

Turf Field Bonding Proposal

Overview

April 11, 2023

Board of Finance Meeting

Turf Field Bonding Proposal

- **Proposal**

- *255' x 405' coconut husk infill turf field*
- *Minimal disruption to Allen's Meadow-no asphalt, no additional fencing*
- *Overview of Allen's Meadow with the turf field here:*
 - [https://www.wiltonct.org/sites/g/files/vyhlf4046/f/agendas/allens_meadow - preliminary schematic design-overview c-1.0.pdf](https://www.wiltonct.org/sites/g/files/vyhlf4046/f/agendas/allens_meadow_-_preliminary_schematic_design-overview_c-1.0.pdf)
- *Close up View of the turf field here:*
 - https://www.wiltonct.org/sites/g/files/vyhlf4046/f/agendas/allens_preliminary_schematic_design_enlargedc-1.1.pdf

Turf Field Bonding Proposal

- **Need**

- *A grass fields doesn't equal the number of hours of playing time of a turf field*
 - Can't play in wet conditions. See photo of wet Allen's https://www.wiltonct.org/sites/g/files/vyhli4046/f/agendas/turf_field_images-allens_march_2023.pdf
 - Our grass fields are overplayed and need to be rested
- *To equal turf in quality, a grass field needs over \$100,000 per year in annual maintenance and must have an irrigation system and longer rest periods*
 - Most of our fields aren't irrigated. See photo of Guy Whitten field https://www.wiltonct.org/sites/g/files/vyhli4046/f/agendas/turf_field_images-guy_whitten-4-10-23.pdf
- *The two current turf fields are not sufficient to meet resident demand for turf*
 - Demonstrated lack of field availability https://www.wiltonct.org/sites/g/files/vyhli4046/f/agendas/turf_field_usage-late_apr-early_maywebsite.pdf
- *High level of youth sports participants*
 - 750+ Wilton Youth Football and Cheer participants
 - 275+ Wilton Youth Field Hockey participants
 - 600+ Wilton Youth Lacrosse Association participants
 - 1,000+ Wilton Soccer Association participants

(https://www.wiltonct.org/sites/g/files/vyhli4046/f/agendas/wilton_youth_sports-documentation_of_need_apr_10_letter.pdf)

Turf Field Bonding Proposal

- **Lease Status**

- *Received a request to reconsider decision by a resident and/or environmental group.*
- *On April 4th, CTDOT advised lease terms were confirmed. To be sent this week*
- *15-year lease with all requested changes to the existing lease*

- **Environmental Review**

- *Reviewed twice by State-original Wilton request and recent appeal*
- *Turf manufacturer representation of no PFAS Chemicals*
(https://www.wiltonct.org/sites/g/files/vyhli4046/f/agendas/shaw_turf_pfasletter.pdf)
- *PFAS testing of water directly from Lilly and Stadium discharge pipe was non detectible* (<https://www.wiltonct.org/home/news/results-turf-field-and-watershed-water-sample-testing-pfas-chemicals>)
- *No liability associated with PFAS per Town Attorney Nick Bamonte* (see Appendix)
- *Coconut husk infill does not create heat. Crumb rubber infill creates heat. Wilton doesn't allow crumb rubber infill*
- *Turf field with coconut husk infill does not need watering. Aquarion to include Wilton as a community with watering restrictions beginning in 2024*

Turf Field Bonding Proposal

Environmental Review, cont.

- *CT DPH Website*

The possibility that artificial turf fields may contain PFAS is an area of active research. Concerns were first raised in 2019 after a number of media outlets reported that testing by nonprofit organizations had identified low levels of PFAS in several artificial turf fields located in Massachusetts. However, because the PFAS concentrations detected in the Massachusetts fields are within the range of “background” PFAS concentrations detected in soils (collected from pristine remote areas) and in surface waters (collected near urban areas) as a result of atmospheric deposition, it is impossible to determine whether the PFAS originated from the turf or from other sources such as atmospheric deposition.

PFAS are used in the production of plastic, rubber, and resin, and as processing aids to improve plastic extrusion; many of the components used to manufacture artificial turf fields. Thus, additional investigation is required to determine if PFAS are present in artificial turf fields, and more importantly, if present, are PFAS released from the fields in sufficient quantities to pose a risk to public health or the environment?

To date, research on this topic is limited to a single, peer-reviewed study (Lauria et. al. 2022). Results of this study, conducted by researchers from public health departments and universities in Sweden and Canada, indicate that the fluorinated substances (fluoropolymers) measured in the artificial turf fields appear to be bound to the components of the artificial turf and do not leach into the environment. Further, they are not the type of fluorinated chemicals that transform in the environment into harmful PFAS. For all these reasons, this peer-reviewed study shows that the presence of fluorinated substances in artificial turf fields does not pose an exposure concern to users of the fields.

Turf Field Bonding Proposal

- **Cost and Funding**

		WARF	BOND
Cost of Turf Field-current \$	\$1,822,527		
Cost Escalation-1 yr @6%	\$109,352		
Contingency @ 10%	\$182,253		
	\$2,114,131	\$180,000	\$1,934,131
Possible Seasonal Bubble Infrastructure	\$ 320,000	\$ 320,000	
		\$500,000	\$1,934,131
Rounded			\$1,950,000

- *If the contingency is not required, the Town's bonding will be reduced to as low as \$1.752 million*
- *The contribution of at least \$180,000 from WARF towards the turf field is fixed. If the cost of the possible seasonal bubble infrastructure is less than \$320,000 that savings will be allocated to the cost of the turf field and reduce the Town's bonding.*
- *Detailed Cost: https://www.wiltonct.org/sites/g/files/vyhlij4046/f/agendas/proposed_turf-cost-funding-4-10-23.pdf*

Turf Field Bonding Proposal

Impact on Debt Service

Budget Year	Debt Service	Mill Rate Impact*	Mill Rate Incr % Impact*
2024	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2025	\$ 135,000	\$ 0.07	0.12%
2026	\$ 257,725	\$ 0.098	0.22%
*Based on Current Mill Rate Calculation			

Annual Maintenance Grass at Allen's Maintained at Turf Quality vs. Turf

	Grass-Equiv Quality to Turf*	Turf	Difference
Labor Field Grooming		\$ 1,120	\$ 1,120
Labor Mowing	\$ 3,360		\$ (3,360)
Fertilization/Herbicide	\$ 4,600		\$ (4,600)
Sodding	\$ 78,400		\$ (78,400)
Top Dressing	\$ 3,000		\$ (3,000)
Irrigation Servicing	\$ 2,000		\$ (2,000)
Water Cost	\$ 8,000		\$ (8,000)
Labor Overseeding	\$ 210		\$ (210)
Labor Aeration	\$ 350		\$ (350)
Field Line Painting	\$ 4,480		\$ (4,480)
Synthetic Turf Repairs		\$ 500	\$ 500
Additional Infill		\$ 7,000	\$ 7,000
Annual Operating Expenses	\$ 104,400	\$ 8,620	\$ (95,780)
Avg. Annual Debt Service		\$230,750	\$230,750
Net Difference-existing grass	\$ 104,400	\$ 239,370	\$ 134,970
* Existing irrigation			

Appendix

- **April 3rd BOS Minutes**

Mr. Bamonte reviewed the status of the law in regards to PFAS and how that relates, if at all, to the liability of the Town. He stated there is no cause for concern from a liability standpoint,

- The Advisory does not create any liability on the part of the Town for PFAS that may or may not exist in private wells.
- Causation is required for liability. The Town's voluntary testing of the water from the discharge pipes from the Town's two turf fields showed no detect, which shows no causation. There is no liability, even if future laws are passed for the advisory levels.
- There are no Connecticut laws or regulations related to PFAS, except for packaging materials.

Mr. Nabulsi asked about the possible risks of a future law related to turf fields being retroactive. Mr. Bamonte responded you can't apply a law retroactively. He could not address the legality should the Legislature adopt a bill with retroactive provisions. During his years of representing municipalities, he had not seen it done.