



CONNECTICUT ASSOCIATION OF ATHLETIC DIRECTORS, INC.

30 REALTY DRIVE - CHESHIRE, CONNECTICUT 06410 - (203) 651-3921 FAX (203) 250-1345

Testimony and Concern for:

Raised Bill No. 5139 – AN ACT CONCERNING THE USE OF RECYCLED TIRE RUBBER AT MUNICIPAL AND PUBLIC SCHOOL PLAYGROUNDS

My name is Fred Balsamo. I am Wallingford resident and I am the executive director of Connecticut Association of Athletic Directors, which represents the athletic directors in 188 high school and 150 middle school athletic programs across the state.

Once again I applaud the committee for their concerns for child safety but I am entering this testimony opposing this Raised Bill No. 5139 because it is a reaction to much propaganda and hype rather than fact. The concern with crumb rubber is not a new one. Recycled tires have been used in the construction of synthetic tracks and athletic fields for many years. It is also used in the development of some grass fields to prevent compaction. This is the same recycled rubber that performs in everyday use for things like the production of the soles for shoes and sneakers, underlayment for household carpet, paints and joint compound, flowerpots and the baseboard kick plate you find in your kitchen. There is no factual proof that using crumb rubber has or does cause cancer. This Raised Bill No. 5139 specifies playgrounds but if enacted it will be a short leap to also include athletic tracks and fields down the road. Without the use of this rubber in the construction of running tracks would move us back into the days of cinder tracks. The development of synthetic fields has made fields safer and has allowed schools to save millions of dollars in maintenance costs and has drastically reduced the use of fertilizers and pesticides. There are many research documents from all over the country including Connecticut that can substantiate there is NO proof to the claim crumb rubber is a carcinogen.

I am attaching a document from the State of Connecticut Department of Public Health as well as a report compiled by Laura C. Green, a toxicologist from MIT that is very compelling. Additionally, there should be no vote taken unless every member of the committee watches the video developed by Michael Peterson, from the American Board of Toxicology, that dispels the claims from the uncorroborated lab work done at Yale. The video can be found at - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pVZSVhyMv-A&feature=youtu.be>

Sincerely,

Fred Balsamo

Fred Balsamo, CMAA

ATTACHMENT A

Cullen, Thomas

From: Cleary, Sands <SCleary@fairfieldct.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2015 4:08 PM
To: Cullen, Thomas
Subject: FW: Artificial Turf Update
Attachments: 2015-02 Recent News Concerning Artificial Turf Fields.pdf

Just as an FYI, here is some info and a video send out by DPH today regarding no risks being associated with turf fields

From: [CTDPHHealth Alert Network@ct.gov](mailto:CTDPHHealthAlertNetwork@ct.gov) [mailto:conf-1837662228@everbridge.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2015 1:26 PM
To: Cleary, Sands
Subject: Artificial Turf Update

[Please click here to acknowledge receipt of this message](#)

The following is a message from CT-Department of Public Health:

Dear Local Health Director – We are resending a circular letter regarding artificial turf fields from June 6, 2014 because some local health departments are being asked to weigh in on safety concerns related to these fields. These concerns largely stem from recent new stories highlighting a theoretical cancer risk in soccer goalies. We have added a new feature to this circular letter: a brief video clip that gives the basic message from DPH. Please review the attached letter/clip and let us know if you need more information on artificial turf fields.

Brian Toal, Supervising Epidemiologist 4
Gary Ginsberg, Toxicologist
Environmental and Occupational Health Assessment Program
860-509-7740

If you have received this notification in error, please reply to:
Ctdphhan@ct.gov

Notice: This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Please note that messages may be subject to the Connecticut Freedom of Information Act and to the confidentiality provisions of the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act. (FPSdisclaimer123)

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH



Jewel Mullen, M.D., M.P.H., M.P.A.
Commissioner

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor
Nancy Wyman
Lt. Governor

EHS Circular Letter #2015-02
(Follow up to Circular Letter #2014-26a)

DATE: January 20, 2015
TO: Local Health Departments and Districts
FROM: Brian Toal, Gary Ginsberg
Environmental and Occupational Health Assessment
RE: Recent News Concerning Artificial Turf Fields

Brief Video Clip for Local Health Departments – *Click Here* →



This letter and video clip are being sent to update you regarding the news story that has circulated since last spring regarding potential cancer risks at artificial turf fields. Various media outlets have continued to run this story and a number of local health departments have inquired as to its validity. Since many Connecticut towns have installed or are considering artificial turf fields an elevated cancer risk would be an important consideration. However, this news story is still based upon very preliminary information and does not change CTDPH's position that outdoor artificial turf fields do not represent an elevated health risk.

The Connecticut Department of Public Health has evaluated the potential exposures and risks from athletic use of artificial turf fields. Our study of 5 fields in Connecticut in 2010-2011 was a comprehensive investigation of releases from the fields during active play. This study was conducted as a joint project with the CT DEEP and the University of CT Health Center and was peer-reviewed by the Connecticut Academy of Science and Engineering. Our study did not find a large amount of vapor or particle release from the fields confirming prior reports from Europe and the US. We put these exposures into a public health context by performing a risk assessment. Our risk assessment did not find elevated cancer risk. These results have been published as a set of 3 articles in a peer review journal and are available on the DPH artificial turf webpage (<http://www.ct.gov/dph/cwp/view.asp?a=3140&q=464068>).

The news story suggests soccer players and especially goalies may have an elevated cancer risk from playing on artificial turf fields. This is based upon anecdotal observations of a university soccer coach (<http://www.komonews.com/news/local/Soccer-coach-Could-field-turf-be-causing-cancer-259895701.html>). Reportedly the coach is developing a list of soccer players who have contracted cancer. However, the types of cancer are undocumented and so it is impossible to say whether they



Phone: (860) 509-7740 • Fax: (860) 509-7785 • VP: (860) 899-1611
410 Capitol Avenue, P.O. Box 340308
Hartford, Connecticut 06134-0308
www.ct.gov/dph

Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer and Provider
If you require aid or accommodation to full and fairly enjoy this publication,
please phone (860) 509-7293

represent a common effect and there has been no reporting on how long the goalies played on artificial turf fields to see if there was plausible exposure and latency. There are many reasons why someone collecting a list of cancer cases may appear to find a cluster including the fact that when you have a single-minded focus on finding cases you do not capture all the non-cases that would tend to disprove the cluster. Documentation of an increased rate in soccer players would require an epidemiological study in which the total number who play on turf fields in a given region was also known so that a cancer rate could be established and compared to those that do not play on artificial turf fields. The current news report does not constitute epidemiological evidence and thus is very preliminary.

Our risk assessment did cover carcinogens that are known to be in recycled tires and the crumb rubber used to cushion fields. Once again, we found there to be very little exposure of any substances, carcinogenic or not, in the vapors and dust that these fields generate under active use, summer conditions. Background levels of chemicals in urban and suburban air from heating sources and automobile traffic are much more significant sources of airborne carcinogens. The fact that we sampled 5 fields (4 outdoor and 1 indoor) of different ages and composition suggests that the results can be generalized to other fields, a conclusion supported by the fact that results were similar to what was found in California, USEPA and European studies. Our study did not evaluate ingestion of the crumb rubber itself as players are unlikely to ingest an entire rubber pellet. However, two studies, one in California and one at Rutgers University did evaluate the cancer risk if children ingested a mouthable chunk of playground rubber (10 gram), using laboratory extraction methods to estimate the amount of chemicals that might become available in the stomach and absorbed into the body. Both studies found very low cancer risk from this scenario (Cal OEHHA 2007; Pavilonis et al. 2014). Thus, CT DPH finds no scientific support for a finding of elevated cancer risk from inhalation or ingestion of chemicals derived from recycled tires used on artificial turf fields. US EPA has a similar position: "At this point, EPA does not believe that the field monitoring data collected provides evidence of an elevated health risk resulting from the use of recycled tire crumb in playgrounds or in synthetic turf athletic fields." (<http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/conservation/materials/tires/health.htm>)

In summary, federal and state authorities have taken seriously the concerns that artificial turf fields may present a health risk due to contaminants in recycled rubber. The best way to investigate these concerns is via an exposure investigation. Studies conducted in Connecticut and elsewhere have shown a very low exposure potential, less than from typical outdoor sources of air pollution. The current news reports of a list of soccer players with cancer does not constitute a correlation or causality and thus raises a concern that currently lacks scientific support. Thus, the CT DPH position expressed in 2011 at the conclusion of the Connecticut study, that outdoor artificial turf fields do not represent an elevated health risk, remains unchanged. For further information please contact Brian Toal or Gary Ginsberg at 860-509-7740.

References

California OEHHA 2007. Evaluation of Health Effects of Recycled Waste Tires in Playground and Track Products. Prepared for the California Waste Management Board, January, 2007.

Pavilonis BT, Weisel CP, Buckley B, Liroy PJ. 2014. Bio accessibility and Risk of Exposure to Metals and SVOCs in Artificial Turf Field Fill Materials and Fibers. Risk Anal. 34: 44-55.

C Suzanne Blancaflor, M.S., M.P.H., Chief
Environmental Health Section
Ellen Blaschinski, R.S., M.B.A., Chief
Regulatory Services Branch

Memorandum

To: Report Responder for the CPSC



From: Laura C. Green, Ph.D., D.A.B.T.

Date: June 29, 2015

Subject: Comment on CPSC Report #20150608-22F81-2147431268
Assessment of the risk of cancer posed by rubber mulch used in playgrounds

As a toxicologist, I have been asked by Rubbecycle (a company that manufactures, among other products, rubber mulch for playgrounds) to comment on CPSC Report #20150608-22F81-2147431268. This CPSC Report provides the following comment and request made by Dr. Debra Lay, Principal of the Jonesport Elementary School, in Jonesport Maine:

There have been a few reports lately about rubber mulch causing cancer in children. We have rubber mulch on our playground and we are interested in getting accurate information in order to make an informed decision on whether we should remove this substance. Please advise.

As explained below, I have examined the relevant evidence, and have found that rubber mulch is neither known nor reasonably expected to cause cancer, and is otherwise safe for use in playgrounds. I know of no reason that this mulch should be removed from the playground at Jonesport Elementary School.

Reports of cancer in soccer players and other athletes who play on synthetic turf fields

To begin, I note that there are no reports that rubber mulch causes cancer (either in children or others). I believe that Principal Lay may be referring instead to news reports of a possibly elevated incidence of cancer among soccer players who play (at least some of their games) on synthetic turf fields, some of which are "infilled" with crumb rubber.



In particular, in May of last year, a Seattle, Washington TV station broadcast a story, "Toxic Turf? UW coach draws connection between turf and cancer." The TV story noted:

University of Washington assistant soccer coach Amy Griffin sees a troubling connection between the turf and cancer among soccer players. Griffin [said] . . . that 13 players from the state of Washington were all diagnosed with rare types of cancer. Of those 13, 11 were goalkeepers. Griffin can't say why goalkeepers are getting cancer but she wonders if it could be caused by the crumb rubber, a kind of filler in turf fields. . . . 'Everyone says it's just a coincidence and kind of walks away, but the ratio of goalkeepers to field players is 15 to 1, 16 to 2, and I know plenty of goalkeepers that have cancers and I don't know many field players,' Griffin said . . .

Other news reports followed, with additional cancers reported; but, to my knowledge, **no systematic or scientific study of these cases has been performed or published.**

For example, in February of this year, the nonprofit group, Environment and Human Health, Inc. (EHHI; at http://www.ehhi.org/turf/cancer_cases_grow_0115.shtml), reported:

Cancer cases among student athletes playing on synthetic turf continue to grow

Amy Griffin, Assistant Women's Soccer Coach at the University of Washington, has been keeping a list of athletes who have developed cancer after playing on turf fields containing waste tires.

So far she has identified 126 athletes, 109 of which are soccer players, 10 were football players, and six were field hockey and lacrosse players, who have developed different forms of cancer.

The reported cancers are:

- 51 lymphomas*
- 19 leukemias*
- 10 Brain*
- 9 Testicular*

*9 Sarcoma
6 Thyroid*

The rest are rare forms of cancer.

It is important to note the predominance of lymphomas and leukemias. 1,3 butadiene is connected to lymphoma and benzene is connected to leukemia. Both of these chemicals are present in rubber tires.

What is *not* known regarding these cancers in soccer players

As noted above, these cancer-cases have not been reported on in any scientific journal, and no details have been reported – we do not even know if the reports are completely accurate. We do not know, for example, the ages, sexes, or races of any of the cases, nor do we know the specific forms of leukemia, lymphoma, or other cancer-type for any individual soccer-player. Nor do we have any idea the extent to which any of these athletes have played on fields containing “waste tires”, nor how “waste tires” is here defined.

Lacking this information, it is not possible to determine whether these cases constitute an actual cluster — that is, whether, as a group (and exactly what group is being examined is unclear), they have experienced a significantly larger incidence of cancer-cases than would be expected, based on rates in the general population. EHHI notes a “predominance of lymphomas and leukemias,” but these are among the most common types of cancer that develop in children and adolescents (Ward *et al.*, 2014), and so are not necessarily noteworthy.

Moreover, although cancers in young people (I am assuming, but do not know, that most of these 126 cases are in relatively young athletes) are not common, in 2014 in the U.S., almost 16,000 children and adolescents (from 0 to 19 years of age) were expected to have been diagnosed with some form of cancer (Ward *et al.*, 2014). Thus, learning about many cancer diagnoses in adolescents (again, I am assuming that most of these cases are among adolescents) would be entirely expected.

Suppose that these 126 cases do represent a cluster — that there are indeed significantly more cases of cancer among soccer players and other young athletes than one would “expect.” Does this mean that the cluster has an identifiable cause? In fact, no. As explained below, a great



many cancer clusters have been evaluated in great detail, and for almost none has a cause ever been found.

Results of prior investigations of cancer clusters

For several reasons, unusual coincidences of cancers among groups of younger people are noteworthy, and many of these have been extensively investigated. However, exhaustive study of such clusters in young people has never established an environmental or other exogenous cause: these clusters appear to be due instead to randomness (Caldwell, 1990; Gawande, 1999; Trumbo, 2000; Connecticut Department of Health, 2012).

Here, for example, is what noted epidemiologist Glynn Caldwell (1990) wrote toward the end of his long career:

Beginning in 1961, the Centers for Disease Control investigated 108 cancer clusters and reported the findings in Epidemic Aid Reports. The clusters studied were of leukemia (38%), leukemia and lymphoma (30%), leukemia and other cancer combinations (13%), and all other cancer or combinations (19%). These clusters occurred in 29 states and five foreign countries . . . Eight different data collection methods were used, often in combinations, and four types of laboratory methods on four different specimen types. Although 14 different categories of associations were reported, no clear cause was found for any cluster.

A priori, then, an apparent association between playing soccer (or other sports) on synthetic turf fields and risk of leukemia and lymphoma may be reported, but that does not mean that the association is causal, as opposed to coincidental.

Of course, some clusters of cancer in communities *are* due to shared environmental and carcinogenic exposures, so one cannot and should not over-generalize.

For example, clusters of skin cancer (and other diseases) have been repeatedly reported among groups of people who drink water that has been (naturally) contaminated with high concentrations of arsenic, and this is because such exposures are genuinely carcinogenic (IARC, 1980). Similarly, clusters of lung cancer and of mesothelioma occur in communities plagued by



naturally large amounts of erionite (a mineral similar to asbestos) in local rocks and soils, and, again, these associations are known to be causal (IARC, 1987).

Importantly, however, no community-based cluster of any of the cancers *at issue here* has been found to have an identifiable, external, chemical cause.

Another reason to doubt an external, chemical cause for adolescent cancers is this: the type of leukemia prevalent in childhood (namely, acute lymphocytic leukemia, or ALL), lymphomas, and brain tumors are *not known to be caused by cigarette smoking* (IARC, 2004). Of course, cigarette smoke is the most chemically complex and important cause of cancers of several tissues and organs (not only the lung) in the U.S. (Surgeon General's Report, 2014; IARC, 2004). Since chronic exposure to such a potent mixture of carcinogenic chemicals does not cause the cancers at issue, then on what reliable basis could it be suggested that the much smaller doses of some of the same chemicals (potentially) emanating from rubber particles could cause these cancers? I can think of none.

Some salient features of lymphomas, leukemias, and other cancers that occur in adolescents

As noted above, EHHI reports that of the 126 cases of cancer in athletes, 51 are cases of lymphoma. Lymphomas are not uncommon cancers: in 2014, more than 760,000 Americans were diagnosed with a form of lymphoma (Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, 2015). Indeed, among adolescents who develop cancer, lymphomas are *the most common type* (IARC, 2008). Interestingly, dogs are also prone to developing lymphoma, with some breeds more likely to develop this cancer than other breeds (Teske, 1994).

I would note that there are many different types of lymphomas, and these vary substantially with regard to their prevalence, genetic pre-dispositions, other risk-factors, and clinical courses (Swerdlow *et al.*, 2008; Morton *et al.*, 2014). (This is one reason that the lack of detail about these cases in athletes makes causal interpretations impossible). As suggested by the patterns of lymphomas in dog-breeds, and in some human families, some lymphoma-types have a strong genetic component (Bassig *et al.*, 2015); while others appear to be due to the significant alterations in the immune systems of people (i) infected with H.I.V., (ii) afflicted with various autoimmune diseases, or (iii) on immunosuppressant drug-therapies (Cáceres *et al.*, 2010; Liang *et al.*, 2014). Although many hypotheses have been raised and investigated, to date, no community-based exposures have been established to cause lymphoma (IARC, 2008).



Leukemias also vary according to type, prevalence, etiologies, and clinical courses (Jandl, 1996). Although not specified by EHHI, as noted above, I suspect that most of the leukemias in the soccer players (at least, in the younger players) are the type known as acute lymphocytic leukemia (ALL). This is important because ALL — as opposed to a major leukemia-type in adults, namely acute myelogenous leukemia (AML) — is *not* known to be caused by overexposures to chemicals, such as benzene, nor by chronic exposure to the chemicals present in cigarette smoke (IARC, 2004).

More generally, no type of cancer in adolescents is known to be caused by overexposure to chemicals. Instead, many of these cancer-cases are known or believed to occur spontaneously, or to be caused by factors common to us all (Lynch, 2010; Matés *et al.*, 2012; Tomasetti *et al.*, 2013; Tomasetti and Vogelstein, 2015). Some cases of cancers in adolescents appear to be due to infections with viruses such as Epstein-Barr virus (EBV); and some are apparently due to inherited genetic mutations (IARC, 2008).

EHHI's causal hypothesis with regard to crumb rubber (and rubber mulch) and cancer

Turning back to EHHI's apparent hypothesis with regard to rubber and cancer, I begin by noting that tires are industrial products made with various potentially hazardous chemicals; and that although tires *per se* are essentially inert, crumbled or shredded tires can release small amounts of various chemicals. In particular, synthetic rubber products tend to have a distinctive smell, caused primarily by release of trace amounts of volatile amines and organic sulfur compounds (Ambelung, 1963). These compounds are more odorous than they are toxic, and they are certainly not known or reasonably expected to pose a risk of cancer, regardless of the level of exposure.

EHHI suggests, however, that two other chemicals (i) emanate at significant concentrations from rubber and (ii) might pose a significant risk of cancer.

As quoted above, EHHI writes:

It is important to note the predominance of lymphomas and leukemias. 1,3 butadiene is connected to lymphoma and benzene is connected to leukemia. Both of these chemicals are present in rubber tires.

These statements are misleading in several ways. First, there is nothing surprising about a “predominance of lymphomas and leukemias” among young people: as noted above, these are the most common cancers in adolescents. Indeed, it would be striking if these cancer types were *not* prevalent in any random group of adolescents with cancer.

Second, the implication that crumb rubber (and/or rubber mulch) is a significant source of people’s exposures to the chemicals 1,3-butadiene and benzene is simply incorrect. It is true that 1,3-butadiene is *used* to make synthetic rubber (for tires and other products), but it is also essentially all *used up* in this process, in that it reacts with another chemical, styrene, to form a stable polymer, styrene-butadiene rubber. This stable polymer is no more a significant source of exposure to 1,3-butadiene than, say, a thoroughly baked cake is a significant source of exposure to raw eggs.

Nor would tires be expected to contain anything more than perhaps trace amounts of benzene. While it is the case that some tire building-machine operations rely on solvents that do contain small amounts (less than 1%) of benzene, there is neither evidence nor reason to maintain that tires would absorb, retain, and then release any significant amounts of benzene.

It is not surprising, then, that studies of ambient air in contact with crumb rubber in-filled synthetic turf fields have reported either (i) no detectable concentrations of 1,3-butadiene or benzene, or (ii) only the very low-level concentrations found in air throughout suburban and urban environments (Dye *et al.*, 2006; Norwegian Pollution Control Authority, 2006; Moretto, 2007; Denly *et al.*, 2008; Lim and Walker, 2009; Li *et al.*, 2010; Schilirò *et al.*, 2012). As noted by researchers Schilirò *et al.* (2012), for example, “On the basis of environmental monitoring, artificial turf football fields present no more exposure risks than the rest of the city.” Their conclusions were based on measurements in ambient air of benzene and the related compounds, toluene and xylenes, as well as on measurements of inhalable particles (in the size ranges of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).

Third, as just suggested, all of us are exposed to very small amounts of both 1,3-butadiene and benzene via ordinary outdoor (and indoor) air, every day. This is because both chemicals are present in the exhaust from automobiles and from several other common sources. However, the evidence that benzene can cause leukemia (and again, only AML, and not ALL of childhood, and not lymphoma) does not come from these common, low-level, environmental exposures, but instead from massive exposures experienced by workers inside poorly ventilated factories,



prior to the institution of modern industrial hygiene (Graham *et al.*, 1988). It is entirely misleading to conflate these genuinely dangerous, historical, occupational settings with any outdoor environments, even on heavily trafficked roads, for example, let alone on playing fields or on playgrounds surfaced with rubber mulch.

Finally, although EHHI claims that 1,3-butadiene “is connected to lymphoma,” in fact it, like benzene, is known to cause leukemia (AML) and not lymphoma; and, again, it is known to do so in over-exposed factory workers (Delzell *et al.*, 1996), but not known to do so in the public at large, which routinely experiences vastly smaller, environmental exposures.

Theoretical risks of cancer from crumb rubber in-filled synthetic turf fields

Because some potentially carcinogenic chemicals are present in crumb rubber (as they are in ordinary dirt and other media), several studies have sought to estimate the degree of theoretical health-risk associated with these chemicals. Although these studies have focused primarily on crumb rubber, they are relevant for rubber mulch as well.

For example, Van Rooij and Jongeneelen (2010) studied young-adult male soccer players following intensive contact with crumb rubber-infilled synthetic turf. The researchers sought to determine whether this contact would lead to increased exposures to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). The researchers found that it did not. They concluded, “If there is any exposure, then the uptake is very limited and within the range of uptake of PAH from environmental sources and/or diet.” This was the case despite the fact that the athletes “had black residue of crumb dust on knees, hand palms and elbows . . . [confirming] that skin contact had occurred to dust of the tire crumb rubber.”

A recently published study from New Jersey’s state medical school (The Robert Wood Johnson Medical School) provides additional information. In particular, Pavilonis and colleagues (2014) subjected samples of both new and turf field-aged crumb rubber to extractions with solutions of synthetic sweat, synthetic lung fluid, and synthetic digestive fluid. They analyzed the types and amounts of chemicals that appeared in these synthetic biofluids, and then assessed whether children’s and adults’ exposures to these chemicals would be risky. Their data indicated that health risks to children and adults from extensive contact with crumb rubber ranged from none to negligible. Small amounts of potentially carcinogenic metals were detected in the crumb rubber-extracts, but the theoretical lifetime risks associated with these



were all less than one in one million, and, *per* the authors, “therefore risk was considered negligible.”

Earlier scientific studies and health risk-assessments have reported similar results. For example, in 2003, Birkholz and colleagues published their study, “Toxicological evaluation for the hazard assessment of tire crumb for use in public playgrounds.” Aggressive extraction of crumb rubber and testing of that extract revealed no significant toxic or mutagenic activity. (Mutagenic activity is an *in vitro* surrogate for ability to initiate cancer). Based on these and other results, the authors wrote, “We conclude that the use of tire crumb in playgrounds results in minimal hazard to children and the receiving environment.”

In 2006, the Norwegian Institute of Public Health published their report, “Artificial turf pitches – an assessment of the health risks for football players.” These researchers focused on indoor fields, because this is the setting in which air emissions would be much more concentrated, relative to outdoor fields. The investigators reported:

Worst case calculations based on air measurements carried out by NILU [Norwegian Institute for Air Research] and exposure values from the Norwegian Institute of Public Health indicate that training in sports halls does not cause any increased risk of leukaemia as a result of benzene exposure or any elevated risk as a result of exposure to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons.

On the basis of the exposures which have been calculated in connection with the use of indoor halls with artificial turf in which recycled rubber granulate is used, there is no evidence to indicate that the use of such halls causes an elevated health risk. . . . It has been concluded that exposure to benzene and PAHs in the quantities in which they have been measured in the halls will not cause any increased risk of cancer in people using the halls.

In 2007, the Dutch researcher Hofstra published his report, “Environmental and Health Risks of Rubber Infill. Rubber Crumb from Car Tyres as Infill on Artificial Turf.” His analysis was based on an extensive review of prior studies, as well as on the generation of new test data from fresh and weathered samples of rubber infill. Hofstra wrote:

Based on the available literature on exposure to rubber crumb by swallowing, inhalation and skin contact and our experimental investigations on skin contact

we conclude that there is not a significant health risk due to the presence of rubber infill for football players on artificial turf pitch with rubber infill from used car tyres.

Finally, the Connecticut Department of Public Health (CT DPH) has published three peer-reviewed studies of synthetic turf fields (Ginsberg *et al.*, 2011a and 2011b; Simcox *et al.*, 2011), and recently (January 20, 2015) issued a memorandum to local health departments and districts in the State. In this, CT DPH (2015) affirms its "position that outdoor artificial turf fields do not represent an elevated health risk." The Department notes:

... CT DPH finds no scientific support for a finding of elevated cancer risk from inhalation or ingestion of chemicals derived from recycled tires used on artificial turf fields. ... federal and state authorities have taken seriously the concerns that artificial turf fields may present a health risk due to contaminants in recycled rubber. The best way to investigate these concerns is via an exposure investigation. Studies conducted in Connecticut and elsewhere have shown a very low exposure potential, less than from typical outdoor sources of air pollution. The current news reports of a list of soccer players with cancer does not constitute a correlation or causality and thus raises a concern that currently lacks scientific support. Thus, the CT DPH position expressed in 2011 at the conclusion of the Connecticut study, that outdoor artificial turf fields do not represent an elevated health risk, remains unchanged.

Data from a recent, unpublished study by EHHI at Yale University

Earlier this month, EHHI (at http://www.ehhi.org/turf/new_study_jun2015.shtml) posted this press release:

New Study – Many carcinogens found in Yale analysis of crumb rubber infill and playground mulch surfacing

North Haven, Conn., June 11, 2015—Environment and Human Health, Inc. (EHHI), an organization of physicians and public health professionals, is releasing its study done at Yale University showing that the analysis found 96 chemicals in the rubber tire infill used in synthetic turf and

rubber tire mulch used as surfacing in toddler playgrounds.

Of the 96 chemicals detected – a little under a half have had NO toxicity assessments done on them for their health effects - therefore nothing is known about them. The other half have had SOME toxicity testing done on them - but even many of those chemicals had incomplete toxicity testing and therefore all health effects are not fully known. Of the half that have had toxicity assessments, 20% are probable carcinogens. . . .

Comments on the EHHI/Yale study

For many reasons, the EHHI/Yale study does not demonstrate that rubber mulch or crumb rubber pose a significant risk of cancer (or other diseases).

First, the study has not been published (or released in any complete form) nor, to my knowledge, has it been peer reviewed. In fact, contrary to the press release, the study does not appear to have been written up in even an unpublished manuscript. At my request, Nancy Alderman of EHHI was kind enough to supply me with a summary of some of the methods and a spreadsheet of the results to date: I have attached these materials to this memorandum.

Second, as far as I can tell, the summary results presented are entirely non-quantitative: there is no indication of the concentrations of any of the detected chemicals, let alone is there any attempt to assess levels of exposure or doses potentially received by children or others playing on or near rubber mulch or crumb rubber. Accordingly, there is no way to judge *the degree to which* any such exposures might be risky. Since all of us eat, drink, breathe, and otherwise contact at least trace levels of many carcinogens daily, it is crucial to be quantitative when assessing cancer-risks (and then acting wisely upon those assessments). Absent at least semi-quantitative estimates of risk, informed judgments simply cannot be made.

Third, according to the summary of the study-methods, the chemicals were detected in methylene chloride extracts of a mixture of ground and unground crumb rubber or rubber mulch — but methylene chloride extraction is not a relevant or reliable means of assessing how rubber mulch in playgrounds might become solubilized or otherwise release chemicals that could then be absorbed across a child's skin, for example, or across a child's digestive tract (were he or she to ingest some rubber). For purposes of human health risk assessment, instead



of using a non-biological solvent such as methylene chloride, one should use simulated sweat or simulated gastric fluid, as was used in the published, peer-reviewed study by Pavilonis *et al.*, 2014, for example, cited above.

Fourth, EHHI reports that eight of the chemicals detected in the methylene chloride extracts of at least one of the nine samples of mulch are “probable carcinogens” (there were another five samples of “infill” that are not considered here) — but none of these eight chemicals is so categorized by authoritative bodies, such as the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), the U.S. National Toxicology Program (NTP), or the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Moreover, not one of the putative “probable carcinogens” is consistently detected in the samples of mulch.

For example, EHHI lists pyrene (detected in seven of the nine samples) as a carcinogen, but no rodent bioassays of pyrene are in fact positive; and, *per* U.S. EPA, “Overall, the database for pyrene is substantial, and the weight of evidence suggests that this PAH is not carcinogenic” (EPA-635-R-08-012A). Not surprisingly, then, neither IARC nor NTP lists pyrene as either a known or a probable human carcinogen (See <http://www.cancer.org/cancer/cancercauses/othercarcinogens/generalinformationaboutcarcinogens/known-and-probable-human-carcinogens#> for complete lists of carcinogens compiled by IARC and NTP).

Similarly, EHHI lists heptadecane (detected in one of the samples) as a carcinogen, but no rodent bioassays indicate that heptadecane is carcinogenic, and it is not listed as a carcinogen by either IARC or NTP. EHHI lists phthalamide as a carcinogen, but the NTP bioassays for phthalamide yielded negative results in male and female rats and mice, and it is not listed as a carcinogen by either IARC or NTP.

And EHHI lists 9,10-dimethylanthracene, fluoranthene, phenanthrene, 4-(1,1,3,3-tetramethylbutyl)-phenol, and 1-methylpyrene as carcinogens; but, again not one of these five chemicals is listed as a carcinogen by either IARC or NTP.

Finally, I would note that the chemicals butadiene and benzene were *not* detected in this EHHI/Yale study. Recall that these two chemicals are indeed established causes of cancer in humans, and that EHHI had hypothesized that both are present — and presumably bioavailable — at significant concentrations in crumb rubber and rubber mulch. I would add that the elevated temperatures used to dry and to analyze the samples would likely have obscured the



presence of either compound, but it remains the case that the causal hypothesis raised by EHHI has yet to be supported by actual data or other reliable evidence.

Overall, then, the evidence on crumb rubber and rubber mulch does not suggest, let alone demonstrate, that rubber mulch poses a significant risk to the health of children or others. As such, I believe that Principal Lay can rest assured that the mulch in her playground has not put her students at risk of developing cancer.

References

- Ambelang, J. C.; Kline, R. H.; Lorenz, O. M.; Parks, C. R.; Wadelin, C.; Shelton, J. R. (1963). Antioxidants and antiozonants for general purpose elastomers. *Rubber Chem. Technol.* 36 (5), 1497–1541.
- Bassig BA, Cerhan JR, Au WY, Kim HN, Sangrajang S, Hu W, Tse J, Berndt S, Zheng T, Zhang H, Pornsopone P, Lee JJ, Kim HJ, Skibola CF, Vijai J, Burdette L, Yeager M, Brennan P, Shin MH, Liang R, Chanock S, Lan Q, Rothman N. Genetic susceptibility to diffuse large B-cell lymphoma in a pooled study of three Eastern Asian populations. *Eur J Haematol.* 2015 Jan 22.
- Birkholz, D. A.; Belton, K. L.; Guidotti, T. L. (2003). Toxicological evaluation for the hazard assessment of tire crumb for use in public playgrounds. *J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc.* 53 (7), 903–907.
- Caldwell GG. (1990). Twenty-two years of cancer cluster investigations at the Centers for Disease Control. *Am J Epidemiol.* Jul;132(1 Suppl):S43-7.
- Connecticut Department of Public Health (2012). Environmental Health Technical Brief: Cancer Clusters. Available at http://www.ct.gov/dph/lib/dph/ctr/docs/cancer_cluster_tech_brief_final.pdf
- Connecticut Department of Public Health (2015). EHS Circular Letter #2015-02. From Brian Toal and Gary Ginsberg, To Local Health Departments and Districts. Recent News Concerning Artificial Turf Fields. January 20, 2015.
- Cáceres W, Cruz-Amy M, Díaz-Meléndez V. AIDS-related malignancies: revisited. *P R Health Sci J.* 2010 Mar;29(1):70-5.
- Delzell E, Sathiakumar N, Hovinga M, et al. A follow-up study of synthetic rubber workers. *Toxicology* 113:182-9. 1996.
- Denly, E.; Rutkowski, K.; Vetrano, K. M. A Review of the Potential Health and Safety Risks from Synthetic Turf Fields Containing Crumb Rubber Infill; New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene: New York, NY, 2008.
- Dye, C.; Bjerke, A.; Schmidbauer, N.; Mano, S. Measurement of Air Pollution in Indoor Artificial Turf Halls, Report NILU OR 03/2006. Norwegian Institute for Air Research: Kjeller, Norway, 2006.
- Gawande, A. (1999, February 8). The cancer-cluster myth. *The New Yorker*, p. 34–37.

- Ginsberg G, Toal B, Kurland T. Benzothiazole toxicity assessment in support of synthetic turf field human health risk assessment. *J Toxicol Environ Health A*. 2011a;74(17):1175-83.
- Ginsberg G, Toal B, Simcox N, Bracker A, Golembiewski B, Kurland T, Hedman C. Human health risk assessment of synthetic turf fields based upon investigation of five fields in Connecticut. *J Toxicol Environ Health A*. 2011b;74(17):1150-74.
- Graham, J.D., Green, L.C., and Roberts, M. (1988). *In Search of Safety - Chemicals and Cancer Risk*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hofstra, U. (2007). Environmental and Health Risks of Rubber Infill. Rubber Crumb from Car Tyres as Infill on Artificial Turf; INTRON: The Netherlands.
- IARC. 1980. Arsenic and arsenic compounds. In *Some Metals and Metallic Compounds*. IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risk of Chemicals to Humans, vol. 23. Lyon, France: International Agency for Research on Cancer. pp. 39-141.
- IARC. 1987. Erionite. In *Silica and Some Silicates*. IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risk of Chemicals to Humans, vol. 42. Lyon, France: International Agency for Research on Cancer. pp. 225-239.
- IARC. 2004. *Tobacco Smoking and Involuntary Smoking*. IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, vol. 83. Lyon, France: International Agency for Research on Cancer.
- IARC. 2008. *World Cancer Report*. Edited by Peter Boyle and Bernard Levin. Lyon, France: International Agency for Research on Cancer.
- Jandl, J. (1996) *Blood: Textbook of Hematology*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Leukemia & Lymphoma Society. 2015. Facts 2014-2015. Available online at <http://www.lls.org/content/nationalcontent/resourcecenter/freeeducationmaterials/generalcancer/pdf/facts.pdf>.
- Li, X.; Berger, W.; Musante, C.; Mattina, M. I. (2010). Characterization of substances released from crumb rubber material used on artificial turf fields. *Chemosphere*, 80 (3), 279–285.
- Liang Y, Yang Z, Qin B, Zhong R. Primary Sjogren's syndrome and malignancy risk: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2014 Jun;73(6):1151-6.
- Lim, L.; Walker, R. (2009). An Assessment of Chemical Leaching: Releases to Air and Temperature at Crumb-Rubber Infilled Synthetic Turf Fields; New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, New York State Department of Health.
- Lynch M. Rate, molecular spectrum, and consequences of human mutation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2010 Jan 19;107(3):961-8.
- Matés JM, Segura JA, Alonso FJ, Márquez J. Oxidative stress in apoptosis and cancer: an update. *Arch Toxicol*. 2012 Nov;86(11):1649-65.

- Menichini, E.; Abate, V.; Attias, L.; De Luca, S.; Di Domenico, A.; Fochi, I.; Forte, G.; Iacovella, N.; Iamiceli, A. L.; Izzo, P.; Merli, F.; Bocca, B. (2011). Artificial-turf playing fields: Contents of metals, PAHs, PCBs, PCDDs and PCDFs, inhalation exposure to PAHs and related preliminary risk assessment. *Sci. Total Environ.* 409 (23), 4950– 4957.
- Moretto, R. (2007). Environmental and Health Assessment of the Use of Elastomer Granulates (Virgin and from Used Tyres) As Filling in Third- Generation Artificial Turf; ADEME/ALIAPUR/Fieldturf Tarkett.
- Morton LM, Slager SL, Cerhan JR, et al. Etiologic heterogeneity among non-Hodgkin lymphoma subtypes: the InterLymph Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma Subtypes Project. *J Natl Cancer Inst Monogr.* 2014 Aug; 2014(48):130-44.
- Norwegian Institute of Public Health and the Radium Hospital (2006). Artificial Turf Pitches – An assessment of the Health Risks for Football Players. Oslo, Norway.
- Pavilonis BT, Weisel CP, Buckley B, Lioy PJ. (2014). Bioaccessibility and Risk of Exposure to Metals and SVOCs in Artificial Turf Field Fill Materials and Fibers. *Risk Anal.* 34:44-55.
- Schilirò T, Traversi D, Degan R, Pignata C, Alessandria L, Scozia D, Bono R, Gilli G. Artificial turf football fields: environmental and mutagenicity assessment. *Arch Environ Contam Toxicol.* 2013 Jan;64(1):1-11.
- Simcox NJ, Bracker A, Ginsberg G, Toal B, Golembiewski B, Kurland T, Hedman C. Synthetic turf field investigation in Connecticut. *J Toxicol Environ Health A.* 2011;74(17):1133-49.
- Surgeon General's Report. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *The Health Consequences of Smoking—50 Years of Progress: A Report of the Surgeon General.* Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 2014.
- Swerdlow SH, Campo E, Harris NL, et al., eds. *World Health Organization Classification of Tumours of Haematopoietic and Lymphoid Tissues.* 4th ed. Lyon, France: IARC Press; 2008.
- Teske E: Canine malignant lymphoma: a review and comparison with human non-Hodgkin's lymphomas. *Vet Q* 4:209–19, 1994.
- Tomasetti C, Vogelstein B. Cancer etiology. Variation in cancer risk among tissues can be explained by the number of stem cell divisions. *Science.* 2015 Jan 2;347(6217):78-81.
- Tomasetti C, Vogelstein B, Parmigiani G. Half or more of the somatic mutations in cancers of self-renewing tissues originate prior to tumor initiation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2013 Feb 5;110(6):1999-2004.
- Trumbo, C. W. (2000). Public requests for cancer cluster investigations: A survey of state health departments. *American Journal of Public Health, 90,* 1300–1303.
- Van Rooij, J. G.; Jongeneelen, F. J. (2010). Hydroxypyrene in urine of football players after playing on

artificial sports field with tire crumb infill. *Int. Arch. Occup. Environ. Health*, 83 (1), 105–110.

Ward E, DeSantis C, Robbins A, Kohler B, Jemal A. (2014). Childhood and adolescent cancer statistics, 2014. *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians*. 64(2):83-103.

