


# Artificial turf fiber pollution in the aquatic environment

**William P. de Haan, Dr.**

Faculty of Earth and Ocean Sciences  
University of Barcelona, Spain

Collaborative for Health & Environment,  
September 18, 2024





## The dark side of artificial greening: Plastic turfs as widespread pollutants of aquatic environments<sup>☆</sup>

William P. de Haan<sup>a</sup>, Rocío Quintana<sup>b</sup>, César Vilas<sup>c</sup>, Andrés Cózar<sup>b</sup>, Miquel Canals<sup>a</sup>, Oriol Uviedo<sup>a</sup>, Anna Sanchez-Vidal<sup>b\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> GRC Geociències Marines, Departament de Dinàmica de la Terra i de l'Oceà, Universitat de Barcelona, 08028, Barcelona, Spain

<sup>b</sup> Departamento de Biología, University of Cadiz and European University of the Seas (SEA-EU), Instituto Universitario de Investigación Marina (INMAR), E-11510, Puerto Real, Spain

<sup>c</sup> Andalusian Institute of Agricultural and Fisheries Research and Training (IFAPA), Centro "El Toruño", Camino Tiro del Pichón, S/N, E-11500, El Puerto de Santa María, Cádiz, Spain

### ARTICLE INFO

**Keywords:**  
Artificial turfs  
Microplastics  
Marine litter  
Rivierine litter

### ABSTRACT

Artificial turf (AT) is a surfacing material that simulates natural grass by using synthetic, mainly plastic, fibers in different shapes, sizes and properties. AT has spread beyond sports facilities and today shapes many urban landscapes, from private lawns to rooftops and public venues. Despite concerns regarding the impacts of AT, little is known about the release of AT fibers into natural environment. Here, for the first time, we specifically investigate the presence of AT fibers in river and ocean waters as major conduits and final destination of plastic debris transported by water runoff. Our sampling survey showed that, AT fibers – composed mainly of polyethylene and polypropylene – can constitute over 15% of the mesoplastics and macroplastics content, suggesting that AT fibers may contribute significantly to plastic pollution. Up to 20,000 fibers a day flowed down through the river, and up to 213,200 fibers per km<sup>2</sup> were found floating on the sea surface of nearshore areas. AT, apart from impacting on urban biodiversity, urban runoff, heat island formation, and hazardous chemical leaching, is a major source of plastic pollution to natural aquatic environments.

### 1. Introduction

Plastics are regarded as a major threat to ecosystems worldwide. Global plastic production reaches peaks of about 450 million metric tons (Mt) annually (Geyer et al., 2017), while estimates of microplastics – plastics smaller than 5 mm in size – in the oceans continue to rise (Isobe et al., 2021). It is estimated that between 19 and 23 Mt are released to aquatic environments each year as of 2016 and will likely double by the end of this decade (Borelle et al., 2020). Rivers are the dominant pathway for the transport of plastics entering the ocean (González-Fernández et al., 2021), discharging 0.8–2.7 Mt of plastics annually (Lebreton et al., 2017; Meijer et al., 2021). However, reanalysis of plastics entering the sea through rivers suggests that rivierine fluxes are up to three orders of magnitude lower, considering that only a small fraction (up to 0.3 Mt) is found floating on the ocean surface globally (Cózar et al., 2014; van Sebille et al., 2015; Weiss et al., 2021). Furthermore, recent studies have suggested that most of the positively

buoyant marine plastic debris released from land-based sources is either beached or floating in coastal and especially nearshore areas (de Haan et al., 2022; Lebreton et al., 2019; Onink et al., 2021).

Even under the lower bound scenario of plastic production and waste generation, higher amounts of plastics will likely enter terrestrial and aquatic systems in the following decades, which may lead to many hardly reversible impacts (Lau et al., 2020; MacLeod et al., 2021). Besides the need of curtailing plastic emissions globally, tackling specific sources of plastics will aid in identifying key priorities in order to prevent plastics from entering the natural environments. To date, however, little information is available on the linkage between marine plastic and primary sources, including tire ware, paint coatings, micro-beads, pellets, textile fibers and artificial turf fibers and infill, which might represent up to 31% (2.5 Mt year<sup>-1</sup>) of the plastics in the ocean (Boucher and Friot, 2017). Most of these plastics are considered microplastics, which can be transported far their source through rivers (Meijer et al., 2021), air (Dris et al., 2016) or urban waterways (Murphy et al., 2016),

<sup>☆</sup> This paper has been recommended for acceptance by Eddy Y. Zeng.

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [anna.sanchez@ub.edu](mailto:anna.sanchez@ub.edu) (A. Sanchez-Vidal).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2023.122094>

Received 13 March 2023; Received in revised form 19 June 2023; Accepted 20 June 2023

Available online 29 June 2023

0269-7491/© 2023 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

## Central questions

Are artificial turfs (AT), an emerging plastic pollutant, an important source of plastics in aquatic systems?

What are the concentrations and properties of AT in ocean surface waters and rivers

What is the relationship with rainfall?




UNIVERSITAT DE  
BARCELONA




**Environmental leaching** will likely occur from all materials used in artificial turf surfaces (plastics and added chemicals), not only infill and fibers.

The **environmental fate** and impacts will largely depend on the chemical and physical properties of the plastic (e.g. density, shape, length, etc.)





Olshammar et al. (2021)


Grass fibre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PE, PP, PET, PA6</li></ul>
Granulate infill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• None</li><li>• SBR, EPDM, TPE, sand, cork, others</li></ul>
Backing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PUR, Latex, PE, PP, PET, PA6</li></ul>
Shock layer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• SBR, PUR, E-PP</li></ul>
Substrate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Crushed gravel and stone flour</li><li>• Drain sheet (PP, EPDM)</li></ul>






Aretxabala (2022)






 Manta trawl, Paddle trawl, and river net

 200 - 1000  $\mu\text{m}$



 Manta trawl, Paddle trawl, and river net

 200 - 1000 μm






## Proportions relative to plastic loads




AT fibers found in > 50% of samples ( $N_{\text{total}} = 417$ )

% AT fibers vs. all plastics



AT represented 1.2% (sea surface) and 0.3% (river waters) of all plastics ( $N_{\text{total}} = 88,502$ )

% AT fibers vs. > 5mm plastics




Plastics > 5 mm in length: 12.2% sea surface (15.6% in nearshore) and 2.4% in river waters



# Proportions relative to plastic loads

**!** AT fibers found in > 50% of samples ( $N_{\text{total}} = 417$ )


% AT fibers vs. all plastics



% AT fibers vs. > 5mm plastics



## AT fiber composition, color, and concentrations



Mostly composed of **polyethylene (PE)** and **polypropylene (PP)**



**Green** (82%), yellow (13%), brown (4%), and gray (1%)



[AT] x50 in surface waters



### Sea surface:

- 0.03 items  $m^{-3}$  (0 – 0.82 items  $m^{-3}$ )
- 0.09 items  $m^{-2}$  (0 – 0.21 items  $m^{-2}$ )



### River waters:

- 0.0006 items  $m^{-3}$  (0 – 0.01 items  $m^{-3}$ )

**?** Lower retention vs. long-term accumulation






## AT fiber size




Significantly **longer and larger** in samples from river waters (mean: 8.6 mm and 5.6 mm<sup>2</sup>; range: 1.8–58.8 mm and 0.3–78.1 mm<sup>2</sup>) than from the sea surface (mean: 5.8 mm and 2.8 mm<sup>2</sup>; range: 0.3–61.7 mm and 0.1–60.6 mm<sup>2</sup>)



Residence times of AT and proximity to sources



Average river flux: 3,073 fibers  $\text{day}^{-1}$  (up to 20,000 fibers  $\text{day}^{-1}$  or 1.1 million fibers  $\text{year}^{-1}$ )  
 0.0025  $\text{kg day}^{-1}$  (up to 0.014  $\text{kg day}^{-1}$  or 5.1  $\text{kg year}^{-1}$ )



River (other river systems?)

Coastal (other coastal areas, mangroves, etc.)

Beaches?

Offshore?

Water column?

Sediments (river, coastal, deep-sea sediments?)


Ingestion by organisms?  
Impacts?

Atmosphere? (e.g. urban dust)


Terrestrial?



Urban biodiversity




Heat island formation




Aquatic systems


Monitoring



↑ urban runoff



Chemical leaching



[litter.shinyapps.io/artificialturfs](https://litter.shinyapps.io/artificialturfs)



[litter.shinyapps.io/surfingforscience2](https://litter.shinyapps.io/surfingforscience2)