

5700303 PERFORMANCE TURF  
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

---

Neil Monkman  
239-462-7371  
[neil.monkman@wrightg.com](mailto:neil.monkman@wrightg.com)

Comment: (11-28-12)

I truly believe that removal of the language for pegging of sod is a mistake for the following reasons.

- I do not believe that this is an issue on many projects. Only those where slopes exceed 4:1 which is the typical norm.
- Contractors have depended on this specification for areas that could not have been reasonably foreseen during the bid phase of a potential issue with sliding. We just finished a project where it was not necessarily the slope, but more so the lack of sufficient turf on the edge of pavement to slow down the flow of storm runoff before it undermined the sidewalk. This was a major issue for us. To resolve the matter we, at our own and additional expense, installed "coconut mat" to alleviate the problem.
- I think what the Department will see is a significant increase in the bid pricing of performance turf to cover these potential costs as well as a potential spending of unnecessary tax payer dollars. An example would be as follows: The Department puts a project out for bids with 100,000 SF of performance turf (sod). Currently at statewide averages you would see pricing of \$1.87/SY or around \$21,000.00. If that increases to \$2.25/SY (to include some form of erosion mat) you are looking at another \$5,000.00. Now, it has been my experience that 10% is a good rule of thumb to use for washouts. If the norm occurs, a contractor would spend \$500 for something he/she is being paid \$5,000 to perform. I can almost guarantee that contractors will use an erosion mat over just replanting sod because it is half the price. I would be more than happy to discuss further should anyone desire to contact me.

Response: The language requiring sod to be pegged is deleted because means to establish turf is the responsibility of the Contractor. Additionally, the language was a source of confusion as it conflicted with the language found in 570-4 Turf Establishment. The language in 570-4 directs the contractor to "provide filling, leveling, and repairing of any washed or eroded areas as may be necessary" at no additional expense to the Department; but, in many instances a Contractor would not repair a washout and wait for the Engineer to direct the repair so it can be paid for as unforeseeable work.

It is incumbent upon the Contractor to determine the most effective means and methods for establishing turf and the Department expects those means and methods to be reflected in the bid pricing.

No change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

Anonymous

Comment: (11-28-12)

570-4 Turf Establishment: I agree with the content changes; however the format of this section could be modified using "bullets" or a "numbering system" so that it will read easier and look better overall.

Response: Bullets are not used in formatting specifications. For clarification, the text referred to in 570-4 has been modified as follows:

Established turf is defined as follows:

1. An ~~E~~established root system (leaf blades break before seedlings or sod can be pulled from the soil by hand).

2. No bare spots larger than one square foot.

3. No continuous streaks running perpendicular to the face of the slope.

4. No bare areas comprising more than 1% of any given 1,000 square foot area.

5. No deformation of the turf areas caused by mowing or other Contractor equipment.

6. *No exposed sod netting.*

7. *No pests or noxious weeds.*

Change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

Stephen Tonjes  
386-943-5394  
[stephen.tonjes@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:stephen.tonjes@dot.state.fl.us)

Comment: (12-4-12)

It's a big improvement to specify a degradable product instead of just waiving the requirement, even if it's a longer time. Do you have any details about that – what conditions speed up or slow down the degradation? Three years is still long enough to get exposed by wear and tear and kill a lot of animals, and even in place, it's a hazard to small burrowing animals.

Response: Exposure to UV light, heat and oxygen determine how quickly sod netting will degrade. Since this product is placed under sod, UV exposure is limited which in turn affects degradation.

\*\*\*\*\*

Steve Farkas  
862-424-6222  
[steven@alfloridasod.com](mailto:steven@alfloridasod.com)

Comment: (12-14-12)

1. I do not understand why the section on pegging sod is being removed? Please expand on the reasoning.

Response: Please see response to Neil Monkman above.

2. Why is there no diesel fuel adjustments for performance turf? My #2 expense is diesel fuel how can I suggest this change?

Response: The department is currently calculating diesel fuel adjustments for Performance Turf and those adjustments will be included in the specifications when finalized.  
No change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

D4 Const.

Comment: (12-17-12)

**570-4 Turf Establishment:** Suggest adding : “No pest plants or noxious weeds present.” after the new proposed text.

**570-4 Turf Establishment.**

Perform all work necessary, including watering and fertilizing, to sustain an established turf until final acceptance, at no additional expense to the Department. Provide the filling, leveling, and repairing of any washed or eroded areas, as may be necessary.

Established turf is defined as follows:

Established root system (leaf blades break before seedlings or sod can be pulled from the soil by hand).

No bare spots larger than one square foot.

No continuous streaks running perpendicular to the face of the slope.

No bare areas comprising more than 1% of any given 1,000 square foot area.

No deformation of the turf areas caused by mowing or other Contractor equipment.

*No exposed sod netting.*[Rudy1]

*No pest plants or noxious weeds present.*

Monitor turf areas and remove all competing

Response: Agree. Change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

Stewart Feketa

772-201-8216

[stewart@natures-keeper.com](mailto:stewart@natures-keeper.com)

Comment: (12-17-12)

The department has been placing many unforeseen conditions on us sod contractors .There is no diesel adjustment when that is our second largest cost to the product and installation .The removal of water as a pay item has left us guessing the weather and now to remove another unforeseen condition the pinning of sod as an additional pay item is going to place even more of hardship on us family run organizations. Please reconsider these decisions as it is going to start driving the price of sod up to place the burden back on the department. Thank you.

Response: The department is currently calculating diesel fuel adjustments for Performance Turf and those adjustments will be included in the specifications when finalized.

The language requiring sod to be pegged is deleted because means to establish turf is the responsibility of the Contractor. Additionally, the language was a source of confusion as it

conflicted with the language found in 570-4 Turf Establishment. The language in 570-4 directs the contractor to “provide filling, leveling, and repairing of any washed or eroded areas as may be necessary” at no additional expense to the Department; but, in many instances a Contractor would not repair a washout and wait for the Engineer to direct the repair so it can be paid for as unforeseeable work.

It is incumbent upon the Contractor to determine the most effective means and methods for establishing turf and the Department expects those means and methods to be reflected in the bid pricing.

No change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

D5 Construction  
386-943-5351

Comment: (12-19-12)

1. Some have concerns with taking this language out of the spec. In situations where the slopes are quite steep this spec is nice to have to direct the Contractor to peg the sod. In this case it is assumed that the Contractor will be responsible for any incidentals to establishment of the sod (whether it is staking or any other necessary work) regardless or the slope?

Response: Yes, the current specification language states that the Contractor is responsible for performing all work necessary for establishment as well as any repairs. No change made.

2. There is still some interest for requiring a biodegradable netting material.

Response: Language has been added to the spec requiring sod netting material to be degradable within a period of 3 years.

3. Sod should have a minimum of a 1” soil mat.

Response: This would require a change to Section 981 and is outside the scope of this change. No change made.

\*\*\*\*\*