



RE: Project Agreement Executed by DNR for TF25-0090

From Carlock, Merrie (DNR) <CarlockM@michigan.gov>

Date Thu 8/27/2026 9:04 AM

To Michael Greene <mgreene@lathrupvillage.org>

Michael:

The application received a higher score for a commitment to install poured in place (PIP) unitary surfacing. We have accepted artificial turf in lieu of PIP if the turf is specifically manufactured for playgrounds and the turf height is ½" or less. The specified product, or approved equal, will be evaluated when plans and specifications are submitted. In general, projects will not be approved for bid advertisement which fail to meet the voluntary design commitments the applicant includes in their application.

I'm not sure what the attraction is for artificial turf over PIP, but it makes it more difficult for persons requiring mobility devices to navigate, although still an improvement over standard engineered wood fiber surfacing products. If they are inquiring about playground surfacing other than turf, no loose fill types will be approved because of the commitment to unitary surfacing made in the application.

Below is direction we've received on the topic from the U.S. Access Board. Please share this information with your Prime Professional:

An accessible route is required to the edge of the playground that must meet all requirements for accessible routes in Chapter 4 of the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design.

Within the boundary of the playground, per [§206.2.17](#), an accessible route is required that connects all the accessible play components. The ground surface of this accessible route, as well as the ground surfaces of any required clear ground spaces or turning spaces for accessible play components, must meet the surface requirements in [§302](#) and [§1008.2.6](#). So, if artificial turf is used, as far as the ADA is concerned, it only has to meet the ground surface requirements on the accessible routes and the required clear spaces and turning spaces for the accessible play components.

The artificial turf must have a height of ½" maximum because it must meet the requirements for carpet in [§302.2](#). The use of infill products to meet the pile height is not recognized by the Standards; one must rely on equivalent facilitation. We cannot say for sure whether a particular product or design will meet the requirements of equivalent facilitation. But the design will not meet the requirement of equivalent facilitation unless the turf with the infill product still meets the requirements of ASTM F 1951 as referenced in [§1008.2.6.1](#) (the Chapter 1 reference is in [§105.2.3](#)). So, the provider of the product should be able to show that the combination of turf and infill product meets that standard, and that proper maintenance allows the product to continue to meet the standard.

Hope this helps.

Sarah Presley
Accessibility Specialist

U.S. Access Board
(202)272-0046
presley@access-board.gov
www.access-board.gov

For technical assistance:
(202)272-0080
ta@access-board.gov

***Disclaimer:** Technical assistance provided in this email is intended solely as informal guidance; it is neither a determination of your legal rights or responsibilities, nor a statement of the official views of the U.S. Access Board or any other federal agency. Any links to non-federal websites are provided as a courtesy and do not represent an endorsement of the linked information, products, or services.*

Merrie M. Carlock, LLA
Recreation Grants Coordinator
Michigan Department of Natural Resources
248-410-5892

Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund:
50 Years Investing in LAND, LIFE & LEGACY



CAUTION: This is an External email. Please report suspicious emails via the "Report to Abuse" button in Outlook
