that is desperately needed as soon as possible. I do not support spending the current budget to renovate the old shelter that is poorly designed. The shelter animals and taxpayers deserve a new modern, energy efficient animal shelter in the Town of Glastonbury. A suggestion, moving the new shelter further up and not set so far back will support the need to possibly expand in the future with plenty of space and will not delay the start of construction.</p>
Karen	Fecko	24 VISTA LN	<p>I'm proud to live in one of only 12 communities in CT that has been awarded a silver medal for its climate leadership by Sustainable CT. Thanks to the work of our town officials and our residents, Glastonbury has held this honor since 2018 because of its efforts at reducing "harmful greenhouse gas emissions and preparing [ ]for the impacts of climate change, while saving money, improving public health, and building community." And for that reason, I'm mystified that our town is considering the purchase of two turf fields at the high school. Where does installation of 80,000 pounds of non-recyclable plastic on two athletic fields fit into reducing greenhouse gas, and where does this proposal fit into saving money? More importantly, having our children and others play on turf fields containing forever chemicals won't improve their health. Glastonbury's athletic programs are known far and wide for their excellence. That notoriety is the result of our students' hard work and dedication, and of the parents, coaches, and administrators who support them. These programs have achieved this excellence without turf fields. If this were a referendum issue, I wouldn't hesitate to vote no. I urge you to do the same.</p>
Brenda	Sullivan	49 Thompson Street	<p>by Brenda J. Sullivan 49 Thompson Street South Glastonbury</p> <p>Esteemed Members, I want to comment on the environmental and health impacts of artificial turf, urging a re-evaluation of its use in our community. The perceived playtime benefits are overshadowed by significant financial and ecological costs. Turf, a plastic carpet, damages the soil, halting natural processes and decreasing rainwater absorption, escalating flood risks. Chemical runoff from turf, carrying PFAS and heavy metals, threatens aquatic ecosystems, and our wells, counteracting government efforts to remediate such contaminants, as seen in Connecticut's new PFAS remediation effort in Public Act 23-74. It doesn't make sense that our Town would spend public funds to perpetuate a problem the State is trying to fund to repair. Our town values green initiatives: hence, supporting artificial turf contradicts our environmental stewardship and financial prudence. Natural field maintenance, as recommended by TURI UMASS, offers a sustainable, cost-effective alternative, promoting sports and health without the detrimental impact of turf. Also, recycling claims by turf companies are false and such claims are being litigated. Used turf in the U.S. always ends up in landfills. Let's choose actions that align with our commitment to environmental and fiscal responsibility. I urge the Council and Board of Ed to consider the long-term implications of artificial turf installation. Please see attached resources detailing my summary. Thank you for considering the broader impact of turf on the environment and our community. Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://www.cga.ct.gov/2023/ACT/PA/PDF/2023PA-00074-R00SB-00100-PA.PDF">https://www.cga.ct.gov/2023/ACT/PA/PDF/2023PA-00074-R00SB-00100-PA.PDF</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://peer.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/3_7_22-Filed-FTC-Complaint-2.28.22.pdf">https://peer.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/3_7_22-Filed-FTC-Complaint-2.28.22.pdf</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://peer.org/false-artificial-turf-recycling-claims-ripped/">https://peer.org/false-artificial-turf-recycling-claims-ripped/</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://www.turi.org/content/download/10395/173557/file/Cost%20Artificial%20Turf.%20Se">https://www.turi.org/content/download/10395/173557/file/Cost%20Artificial%20Turf.%20Se</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://www.turi.org/var/plain_site/storage/origin">https://www.turi.org/var/plain_site/storage/origin</a></li> </ul>

Lisa	Mendum	45 Candlewood Road	<p>Regarding the request to fund 2 more turf fields, Glastonbury holds Silver Status in Climate Leadership. We also have a Sustainable Purchasing Policy. More artificial turf does not align with our towns values. Our district ALREADY holds a hard-earned title of 1st in CT and 2nd nationwide for sports. Here are some suggestions of how to spend \$3m instead. Invest in curriculum less dependent on YouTube. Kids signing acceptable use agreements for ipads does not safeguard them against rabbit holes. Having school ipads at home needs more parental oversight and does not foster independence or trust. The rates of tech-related mental/emotional health issues in kids are on the rise. Effects to brain development, dopamine response and addiction are also coming to light. Installing structures/screens/trees at school/town buildings to help regulate temperatures and lengthen the life of HVAC equipment was part of a bill proposed last legislative session to help combat new-normal higher temperatures/costs Electric school buses won't be an easy switch but can any of our older fleet be swapped for something cleaner? Any pollution reduction benefits everyone. Food surplus/waste collection in schools. Surplus can be donated to those in need and waste can be collected for biofuel then turned into compost like neighboring school districts. We send ~82 tons of food a year on a 700 mile train ride to a Ohio landfill ignoring how these actions affect others. We have to own our contribution to climate impact. From a social injustice perspective this often affects vulnerable people the most. Endocrine disruptors, pollutants and environmental toxicants are contributing to MANY health issues in children. They are also off-gassed from artificial turf. Another reason we should not be installing more. Can we further enhance our curriculum to help farmers research new methods? Agriculture represent \$0.6 billion dollars to CT. UCONN are changing the face of agriculture. Our schools can be part of that too.</p>
WILLIAM	MARUT	264 CARRIAGE DRIVE	<p>PARAGRAPH 1: The purpose of this statement is to recommend AGAINST future implementation of synthetic turf playing fields. PARAGRAPH 2: On February 24, 2023, Glastonbury Public Schools published a 10-page report on "Turf Field Background Information." After analysis in the following areas, it comes down in favor of artificial turf playing fields: Injuries (with 6 references); Heat-related illnesses (with 1 reference); Turf Burns (with 1 reference); Environmental Damage (with 5 references); Cancer-causing Chemicals (with 7 references); Off-gassing of Volatile Organic Compounds (with 2 references); and What Other Towns in Connecticut are Doing (with 12 references). PARAGRAPH 3: On the other side, Glastonbury TALK (Truth in Action with Love and Kindness) published a 10-page report called "2023 Glastonbury Artificial Turf Concerns," which comes down against artificial turf playing fields. It has sections on Risk of Injury (with 3 references); Environmental Issues (with 13 references); Health Issues (with 5 references); Synthetic Turf Field Composition (with 1 reference); and a Conclusion (with 6 references). PARAGRAPH 4: With all this "point-counterpoint" research available, how can the Town Council decide which side to come down on? As long as "the jury is still out" on synthetic turf, my recommendation is to eschew the more controversial, higher risk, and less well-understood solution of artificial turf, and move forward with the less controversial, lower risk, and more well-understood solution of natural turf.</p>
David	Kuzmak	20 Tryon Farm Road	<p>The Buffalo Bills Have played on artificial turf since 1973. In their new stadium, set to open in 2026, they will play on natural grass. So we have a proposal to do the opposite of a very successful NFL franchise. Really?</p>
Melinda	Kuzmak	265 TRYON ST	<p>Please stay with natural grass on the athletic fields. The initial expense, replacement cost (lifespan is approximately 8-10 years) and maintenance will exceed the cost of maintaining grass. Injuries to our young athletes are far more like to occur which could permanently affect their ability to play in future years. By the way, on a 90 degree day artificial turf can reach 165 degrees.</p>

---

Joan

Brown

119 South Mill  
Drive

Dear Town Council members. I am against town funding for artificial turf fields currently under consideration. The environmental, safety and health concerns, in my consideration, overrule the benefits of the turf fields. The PFAs-containing plastics cause long-term health concerns, use fossil fuels and conflicts with the town's sustainable purchasing policy agreement. As an aside, I believe injury rates are higher on this type of field. And I'm not sure what the educational benefits are for this. Bottomline, I do not support funding artificial fields. Thank you.

---