

## **IC2 Product Testing Workgroup Meeting Notes | August 26th, 2026 at 3pm ET/ 12pm PT**

**Participants (21):** Mikalah Bailey, Karna Holquist, Brenna Giannetti, André Algazi, Michael Zahn, Sara Sekerak, Amy Salamone, Jessica Archer, Amanda Charette, Andrea Allen, Victoria Klipp, Nicole Orabona, Kelleigh Wasser, Sarah Briggs, Michele McCaughey, Ivan Titaley, Jennifer Branyan, Myles Perkins, Tom Bruton, Paromita Hore, and Mui Koltunov

### **Amy Salamone, WA Ecology: Assessing Toxic Chemicals in Stormwater Runoff from Artificial Turf Field and Artificial Turf Components**

- WA Ecology (ECY) is conducting two artificial turf studies focused on stormwater runoff and turf components to evaluate potential releases of 40 target PFAS compounds (EPA 1633), 6PPD-Q, and 6 metals.
- The studies are intended to support Washington's Product Replacement Program, which helps businesses and municipalities transition to safer products through replacement funding and disposal assistance.
- Potential PFAS sources being evaluated include: Turf blades, backing materials, coatings, and infill materials.
- Crumb rubber infill, made from recycled tires, was identified as a potential source of 6PPD-Q.
- The study sought representation across Washington by including fields with different ages, uses, materials, and infill types, including athletic fields and playgrounds.
- ECY identified approximately 110 artificial turf installations statewide through grants databases, online research, local outreach, and satellite imagery reviews.
- Initial recruitment resulted in 30 participating installations, including sites owned by cities, counties, tribes, school districts, universities, and one private athletic facility.
- Field owners raised concerns regarding public identification of sites, potential cleanup responsibilities, and impacts to stormwater permits. Ecology clarified that samples were not collected for permit compliance purposes
- Site access and drainage challenges reduced the study from 30 sites to 16 viable runoff sampling locations.
  - Excluded sites lacked accessible outfalls, infiltrated directly to ground, had stormwater treatment systems, or had potential runoff from adjacent parking lots.
- Runoff sampling was conducted from April 2025 through Spring 2026 after drought conditions and low rainfall required an extension of the original sampling period.
- Despite 33 unsuccessful field visits, runoff samples were successfully collected from 8 installations, with one field sampled twice.
- A key finding from the field work was that artificial turf does not behave like a traditional impervious surface, making runoff generation more difficult to predict than anticipated.

- Component sampling resulted in 64 total samples, including turf blades, infill, limited backing materials, and some running track material. Shock pad samples were not available for collection.
- Ecology is currently analyzing data and drafting reports, with two reports expected by the end of 2026.
- Sample preparation challenges included:
  - Cryo-milled turf samples forming clumps rather than adequately reducing in size, which may have affected extraction efficiency.
  - 30 of 64 component samples did not fully digest during metals analysis, creating potential limitations in metals results.

### **Presentation Discussion and Q&A**

- Myles Perkins (King County) asked how Ecology was able to recruit participants for the study. As well as whether study results could trigger regulatory consequences for participating sites.
  - Amy explained that outreach was extensive and required repeated engagement. Responses ranged from complete non-response and refusal to active participation from owners interested in understanding the impacts of artificial turf.
  - ECY coordinated with stormwater permit staff and confirmed that study samples would not be treated as permit compliance samples because they were collected differently and for a separate purpose.
- André Algazi (DTSC) asked whether QA objectives and reporting limits were developed specifically for the project, and whether any preliminary findings could be shared.
  - Amy stated that Ecology used accredited analytical methods and adopted the QA/QC criteria already established within those methods.
  - Runoff testing identified one detection of 6PPD-Q and a few very low-level PFAS detections. Component testing results are still pending.
- Tom Bruton (DTSC) asked about industry arguments that PFAS testing should be conducted on new products using ASTM methods because installed turf may be contaminated from environmental exposure.
  - Amy agreed that this is a valid concern and shared that ECY is planning a third study focused on new turf materials obtained directly from manufacturers, which will include PFAS and extractable organic fluorine (EOF) analyses.
- Sarah Sekerak (ECY) noted that ASTM methods are consensus-based and often involve significant industry participation. She encouraged regulators to critically evaluate whether ASTM methods are appropriate for regulatory applications and whether quality requirements align with project goals.

- Tom noted that DTSC declined requests from industry to require a specific ASTM PFAS method in manufacturer testing requests and emphasized the importance of maintaining flexibility in method selection.
- Ivan Titaley (ECY) asked whether pet turf was considered and how its drainage compares with athletic turf fields, and whether runoff results could be linked to nearby environmental monitoring data.
  - Amy explained that pet turf drainage systems vary significantly and may discharge to soils, sewer systems, or stormwater infrastructure depending on installation design.
  - Making a direct connection would be difficult because monitored water bodies are often not located near sampled turf fields and the available data would be largely speculative.
- Ivan also asked whether controlled leaching studies would provide valuable information compared to total-content testing, and whether total organic fluorine would be more appropriate than extractable organic fluorine given the sample preparation challenges observed.
  - Amy agreed they could be useful but noted they were beyond the scope of the current study. She explained that Ecology's product testing programs generally focus on total extraction and digestion approaches rather than leaching studies.
  - ECY selected EOF because total fluorine approaches may include inorganic fluorine, making PFAS-specific conclusions more difficult. She emphasized the need for scientifically defensible methods that support regulatory decision-making.
- Sarah Briggs (NYSP2I) asked why Ecology was not relying on a more conservative total fluorine approach commonly used for PFAS screening.
  - Amy explained that, while total fluorine can be useful for screening, Ecology's work informs potential product replacement decisions and public investments. As a result, the agency prefers methods that provide stronger evidence that PFAS are actually present rather than potentially inflating estimates.

**Chat Links:**

- <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/documents/2603109.pdf>
- <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/documents/2403108.pdf>

