

Expert Presentations

Sullivan, Joseph <JSullivan@chacompanies.com>

Thu 2/18/2021 5:29 PM

To: Adam Turner <turner@mvcommission.org>; Alex Elvin <elvin@mvcommission.org>;

Cc: Richie Smith <rsmith@mvyys.org>; Matthew D'Andrea <mdandrea@mvyys.org>; Kimberly Kirk <mvmiddlesexcountry@gmail.com>;

Dear Adam and Alex,

I have reviewed the presentations provided by the Field Fund and Amanda Faber with my client (MVRHS). Given that they are intended for discussion this evening with the MVC, we would like to record our objection in advance of the hearing.

Specifically, I would like to put our objection on record to the following information contained within their presentations as they include statements, details and products that are not proposed and/or not pertinent to our application. These statements, details and references to products we are **NOT** proposing are intentionally misleading and should not be allowed to be part of the public record. Further much of the presentation provided by Amanda Farber is redundant to that provided by the Field Fund. It was my understanding that redundant presentations would not be allowed by the hearing officer. We would further request that this objection be read into the record in advance of the presentations proposed this evening by both parties. Please also make this email part of the MVRHS DRI public record. The following is a list of the slides to which we object.

FIELD FUND PRESENTATION:

1. Slide #15: The image of the "Synthetic System" shows SBR Crumb rubber infill. We are not proposing the use of crumb rubber infill at MVRHS.
2. Slide #22: We have responded in writing to the claim that "usage numbers were not accurate" on 12/28/21. Mark McCarthy (MVRHS Athletic Director) has confirmed the usage numbers and answered Mr. Bennett's questions.
3. Slide #26: The life cycle analysis used is for single use plastic bottles. This is not representative of the proposed products.
4. Slide #28: Photo show black SBR crumb rubber. We are not proposing the use of SBR crumb rubber at MVRHS.
5. Slide #29: Photo show black SBR crumb rubber. We are not proposing the use of SBR crumb rubber at MVRHS.
6. Slide #30: Photo show black SBR crumb rubber. We are not proposing the use of SBR crumb rubber at MVRHS. Also, please identify the fiber manufacturer in the photo provided and provide the source of your documentation.
7. Slide #31: The fiber shown is known as slit film fiber. We are not proposing the use of slit film fiber at MVRHS. Also, please identify the fiber manufacturer in the photo provided and provide the source of your documentation.
8. Slide #32: Please identify the fiber manufacturer in the photo provided and provide the source of your documentation.
9. Slide #33: Please identify the fiber manufacturer in the photo provided and provide the source of your documentation.

10. Slide #34: This photo shows SBR crumb rubber and a polyurethane backing. We are not proposing the use of those products at MVRHS.
11. Slide #35: Please identify the turf manufacturer in the photo provided and provide the source of your documentation.
12. Slide #36: Please identify the turf manufacturer in the photo provided and provide the source of your documentation.
13. Slide #37: This photo shows SBR crumb rubber and a polyurethane backing. We are not proposing the use of those products at MVRHS.
14. Slide #38: Please identify the turf manufacturer in the photo provided and provide the source of your documentation.
15. Slide #42, 43 & 44: The turf products that are highlighted in this article are not being proposed at MVRHS. We should be discussing toxicology results completed by TetraTech on the proposed products.
16. Slide #45: Provide documentation to the claim that the EPA, CPSC, Mount Sinai Children's Environmental Health Center have reviewed the products proposed for use at MVRHS.
17. Slide #46: This application does not include the use of cork or SBR crumb rubber infill.
18. Slide #47 & 48: This application does not include the use of SBR crumb rubber, or "tire dust" as insinuated by the text.
19. Slide #49: Liberty Tire Recycling image: We are not proposing the use of Liberty Tire products or SBR crumb rubber at MVRHS.
20. Slide #50: This drainage detail does not relate to the plans, details or specifications of our project. There is no location on our proposed plan where this condition could exist.
21. Slide #51: This field was not designed by Huntress Associates, and the products used are not the same as those proposed in our application. Also, please identify the turf manufacturer in the reference provided and provide the source of your documentation.
22. Slide #52: We are not proposing the use of this disinfectant product at MVRHS.
23. Slide #53: We have specifically stated that we are not proposing broadcast disinfectant or "fogging" of the field at MVRHS.
24. Slide #54: We spoke with Colin Veditz of Tencate. Mr. Veditz stated that the individual who contacted him expressed a desire to install a new field and did not disclose the location. Once he understood the project in question was on MV and within a Zone II Aquifer protection district stated he would not recommend the use of MPerial or similar disinfectants. Mr. Veditz has offered to speak directly to the MVC should they have further questions.
25. Slide #57 & 58: The image in question shows the burning of SBR crumb rubber. We are not proposing the use of SBR crumb rubber at MVRHS.
26. Slide #59: The press release in question is dated 2014, and not from the proposed manufacturer we intend to use at MVRHS.
27. Slide #63: & 64: Synthetic Turf Fields designed for the NFL are very different from Synthetic turf fields for HS students. The NFL intentionally requires the GMax of their turf fields to be very high (too firm) to create a faster game. We are not proposing the same specification at MVRHS that would be required by the NFL.
28. Slide #66 & 67: We have repeatedly answered questions about costs and funding. The applicant has requested the MVC place a condition on the project that the construction be privately funded.
29. Slide #68. We agree, all fields require maintenance.
30. Slide #70: The MVRHS staff is available to answer questions regarding Title IX. There is no "void". The MVRHS has agreed to remove the old track within five years. Phase one does NOT propose to clear any trees.
31. Slide #72: This plan provided significant improvements to vehicular and pedestrian circulation at the MVRHS campus.

32. Slide #76: This slides shows a field that was in the process of installation when it was struck by a microburst. The turf had not yet been secured to the field edges.
33. Slide #77: We are not proposing the use of a coconut/cork infill as referenced in their slides.
34. Slide #78 & 79: Please provide the documentation and backup of the reading taken.
35. Slide #82: We agree, and we are proposing that 80% of the fields at MVRHS be natural grass.

AMANDA FARBER PRESENTATION

Overall, this presentation is undocumented, vague and intentionally misleading. We request that it be removed from the public record.

1. Slide #1: None of the products shown are proposed for use at MVRHS. Please provide a location and documentation for the factory photo provided. I do not believe that is a turf manufacturing facility.
2. Slide #2: None of the products shown are being proposed at MVRHS. These same images and articles were presented in the Field Fund Presentation. They are inaccurate, misleading and redundant.
3. Slide #3: This slide shows SBR crumb rubber and turf with polyurethane backing. Neither of these products are being proposed at MVRHS.
4. Slide #4: Christian Huntress has provided a written response to this matter. Please refer to Letter to Alex Elvin, dated February 10, 2021.
5. Slide #5: This field contains SBR rubber, which is not being proposed. Please provide the field location, turf manufacturer and document the source of your information.
6. Slide #6: Products by Field Turf and Target Technologies are not being proposed at MVRHS.
7. Slide #7 & 8: The turf in the photos has polyurethane backing and SBR crumb rubber infill, neither of which are being proposed at MVRHS.
8. Slide #9: Please provide a location reference and identify the turf products and manufacturers products shown in the photo. Please provide documentation the source of information.
9. Slide #10: The products shown in the photos are not proposed at MVRHS. WE have answered over 200 questions. Please be specific about which questions still need to be answered.

Thank you for your immediate attention to this matter. I am available to discuss this prior to tonight's hearing at your convenience.

Sincerely

Joe Sullivan, Owner's Project Manager
Daedalus Projects, Inc.