



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Stevens Field Turf replacement

1 message

Michael W. Lembo <mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
To: Antoinette Kelly <Akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:10 AM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com>
Date: June 17, 2020 at 13:23:47 EDT
To: mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us
Subject: Re: Stevens Field Turf replacement

I sen too fastI wanted to add:

Best regards,

Lee

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
[96 Evesboro Lane](#)
[Freehold, NJ 07728](#)

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

On Wed, Jun 17, 2020 at 1:20 PM Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Lembo,

I hope this note finds your family, you and all with the Ridgewood Board of Education staying well during these trying days.

I am the New Jersey representative of Shaw Sports Turf. Shaw as you may know is one of the prominent manufacturers of synthetic turf in North America, a division of Shaw Industries the world's largest carpet company and a Berkshire Hathaway Company. We were one of the companies under consideration for the Stevens Field replacement project that the board awarded on Monday night to one of our competitors. I do want to first thank the Ridgewood Board and administration for any and all consideration that was given to Shaw Sports Turf.

With that, I did listen to that meeting and discussion about the turf proposal and options. I found the process leading up to your award and some of the information provided of "concern" for lack of a better term. With all due respect to Dr. Fishbein as I know buying turf is unique and something that does not happen everyday, I found some of his comments about the process and turf product comparisons to be "not factual". The information about the products being offered seemed very limited in comparison to the significant financial investment being made. The information about the two systems being compared seemed cryptic at best and with that, I do not know how the board was able to make an informed decision. I did feel it was important to follow up with the board to at the very least, provide the correct product information for what Shaw Sports Turf is recommending. (and also what we were asked to provide)

With regard to the "bidding" process, while using a "Coop" program to procure turf is typically more open than a standard bid, if more than one company is being considered, there almost always are guidelines set for each company to follow up to full blown specifications. While we were asked to provide a certain system, specific product minimums and maximums were not requested. (For example, I heard weight mentioned, so if there was a specific desire for this, it could have been translated to all bidders). In Shaw and Fieldturf you have companies with differing philosophies of building a turf system....we believe in a heavy backing and high fiber weight..so a heavier denser system. Your kids play on the fiber, that's what wears out, so put more of it in the system. Our competitor is more infill driven ..they like lighter turf and more infill. The problem with that is, the weight comes in a large part from sand which will compact over time and yes, the shock absorbency reduces over time (called "gmax". It gets higher). With a higher fiber system, you typically can not get as much infill by weight in the turf, but the system as a whole provides a longer lasting, safer system in our opinion...and most of the turf industry and testing agree with this. For the so called "heavier infill" system..the issue in addition to less fiber is that structurally the system will break down faster and you end up having infill all over the field (remember Maple Park when it got older). The safety in the system is driven by the amount of rubber ..you need at least 3 pounds per foot to provide the shock protection needed..then you tune with sand from there. We were never made aware of what type(style) of turf system our competitor was proposing, so we had no way of knowing if we were bidding "apples to apples"

There is a sentiment I heard that heavier infill will be better for a field that may flood. Not true, even with the philosophy differences, we are not talking about a huge difference in infill weights. And we have found that a stronger, heavier backing is a better deterrent to a field moving than infill weight. The bottom line is, we can make our system heavier and would consider it if a quantity was provided..it was not and we will always take the side of long term shock absorbency and safety over anything else. As I explained to Keith Cook, it is very difficult to compare turf systems, especially when we are asked for our recommendation. Other comparison questions do come up in these "open" situations ..one big consideration is infill..with replacements, some are reusing a portion of the existing infill. We have proposed all new. Does the other proposal have all new? Or are they reusing any of the existing. They may not be, but it's important to know when evaluating proposals and what the pricing includes.

Also with regard to the process. Dr. Fishbein mentioned that the turf vendors were reaching out all weekend and lowering our price and that this also happened last year. I can only speak for Shaw Sports Turf and in our case, this did not happen. We were asked by your athletic director to provide a proposal on certain turf and infill options. These were for a standard rubber system, a top "cooling" top layer and then one we proposed for the entire infill to be green rubber/sand. Keith then reached out to us to provide a "best and final", which we did our best to provide any savings we could. We provided this on 6/12 with a recommendation to not do a top layer option and that if not regular black rubber, then go all green

rubber (or full depth of any cooling option over a top layer). Mr. Cook reached out again on Sunday 6/14 requesting an additional price for a higher pile height turf. With the price difference being a small amount, as a good faith gesture, we made no changes to our pricing. We have provided the best possible pricing we could for the systems provided. We were not made aware of our competitors pricing, so why would we reach out to voluntarily lower our price? (I did find it interesting that the turf resolution first said Shaw Sports Turf at \$584K, then it changed to Field turf at \$592K and then at the meeting it was Fieldturf at 579K) Reference was made of this last year as well...again, as far as Shaw was concerned, this did not happen. We priced the systems we were requested to price and addressed a few questions that were asked. In fact, after spending significant time on the requested proposal and follow up questions, we never even got the courtesy call informing us that we were not awarded the project or of any result.

With regard to the actual turf systems that were being compared:

-It was stated that our competitor has a heavier product. This can only be referring to the infill weight they proposed (which was not disclosed). For the turf portion, Shaw Sports Turf typically is heavier in fiber and backing. We coat the entire backing which will provide you best resistance to the turf wrinkling should water hit it. The infill weight has to be balanced to provide a safe system for the life of the turf.

-a question was asked if one system would have a better Gmax. It is our opinion that the infill ratio proposed by Shaw (same as Maple Park) would provide a better long term shock absorbency.

-from the discussion and pricing in the resolutions, the two systems being compared was a Fieldturf system with black rubber and a top layer called 'CoolPlay'. It can only provide cooling due to its lighter color the same as green rubber does. (the best cooling comes from infills that absorb moisture. Neither of these do, but will provide a cooler surface than just black rubber)

The Shaw system recommended was a full depth green rubber (as opposed to just a top layer). While we provided a price for it, I advised Mr. Cook that any cooling solution used as a top layer, will start getting mixed in with the black as soon as the field is used and maintenance is performed. In the case of "Coolplay" being a light material, it can also migrate off the top. We advised that although it is a higher price than going with just a top layer, all green/sand will not have the problem of mixing in with the black...it will remain consistent throughout. (recent projects to use green rubber are Scotch Plains HS (2 fields); Monroe Woodbury HS (3 fields) and Morristown Beard School.) It was stated that our proposed system also (compared with Fieldturf) contained black rubber. To be clear, the system we recommended and the \$584K in the initial resolution was based on was black rubber that is 100% coated green.

-So based on the above system comparisons and pricing, you awarded to Fieldturf at an amount of \$579K for a turf system with black rubber and just a top layer, when for \$5,000 dollars more, you could have had a Shaw system with all green cooling rubber...not just a top layer. From what I heard, this information and comparison was not provided to the board. (and a question if the \$579 price includes reusing any of the existing rubber. It may not, but it is information that you may want to get)

-A question was asked if one system was better environmentally. While Shaw has no issues with approved black rubber, it still contains PAH's and other chemicals. One advantage of rubber sealed with a green coating in addition to cooling is that it "seals" the rubber, limits "off gassing" and locks in the items some are concerned about. If it migrates to a waterway, the coated rubber is considered better for the environment.

My apologies for this being so lengthy. As the project was awarded to our competitor, I do not know if the more specific information I have provided along with clearing up the inaccuracies will change anything. However, I did feel it was important to get on the record and present the product information along with how the process actually happened.

Thanks again for to your Board and administration for considering Shaw Sports Turf once again.

LEE DEFREITAS

**TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF**

96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

Privileged and/or confidential information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or are not responsible for delivery of this message to that person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone. In such case, you should destroy this message and notify the sender by reply e-mail.

If you or your employer do not consent to Internet e-mail for messages of this kind, please advise the sender.

Shaw Industries does not provide or endorse any opinions, conclusions or other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of the company or its subsidiaries.

**THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL
AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).**

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Stevens Field Turf replacement

1 message

Michael W. Lembo <mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
To: Antoinette Kelly <Akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:10 AM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com>
Date: June 17, 2020 at 17:25:42 EDT
To: mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us
Cc: sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
Subject: Re: Stevens Field Turf replacement

Dear Ridgewood Board of Education,

I respectfully need to stand corrected and amend a statement made in my earlier email .

On review , I did reach out to your administration at or close to award of that turf project . I did want to make sure we were being compared with regard to price , make sure our correct products had been considered and to inform that under the Coop there was latitude to discuss pricing (not that we had latitude but of there was a product of interest it could be discussed) . I did receive a call from Ms. Kelley and did provide additional pricing that she requested then . It certainly was not a case of throwing new prices up over the fence , but more time make sure if price was a factor , we had the correct products priced for consideration .And we typically do not provide new pricing unless requested which was the case then. There was also some last questions about our intended infill ratio. As you see from the process you just went through , trying to get these turf systems to line up for comparison can be difficult.

It was from point we did not hear anything and assumed the project was awarded to a competitor .

I apologize for any confusion caused or misrepresentation . I do hope the information provided was helpful , especially the difference between a top layer only and our recommendation to do the cooling solution full depth . There no doubt seems to be an issue of infill weight as well. I did my best in my email to explain our opinion with this and impact long term to the safety of the system . (just as we did last year) . It is difficult to go back once the Gmax of a turf field climes higher. Grooming will only do so much..and why balance is so important .

Thanks again

Lee

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

On Jun 17, 2020, at 1:20 PM, Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Lembo,

I hope this note finds your family, you and all with the Ridgewood Board of Education staying well during these trying days.

I am the New Jersey representative of Shaw Sports Turf. Shaw as you may know is one of the prominent manufacturers of synthetic turf in North America, a division of Shaw Industries the world's largest carpet company and a Berkshire Hathaway Company. We were one of the companies under consideration for the Stevens Field replacement project that the board awarded on Monday night to one of our competitors. I do want to first thank the Ridgewood Board and administration for any and all consideration that was given to Shaw Sports Turf.

With that, I did listen to that meeting and discussion about the turf proposal and options. I found the process leading up to your award and some of the information provided of "concern" for lack of a better term. With all due respect to Dr. Fishbein as I know buying turf is unique and something that does not happen everyday, I found some of his comments about the process and turf product comparisons to be "not factual". The information about the products being offered seemed very limited in comparison to the significant financial investment being made. The information about the two systems being compared seemed cryptic at best and with that, I do not know how the board was able to make an informed decision. I did feel it was important to follow up with the board to at the very least, provide the correct product information for what Shaw Sports Turf is recommending. (and also what we were asked to provide)

With regard to the "bidding" process, while using a "Coop" program to procure turf is typically more open than a standard bid, if more than one company is being considered, there almost always are guidelines set for each company to follow up to full blown specifications. While we were asked to provide a certain system, specific product minimums and maximums were not requested. (For example, I heard weight mentioned, so if there was a specific desire for this, it could have been translated to all bidders). In Shaw and Fieldturf you have companies with differing philosophies of building a turf system....we believe in a heavy backing and high fiber weight...so a heavier denser system. Your kids play on the fiber, that's what wears out, so put more of it in the system. Our competitor is more infill driven ..they like lighter turf and more infill. The problem with that is, the weight comes in a large part from sand which will compact over time and yes, the shock absorbency reduces over time (called "gmax". It gets higher). With a higher fiber system, you typically can not get as much infill by weight in the turf, but the system as a whole provides a longer lasting, safer system in our opinion...and most of the turf industry and testing agree with this. For the so called "heavier infill" system...the issue in addition to less fiber is that structurally the system will break down faster and you end up having infill all over the field (remember Maple Park when it got older). The safety in the system is driven by the amount of rubber ..you need at least 3 pounds per foot to provide the shock protection needed..then you tune with sand from there. We were never made aware of what type(style) of turf system our competitor was proposing, so we had no way of knowing if we were bidding "apples to apples"

There is a sentiment I heard that heavier infill will be better for a field that may flood. Not true, even with the philosophy differences, we are not talking about a huge difference in infill

weights. And we have found that a stronger , heavier backing is a better deterrent to a field moving than infill weight. The bottom line is , we can make our system heavier and would consider it if a quantity was provided..it was not and we will always take the side of long term shock absorbency and safety over anything else. As I explained to Keith Cook, it is very difficult to compare turf systems , especially when we are asked for our recommendation . Other comparison questions do come up in these "open" situations ..one big consideration is infill..with replacements, some are reusing a portion of the existing infill. We have proposed all new. Does the other proposal have all new? Or are they reusing any of the existing. They may not be , but it's important to know when evaluating proposals and what the pricing includes.

Also with regard to the process . Dr. Fishbein mentioned that the turf vendors were reaching out all weekend and lowering our price and that this also happened last year. I can only speak for Shaw Sports Turf and in our case , this did not happen. We were asked by your athletic director to provide a proposal on certain turf and infill options. These were for a standard rubber system, a top "cooling" top layer and then one we proposed for the entire infill to be green rubber/sand. Keith then reached out to us to provide a "best and final" , which we did our best to provide any savings we could. We provided this on 6/12 with a recommendation to not do a top layer option and that if not regular black rubber , then go all green rubber (or full depth of any cooling option over a top layer). Mr. Cook reached out again on Sunday 6/14 requesting an additional price for a higher pile height turf. With the price difference being a small amount, as a good faith gesture, we made no changes to our pricing. We have provided the best possible pricing we could for the systems provided. We were not made aware of our competitors pricing, so why would we reach out to voluntarily lower our price?(I did find it interesting that the turf resolution first said Shaw Sports Turf at \$584K, then it changed to Field turf at \$592K and then at the meeting it was Fieldturf at 579K) Reference was made of this last year as well..again, as far as Shaw was concerned , this did not happen. We priced the systems we were requested to price and addressed a few questions that were asked. In fact, after spending significant time on the requested proposal and follow up questions, we never even got the courtesy call informing us that we were not awarded the project or of any result.

With regard to the actual turf systems that were being compared:

-It was stated that our competitor has a heavier product. This can only be referring to the infill weight they proposed (which was not disclosed) . For the turf portion, Shaw Sports Turf typically is heavier in fiber and backing. We coat the entire backing which will provide you best resistance to the turf wrinkling should water hit it . The infill weight has to be balanced to provide a safe system for the life of the turf.

-a question was asked if one system would have a better Gmax. It is our opinion that the infill ratio proposed by Shaw (same as Maple Park) would provide a better long term shock absorbency.

-from the discussion and pricing in the resolutions, the two systems being compared was a Fieldturf system with black rubber and a top layer called 'CoolPlay" . It can only provide cooling due to its lighter color the same as green rubber does. (the best cooling comes from infills that absorb moisture. Neither of these do, but will provide a cooler surface than just black rubber)

The Shaw system recommended was a full depth green rubber (as opposed to just a top layer). While we provided a price for it, I advised Mr. Cook that any cooling solution used as a top layer, will start getting mixed in with the black as soon as the field is used and maintenance is performed. In the case of "Coolplay" being a light material, it can also migrate off the top. We advised that although it is a higher price than going with just a top layer, all green/sand will not have the problem of mixing in with the black...it will remain consistent throughout. (recent projects to use green rubber are Scotch Plains HS(2 fields); Monroe Woodbury HS (3 fields) and Morristown Beard School.) It was stated that our proposed system also (compared with Fieldturf) contained black rubber. To be clear, the system we recommended and the \$584K in the initial resolution was based on was black rubber that is 100% coated green.

-So based on the above system comparisons and pricing , you awarded to Fieldturf at an amount of \$579K for a turf system with black rubber and just a top layer , when for \$5,000 dollars more, you could have had a Shaw system with all green cooling rubber...not just a top layer. From what I heard, this information and comparison was not provided to the board.

(and a question if the \$579 price includes reusing any of the existing rubber. It may not, but it is information that you may want to get)

-A question was asked if one system was better environmentally. While Shaw has no issues with approved black rubber, it still contains PAH's and other chemicals. One advantage of rubber sealed with a green coating in addition to cooling is that it "seals" the rubber, limits "off gassing" and locks in the items some are concerned about. If it migrates to a waterway, the coated rubber is considered better for the environment.

My apologies for this being so lengthy. As the project was awarded to our competitor, I do not know if the more specific information I have provided along with clearing up the inaccuracies will change anything. However, I did feel it was important to get on the record and present the product information along with how the process actually happened.

Thanks again for to your Board and administration for considering Shaw Sports Turf once again.

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

Privileged and/or confidential information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or are not responsible for delivery of this message to that person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone. In such case, you should destroy this message and notify the sender by reply e-mail.

If you or your employer do not consent to Internet e-mail for messages of this kind, please advise the sender.

Shaw Industries does not provide or endorse any opinions, conclusions or other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of the company or its subsidiaries.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Stevens Field Turf replacement

1 message

Michael W. Lembo <mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
To: Antoinette Kelly <Akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:10 AM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com>
Date: June 17, 2020 at 17:29:03 EDT
To: mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us
Cc: sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
Subject: Re: Stevens Field Turf replacement

This was regarding last year

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

On Jun 17, 2020, at 5:25 PM, Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com> wrote:

Dear Ridgewood Board of Education,

I respectfully need to stand corrected and amend a statement made in my earlier email .

On review , I did reach out to your administration at or close to award of that turf project . I did want to make sure we were being compared with regard to price , make sure our correct products had been considered and to inform that under the Coop there was latitude to discuss pricing (not that we had latitude but of there was a product of interest it could be discussed) .

I did receive a call from Ms. Kelley and did provide additional pricing that she requested then . It certainly was not a case of throwing new prices up over the fence , but more time make sure if price was a factor , we had the correct products priced for consideration .And we typically do not provide new pricing unless requested which was the case then. There was also some last questions about our intended infill ratio. As you see from the process you just went through , trying to get these turf systems to line up for comparison can be difficult.

It was from point we did not hear anything and assumed the project was awarded to a competitor .

I apologize for any confusion caused or misrepresentation . I do hope the information provided was helpful , especially the difference between a top layer only and our recommendation to do the cooling solution full depth . There no doubt seems to be an issue of infill weight as well. I did my best in my email to explain our opinion with this and impact long term to the safety of the system . (just as we did last year) . It is difficult to go back once the Gmax of a turf field climes higher. Grooming will only do so much..and why balance is so important .

Thanks again

Lee

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

On Jun 17, 2020, at 1:20 PM, Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Lembo,

I hope this note finds your family, you and all with the Ridgewood Board of Education staying well during these trying days.

I am the New Jersey representative of Shaw Sports Turf. Shaw as you may know is one of the prominent manufacturers of synthetic turf in North America, a division of Shaw Industries the world's largest carpet company and a Berkshire Hathaway Company. We were one of the companies under consideration for the Stevens Field replacement project that the board awarded on Monday night to one of our competitors. I do want to first thank the Ridgewood Board and administration for any and all consideration that was given to Shaw Sports Turf

With that, I did listen to that meeting and discussion about the turf proposal and options. I found the process leading up to your award and some of the information provided of "concern" for lack of a better term. With all due respect to Dr. Fishbein as I know buying turf is unique and something that does not happen everyday, I found some of his comments about the process and turf product comparisons to be "not factual". The information about the products being offered seemed very limited in comparison to the significant financial investment being made. The information about the two systems being compared seemed cryptic at best and with that, I do not know how the board was able to make an informed decision. I did feel it was important to follow up with the board to at the very least, provide the correct product information for what Shaw Sports Turf is recommending. (and also what we were asked to provide)

With regard to the "bidding" process, while using a "Coop" program to procure turf is typically more open than a standard bid, if more than one company is being considered, there almost always are guidelines set for each company to follow up to full blown specifications. While we were asked to provide a certain system, specific product minimums and maximums were not requested. (For example, I heard weight mentioned, so if there was a specific desire for this, it could have been translated to all bidders). In Shaw and Fieldturf you have companies with differing philosophies of building a turf system....we believe in a heavy backing and high fiber weight..so a heavier denser system. Your kids play on the fiber, that's what wears out, so put more of it in the system. Our competitor is more infill driven ..they like lighter turf and more infill. The problem with that is, the weight comes in a large part from sand which will compact over time and yes, the shock absorbency reduces over time (called "gmax". It gets higher). With a higher fiber system, you typically can not get as much infill by weight in the turf, but the system as a whole provides a longer lasting, safer system in our opinion...and most of the turf industry and testing agree with this. For the so called "heavier infill" system..the issue in addition to less fiber is that structurally the system will break down faster and you end up having infill all over the field (remember Maple Park when it got older). The safety in the system is driven by the amount of rubber ..you need at least 3 pounds per foot to provide the shock protection needed..then you tune with sand from there. We were never made aware of what type(style) of turf system our competitor was proposing, so we had no way of knowing if we were bidding "apples to apples"

There is a sentiment I heard that heavier infill will be better for a field that may flood. Not true, even with the philosophy differences, we are not talking about a huge difference in infill weights. And we have found that a stronger, heavier backing is a better deterrent to a field moving than infill weight. The bottom line is, we can make our system heavier and would consider it if a quantity was provided..it was not and we will always take the side of long term shock absorbency and safety over anything else. As I explained to Keith Cook, it is very difficult to compare turf systems, especially when we are asked for our recommendation. Other comparison questions do come up in these "open" situations ..one big consideration is infill..with replacements, some are reusing a portion of the existing infill. We have proposed all new. Does the other proposal have all new? Or are they reusing any of the existing. They may not be, but it's important to know when evaluating proposals and what the pricing includes.

Also with regard to the process. Dr. Fishbein mentioned that the turf vendors were reaching out all weekend and lowering our price and that this also happened last year. I can only speak for Shaw Sports Turf and in our case, this did not happen. We were asked by your athletic director to provide a proposal on certain turf and infill options. These were for a standard rubber system, a top "cooling" top layer and then one we proposed for the entire infill to be green rubber/sand. Keith then reached out to us to provide a "best and final", which we did our best to provide any savings we could. We provided this on 6/12 with a recommendation to not do a top layer option and that if not regular black rubber, then go all green rubber (or full depth of any cooling option over a top layer). Mr. Cook reached out again on Sunday 6/14 requesting an additional

price for a higher pile height turf. With the price difference being a small amount, as a good faith gesture, we made no changes to our pricing. We have provided the best possible pricing we could for the systems provided. We were not made aware of our competitors pricing, so why would we reach out to voluntarily lower our price? (I did find it interesting that the turf resolution first said Shaw Sports Turf at \$584K, then it changed to Field turf at \$592K and then at the meeting it was Fieldturf at 579K) Reference was made of this last year as well..again, as far as Shaw was concerned, this did not happen. We priced the systems we were requested to price and addressed a few questions that were asked. In fact, after spending significant time on the requested proposal and follow up questions, we never even got the courtesy call informing us that we were not awarded the project or of any result.

With regard to the actual turf systems that were being compared:

-It was stated that our competitor has a heavier product. This can only be referring to the infill weight they proposed (which was not disclosed). For the turf portion, Shaw Sports Turf typically is heavier in fiber and backing. We coat the entire backing which will provide you best resistance to the turf wrinkling should water hit it. The infill weight has to be balanced to provide a safe system for the life of the turf.

-a question was asked if one system would have a better Gmax. It is our opinion that the infill ratio proposed by Shaw (same as Maple Park) would provide a better long term shock absorbency.

-from the discussion and pricing in the resolutions, the two systems being compared was a Fieldturf system with black rubber and a top layer called "CoolPlay". It can only provide cooling due to its lighter color the same as green rubber does. (the best cooling comes from infills that absorb moisture. Neither of these do, but will provide a cooler surface than just black rubber)

The Shaw system recommended was a full depth green rubber (as opposed to just a top layer). While we provided a price for it, I advised Mr. Cook that any cooling solution used as a top layer, will start getting mixed in with the black as soon as the field is used and maintenance is performed. In the case of "Coolplay" being a light material, it can also migrate off the top. We advised that although it is a higher price than going with just a top layer, all green/sand will not have the problem of mixing in with the black...it will remain consistent throughout. (recent projects to use green rubber are Scotch Plains HS(2 fields); Monroe Woodbury HS (3 fields) and Morristown Beard School.) It was stated that our proposed system also (compared with Fieldturf) contained black rubber. To be clear, the system we recommended and the \$584K in the initial resolution was based on was black rubber that is 100% coated green.

-So based on the above system comparisons and pricing, you awarded to Fieldturf at an amount of \$579K for a turf system with black rubber and just a top layer, when for \$5,000 dollars more, you could have had a Shaw system with all green cooling rubber...not just a top layer. From what I heard, this information and comparison was not provided to the board. (and a question if the \$579 price includes reusing any of the existing rubber. It may not, but it is information that you may want to get)

-A question was asked if one system was better environmentally. While Shaw has no issues with approved black rubber, it still contains PAH's and other chemicals. One advantage of rubber sealed with a green coating in addition to cooling is that it "seals" the rubber, limits "off gassing" and locks in the items some are concerned about. If it migrates to a waterway, the coated rubber is considered better for the environment.

My apologies for this being so lengthy. As the project was awarded to our competitor, I do not know if the more specific information I have provided along with clearing up the inaccuracies will change anything. However, I did feel it was important to get on the record and present the product information along with how the process actually happened.

Thanks again for to your Board and administration for considering Shaw Sports Turf once again.

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawportsturf.com

Privileged and/or confidential information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or are not responsible for delivery of this message to that person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone. In such case, you should destroy this message and notify the sender by reply e-mail.

If you or your employer do not consent to Internet e-mail for messages of this kind, please advise the sender.

Shaw Industries does not provide or endorse any opinions, conclusions or other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of the company or its subsidiaries.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Saurabh Dani <sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Stevens Field Turf replacement

Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com>

Wed, Jun 17, 2020 at 1:20 PM

To: mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us

Cc: kkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us

Dear Mr. Lembo,

I hope this note finds your family, you and all with the Ridgewood Board of Education staying well during these trying days.

I am the New Jersey representative of Shaw Sports Turf. Shaw as you may know is one of the prominent manufacturers of synthetic turf in North America, a division of Shaw Industries the world's largest carpet company and a Berkshire Hathaway Company. We were one of the companies under consideration for the Stevens Field replacement project that the board awarded on Monday night to one of our competitors. I do want to first thank the Ridgewood Board and administration for any and all consideration that was given to Shaw Sports Turf.

With that, I did listen to that meeting and discussion about the turf proposal and options. I found the process leading up to your award and some of the information provided of "concern" for lack of a better term. With all due respect to Dr. Fishbein as I know buying turf is unique and something that does not happen everyday, I found some of his comments about the process and turf product comparisons to be "not factual". The information about the products being offered seemed very limited in comparison to the significant financial investment being made. The information about the two systems being compared seemed cryptic at best and with that, I do not know how the board was able to make an informed decision. I did feel it was important to follow up with the board to at the very least, provide the correct product information for what Shaw Sports Turf is recommending. (and also what we were asked to provide)

With regard to the "bidding" process, while using a "Coop" program to procure turf is typically more open than a standard bid, if more than one company is being considered, there almost always are guidelines set for each company to follow up to full blown specifications. While we were asked to provide a certain system, specific product minimums and maximums were not requested. (For example, I heard weight mentioned, so if there was a specific desire for this, it could have been translated to all bidders). In Shaw and Fieldturf you have companies with differing philosophies of building a turf system....we believe in a heavy backing and high fiber weight..so a heavier denser system. Your kids play on the fiber, that's what wears out, so put more of it in the system. Our competitor is more infill driven ..they like lighter turf and more infill. The problem with that is, the weight comes in a large part from sand which will compact over time and yes, the shock absorbency reduces over time (called "gmax". It gets higher). With a higher fiber system, you typically can not get as much infill by weight in the turf, but the system as a whole provides a longer lasting, safer system in our opinion...and most of the turf industry and testing agree with this. For the so called "heavier infill" system...the issue in addition to less fiber is that structurally the system will break down faster and you end up having infill all over the field (remember Maple Park when it got older). The safety in the system is driven by the amount of rubber ..you need at least 3 pounds per foot to provide the shock protection needed..then you tune with sand from there. We were never made aware of what type(style) of turf system our competitor was proposing, so we had no way of knowing if we were bidding "apples to apples"

There is a sentiment I heard that heavier infill will be better for a field that may flood. Not true, even with the philosophy differences, we are not talking about a huge difference in infill weights. And we have found that a stronger, heavier backing is a better deterrent to a field moving than infill weight. The bottom line is, we can make our system heavier and would consider it if a quantity was provided..it was not and we will always take the side of long term shock absorbency and safety over anything else. As I explained to Keith Cook, it is very difficult to compare turf systems, especially when we are asked for our recommendation. Other comparison questions do come up in these "open" situations ..one big consideration is infill..with replacements, some are reusing a portion of the existing infill. We have proposed all new. Does the other proposal have all new? Or are they reusing any of the existing. They may not be, but it's important to know when evaluating proposals and what the pricing includes.

Also with regard to the process . Dr. Fishbein mentioned that the turf vendors were reaching out all weekend and lowering our price and that this also happened last year. I can only speak for Shaw Sports Turf and in our case , this did not happen. We were asked by your athletic director to provide a proposal on certain turf and infill options. These were for a standard rubber system, a top "cooling" top layer and then one we proposed for the entire infill to be green rubber/sand. Keith then reached out to us to provide a "best and final" , which we did our best to provide any savings we could. We provided this on 6/12 with a recommendation to not do a top layer option and that if not regular black rubber , then go all green rubber (or full depth of any cooling option over a top layer). Mr. Cook reached out again on Sunday 6/14 requesting an additional price for a higher pile height turf. With the price difference being a small amount, as a good faith gesture, we made no changes to our pricing. We have provided the best possible pricing we could for the systems provided. We were not made aware of our competitors pricing, so why would we reach out to voluntarily lower our price?(I did find it interesting that the turf resolution first said Shaw Sports Turf at \$584K, then it changed to Field turf at \$592K and then at the meeting it was Fieldturf at 579K) Reference was made of this last year as well..again, as far as Shaw was concerned , this did not happen. We priced the systems we were requested to price and addressed a few questions that were asked. In fact, after spending significant time on the requested proposal and follow up questions, we never even got the courtesy call informing us that we were not awarded the project or of any result.

With regard to the actual turf systems that were being compared:

-It was stated that our competitor has a heavier product. This can only be referring to the infill weight they proposed (which was not disclosed) . For the turf portion, Shaw Sports Turf typically is heavier in fiber and backing. We coat the entire backing which will provide you best resistance to the turf wrinkling should water hit it . The infill weight has to be balanced to provide a safe system for the life of the turf.

-a question was asked if one system would have a better Gmax. It is our opinion that the infill ratio proposed by Shaw (same as Maple Park) would provide a better long term shock absorbency.

-from the discussion and pricing in the resolutions, the two systems being compared was a Fieldturf system with black rubber and a top layer called 'CoolPlay" . It can only provide cooling due to its lighter color the same as green rubber does. (the best cooling comes from infills that absorb moisture. Neither of these do, but will provide a cooler surface than just black rubber)

The Shaw system recommended was a full depth green rubber (as opposed to just a top layer). While we provided a price for it, I advised Mr. Cook that any cooling solution used as a top layer, will start getting mixed in with the black as soon as the field is used and maintenance is performed. In the case of "Coolplay" being a light material, it can also migrate off the top. We advised that although it is a higher price than going with just a top layer, all green/sand will not have the problem of mixing in with the black...it will remain consistent throughout. (recent projects to use green rubber are Scotch Plains HS(2 fields); Monroe Woodbury HS (3 fields) and Morristown Beard School.) It was stated that our proposed system also (compared with Fieldturf) contained black rubber. To be clear, the system we recommended and the \$584K in the initial resolution was based on was black rubber that is 100% coated green.

-So based on the above system comparisons and pricing , you awarded to Fieldturf at an amount of \$579K for a turf system with black rubber and just a top layer , when for \$5,000 dollars more, you could have had a Shaw system with all green cooling rubber...not just a top layer. From what I heard, this information and comparison was not provided to the board. (and a question if the \$579 price includes reusing any of the existing rubber. It may not, but it is information that you may want to get)

-A question was asked if one system was better environmentally. While Shaw has no issues with approved black rubber, it still contains PAH's and other chemicals. One advantage of rubber sealed with a green coating in addition to cooling is that in "seals" the rubber , limits "off gassing" and locks in the items some are concerned about. If it migrates to a waterway, the coated rubber is considered better for the environment.

My apologies for this being so lengthy. As the project was awarded to our competitor, I do not know if the more specific information I have provided along with clearing up the inaccuracies will change anything. However, I did feel it was important to get on the record and present the product information along with how the process actually happened.

Thanks again for to your Board and administration for considering Shaw Sports Turf once again.

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF

96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

Privileged and/or confidential information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or are not responsible for delivery of this message to that person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone. In such case, you should destroy this message and notify the sender by reply e-mail.

If you or your employer do not consent to Internet e-mail for messages of this kind, please advise the sender.

Shaw Industries does not provide or endorse any opinions, conclusions or other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of the company or its subsidiaries.



Saurabh Dani <sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Stevens Field Turf replacement

Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com>

Wed, Jun 17, 2020 at 5:25 PM

To: mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us

Cc: sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Dear Ridgewood Board of Education,

I respectfully need to stand corrected and amend a statement made in my earlier email .

On review , I did reach out to your administration at or close to award of that turf project . I did want to make sure we were being compared with regard to price , make sure our correct products had been considered and to inform that under the Coop there was latitude to discuss pricing (not that we had latitude but of there was a product of interest it could be discussed) . I did receive a call from Ms. Kelley and did provide additional pricing that she requested then . It certainly was not a case of throwing new prices up over the fence , but more time make sure if price was a factor , we had the correct products priced for consideration .And we typically do not provide new pricing unless requested which was the case then. There was also some last questions about our intended infill ratio. As you see from the process you just went through , trying to get these turf systems to line up for comparison can be difficult.

It was from point we did not hear anything and assumed the project was awarded to a competitor .

I apologize for any confusion caused or misrepresentation . I do hope the information provided was helpful , especially the difference between a top layer only and our recommendation to do the cooling solution full depth . There no doubt seems to be an issue of infill weight as well. I did my best in my email to explain our opinion with this and impact long term to the safety of the system . (just as we did last year) . It is difficult to go back once the Gmax of a turf field climes higher. Grooming will only do so much..and why balance is so important .

Thanks again

Lee

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shaw sportsturf.com

On Jun 17, 2020, at 1:20 PM, Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]



Saurabh Dani <sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Stevens Field Turf replacement

Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com>

Wed, Jun 17, 2020 at 5:29 PM

To: mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us

Cc: sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

This was regarding last year

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

On Jun 17, 2020, at 5:25 PM, Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com> wrote:

Dear Ridgewood Board of Education,

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: June 1st Board of Education Meeting

1 message

Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
 To: Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:03 AM

For: OPRA request

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Linda McNamara <lmcnamara1@gmail.com>

Date: Thursday, June 4, 2020

Subject: June 1st Board of Education Meeting

To: Daniel Fishbein <dfishbein@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Sheila Brogan <sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Christopher Kaufman <ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Dear Dr. Fishbein, Mr. Lembo, Members of the BOE and Ms. Kelley, I just listened to your meeting and thought the content and discussion was so informative. My comment about the budget is that we are all aware that COVID-19 has presented additional expenditures that will need to be met. The future may hold other un foreseen budget needs. Everyone that I talk to in business and at home is holding off on non essential projects with a plan to revisit these same items in next year's budget. I feel bathrooms, necessary infrastructure projects ,Orchard School rehab and other health and safety needs should move forward but Stevens Field could be on the agenda for next year giving us time to have the public meeting with experts that was not part of the process last year. The field itself is approx. 10 years old and can still be used all though not in optimum condition due to flooding incidents(which will continue preventing us from product warranties). This is a 600,000 dollar expenditure which can be postponed with the added benefit of possibly a better choice of turf and bidding process. I thought Ms. Kwak's suggestion of placing the final public comment section at the end of the meeting (something that I have asked for) is so important to implement. The Board often has pertinent discussions after public comment which leaves no opportunity for the public to react to in the form of questions, suggestions ,concerns or praise! I was so glad that Mr. Dani had several items removed from last week's consent agenda so that more information could be afforded to new board members before voting.Also, please donot move forward on the appeal regarding Mr.Dani's suit. It is a waste of money. The judge will rule in his favor again and it would be a positive act to bestow on your colleague. I must mention that I think Mr. Lembo is doing a fine job running the meetings and this was only is second outing! Last , I agree wholeheartedly with the Board that maintaining our teaching staff, class sizes and programs is essential and our top priority. Thank you for serving our community with your time, energy and brains. Sincerely, Linda McNamara

Sent from my iPad

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Ridgewood's Somerville Elementary Receives Sustainability Grant | Ridgewood, NJ Patch

1 message

Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
To: Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:12 AM

OPRA request

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Linda McNamara** <lmcnamara1@gmail.com>

Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2020

Subject: Ridgewood's Somerville Elementary Receives Sustainability Grant | Ridgewood, NJ Patch

To: Daniel Fishbein <dfishbein@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Sheila Brogan <sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Cristopher Kaufman <ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Keith Cook <kcook@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Dear Community Leaders, You probably have already seen this. Our children are climate activists. Please consider environmentally friendly products for our fields. We have no excuse but to use the newest grass blends which are pest and drought resistant.

<https://patch.com/new-jersey/ridgewood/somerville-elementary-receives-sustainability-grant>

Sent from my iPad

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Turf

1 message

Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
 To: Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:12 AM

OPRA request

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Linda McNamara <lmcnamara1@gmail.com>

Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2020

Subject: Re: Turf

To: Daniel Fishbein <dfishbein@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Cc: Saurabh Dani <saurabh@danicorp.com>, Jennie Smith Wilson <jswilson@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Jim Morgan <jmorgan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Sheila Brogan <sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Cristopher Kaufman <ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Muhammad Mahmoud <mmahmoud@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Steve Kim <Steve_kim1234@hotmail.com>, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Keith Cook <kcook@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Dear All, I am resending a letter I wrote several months ago. Last night's decision was the wrong one. Saurabh's request for allowing two weeks to gather more information was squashed because Dr. Fishbein said that it had to go forward immediately in order to ensure it's completion by the opening of school. Does anybody really believe that, especially with vendors vying for the job. Dr. Fishbein was judge and jury on the choice of field and the company used. This is truly the height of non transparency. Where were the experts? Where was public discussion? Did he ask the vendors for their best recommendation taking into consideration health and safety and environmental considerations. I doubt it. He knows that many of his statements last night were at the very least disingenuous. I just don't know why. I am and advocate for kids, animals and the environment. I have headed many sports related projects in the school district and the town including field maintenance, play grounds, SkateBoard Park etc. and paid for them through grants and fundraisers. The town wants a new field at Stevens. They relied on you to make the best choice taking into consideration health and safety and the environment. You could have had it all. I will never understand Dr. Fishbein's obstructive behavior that has lead to another crumb rubber field in a flood plain from a company with many law suits filed against them.

Dear Dr. Fishbein, I feel that you and the Board are missing the major reasons for not placing artificial turf on our fields. It isn't about money, playing time or the fact that it hasn't been banned yet. It is that all the information is pointing to the harmful, long term effects of artificial turf especially the product you have chosen from FieldTurf. We have had public forums at the BOE in the past including the one with representatives from the DEP were invited in I believe 2008/ 2009. Prior to that, artificial turf was voted down by the community when it was presented as a separate item on the ballot. The next time it was incorporated in the budget and since the budget passed, so did the artificial turf installation. I just do not understand how we can be banning plastic at the town level and putting it on our fields just because you can. I have 3 close friends who have died in the last 2 years due to their exposure to agent orange during the Vietnam War. The information was out there and it wasn't until 2007 I believe that it was finally recognized as a toxic substance that was harmful to humans. Turning a blind eye to climate change and other environmental concerns, the long term health and safety issues of the product and the fact that are fields are in an active flood plain is unconscionable. I am running out of words and energy. The least you can do is have a proper forum and allow the town and experts to participate. This is 2020. The biggest issues we face are environmental. We all need to be pro active and in the case of fields, we have choices!

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 9, 2020, at 5:29 PM, Daniel Fishbein <dfishbein@ridgewood.k12.nj.us> wrote:

Mr. Dani,

Last year we purchased the materials and installation of the field through a bidding cooperative. NJ permits and organizes cooperative purchasing because the products and services are competitively bidded out. We purchase goods and services through this process for most of the materials we use in the district. Office and school supplies, energy, bathroom tissue.... you name it we purchase through this state approved cooperative bidding process.

Daniel Fishbein, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools
Affirmative Action Officer
School Security Specialist
Ridgewood Public Schools
49 Cottage Place
Ridgewood, NJ 07450

Phone: 201-670-2700 ext. 10530
Email: Dfishbein@Ridgewood.k12.nj.us
Twitter: @RWDSupt
Facebook: www.facebook.com/RidgewoodPublicSchools/



**THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS
INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED
RECIPIENT(S).**

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



On Thu, Jan 9, 2020 at 11:43 AM Saurabh Dani <saurabh@danicorp.com> wrote:

Thank you for passing the buck.

On Thu, Jan 9, 2020 at 11:41 AM Jennie Smith Wilson <jswilson@ridgewood.k12.nj.us> wrote:

Dear Mr. Dani,

Thank you for your email and for expressing your thoughts and concerns regarding the turf fields at RHS. If it is determined that a replacement is needed and recommended by the Superintendent

the Board will take any concerns raised by the community into consideration. The health and safety of the students of Ridgewood is a priority for the Board in all decisions.

I have copied Dr. Fishbein on this email to respond to your questions regarding the administrative process of soliciting bids for projects like turf replacement.

Dr. Fishbein and the Trustees of the Ridgewood Board of Education are copied on this email.

Best regards,
Jennie Smith Wilson
President, Ridgewood Board of Education
Mobile: 201-316-0010

On Wed, Jan 8, 2020 at 10:23 AM Saurabh Dani <saurabh@danicorp.com> wrote:

Dear Members of the Ridgewood Board of Education,

This was brought to our attention that the board is planning to replace Turf at a field this year using artificial turf and using the same vendor that was used by the board earlier.

There has been a lot of new scientific research that has been published in the last few years since this field was last updated AND we have sufficient time from now until the project needs to start in the summer. I therefore ask as a tax paying resident that the board should plan public hearings for this turf replacement and each board member should be on the record on why do they prefer this project to go on annual budget instead of referendum, and why do they support this specific vendor and turf product over other available products that may be better.

I hope you will invite the competitive vendors and alternative views at the public comments and not just one vendor that you prefer (like how it has been done for the referendum so far).

There is enough time, and no good reason to "not" do public hearings, and there is no good reason to pass this during a lame duck session under consent agenda item.

Regards
Saurabh

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or

other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Artificial Turf

1 message

Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
 To: Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:15 AM

OPRA request

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **linda mcnamara** <llmcnamara1@gmail.com>

Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2020

Subject: Fwd: Artificial Turf

To: dfishbein <dfishbein@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, sbrogan <sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Cristopher Kaufman <ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Keith Cook <kcook@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Bob Upton <bobupton@aol.com>, Bernadette Coghlan-Walsh <bwalsh@ridgewoodnj.net>, Heather Mailander <hmailander@ridgewoodnj.net>, Lorraine Reynolds <lorrainereynolds@mac.com>, Mary Jane Shinozuka <mj@shinozuka.org>, Michael Sedon <msedon@ridgewoodnj.net>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Linda McNamara** <llmcnamara1@gmail.com>

Date: Thu, Jan 30, 2020 at 11:29 AM

Subject: Artificial Turf

To: Marlene Burton <aspensat@gmail.com>, Linda McNamara <llmcnamara1@gmail.com>

The Ridgewood Board of Education is proposing more artificial turf for Stevens Field, a district owned field, despite mounting evidence that it presents significant health and safety concerns for those using the fields and to the environment. A recent article in the NJEA Review Magazine, "Use it? Ban it?" quotes the following statements from Dr. Philip Landrigan, a Public Health and Pediatrics Professor at Mount Sinai: "The companies that are marketing the fields don't talk about the heat hazards, they don't talk about the chemical hazards, they don't talk about the costs that are going to be associated with dismantling the fields when they reach the end of their natural life span, when they must be treated as hazardous waste a better solution is to build fields that are properly drained and are planted with tough species of grass that do not require pesticides."

The Massachusetts Toxics Use Reduction Institute 2019 Report concludes: "From an environmental and health standpoint, organically managed natural grass is a safer choice for sports fields... also offers lower costs over time." With regards to playgrounds, the Ecology Center, a national environmental organization, recommends virgin engineered wood fiber for the play scape.

An important fact that seems to go unrecognized by the school district is that are fields exist in an active flood plain. Professional Sports Field Services, LLC states the following: "Flood water can destroy the performance of a turf athletic field in a single event. This will not occur every time, but the potential is always there.... the best covering for a field located in a flood plain would be using natural grass." A 2019 study done by Non Toxic Communities asserts that artificial turf emits greenhouse gases. In addition the grass like blades that are made of plastic release an abundance of methane and ethylene. Methane is 20 times more potent than CO2, a known greenhouse gas. Solar radiation activates the gas releasing process which continues the entire life time of the product and accelerates as the plastic wears and becomes fragmented. Given these facts, the contents of artificial turf significantly impacts the emission of greenhouse gases, a prime contributor of climate change. It has also been shown that artificial turf negatively effects biological organisms and zinc which is another component of artificial turf has been found at levels above the EPA Fresh Water Standards. Jeff Gearhart of the Ecology Center stated that the nonprofit research group based in Michigan found significant amounts of fluorine in the plastic blades. A recent EPA study reported that the recycled crumb rubber used in artificial turf which can be seen on players clothes and on the fields contains compounds including cadmium, benzene, nickel, chromium and arsenic which are known carcinogens.

To sum up, we know that artificial turf is made of toxic chemicals which pose health and safety risks for those using the playing fields. Ridgewood's fields exist in an active flood plain which allows for crumb rubber and other chemical compounds to enter into the abutting streams and rivers adversely affecting the environment. We know that it is costly requiring much maintenance and that the upper layer (carpet) is not biodegradable and is considered hazardous material.

The NJ School Board Association states that health and wellness directly impact student achievement and well being. Providing safe, healthy and eco friendly playing fields should be a primary goal of the district.

Sent from my iPad

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Infill Systems

1 message

Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
To: Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:14 AM

OPRA request

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Linda McNamara** <lmcnamara1@gmail.com>

Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2020

Subject: Infill Systems

To: Daniel Fishbein <dfishbein@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Sheila Brogan <sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Keith Cook <kcook@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Dear All, This is from Field Turf (the company you have chosen to use).You can see for yourself what products they can install. Dr. Fishbein made a choice for one of the least eco friendly products they offer. Can you not choose from this list? Can you not have the Field Turf rep talk to the entire board before making the final decision? They most certainly will oblige and you can make a more informed choice. Please read for yourself. It will take only minutes and you might be convinced that there our better products than the one that was chosen for you.

<https://fieldturf.com/en/>

Sent from my iPad

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: PLEASE no crumb rubber!

1 message

Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
 To: Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:14 AM

OPRA request

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Linda McNamara <lmcnamara1@gmail.com>

Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2020

Subject: PLEASE no crumb rubber!

To: Anne LaGrange Loving <anneloving@gmail.com>

Cc: mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Cristopher Kaufman <ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Sheila Brogan <sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Daniel Fishbein <dfishbein@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thank you so much Anne! Just got off the phone with HJ she wants me to get everyone know to write a letter to the Board thanking them for their decision to replace the field but that is imperative to use the safest products on the market. As we know there is a bidding war between Field Turf and Shaw Turf. Each want the job and each offer more eco friendly products at barely a difference in price. ❤️ ❤️ ❤️ ❤️ ❤️ ❤️ ❤️

Sent from my iPad

On Jun 16, 2020, at 5:33 PM, Anne LaGrange Loving <anneloving@gmail.com> wrote:

To the members of the Ridgewood Board of Education,

I am writing to implore you to change the decision you made last night, authorizing the installation of crumb rubber on Stevens Field.

I am completely supportive of the remediation of this heavily used field. I do not object to using artificial materials for this field (although in a perfect world I would prefer grass). But I am asking you to please use a product that is safer for the health of the children and the environment.

The use of crumb rubber is wrong on every level. Please, I implore you for the safety of our children, please PLEASE remediate the field but use a safer product. It is not too late. Yes, you approved the remediation last night, but can't you change the vendor or the product? Of course you can, you are in charge! Make an amendment to the resolution you passed. This is simple to accomplish.

Dr. Fishbein indicated that waiting two weeks would not be possible "if we want to get the field done." Come on, a two-week delay in order to do the right thing for the health of our children and the impact on our environment would be time well spent.

Dr. Fishbein indicated that “research on safety is mixed and not recent.” We all know there is a boatload of recent scientific studies that are unequivocal on this matter – Linda MacNamara has kept us (and Dr. Fishbein) well stocked with these important documents. The evidence is clear. And even if there is an occasional study that questions the hazards of crumb rubber, it behooves you to act on the side of caution.

Dr. Fishbein defended the crumb rubber by stating that it “has been used for decades.” This defense is useless. Honey was given to fussy infants for decades until we learned about Infant Botulism. Agent Orange was used as a defoliant until we learned how horribly dangerous it was. Asbestos was used in homes until we learned about mesothelioma. Yes, crumb rubber has been used for decades. But it should not be used ever again.

Dr. Fishbein indicated that his “own children played on the field” and he does not “share these concerns.” While I am very grateful that his children are ok, this is not a useful argument to defend the use of a product that we now know to be dangerous.

I am asking you to please do the right thing. A simple motion, seconded, and a vote, and you can switch to a better product to remediate this field. I know this was thrown at you last night with a last-minute agenda change, confusion about the actual cost, and resistance from Dr. Fishbein to grant a two-week extension. I understand why this resolution passed because you want the field to be remediated. But I am hoping you will amend it right away in order to do the right thing, the safe thing, the only moral and ethical choice for our children and our environment.

Thank you,

Anne Loving



Virus-free. www.avg.com

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Dr. Fishbein's Monday Night Presentation

1 message

Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
 To: Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:11 AM

OPRA request

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Linda McNamara <llmcnamara1@gmail.com>

Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2020

Subject: Dr. Fishbein's Monday Night Presentation

To: Daniel Fishbein <dfishbein@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Sheila Brogan <sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Cristopher Kaufman <ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Keith Cook <kcook@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Cc: "Ramon M. Hache" <rhache@ridgewoodnj.net>, Susan Knudsen <sknudsen@ridgewoodnj.net>, Bernadette Walsh <bwalsh@ridgewoodnj.net>, Michael Sedon <msedon@ridgewoodnj.net>, Jeff Voigt <jvoigt@ridgewoodnj.net>, Matthew Rogers <MSR@mrogerslaw.com>, bob upton <bobupton@aol.com>, Lorraine Reynolds <lorrainereynolds@mac.com>, Pamela Perron <pamela@perronlaw.net>, aspensat@gmail.com, yishane@gmail.com, lebenson1000@yahoo.com

Dear Community Leaders, As of Monday late afternoon, the agenda led us to believe we were to have a meaningful presentation on the returfing of Stevens Field. Many thought that we would be using Shaw Turf and possibly a safer, more eco friendly field. Sometime between late afternoon and the meeting, Shaw Turf was gone and the presentation consisted of disingenuous words from Dr. Fishbein. It was a disservice to the Board and to the community. Today I heard from sources who watched the meeting that Dr. Fishbein had never asked for Field Turf or Shaw about an environmentally and safer field. He actually went with one of the worst choices from Field Turf which has many law suits filed against it for poor performance issues. The people wanted a chance to weigh in. Most of us wanted the safest and most environmentally friendly field. I was told today that the turf that was chosen has a concentration of sand that makes the product less absorbent and a harder playing surface. Though Dr. Fishbein said there are warranties, he once again mislead us. He quoted a period of time 8 to 10 years. That was an average on how long you could expect the product would last. All is off the table if we have a flood and the cost of repairs will for the most part rest on us. Never have I heard from Dr. Fishbein how high our maintenance costs were over the last ten years due to flooding. We know they were significant. The Board of Education was asked to make a decision based on false and or misleading information. We cannot go with a bad product from a questionable firm. The town is satisfied with the Maple Field installation from Shaw and they enjoyed working with them. I am told that the Field Turf rep. was extremely difficult and not particularly nice. That is all beside the point. You are not giving the people what they asked for, a safer and eco friendly product. The so called presentation was awful and at best misleading. What many can't figure out is why. We could have had a video presentation from Shaw and Field Turf which would have been interactive and allowed for questions with real answers. Linda McNamara

Sent from my iPad

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should

6/26/2020

Ridgewood Public Schools Mail - Fwd: Dr. Fishbein's Monday Night Presentation

have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Across N.J. and U.S., once revolutionary turf fields now show signs of 'defect'

1 message

Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
To: Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:11 AM

OPRA request

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Linda McNamara** <lmcnamara1@gmail.com>

Date: Saturday, June 20, 2020

Subject: Across N.J. and U.S., once revolutionary turf fields now show signs of 'defect'

To: Daniel Fishbein <dfishbein@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Sheila Brogan <sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Cristopher Kaufman <ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Keith Cook <kcook@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, "Ramon M. Hache" <rhache@ridgewoodnj.net>, Nancy Bigos <nbigos@ridgewoodnj.net>, Michael Sedon <msedon@ridgewoodnj.net>, bob upton <bobupton@aol.com>, Eleanor Gruber <mandegruber@gmail.com>

Please read. This is the firm you are choosing to use again. The public wants the best field at the right price that is safer to play on and more eco friendly. You can have the field that was installed at Maple Park in 2018 which meets that criteria and by all accounts is a success

<https://readymag.com/njdotcom/fieldturf-new-jersey/>

Sent from my iPad

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Artificial turf: Use it? Ban it? » New Jersey Education Association

1 message

Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
 To: Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:13 AM

OPRA request

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Linda McNamara <lmcnamara1@gmail.com>

Date: Sunday, June 21, 2020

Subject: Artificial turf: Use it? Ban it? » New Jersey Education Association

To: Daniel Fishbein <dfishbein@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Sheila Brogan <sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Cristopher Kaufman <ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Keith Cook <kcook@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, tgorman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us

Cc: "Ramon M. Hache" <rhache@ridgewoodnj.net>, Nancy Bigos <nbigos@ridgewoodnj.net>, Michael Sedon <msedon@ridgewoodnj.net>, Pamela Perron <pamela@perronlaw.net>, mandegruber@gmail.com, bob upton <bobupton@aol.com>, Steve Kim <Steve_kim1234@hotmail.com>, Aditya Singh <aditya.ca@gmail.com>, Jennie S Wilson <jenniesmithwilson@mac.com>, Nancy Brennan-Hill <nbrennanhill@gmail.com>, Kelly Buchsbaum <kellyjakeb@gmail.com>, harrisonsusang@gmail.com, yishane@gmail.com

Dear Community Leaders, I am resending the above referenced article which was posted in 2019. Dr. Fishbein stated that there are no new concerns/ articles since 2015. This is one of dozens that I have sent to the Board of Education , all from recent years including May 2020. We have a chance to install a safer more eco friendly field. Dr. Fishbein is not an expert but there are many who are. We could have had a video presentation from our competing vendors so that Board members and the public could have asked meaningful questions and received real answers. First and foremost we are about our children's health and safety. How can we install a field that isn't when we have choices. One is 1/2 mile away at Maple Field. It isn't grass but it will do. It is cooler, better gmax ratings and more environmentally friendly as it uses geofill(organic product) similar in cost and kids and coaches like it! Isn't that enough?

<https://www.njea.org/artificial-turf-use-it-ban-it/>

Sent from my iPad

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Federal Research on Recycled Tire Crumb Used on Playing Fields | Safer Chemicals Research | US EPA

1 message

Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
To: Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:03 AM

OPRA request

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Linda McNamara <llmcnamara1@gmail.com>

Date: Tuesday, June 23, 2020

Subject: Federal Research on Recycled Tire Crumb Used on Playing Fields | Safer Chemicals Research | US EPA

To: Daniel Fishbein <dfishbein@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Sheila Brogan <sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Cristopher Kaufman <ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Keith Cook <kcook@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, "Ramon M. Hache" <rhache@ridgewoodnj.net>, Michael Sedon <mседon@ridgewoodnj.net>, bob upton <bobupton@aol.com>, Eleanor Gruber <mandegruber@gmail.com>, Pamela Perron <pamela@perronlaw.net>

Dear Community Leaders: Last week's Board of Education meeting led us to believe that there would be a deliberative discussion regarding the replacement turf choice at Stevens Field. Instead, the single person defending his choice of turf was Dr. Fishbein. He may be an expert in many areas but not turf fields. 90 percent of his statements were disingenuous and opinions rather than facts. I have no answers for his choice of product and for his insistence on using Field Turf, a company fraught with law suits for poor performance issues. My gut feeling is that it's a case of administrative obstinance. The simplest and better decision all around would be to go with the field installed at Maple Park in 2018, which is cooler, has lower gmax ratings and contains an organic infill at a comparable price. Please amend your decision if only to have a proper presentation where meaningful questions could be asked and answered. Our kids and our community deserve a safe and eco friendly field. Sincerely, Linda McNamara

<https://www.epa.gov/chemical-research/federal-research-recycled-tire-crumb-used-playing-fields>

Sent from my iPad

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Stevens Field Turf replacement

1 message

Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
To: Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:16 AM

OPRA request. Shaw's did not have my email address.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Lee Defreitas** <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com>
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2020
Subject: Fwd: Stevens Field Turf replacement
To: hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us

kicked back the first time I sent ..sorry!

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
[96 Evesboro Lane](#)
[Freehold, NJ 07728](#)

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shaw sportsturf.com

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Lee Defreitas** <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com>
Date: Wed, Jun 17, 2020 at 1:20 PM
Subject: Stevens Field Turf replacement
To: <mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
Cc: <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, <sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, <sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, <ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Dear Mr. Lembo,

I hope this note finds your family, you and all with the Ridgewood Board of Education staying well during these trying days.

I am the New Jersey representative of Shaw Sports Turf. Shaw as you may know is one of the prominent manufacturers of synthetic turf in North America, a division of Shaw Industries the world's largest carpet company and a Berkshire Hathaway Company. We were one of the companies under consideration for the Stevens Field replacement project that the board awarded on Monday night to one of our competitors. I do want to first thank the Ridgewood Board and administration for any and all consideration that was given to Shaw Sports Turf.

With that, I did listen to that meeting and discussion about the turf proposal and options. I found the process leading up to your award and some of the information provided of "concern" for lack of a better term. With all due respect to Dr. Fishbein as I know buying turf is unique and something that does not happen everyday, I found some of his comments about the process and turf product comparisons to be "not factual". The information about the products being offered seemed very limited in comparison to the significant financial investment being made. The information about the two systems being compared seemed cryptic at best and with that, I do not know how the board was able to make an informed decision. I did feel it was important to follow up with the board to at the very least, provide the correct product information for what Shaw Sports Turf is recommending. (and also what we were asked to provide)

With regard to the "bidding" process, while using a "Coop" program to procure turf is typically more open than a standard bid, if more than one company is being considered, there almost always are guidelines set for each company to follow up to full blown specifications. While we were asked to provide a certain system, specific product minimums and maximums were not requested. (For example, I heard weight mentioned, so if there was a specific desire for this, it could have been translated to all bidders). In Shaw and Fieldturf you have companies with differing philosophies of building a turf system....we believe in a heavy backing and high fiber weight..so a heavier denser system. Your kids play on the fiber, that's what wears out, so put more of it in the system. Our competitor is more infill driven ..they like lighter turf and more infill. The problem with that is, the weight comes in a large part from sand which will compact over time and yes, the shock absorbency reduces over time (called "gmax". It gets higher). With a higher fiber system, you typically can not get as much infill by weight in the turf, but the system as a whole provides a longer lasting, safer system in our opinion...and most of the turf industry and testing agree with this. For the so called "heavier infill" system..the issue in addition to less fiber is that structurally the system will break down faster and you end up having infill all over the field (remember Maple Park when it got older). The safety in the system is driven by the amount of rubber ..you need at least 3 pounds per foot to provide the shock protection needed..then you tune with sand from there. We were never made aware of what type(style) of turf system our competitor was proposing, so we had no way of knowing if we were bidding "apples to apples"

There is a sentiment I heard that heavier infill will be better for a field that may flood. Not true, even with the philosophy differences, we are not talking about a huge difference in infill weights. And we have found that a stronger, heavier backing is a better deterrent to a field moving than infill weight. The bottom line is, we can make our system heavier and would consider it if a quantity was provided..it was not and we will always take the side of long term shock absorbency and safety over anything else. As I explained to Keith Cook, it is very difficult to compare turf systems, especially when we are asked for our recommendation. Other comparison questions do come up in these "open" situations ..one big consideration is infill..with replacements, some are reusing a portion of the existing infill. We have proposed all new. Does the other proposal have all new? Or are they reusing any of the existing. They may not be, but it's important to know when evaluating proposals and what the pricing includes.

Also with regard to the process. Dr. Fishbein mentioned that the turf vendors were reaching out all weekend and lowering our price and that this also happened last year. I can only speak for Shaw Sports Turf and in our case, this did not happen. We were asked by your athletic director to provide a proposal on certain turf and infill options. These were for a standard rubber system, a top "cooling" top layer and then one we proposed for the entire infill to be green rubber/sand. Keith then reached out to us to provide a "best and final", which we did our best to provide any savings we could. We provided this on 6/12 with a recommendation to not do a top layer option and that if not regular black rubber, then go all green rubber (or full depth of any cooling option over a top layer). Mr. Cook reached out again on Sunday 6/14 requesting an additional price for a higher pile height turf. With the price difference being a small amount, as a good faith gesture, we made no changes to our pricing. We have provided the best possible pricing we could for the systems provided. We were not made aware of our competitors pricing, so why would we reach out to voluntarily lower our price?(I did find it interesting that the turf resolution first said Shaw Sports Turf at \$584K, then it changed to Field turf at \$592K and then at the meeting it was Fieldturf at 579K) Reference was made of this last year as well..again, as far as Shaw was concerned, this did not happen. We priced the systems we were requested to price and addressed a few questions that were asked. In fact, after spending significant time on the requested proposal and follow up questions, we never even got the courtesy call informing us that we were not awarded the project or of any result.

With regard to the actual turf systems that were being compared:

-It was stated that our competitor has a heavier product. This can only be referring to the infill weight they proposed (which was not disclosed) . For the turf portion, Shaw Sports Turf typically is heavier in fiber and backing. We coat the entire backing which will provide you best resistance to the turf wrinkling should water hit it . The infill weight has to be balanced to provide a safe system for the life of the turf.

-a question was asked if one system would have a better Gmax. It is our opinion that the infill ratio proposed by Shaw (same as Maple Park) would provide a better long term shock absorbency.

-from the discussion and pricing in the resolutions, the two systems being compared was a Fieldturf system with black rubber and a top layer called 'CoolPlay' . It can only provide cooling due to its lighter color the same as green rubber does. (the best cooling comes from infills that absorb moisture. Neither of these do, but will provide a cooler surface than just black rubber)

The Shaw system recommended was a full depth green rubber (as opposed to just a top layer). While we provided a price for it, I advised Mr. Cook that any cooling solution used as a top layer, will start getting mixed in with the black as soon as the field is used and maintenance is performed. In the case of "Coolplay" being a light material, it can also migrate off the top. We advised that although it is a higher price than going with just a top layer, all green/sand will not have the problem of mixing in with the black...it will remain consistent throughout. (recent projects to use green rubber are Scotch Plains HS(2 fields); Monroe Woodbury HS (3 fields) and Morristown Beard School.) It was stated that our proposed system also (compared with Fieldturf) contained black rubber. To be clear, the system we recommended and the \$584K in the initial resolution was based on was black rubber that is 100% coated green.

-So based on the above system comparisons and pricing , you awarded to Fieldturf at an amount of \$579K for a turf system with black rubber and just a top layer , when for \$5,000 dollars more, you could have had a Shaw system with all green cooling rubber...not just a top layer. From what I heard, this information and comparison was not provided to the board. (and a question if the \$579 price includes reusing any of the existing rubber. It may not, but it is information that you may want to get)

-A question was asked if one system was better environmentally. While Shaw has no issues with approved black rubber, it still contains PAH's and other chemicals. One advantage of rubber sealed with a green coating in addition to cooling is that it "seals" the rubber , limits "off gassing" and locks in the items some are concerned about. If it migrates to a waterway, the coated rubber is considered better for the environment.

My apologies for this being so lengthy. As the project was awarded to our competitor, I do not know if the more specific information I have provided along with clearing up the inaccuracies will change anything. However, I did feel it was important to get on the record and present the product information along with how the process actually happened.

Thanks again for to your Board and administration for considering Shaw Sports Turf once again.

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

Privileged and/or confidential information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or are not responsible for delivery of this message to that person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone. In such case, you should destroy this message and notify the sender by reply e-mail.

If you or your employer do not consent to Internet e-mail for messages of this kind, please advise the sender.

Shaw Industries does not provide or endorse any opinions, conclusions or other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of the company or its subsidiaries.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Stevens Field Turf replacement

1 message

Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
To: Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:17 AM

OPRA request

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Lee Defreitas** <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com>

Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2020

Subject: Fwd: Stevens Field Turf replacement

To: mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us

Cc: sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, ckaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Dear Ridgewood Board of Education,

I respectfully need to stand corrected and amend a statement made in my earlier email .

On review , I did reach out to your administration at or close to award of that turf project . I did want to make sure we were being compared with regard to price , make sure our correct products had been considered and to inform that under the Coop there was latitude to discuss pricing (not that we had latitude but of there was a product of interest it could be discussed) . I did receive a call from Ms. Kelley and did provide additional pricing that she requested then . It certainly was not a case of throwing new prices up over the fence , but more time make sure if price was a factor , we had the correct products priced for consideration .And we typically do not provide new pricing unless requested which was the case then. There was also some last questions about our intended infill ratio. As you see from the process you just went through , trying to get these turf systems to line up for comparison can be difficult.

It was from point we did not hear anything and assumed the project was awarded to a competitor .

I apologize for any confusion caused or misrepresentation . I do hope the information provided was helpful , especially the difference between a top layer only and our recommendation to do the cooling solution full depth . There no doubt seems to be an issue of infill weight as well. I did my best in my email to explain our opinion with this and impact long term to the safety of the system . (just as we did last year) . It is difficult to go back once the Gmax of a turf field climbs higher. Grooming will only do so much..and why balance is so important .

Thanks again

Lee

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

On Jun 17, 2020, at 1:20 PM, Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Lembo,

I hope this note finds your family, you and all with the Ridgewood Board of Education staying well during these trying days.

I am the New Jersey representative of Shaw Sports Turf. Shaw as you may know is one of the prominent manufacturers of synthetic turf in North America, a division of Shaw Industries the world's largest carpet company and a Berkshire Hathaway Company. We were one of the companies under consideration for the Stevens Field replacement project that the board awarded on Monday night to one of our competitors. I do want to first thank the Ridgewood Board and administration for any and all consideration that was given to Shaw Sports Turf.

With that, I did listen to that meeting and discussion about the turf proposal and options. I found the process leading up to your award and some of the information provided of "concern" for lack of a better term. With all due respect to Dr. Fishbein as I know buying turf is unique and something that does not happen everyday, I found some of his comments about the process and turf product comparisons to be "not factual". The information about the products being offered seemed very limited in comparison to the significant financial investment being made. The information about the two systems being compared seemed cryptic at best and with that, I do not know how the board was able to make an informed decision. I did feel it was important to follow up with the board to at the very least, provide the correct product information for what Shaw Sports Turf is recommending. (and also what we were asked to provide)

With regard to the "bidding" process, while using a "Coop" program to procure turf is typically more open than a standard bid, if more than one company is being considered, there almost always are guidelines set for each company to follow up to full blown specifications. While we were asked to provide a certain system, specific product minimums and maximums were not requested. (For example, I heard weight mentioned, so if there was a specific desire for this, it could have been translated to all bidders). In Shaw and Fieldturf you have companies with differing philosophies of building a turf system....we believe in a heavy backing and high fiber weight..so a heavier denser system. Your kids play on the fiber, that's what wears out, so put more of it in the system. Our competitor is more infill driven ..they like lighter turf and more infill. The problem with that is, the weight comes in a large part from sand which will compact over time and yes, the shock absorbency reduces over time (called "gmax". It gets higher). With a higher fiber system, you typically can not get as much infill by weight in the turf, but the system as a whole provides a longer lasting, safer system in our opinion...and most of the turf industry and testing agree with this. For the so called "heavier infill" system..the issue in addition to less fiber is that structurally the system will break down faster and you end up having infill all over the field (remember Maple Park when it got older). The safety in the system is driven by the amount of rubber ..you need at least 3 pounds per foot to provide the shock protection needed..then you tune with sand from there. We were never made aware of what type(style) of turf system our competitor was proposing, so we had no way of knowing if we were bidding "apples to apples"

There is a sentiment I heard that heavier infill will be better for a field that may flood. Not true, even with the philosophy differences, we are not talking about a huge difference in infill weights. And we have found that a stronger, heavier backing is a better deterrent to a field moving than infill weight. The bottom line is, we can make our system heavier and would consider it if a quantity was provided..it was not and we will always take the side of long term shock absorbency and safety over anything else. As I explained to Keith Cook, it is very difficult to compare turf systems, especially when we are asked for our recommendation. Other comparison questions do come up in these "open" situations ..one big consideration is infill..with

replacements, some are reusing a portion of the existing infill. We have proposed all new. Does the other proposal have all new? Or are they reusing any of the existing. They may not be , but it's important to know when evaluating proposals and what the pricing includes.

Also with regard to the process . Dr. Fishbein mentioned that the turf vendors were reaching out all weekend and lowering our price and that this also happened last year. I can only speak for Shaw Sports Turf and in our case , this did not happen. We were asked by your athletic director to provide a proposal on certain turf and infill options. These were for a standard rubber system, a top "cooling" top layer and then one we proposed for the entire infill to be green rubber/sand. Keith then reached out to us to provide a "best and final" , which we did our best to provide any savings we could. We provided this on 6/12 with a recommendation to not do a top layer option and that if not regular black rubber , then go all green rubber (or full depth of any cooling option over a top layer). Mr. Cook reached out again on Sunday 6/14 requesting an additional price for a higher pile height turf. With the price difference being a small amount, as a good faith gesture, we made no changes to our pricing. We have provided the best possible pricing we could for the systems provided. We were not made aware of our competitors pricing, so why would we reach out to voluntarily lower our price?(I did find it interesting that the turf resolution first said Shaw Sports Turf at \$584K, then it changed to Field turf at \$592K and then at the meeting it was Fieldturf at 579K) Reference was made of this last year as well..again, as far as Shaw was concerned , this did not happen. We priced the systems we were requested to price and addressed a few questions that were asked. In fact, after spending significant time on the requested proposal and follow up questions, we never even got the courtesy call informing us that we were not awarded the project or of any result.

With regard to the actual turf systems that were being compared:

-It was stated that our competitor has a heavier product. This can only be referring to the infill weight they proposed (which was not disclosed) . For the turf portion, Shaw Sports Turf typically is heavier in fiber and backing. We coat the entire backing which will provide you best resistance to the turf wrinkling should water hit it . The infill weight has to be balanced to provide a safe system for the life of the turf.

-a question was asked if one system would have a better Gmax. It is our opinion that the infill ratio proposed by Shaw (same as Maple Park) would provide a better long term shock absorbency.

-from the discussion and pricing in the resolutions, the two systems being compared was a Fieldturf system with black rubber and a top layer called 'CoolPlay' . It can only provide cooling due to its lighter color the same as green rubber does. (the best cooling comes from infills that absorb moisture. Neither of these do, but will provide a cooler surface than just black rubber)

The Shaw system recommended was a full depth green rubber (as opposed to just a top layer). While we provided a price for it, I advised Mr. Cook that any cooling solution used as a top layer, will start getting mixed in with the black as soon as the field is used and maintenance is performed. In the case of "Coolplay" being a light material, it can also migrate off the top. We advised that although it is a higher price than going with just a to player, all green/sand will not have the problem of mixing in with the black...it will remain consistent throughout. (recent projects to use green rubber are Scotch Plains HS(2 fields); Monroe Woodbury HS (3 fields) and Morristown Beard School.) It was stated that our proposed system also (compared with Fieldturf) contained black rubber. To be clear, the system we recommended and the \$584K in the initial resolution was based on was black rubber that is 100% coated green.

-So based on the above system comparisons and pricing , you awarded to Fieldturf at an amount of \$579K for a turf system with black rubber and just a top layer , when for \$5,000 dollars more, you could have had a Shaw system with all green cooling rubber...not just a top layer. From what I heard, this information and comparison was not provided to the board. (and a question if the \$579 price includes reusing any of the existing rubber. It may not, but it is information that you may want to get)

-A question was asked if one system was better environmentally. While Shaw has no issues with approved black rubber, it still contains PAH's and other chemicals. One advantage of rubber sealed with a green coating in addition to cooling is that in "seals" the rubber , limits "off gassing" and locks in the items some are concerned about. If it migrates to a waterway, the coated rubber is considered better for the environment.

My apologies for this being so lengthy. As the project was awarded to our competitor, I do not know if the more specific information I have provided along with clearing up the inaccuracies will change anything. However, I did feel it was important to get on the record and present the product information along with how the process actually happened.

Thanks again for to your Board and administration for considering Shaw Sports Turf once again.

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

Privileged and/or confidential information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or are not responsible for delivery of this message to that person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone. In such case, you should destroy this message and notify the sender by reply e-mail.

If you or your employer do not consent to Internet e-mail for messages of this kind, please advise the sender.

Shaw Industries does not provide or endorse any opinions, conclusions or other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of the company or its subsidiaries.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.



Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Fwd: Stevens Field Turf replacement

1 message

Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
To: Antoinette Kelly <akelly@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 11:19 AM

Per OPRA request. Shaw's response after my email thanking him for info (as he did not have my correct email address).

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Lee Defreitas** <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com>
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2020
Subject: Re: Stevens Field Turf replacement
To: Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Thank you for the quick response !

Please know that my intent is not to be contentious . I just thought the information the board was being provided lacked details of what was actually being provided and compared .

I do not believe anyone I have worked with would chose a top layer only over a full depth of alternative infill (green rubber) for only \$5K more , but certainly no doubt the boards call on that . Listening in , I just did not think the two options were explained well.

Yes, Maple Park is a Shaw field installed two years ago . It is regular black rubber that had a layer of organic (Geofill) material on top of it that has now worked into the system. That material will still provide cooling when mixed in with the rubber as it absorbs moisture . We do plan to evaluate his that layer is working and functioning to make sure it is bringing the value the Village is expecting .

If I can provide any additional information please let me know .

Best regards ,

Lee

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

On Jun 17, 2020, at 2:15 PM, Hyunju Kwak <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us> wrote:

Thank you for the info. I will be meeting Dr. Fishbein and maybe Ms. Sheila Brogan tomorrow at Maple Field in Ridgewood at 12pm. Mr. Richard Brooks from Ridgewood parks committee also. I believe that field has Shaw's product.

HyunJu

Cell 646-228-3891

On Wednesday, June 17, 2020, Lee Defreitas <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com> wrote:
kicked back the first time I sent ..sorry!

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Lee Defreitas** <lee.defreitas@shawinc.com>
Date: Wed, Jun 17, 2020 at 1:20 PM
Subject: Stevens Field Turf replacement
To: <mlembo@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>
Cc: <hkwak@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, <sbrogan@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, <sdani@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>, <c Kaufman@ridgewood.k12.nj.us>

Dear Mr. Lembo,

I hope this note finds your family, you and all with the Ridgewood Board of Education staying well during these trying days.

I am the New Jersey representative of Shaw Sports Turf. Shaw as you may know is one of the prominent manufacturers of synthetic turf in North America, a division of Shaw Industries the world's largest carpet company and a Berkshire Hathaway Company. We were one of the companies under consideration for the Stevens Field replacement project that the board awarded on Monday night to one of our

competitors. I do want to first thank the Ridgewood Board and administration for any and all consideration that was given to Shaw Sports Turf.

With that, I did listen to that meeting and discussion about the turf proposal and options. I found the process leading up to your award and some of the information provided of "concern" for lack of a better term. With all due respect to Dr. Fishbein as I know buying turf is unique and something that does not happen everyday, I found some of his comments about the process and turf product comparisons to be "not factual". The information about the products being offered seemed very limited in comparison to the significant financial investment being made. The information about the two systems being compared seemed cryptic at best and with that, I do not know how the board was able to make an informed decision. I did feel it was important to follow up with the board to at the very least, provide the correct product information for what Shaw Sports Turf is recommending. (and also what we were asked to provide)

With regard to the "bidding" process, while using a "Coop" program to procure turf is typically more open than a standard bid, if more than one company is being considered, there almost always are guidelines set for each company to follow up to full blown specifications. While we were asked to provide a certain system, specific product minimums and maximums were not requested. (For example, I heard weight mentioned, so if there was a specific desire for this, it could have been translated to all bidders). In Shaw and Fieldturf you have companies with differing philosophies of building a turf system....we believe in a heavy backing and high fiber weight..so a heavier denser system. Your kids play on the fiber, that's what wears out, so put more of it in the system. Our competitor is more infill driven ..they like lighter turf and more infill. The problem with that is, the weight comes in a large part from sand which will compact over time and yes, the shock absorbency reduces over time (called "gmax". It gets higher). With a higher fiber system, you typically can not get as much infill by weight in the turf, but the system as a whole provides a longer lasting, safer system in our opinion...and most of the turf industry and testing agree with this. For the so called "heavier infill" system..the issue in addition to less fiber is that structurally the system will break down faster and you end up having infill all over the field (remember Maple Park when it got older). The safety in the system is driven by the amount of rubber ..you need at least 3 pounds per foot to provide the shock protection needed..then you tune with sand from there. We were never made aware of what type(style) of turf system our competitor was proposing, so we had no way of knowing if we were bidding "apples to apples"

There is a sentiment I heard that heavier infill will be better for a field that may flood. Not true, even with the philosophy differences, we are not talking about a huge difference in infill weights. And we have found that a stronger, heavier backing is a better deterrent to a field moving than infill weight. The bottom line is, we can make our system heavier and would consider it if a quantity was provided..it was not and we will always take the side of long term shock absorbency and safety over anything else. As I explained to Keith Cook, it is very difficult to compare turf systems, especially when we are asked for our recommendation. Other comparison questions do come up in these "open" situations ..one big consideration is infill..with replacements, some are reusing a portion of the existing infill. We have proposed all new. Does the other proposal have all new? Or are they reusing any of the existing. They may not be, but it's important to know when evaluating proposals and what the pricing includes.

Also with regard to the process. Dr. Fishbein mentioned that the turf vendors were reaching out all weekend and lowering our price and that this also happened last year. I can only speak for Shaw Sports Turf and in our case, this did not happen. We were asked by your athletic director to provide a proposal on certain turf and infill options. These were for a standard rubber system, a top "cooling" top layer and then one we proposed for the entire infill to be green rubber/sand. Keith then reached out to us to provide a "best and final", which we did our best to provide any savings we could. We provided this on 6/12 with a recommendation to not do a top layer option and that if not regular black rubber, then go all green rubber (or full depth of any cooling option over a top layer). Mr. Cook reached out again on Sunday 6/14 requesting an additional price for a higher pile height turf. With the price difference being a small amount, as a good faith gesture, we made no changes to our pricing. We have provided the best possible pricing we could for the systems provided. We were not made aware of our competitors pricing, so why would we reach out to voluntarily lower our price?(I did find it interesting that the turf resolution first said Shaw Sports Turf at \$584K, then it changed to Field turf at \$592K and then at the meeting it was Fieldturf at \$579K) Reference was made of this last year as well..again, as far as Shaw was concerned, this did not happen. We priced the systems we were requested to price and addressed a few questions that were asked. In fact, after spending significant time on the requested proposal and follow up questions, we never even got the courtesy call informing us that we were not awarded the project or of any result.

With regard to the actual turf systems that were being compared:

-It was stated that our competitor has a heavier product. This can only be referring to the infill weight they proposed (which was not disclosed) . For the turf portion, Shaw Sports Turf typically is heavier in fiber and backing. We coat the entire backing which will provide you best resistance to the turf wrinkling should water hit it . The infill weight has to be balanced to provide a safe system for the life of the turf.

-a question was asked if one system would have a better Gmax. It is our opinion that the infill ratio proposed by Shaw (same as Maple Park) would provide a better long term shock absorbency.

-from the discussion and pricing in the resolutions, the two systems being compared was a Fieldturf system with black rubber and a top layer called 'CoolPlay' . It can only provide cooling due to its lighter color the same as green rubber does. (the best cooling comes from infills that absorb moisture. Neither of these do, but will provide a cooler surface than just black rubber)

The Shaw system recommended was a full depth green rubber (as opposed to just a top layer). While we provided a price for it, I advised Mr. Cook that any cooling solution used as a top layer, will start getting mixed in with the black as soon as the field is used and maintenance is performed. In the case of "Coolplay" being a light material, it can also migrate off the top. We advised that although it is a higher price than going with just a top layer, all green/sand will not have the problem of mixing in with the black...it will remain consistent throughout. (recent projects to use green rubber are Scotch Plains HS(2 fields); Monroe Woodbury HS (3 fields) and Morristown Beard School.) It was stated that our proposed system also (compared with Fieldturf) contained black rubber. To be clear, the system we recommended and the \$584K in the initial resolution was based on was black rubber that is 100% coated green.

-So based on the above system comparisons and pricing , you awarded to Fieldturf at an amount of \$579K for a turf system with black rubber and just a top layer , when for \$5,000 dollars more, you could have had a Shaw system with all green cooling rubber...not just a top layer. From what I heard, this information and comparison was not provided to the board. (and a question if the \$579 price includes reusing any of the existing rubber. It may not, but it is information that you may want to get)

-A question was asked if one system was better environmentally. While Shaw has no issues with approved black rubber, it still contains PAH's and other chemicals. One advantage of rubber sealed with a green coating in addition to cooling is that in "seals" the rubber , limits "off gassing" and locks in the items some are concerned about. If it migrates to a waterway, the coated rubber is considered better for the environment.

My apologies for this being so lengthy. As the project was awarded to our competitor, I do not know if the more specific information I have provided along with clearing up the inaccuracies will change anything. However, I did feel it was important to get on the record and present the product information along with how the process actually happened.

Thanks again for to your Board and administration for considering Shaw Sports Turf once again.

LEE DEFREITAS
TERRITORY MANAGER
SHAW SPORTS TURF
96 Evesboro Lane
Freehold, NJ 07728

cell: 609.977.3961
fax: 732.863.6881
email: lee.defreitas@shawinc.com



A Division of Shaw, A Berkshire Hathaway Company
www.shawsportsturf.com

Privileged and/or confidential information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or are not responsible for delivery of this message to that person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone. In such case, you should destroy this message and notify the sender by reply e-mail.

If you or your employer do not consent to Internet e-mail for messages of this kind, please advise the sender.

Shaw Industries does not provide or endorse any opinions, conclusions or other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of the company or its subsidiaries.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.

Privileged and/or confidential information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or are not responsible for delivery of this message to that person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone. In such case, you should destroy this message and notify the sender by reply e-mail.

If you or your employer do not consent to Internet e-mail for messages of this kind, please advise the sender.

Shaw Industries does not provide or endorse any opinions, conclusions or other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of the company or its subsidiaries.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE (E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S).

If any reader of this message is not an intended recipient or any agent responsible for delivering it to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail message or by telephone and delete the original message from your e-mail system and/or computer database. Thank you.

NOTICE:

6/26/2020

Ridgewood Public Schools Mail - Fwd: Stevens Field Turf replacement

You are advised that e-mail correspondence and attachments between the public and the Ridgewood Board of Education are obtainable by any person who files a request under the NJ Open Public Records Act (OPRA) unless it is subject to a specific OPRA exception. You should have no expectation that the content of e-mails sent to or from school district e-mail addresses, or between the public and school district officials and employees, will remain private.
