

From: [stevo smith](#)
To: [Council, City; Magdalena Cabrera](#)
Subject: synthetic grass
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 8:11:43 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Please vote no on \$160,825 contract to evaluate this product use.

Palo Alto deserves real grass and safe nontoxic products in our parks

I am very disappointed to see the toxic product in our refurbished park.

Thank you for keeping our parks safe for all living things. Stevo Smith

From: [Jacquie Knott](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Lloyd contract
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 7:46:06 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Please vote NO on Lloyd contract. The artificial grass is terrible for my dogs paws as well as the environment.

Thank you
Jacqueline knott
230 Fernando ave
Palo Alto

From: [CeCi Kettendorf](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Vote NO on the artificial turf expenditure.
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 7:43:09 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Council Members,

It is well documented that artificial turf is toxic. The number of teenage boys with testicular cancer across the USA who played soccer on it has skyrocketed. Whereas testicular cancer in teens was rare, it has spiked alarmingly over the past thirty years. Anecdotally, my sons have three Palo Alto teenage friends who came down with testicular cancer playing on artificial turf on the Peninsula. Testicular cancer is just one of many health risks.

It might be useful to have one of City Manager Ed Shikada's thirteen assistants Google it. In fifteen minutes they could print out multiple journal articles from Lancet, New England Journal, Johns Hopkins, the Mayo Clinic....documenting the health hazards of the turf. That would save the city the 160K to pay a biased company to present bogus findings. For 160K, is one of Lloyd's employees working 40 hours a week for a year to justify that generous funding?

Perhaps that 160K could be dedicated towards the permanent salary of a fire fighter for Fire Station 4? To date, there is no plan to staff the fire station with well rested firefighters; Geo said it would be staffed with exhausted firefighters working 12 hours of overtime. Put that money to better use! Fund Fire!

So please do not fund that ridiculous study. Install natural grass.

Thank you for the work you do for us to protect us.

Sincerely,

CeCi Kettendorf

Please Contact the Clerk's Office
to View Additional Pages,
Attachments, or Images Related

From: [Debbie Mytels](#)
To: [Lauing, Ed](#)
Cc: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Vote NO on Contract to evaluate plastic "grass" materials
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 12:39:03 AM
Attachments: [PastedGraphic-1.tiff](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Lauing and Members of the City Council,

Your agenda for Monday, April 21 includes a vote to contract with the Lloyd Consulting Group in order to evaluate whether they will recommend additional use of plastic "grass" materials at various City playing fields.

Please vote NO on this contract. This company recently installed synthetic grass at the City's Boulware Park, and little if any attention was paid to the significant evidence that such use of plastic is harmful in many ways:

- First off, such plastic "grass" is made from toxic materials that are polluting up and down their manufacturing process.
- When installed, the materials break off into microplastics that are easily washed into drains and into nearby creeks, polluting fresh water all along the way.
- Thirdly, because it is not a natural, growing plant, such "grass" must be replaced at additional expense after a few years. Moreover, recycling this blanket of fake grass is not possible, so more plastic goes into the landfill.
- Lastly, this fake grass material is slippery, and when temperatures are high, it gets very hot, even causing burn injuries when players slide over it. Studies have found more injuries among children, youth and adults that have to use it as a playing surface. Professional athletes evidently are demanding natural grass, not plastic, for their playing fields. Do our children not also deserve something better?

There are other alternatives to adding more plastic to our environment. By using natural grass, our playing fields will continue to be a positive impact on Earth's climate, giving off oxygen and sequestering carbon dioxide. Where real grass is not suitable, natural wood fibers are another alternative. Because the Lloyd Consulting Group has previously been engaged to install plastic "grass," it's less likely that they will be objective in their review of such alternatives. Either the contract must stipulate that they will NOT recommend synthetics, or another contractor should be chosen to do the review of materials for Palo Alto's other playing fields.

Palo Alto can do better than laying down plastic to create polluting playing surfaces for our children and others. Thanks for your attention to this important issue.

Debbie Mytels
2824 Louis Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303

From: [Shannon McEntee](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Artificial Turf
Date: Saturday, April 19, 2025 10:51:43 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

This message needs your attention

- This is a personal email address.
- This is their first email to you.

Mark Safe

Report

Powered by Mimecast

Dear Mayor Lauing and Council Members,

I understand that you will be considering whether we should make artificial turf illegal in Palo Alto. I urge you to definitely **make artificial turf illegal**.

Large swaths of artificial turf in public places is environmentally disastrous for any number of reasons - microplastics from the turf as it slowly disintegrates, off gassing of volatile organic compounds from the plastic, destruction of soil microbiome underneath the “turf,” and heat radiating off artificial turf contributes to global warming! Artificial turf proponents claim that there are big maintenance cost and water use savings, but it is my understanding that any savings (if there are any) would hardly outweigh the environmental cost of artificial turf.

Please do the right thing for our fragile planet and make artificial turf illegal in Palo Alto.

Sincerely,

Shannon Rose McEntee
410 Sheridan Avenue

From: [Angela Dellaporta](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Addendum!
Date: Friday, April 18, 2025 9:35:21 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear City Council Members,

I have just been informed that the website I looked at for Lloyd's Turf and Landscaping may not be the same company that you have hired.

Or is it?

Is Lloyd's Consulting Group associated with Lloyd's Turf and Landscaping? What percentage of the sports projects they do turn out to be artificial turf?

Most importantly, do they include the health and safety of the community and the environment in their assessments?

I have also just been informed that the decision to hire them is already a done deal and that the vote on Monday just a formality.

I am frankly surprised that you would want to spend city money on a study that will provide you with information that is already available — and to spend it on a company that is not focused on health and safety of the community.

I may not have the full story here — wish that I did!

Angela Dellaporta

From: [Angela Dellaporta](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Monday's vote
Date: Friday, April 18, 2025 8:50:06 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear City Council Members,

You will be voting Monday on whether to spend tax money on hiring Lloyd's Turf and Landscaping to make their recommendation regarding the type of surfacing for future playing fields and playgrounds in Palo Alto. I urge you to vote no.

I am sure that Lloyd's would approach this task with a lack of bias, even though — as they declare on their website — they “specialize in all applications of artificial turf”. Their website also has a thorough list of the benefits of artificial turf, though nothing that I could find on the benefits of natural grass.

However, as it turns out, there is no need for you to spend a large sum of city assets to ask Lloyds to compare the merits of artificial turf versus natural grass, since this research has been done already by an independent government agency:

“Established by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in 1989, the Toxics Use Reduction Institute (TURI) is an independent government agency with a mandate to help protect workers, communities and the environment from toxic chemicals and pollution. Working in close collaboration with businesses of all sizes, as well as government agencies, local communities and international organizations, TURI helps identify actions companies and communities can take to protect workers and public health.” I am sure that Turi's goals align with your goals for the citizens of Palo Alto — that is, to protect the health of the community and the environment from toxic chemicals and pollution.

Turi's meticulously researched paper comparing playing field surfaces notes that artificial turf gets very hot (difficult for athletes); causes injuries; emits dangerous gasses, and results in broad and long lasting environmental damage. Since it needs to be replaced every 8 years or so, disposal is a major problem. You may be particularly interested in the table that points out that artificial turf, over the course of 16 years, costs 2.5 times as much as natural grass.

Here is a link to the short version:

<https://www.turi.org/publications/artificial-turf/>

Here is a longer version of the same paper:

<https://www.turi.org/publications/athletic-playing-fields-choosing-safer-options-for-health-and-the-environment/>

Another paper — also researched in depth — examines the merits of different playground surfacing alternatives specifically for the use of municipalities making decisions about what is best for their community. You will again be interested in the comparison tables.

<https://www.turi.org/publications/playground-surfacing-choosing-safer-materials-for-childrens-health-and-the-environment/>

I encourage you to peruse these excellent sources rather than pay a company that specializes in artificial turf to replicate what has already been done by an independent research organization whose goal is to protect citizens and the environment.

I also encourage you to reach out to the Millbrae city council members to learn more about their decision to prohibit all artificial turf landscaping “to protect and enhance the health, safety and general welfare of residents and to protect the water quality of our watercourses, water bodies and wetlands in a manner pursuant to and consistent with the state and federal regulations and permits, including the Clean Water Act.”

Their goals, too, align with yours, I am sure.

<https://www.ci.millbrae.ca.us/276/Prohibition-of-Artificial-Turf>

Thank you very much for all the work you do for the community!

Angela Dellaporta