


SUSTAINABLE
DESIGN
with

AirDrain

by AirField Systems



THE ADVANCED GEOCELL FOR MODERN GOLF COURSE CONSTRUCTION
RAPID DRAINAGE, COLLECTION, RETENTION AND REUSE FOR GREENS, TEE BOXES AND BUNKERS



Comparison of Putting Greens Constructed with Airfield Systems and USGA Designs



Kevin J. McInnes, Keisha Rose-Harvey, James C. Thomas
Texas A&M Agrilife Research

Turfgrass and Environmental Research Online
Volume 12, Number 4 | July – August 2013

Note: The information in this article has been adapted from the original work published in Crop Science titled "Water Storage in Putting Greens Constructed with United States Golf Association and Airfield Systems Designs" (McInnes and Thomas, 2011, 51:1261–1267) and in HortScience titled "Water Flow Through Sand-based Root Zones atop Geotextiles" (Rose-Harvey et al., 2012, 47:1543–1547). The research was collaboratively funded by Texas A&M University, Airfield Systems (Oklahoma City, OK), and the United States Golf Association.


Airfield Systems offers an alternative to the standard USGA putting green design. Their design utilizes a highly porous, 1-inch deep plastic grid (AirDrain, Figure 1) in place of a 4-inch deep gravel layer. As with gravel, AirDrain allows rapid lateral movement of excess water to drains and thus provides for uniform horizontal moisture content within the root zone. While voids in AirDrain are very effective in transmitting water, they are much too large for the sand in the root zone to bridge for self-support so a geotextile is used atop the grid to prevent infilling of the void space. Use of geotextiles in putting green construction has been controversial due to the perceived potential for clogging of the fabric by migrating fine particles and eventual loss of permeability.

We became interested in the hydraulic performance of the Airfield Systems design after Texas A&M University constructed a soccer field with the Airfield System design in 2002. Anecdotal evidence from field managers suggested that the new field required less frequent watering than the University's football field that had been constructed following the USGA design. While the two fields were constructed with different root zone mixtures and the physical environments surrounding the fields are quite different, we suspected that there may have been a difference in the amount of water stored in root zones on fields constructed with the two designs (i.e., a difference in the vertical distributions of water content in the root zones). We knew from the physics of water in sand that the amount

of water stored in a root zone decreases with increasing tension at the bottom of the root zone, and we expected because of the geometrical and physical differences in the designs that there would be differences in water tension at the bottom of the root zones.



Figure 1. The highly porous, 1-inch deep AirDrain (right) offers an alternative to the 4-inch deep gravel layer in the standard USGA putting green design (above left).



Cross-section of a putting green using the AirDrain instead of a 4-inch gravel layer in a USGA green (Drawing courtesy of [AirField Systems](#)).

While the root zone may be saturated above the drainage layer, the water is under tension so the term "perched water table" often used to describe the state of water in the root zone immediately above the drainage layer is a bit of a misnomer. A better term might be "perched capillary fringe." Capillary fringe is the saturated zone above a water table where water is under tension. The further upward from the bottom of the root zone the greater the water tension. As distance increases upward and water tension increases, the root zone eventually begins to desaturate as the largest pores drain. As distance increases beyond this height water content continues to decrease. As a consequence, the tension that develops at the bottom sets the starting tension and determines the thickness of the saturated zone and the amount of water stored in the root zone profile (Figure 2). The depth and hydraulic properties of the drainage layer determine the magnitude of tension that develops at the bottom of the root zone.

AirDrain is 1-inch deep so the maximum tension that can develop at the bottom of the root zone during drainage in the Airfield Systems design would be 1 inch of water. Gravel is typically 4 inches deep so the tension that could develop would be up to 4 inches of water, depending on the hydraulic properties of the gravel and the depth to which sand ingresses pores of the gravel. Water is slow to drain from small pores into large pores, but if both systems were sealed from evaporation the tensions would eventually reach 1 and 4 inches at the bottom of the root zone in the Airfield Systems and USGA design greens, respectively. An occasional finger of sand penetrating the gravel in the USGA design green can lead to an appreciably quicker increase in tension at the root zone gravel interface.

To test for differences in tension developed at the bottom of the root zones of the two designs, we constructed laboratory-based test cells from 4-inch diameter PVC pipe containing profiles of the Airfield Systems and USGA greens. Using tensiometers, we were able to demonstrate that the tension that developed at the bottom of the root zone in the Airfield Systems design was appreciably less than that in the USGA design. At that point we thought it worthwhile to investigate this finding on a slightly larger scale and a more realistic setting. To this end, we constructed test greens in 14-inch diameter PVC pipe. Three sands and three gravels were chosen such that they covered the ranges from coarser to finer sides of the USGA recommendations for particle size distribution. To create root zone mixtures, the coarser two sands had peat moss added to increase water retention. The finer sand was




Figure 2. Graphic representation of the dependence of water-holding capacity on tension at the bottom of the profile for a typical root zone mixture meeting USGA recommendation for total, air-filled, and capillary porosities. The curved lines to the right represent the relationship between water tension and water content for the root zone mixture.



Figure 3. Test greens constructed in 14-inch PVC pipe with either gravel or geotextile atop AirDrain as the drainage layers. Both types of test greens contained a pair of porous cups connected to plastic tubing that formed manometer–tensiometers to allow measurement of water pressure or tension at the root zone–drainage layer interface.

not amended. These three root zone mixtures were used in combination with the three gravels to construct test greens of the USGA design. The gravel layer in all of the test greens was 4 inches deep. An intermediate choke layer of coarse sand was not used. The same three root zone mixtures were used in combination with four geotextiles atop AirDrain to construct test greens of the Airfield Systems design. We used the Lutradur polyester geotextile prescribed by Airfield Systems at the time and chose three additional geotextiles that had the same apparent opening size (0.2 mm), but differed in material and/or manner of construction. Manometer–tensiometers were used to measure pressure or tension that developed at the root zone–drainage layer interface of both designs (Figure 3). After the test green columns were packed with 12 inches of the root zone mixtures they were sprigged with MiniVerde bermudagrass supplied by King Ranch Turfgrass–Wharton Farms (Wharton, TX). Following a period to grow–in the grass, a series of experiments were conducted that measured the amount of water stored in the root zone profiles and the water tension that developed at the bottom of the root zones of the different treatments after irrigation and drainage. Vertically oriented time domain reflectometry TDR probes were used to measure the amount of water stored in the root zone profiles (Figure 4).

Periodically during the course of the study, the test greens were watered until drainage was observed and then the amount of water stored in the profiles and the water tension at the bottom of the root zones were recorded for 48 hours. As with our preliminary lab study, we found that the water at the bottom of the root zones of test greens constructed with the Airfield design

was under less tension than the water in test greens constructed with the USGA design, by about 2.2 inches of water tension (Figure 5). This lower tension was associated with an increase in water storage of about 0.5 inch in the Airfield System design greens above that in the USGA design greens (Figure 5). This increase in water retention could lead to less frequent necessity to irrigate.

Because of reduced tension at the bottom of the root zone, these results also implied that the tension at which root zone mixtures should be tested for capillary porosity when intended to be used in an Airfield System design green should be reduced to achieve similar




Figure 4. Test green with vertically installed, 1–ft long TDR probe used to measure average water content within the root zone profile.




Figure 5. Range in the mean amount of water stored in 12-inch root zone profiles in Airfield Systems (geotextiles atop AirDrain) and USGA (gravels) design test greens 12 hours after irrigation. Means were of the three root zone mixture treatments and variations shown were from drainage-type treatments (i.e., type of geotextile or gravel). Stored water in the profile was measured by TDR and water tension was measured with manometer-tensiometers.

moisture retention to greens built according to the USGA recommendations. In doing so, slightly coarser sand would meet specifications for capillary water retention in the Airfield design. Conversely, sands that push the very fine side of the current recommendations might not meet specifications for air-filled porosity.

The question of whether or not geotextiles used in a green will clog with fines migrating out of the root zone was also studied. To address this issue, we conducted a

year-long laboratory experiment to investigate a range of geotextiles that were suited to supporting sand in the Airfield System design and determine whether or not they limit drainage out of the root zone. In this experiment, 6-inch diameter PVC columns were used to contain combinations of 12 inches of three sand mixes with 10 geotextiles held atop AirDrain (Figure 6). Manometer-tensiometers again were used to measure pressure or tension at the sand-geotextile interfaces. Mix 1 had a particle size distribution that ran down the center of the USGA specs. Mix 2 was made by blending Mix 1 with a sandy clay loam (9:1 by mass) and Mix 3 was made by blending Mix 1 with a sand having excess fines (1:1 by mass). Mix 1 and Mix 2 met USGA recommendations. Mix 3 contained twice the recommended amount of very fine sand. The apparent opening sizes of the geotextiles used ranged from 0.15 to 0.43 mm. After the sands were added to the columns they were regularly irrigated. Periodically, the rate that 1-inch of irrigation water drained from a column was measured and the pressure/tension at the sand-geotextile interface was recorded.

For the first six months, any particles that washed out of the sand through the geotextiles were accumulated and analyzed for total dry weight and particle size distribution. At the end of the study, the saturated hydraulic conductivity of the sand-geotextile combinations were measured. Statistical analyses showed that drainage rate, saturated hydraulic conductivity, and mass of eluviated particles were not dependent on the properties of the geotextiles, but rather on the properties of the sands (Figure 7). Most all of the particles that washed out of the columns were of clay and silt sizes. This could be construed as evidence that the geotextiles were sieving out larger particles, but we found that the size of particles in the drainage water was not related to the apparent opening size of



Figure 6. Columns used to measure potential clogging of geotextiles by fines migrating out of the root zone.




Figure 7. Size distribution of particles washed out of the three sand mixes through the geotextiles. The solid line for each sand mixture represent the mean fraction of particles finer than a given diameter over 30 columns containing the mixture (10 geotextiles with 3 replicates) and the dashed lines represent one standard deviation each side of the mean.

the geotextiles, which it should have been if the geotextiles were acting as sieves (i.e., the geotextiles with the larger AOS would have let larger particles pass, and vice versa, but this did not happen). The geotextiles obviously prevented the passage of particles as their purpose is to prevent migration of the root zone sand into the drainage layer, but it appeared in our study that the sands were responsible for determining the particle sizes leaving the columns.

Drainage rates from the columns containing the sand without added fines increased over the year, presumably because pore channels in the sand were widened when silt and clay washed out of the profile. Drainage rates of the columns containing the two sands with additional fines decreased over the year, but the decrease was not statistically related to the properties of the geotextiles. To test if the sands themselves were clogging, saturated hydraulic conductivities were measured as layers of sand were removed from columns. Since saturated hydraulic conductivity would not depend on the depth of sand in a hydraulically uniform column, any observed changes would be due to difference in the conductivity of the layers removed compared to those remaining. We found that when surface layers were removed the saturated hydraulic conductivity increased, indicating that the surface layers had lower conductivities. This was not too surprising as the majority of inter-particle pores of sand meeting USGA recommendation are smaller than the apparent opening sizes of the geotextiles we tested. In support of our conclusion that the sands were clogging and not the geotextiles, we did not notice a build-up of positive

pressure atop any of the geotextiles during drainage, as would have occurred if the geotextile had been restricting drainage out of the column.

In conclusion, the results of our studies gave no reason to prevent more widespread use of Airfield Systems' design as an alternative to the USGA method for putting green construction. Airfield Systems design produces additional water holding capacity above the USGA design, which leads to more plant available water, given the same root zone mixture, and, possibly, less frequent requirement for irrigation. Our data also support the general use of properly sized geotextiles to support sand based root zones in putting greens. Geotextiles with apparent opening size of 0.2 mm worked well in our test greens and a woven geotextile with an apparent opening size twice as large (0.43 mm) retained the root zone sand just as well.

Summary Points

- Water at the bottom of the test green rootzones constructed with the Airfield design was under less tension than the water in test greens constructed with the USGA design (about 2.2 inches of water tension).
- This lower tension was associated with an increase in water storage of about 0.5 inch in the Airfield System design greens above that in the USGA design greens.
- Geotextiles with apparent opening size of 0.2 mm worked well in test greens and a woven geotextile with an apparent opening size twice as large (0.43 mm) retained the root zone sand just as well
- The geotextiles that were tested prevented the migration and passage of the sand rootzone mixture into the drainage layer, but it appeared that the tested sands were responsible for determining the particle sizes leaving the columns.
- The results gave no reason to prevent more widespread use of Airfield Systems' design as an alternative to the USGA method for putting green construction.

DR. KEVIN J. MCINNES is Professor of Soil and Environmental Physics in the Department of Soil and Crop Sciences, Texas A&M University. His research focuses on water and energy transport in soil.

KEISHA M. ROSE-HARVEY graduate student in the Department of Soil and Crop Sciences, Texas A&M University.


JAMES C. THOMAS, CPAg, is senior research associate in the Department of Soil and Crop Sciences at Texas A&M University.

AirDrain

– What drains better than Air?

For Golf- Greens, Bunkers, Tee Boxes and Fairways

Thru a research project conducted at Texas A&M, it was concluded that you can reduce your irrigation needs using AirField Systems AirDrain. The five year research project was jointly funded by the United States Golf Association and AirField Systems and was a collaborative effort between Texas A&M, AirField Systems and the United States Golf Association. The data from the research showed that the AirField Systems drainage profile provided between one to three more days of plant available water than a **United States Golf Association** recommended gravel and sand profile. Click [here](#) for more information about the study titled “[A Comparison of Water Drainage and Storage in Putting Greens Built Using Airfield Systems and USGA Methods of Construction](#)”.



Benefits of an AirField System Design include:

- 1 to 3 more days of plant available water stored in the root zone (depending on climate)
- Significantly reduces daily irrigation needs (as told to us by our customers)
- Healthier turf / Stronger root system (as told to us by our customers)
- 100% Vertical Drainage under the entire playing surface
- AirDrain is a 100% recycled copolymer with the impact modifier “metallocene” qualifying it as a “No Break” plastic
- Helps eliminate standing water / Simplifies maintenance (as told to us by our customers)
- Minimal site disturbance / Far less excavation and disposal
- Several Installation days are saved over a gravel installation
- Compact shipping that reduces overall storage and transportation costs

Whether it's a single sports field, a sports field complex, a golf course, or municipal landscaping, it's time to harvest your water. Water allocations are at an all time low, and that trend will continue. Many facilities are sacrificing landscaping to keep sports fields alive, or simply not receiving enough water to do either.

An AirField System allows you to get more out of the water you have while it's in use, and then reuse what is left over. With a one inch void below the entire surface of a field or green, water is quickly routed to retention ponds or underground harvesting tanks for treatment and later use. Taking rain water and paid-for sprinkler water further by collecting it and reusing it is a great way to recycle, but AirField also allows you to use your water more efficiently.

That means you save and utilize water every way you can, lowering the total environmental impact of your facility while saving money, and avoiding continued problems due to lack of water.

Dramatically cut your water use.

The daily volume of water required for an average golf course is 400,000 gallons. That's over 145,000,000 gallons of water per year. With drastic reductions in water allocation today, what will tomorrow bring? Green building with the AirField System creates up to 4 more days of plant available water compared to a gravel drainage profile, and allows you to reclaim water for later use.

With AirDrain as part of your sustainable site design you will enjoy:


- Healthier turf and stronger roots with a nearly perfect perched water table
- Less frequent irrigation
- Reduced damage and loss of play
- Reduced site disturbance during installation
- Dramatically lower carbon footprint and sustainable site impact

To learn more about sustainable sports field design, contact AirField Systems today.

Or Contact an authorized AirField distributor:


Corporate Office:
8028 N. May Avenue, Suite 201
Oklahoma City, OK 73120

Phone: (405) 359-3775
Email: info@airfieldsystems.com
Web: www.airfieldsystems.com



AIRFIELD PROUDLY SUPPORTS THESE SUSTAINABILITY FRIENDLY ORGANIZATIONS:





Unit Panel Specifications:

Size: 32" x 32" x 1"
Weight: 3.1 lb
Strength: 233 psi (unfilled)
6747 psi (filled)
Resin: 100% Recycled (PIR)
Copolymer with Impact Modifier
"No Break" Polymer Material
Color: Black
(3% carbon black added for UV Protection)

AirDrain Cross Section

Scale 0.12:1

Typical

For AirDrain Grass Systems




Airfield Systems, LLC
8028 N May Ave, Suite 201
Oklahoma City, OK 73120
(405) 359-3375

www.airfieldsystems.com

Drawing No. ADCS002.dwg

This is a typical drainage profile, your profile may vary.

Check with a Geotechnical Engineer for recommendations for your site conditions and geographical region.



AirDrain™ Natural Turf Typical Detail


AirDrain™ Impermeable Natural Turf Detail

Airfield Systems
8028 N. May Ave., Suite 201
Oklahoma City, OK 73120
(405) 359-3775

*per geotechnical engineer

www.airfieldsystems.com
AirDrain_Nat_Turf_Typical_Detail_002.idw







AirDrain™ Natural Edge Typical Detail Permeable

This drawing, specifications and the information contained herein is for general presentation purposes only. All final drawings and layouts should be determined by a licensed engineer(s).

Airfield Systems
8028 N. May Ave., Suite 201
Oklahoma City, OK 73120
(405) 359-3775



| | | | | |
|----------|------|----------|---|-----|
| DRAWN | Gary | 8/4/2013 | Airfield Systems | |
| CHECKED | | | AirDrain™ Natural Edge Typical Detail | |
| QA | | | | |
| MFG | | | | |
| APPROVED | | | | |
| | | SIZE | DWG NO | REV |
| | | C | Natural_Edge | 1 |
| | | SCALE | <small>The information contained in this drawing is the sole property of Airfield Systems. Any reproduction in part or as a whole without prior written consent is prohibited.</small> SHEET 1 OF 1 | |



This drawing, specifications and the information contained herein is for general presentation purposes only. All final drawings and layouts should be determined by a licensed engineer(s).



| | |
|---------------|-----------|
| DRAWN Gary | 12/1/2013 |
| CHECKED | |
| QA | |
| MFG | |
| APPROVED | |

The information contained in this drawing is the sole property of Airfield Systems. Any reproduction in part or as a whole without prior written consent is prohibited.

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Airfield Systems | |
| Bunker Airdrain Detail | |
| SIZE C | DWG NO Bunker_Detail_REV002 |
| SCALE | REV 0 |
| SHEET 1 OF 1 | |

| General Information | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|---------|
| General | | | |
| Construction | 100% Post-Manufactured Content Injection Molded Copolymer | | |
| Composition | Copolymer Polypropylene Using Impact Modifier and 3% Carbon Black for UV Resistance | | |
| Dimensions | 31.784" x 31.880" x 1.000" (7.03 sq ft.) | | |
| Unit Weight | 3.100 lbs. | | |
| Forms | Pellets | | |
| Shipping | | | |
| Parts Per Pallet | 114 | | |
| Pallet Dimensions | 33" x 33" x 48" | | |
| Pallet Weight | 390 lbs. | | |
| Area Per Pallet | 798 sq. ft. | | |
| Pallets Per Trailer | 114 (3 wide x 2 tall x 19 deep) | | |
| Area Per Trailer | 90,972 sq. ft. | | |
| ASTM and ISO Properties ¹ | | | |
| Physical | Nominal Value | Test Method | |
| Specific Gravity | 0.940 | ASTM D792 | |
| Melt Mass-Flow Rate (230°C/2.16 kg) | 20 g/10 min | ASTM D1238 | |
| Mechanical | Nominal Value | Test Method | |
| Density | 57.490 lb/ft ³ | ASTM D1505 | |
| Tensile Strength (Yield, 73°F) | 2,145 psi | ASTM D638 | |
| Tensile Elongation (Yield, 73°F) | 16% | ASTM D638 | |
| Flexural Modulus (73°F) | 100,175 psi | ASTM D790 | |
| Compression Strength (73°F) | 233 psi | ASTM D6254 | |
| Impact | Nominal Value | Test Method | |
| Notched Izod Impact (73°F, 0.125 in) | | ASTM D256 | |
| Thermal | Nominal Value | Test Method | |
| Deflection Temperature Under Load 264 psi, Unannealed | 160°F | ASTM D648 | |
| Expansion/Contraction Index ¹ | | | |
| Temperature | Humidity | Length | Width |
| 100°F | 98% | 31.881" | 31.817" |
| -5°F | 0% | 31.765" | 31.713" |
| Change | | .116" | .104" |
| Joint Expansion/Contraction Capacity | | .420" | .572" |
| Safety Factor | | 362% | 550% |
| Examples of Usage | | | |
| Application | Required Strength | Safety Factor | |
| Auto | 40 psi | x 168 | |
| Truck | 110 psi | x 61 | |
| DC10 | 250 psi | x 27 | |
| Space Shuttle | 340 psi | x 19 | |

¹ Independent laboratory testing conducted by TRI/Environmental, Inc., TSI/Testing Services, Inc. and Wassenaar.

100% Post Manufactured Content



Recycled

The **AirDrain** GeoGrid is made of 100% post-manufactured material, so you can feel good about helping the planet [while adding valuable LEED Points](#) to your project. We also add an impact modifier for incredible strength and superior performance in extreme heat and cold - on top of the already durable **AirDrain** design.

AirDrain Co-Polymer with an Impact Modifier Performance and Temperature Durability

Attached you will find the specification of the resin used to produce both the 32 x 32 and the 32 x 18 Geo cells. This material is a co-polymer polypropylene that is 100% recycled resin. In order to be able to produce a consistent recycled resin a PIR (post industrial resin) is used for the base resin. This is the only way to produce a consistent material as opposed to a PCR (post consumer resin) which is dependent on the consumer to supply a consistent material. Using the PIR as a base resin 3% carbon black is added to insure good UV stabilization and metallocene (an ethylene base material) is used as an impact modifier.

Impact Modifier

The impact modifier is added in an amount to achieve a 10.0 Notched Izod Impact which comfortably qualifies this material as a NO BREAK material (4.0 and greater are normally considered no break material). The **AirDrain** resin offers an advantage over many ethylene and HDPE products since the **AirDrain** resin is often superior when it comes to pliability, warping and internal stress related issues. Referring to the attached specification sheet you will notice that all testing is done to specific ASTM Standards.

Resin Blends

AirDrain's blend of resins gives it the ability to perform in extreme temperatures. **AirDrain** does not need a temperature above 50 degrees Fahrenheit to be installed or warmed in the sun to be pliable on site for install. In addition, **AirDrain's** unique resin blend also helps prevent breakage and cracking in extreme temperatures. Giving it the ability to withstand repeated freeze thaw cycles.


Airfield posts its resin content and performance values with ASTM test methods and guide lines to measure the properties of our grid.

Proper Sequencing and Orientation of AirDrain GeoCell Panels for Rapid Installation

Pallet Staging: AirDrain pallets cover approximately 798sqft. per pallet and should be staged accordingly within the installation area so that you minimize the amount of time to stage the AirDrain grid along the install lines across the project. Typically placing the AirDrain every 65 feet across and 15-20 feet back from each other. (Call AirField with questions that you might have about proper staging and installation.)

All Installations must start in the Top Left Corner of the Field and work Left to Right to be installed properly.

1. Orientate the AirDrain GeoCell materials with the integral indicator tab to the panel's bottom left corner (painted yellow). **Install the AirDrain units by placing units with the connectors and platforms up creating a flat surface for the profile above. If the male connectors do not fall or drop into the female connectors then the orientation is incorrect, please call AirField Systems Immediately at 405-359-3775.**



2. Install the AirDrain panels across the field in a rowed pattern. Staggering of rows will allow for multiple row completion by a multi-manned crew.
3. Once the first row has progressed across the project, start with a second row. Have a person staging the panels in three's snapped together along the row. The crew can then install the left side of the panel while elevating slightly the top portion (so the male and female connectors don't sync) once the left side has been snapped with a pull along the row direction, the top portion should fall into place and with a bottom vertical pull holding the inside of parts 1 & 3 snap all three parts in place.



4. AirDrain panels can be shaped to individual field areas as needed with appropriate cutting device. If a typical field is installed correctly there should only be two sides that would need to be trimmed.
 - A. If only a few parts need to be trimmed, use tin snips.
 - B. If many parts require trimming, set up a table and use a circular saw with a no melt, plastic cutting saw blade.

Visit [AirField Systems Flickr page](#) to watch a video of a 74,000 sq ft project for Chesapeake Energy illustrating a 3 man crew installation.

DISCLAIMER: The preceding and following drawings and/or general installation guidelines are provided only to show a concept design for installation and are not instructions for any particular installation. These drawings and general instructions are not complete and are provided only to assist a licensed Geo-Technical Engineer, a Landscape Architect and/or Civil Engineer in preparing actual construction and installation plans. These drawings and instructions must be reviewed by a licensed Geo-Technical Engineer, a Landscape Architect and/or Civil Engineer and adapted to the condition of a particular installation site and to comply with all state and local requirements for each installation site. THESE DRAWINGS AND/OR GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS DO NOT MODIFY OR SUPPLEMENT ANY EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES INCLUDING MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, IF APPLICABLE RELATING TO THE PRODUCT.

Thomas Turf Services, Inc. will Consult on Natural Turf Profiles for AirField Systems AirDrain



Mr. Blackwood:

Thank you for your call today and congratulations on your new projects. I would be pleased to work with you and your customers to help select appropriate sands and/or amendments if needed to use with your [AirField Systems](#) for natural turf. As you know, we have been pleased with its performance here in Texas and I think we can help others have equally good experiences with it.

Please feel free to have people contact me at the following cell phone, fax, and E-mail address.

Samples may be mailed to me at the address below.

Sincerely,

Jim Thomas

James C. Thomas, Pres.

[Thomas Turf Services, Inc.](#)

11183 State Hwy. 30

College Station, TX 77845

Fax: 979-774-1604

Mobile: 979-575-5107

E-mail: soiltest@thomasturf.com