Specification Section 514
Subarticle 514-1

ORIGINATION
Date: 6-5-25
Name: Kelly Shishlova
Email: Kelly.Shishlova@dot.state.fl.us

COMMENTARY

The current language is missing the label requirements for geotextile rolls on the job which is needed for proper identification and manufacturing quality control data. Additionally, the specification required the reader to turn to section 985 to find the requirements for the geotextile selection and construction requirements for overlapping the material, language that is better suited for under Division II since this is relevant to the contractor and not the manufacturer. Furthermore, the current language requires a certification that is job-specific signed by the manufacturer or supplier. However, this may not be possible for rolls being used on across multiple jobs, therefore, language needs to be updated to allow more options for proving the product that is being used on the job is the APL product to accommodate different situations. Lastly, the language is missing the Engineer's responsibility to check the product being used on the job is on the APL and appropriate for the drainage application, and SMO's role in the verification process.

INTERNAL COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
(Please note all comments and responses are verbatim as received. The Specifications Office does not alter typos or grammar.)

BLACK = Comment **BLUE** = Specifications Response **GREEN** = Change Made to Specification

Name: Melissa Hollis
Date: 7-17-25
COMMENT: Unopened packages should not need to be submitted to verify product as labeled. Selection of the geotextile type should be a design decision, with the requirement in the plans. Consider moving design criteria to the appropriate design document (FDM, drainage manual, or other).

Name: Kelly Shishlova
Date: 7-24-25
RESPONSE: Material needs to be submitted to SMO to verify the use of the product matches the intended application so that if needed, testing can be performed in the laboratory. Only certain applications/situations—such as the design of revetment systems—might the designer know the in-situ conditions and be able to call out in the Plans the exact class type that needs to be used. Otherwise, this decision needs to be made in the field based on the material the Contractor is using during backfill operations. For example, when wrapping pipe joints, the percentage of fines of the trench backfill material may vary depending on what the Contractor provides, therefore, changing the requirement of the geotextile class type. If the CEI or project engineer submits material samples prior to installation rather than waiting until the final stages of the project, many common issues with geosynthetics can be avoided. By the time it comes for material certification (finalizing the job), the project personnel are requesting a sample from the Contractor instead of

sampling directly from the roadway and witnessing the installation. At that stage, they can no longer verify what was actually installed, as they are relying solely on the Contractor's submission rather than firsthand observation. There is a deeper problem with verification, and I don't think specifying the type in the Plans would solve this problem.

ACTION TAKEN:
None.