



HAL
open science

Flow rate in composite liners including GCLs and a bituminous geomembrane

Hajer Bannour, C. Barral, Nathalie Touze

► **To cite this version:**

Hajer Bannour, C. Barral, Nathalie Touze. Flow rate in composite liners including GCLs and a bituminous geomembrane. The 3rd International Conference on Geotechnical Engineering, Feb 2013, Hamamet, Tunisia. 11 p. hal-00813189

HAL Id: hal-00813189

<https://hal.science/hal-00813189>

Submitted on 15 Apr 2013

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Flow rate in composite liners including GCLs and bituminous geomembranes

Hajer BANNOUR

Irstea Antony, France; Tel: +33-1 40 96 62 14; Fax: +33-1 40 96 62 70; Email: hajer.bannour@irstea.fr

Camille BARRAL

Irstea Antony, France; Tel: +33-1 40 96 60 48; Fax: +33-1 40 96 62 70; Email: camille.barral@irstea.fr

Nathalie TOUZE-FOLTZ

Irstea Antony, France; Tel: +33-1 40 96 60 39; Fax: +33-1 40 96 62 70; Email: nathalie.touze@irstea.fr

ABSTRACT: Some studies were performed in the past years regarding the behaviour of geosynthetic clay liners (GCLs) as part of a composite liner, focused on the situation where a GCL is located under a hole in a high density polyethylene (HDPE) geomembrane (GM). In this case, the contact between the GM and the GCL was quantified in terms of flow rate through the composite liner and in terms of interface transmissivity. Various situations were tested in the past in order to evaluate the situation where a smooth GM is used in contact with the GCL. The situation where a textured GM is used in contact with the GCL was also evaluated. More recently, the effect of the nature of the bentonite in the GCL, sodium or calcium bentonite, leading to different flow rates in the GCL was evaluated. In all cases an HDPE GM was used. This choice is linked to the fact that it is the most commonly GM used in composite liners including GCLs for chemical compatibility reasons. However one could imagine that the use of other GMs, like bituminous geomembranes (B-GMs) associated to a GCL, could be adapted for hydraulic applications.

A quantification of flow rates was thus performed in laboratory tests at the decimetric scale for the case of a damaged B-GM located on top of sodium or calcium GCLs. This corresponds to an alternative design for a canal projected in France at the moment.

Results obtained will be presented in the paper and evaluated depending on the B-GM side (polymeric film or sand layer) in contact with the GCL, the type of GCL tested (sodium or calcium bentonite in the GCL) and also compared to test results obtained from the literature carried out with a HDPE GM associated to a GCL.

1 INTRODUCTION

Bituminous geomembranes (B-GMs) are used in many geotechnical and environmental protection applications and specifically for hydraulic, infrastructure and transportation fields such as water storage and transportation where B-GMs were used in lining drinking and navigation water canals (Domange 1983, Duquennois et al. 1995, Etienne et al. 1995, Breul & Herment 1998, Potié 1999, Fagon et al. 1999, Flaquet-Lacoux et al. 2005), lining, reinforcement and protection of dams and reservoirs (Tisserand 1983, Alonso et al. 1990, Girard et al. 1996, Poulain et al. 1997, Breul & Herment 1997, Breul et al. 1998, Breul & Eldrige 2009) and also for retention ponds (Breul et al. 2006) and aquifer protection from environmental impact of roads (Coppinger et al. 2002). Apart

from environmental applications, B-GM were also used as components of cover systems in landfills (Ossena et al. 1997, Potié et al. 1997, Faure & Itty 1999, Peggs 2008, Marchiol et al. 2006) mining (Breul et al. 2008), tunnels (Benchet et al. 2011), ditches (Imbert & Carcenac 1997), railways (Imbert et al. 1997), and road foundations (Breul & Herment 1995, 1997) As presented by Breul et al. (2008), the structure of a B-GM is generally composed by (Figure 1): (i) a non-woven polyester geotextile whose mass per unit area is 200 to 400 g/m², (ii) a glass fleece reinforcement which provides stability during fabrication and contributes to the strength of the GM, (iii) a bituminous mastic consisting of a blown 100/40 pen bitumen, and filler. This mastic impregnates the whole structure and gives the waterproofing of the product and ensures the longevity and the high resistance of the product, (iv) a Terphane film bonded to the underside when the membrane is hot, which prevents penetration of the geomembrane by plant roots, and (v) a coating of fine sand on the upper surface to provide a greater traction on slopes, giving greater operator safety and security, and to give protection from the degrading effects of UV radiation (Breul et al. 2008).




Figure 1. Typical cross-section of a BGM (adapted from Breul et al. 2008)

On another hand, design engineers working on projects requiring the use of a GM in a composite liner with a GCL often limit their consideration of options to a high density polyethylene (HDPE) GM, perhaps on the basis of their experience with landfill design. Research performed on HDPE GMs and GCLs as parts of a composite liner focused on the situation where the GM is presenting a hole, aimed to quantify the interface transmissivity between the GM and the upper geotextile of the GCL. This paper shows that the use of a B-GM in a composite liner including a GCL, is a reliable alternative to HDPE GM- GCL composite liner, especially when there is no consideration of chemical resistance of the geomembrane. This should provide design engineers elements to consider a broader range of GMs in their designs and to use a rational approach for GM selection for hydraulic applications.

In this paper, we present first, previous results on interface transmissivity measurements in composite liners composed by a HDPE GM and a GCL. Second, we introduce materials tested and the procedure of interface transmissivity measurement. Finally, we present and discuss flow rates and interface transmissivity test results done on a composite liner made with a B-GM and a GCL containing calcium and sodium bentonite.

2 FLOW RATES AND INTERFACE TRANSMISSIVITY IN COMPOSITE LINERS WITH A GCL, INCLUDING DAMAGED GM

The work performed in the past years regarding the behaviour of a composite liner containing a GCL and a punctured HDPE GM was focused on obtaining flow rates and interface transmissivities. The flow through a defect in the GM depends, as indicated by Brown et al. (1987),

on the contact between the GM and the underlying soil liner. According to these authors, if the contact is not perfect, once fluid has migrated through the defect, it spreads laterally through the gap existing between the GM and the underlying soil, called interface. This interface flow covers an area called wetted area. Finally, the liquid migrates into and through the soil liner. The contact between the GM and the GCL was quantified in terms of flow rate through the composite liner and in terms of interface transmissivity.

2.1 Analytical solution for calculating interface transmissivity in a composite liner

To calculate the GM–GCL interface transmissivity θ , an analytical solution developed by Touze-Foltz et al. (1999) for the case of a circular defect in the GM was used. This analytical solution assumes that: (i) the interface transmissivity is uniform; (ii) the liquid flow in the transmissive layer is radial; (iii) the flow occurs under steady-state conditions; (iv) the compacted clay liner (CCL), the GCL and the GM–GCL interface are saturated; and (v) the additional flow through the passive barrier (CCL + GCL) is one-dimensional and vertical. The final flow rates (steady-state conditions) measured in the transmissivity tests were used in the calculations. It should be pointed out that the interface transmissivity calculated based on the analytical solution described above should be viewed as an apparent transmissivity, due to the fact that preferential flow paths occurred in the tests, as discussed above, which were not considered in the development of the analytical solution employed.

In a composite liner, a great fraction of the liquid that passes through the GM puncture flows along the GM–GCL interface, moving laterally to a certain distance from the GM puncture before infiltrating into the GCL and underlying layers. The contour of the region reached by the fluid defines the wetted area. Under the conditions of the tests performed in this work, the radius of the wetted area is the internal radius of the cell. Equations 1 to 5 below apply to the boundary condition where the hydraulic head is equal to zero at a certain radius in the specimen, which in the present case is the cell radius:

$$Q = \pi r_0^2 k_s \frac{h_w + d}{H_s} - 2\pi r_0^2 \theta \alpha [AI_1(\alpha r_0) - BK_1(\alpha r_0)] \quad (1)$$

Where: Q is the flow rate under steady-state conditions; r_0 is the circular defect radius; k_s is the hydraulic conductivity of the liner GCL + (CCL); h_w is the hydraulic head; d_s is the thickness of the liner (GCL + CCL); H_s is the thickness of the soil component of the composite liner (GCL + CCL); θ is the interface transmissivity; I_1 and K_1 are modified Bessel functions of the first order; and α , A and B are parameters given by Equations 2 to 5, as follows

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{k_s}{\theta d_s}} \quad (2)$$

$$A = -\frac{h_w K_0(\alpha R) + H_s (K_0(\alpha R) - K_0(\alpha r_0))}{K_0(\alpha r_0) I_0(\alpha R) - K_0(\alpha R) I_0(\alpha r_0)} \quad (3)$$

$$B = \frac{h_w K_0(\alpha R) + H_s (I_0(\alpha R) - I_0(\alpha r_0))}{K_0(\alpha r_0) I_0(\alpha R) - K_0(\alpha R) I_0(\alpha r_0)} \quad (4)$$

As

$$AI_1(\alpha R) + BK_1(\alpha R) - H_s = 0 \quad (5)$$

Where K_0 and I_0 are modified Bessel functions of zero order and R is the radius of the wetted area.

It should be pointed out that the interface transmissivity calculated based on the analytical solution should be viewed as an apparent transmissivity, due to the fact that preferential flow paths can occur in the tests due to the application of the load through a granular layer having points of contact with the GM. The type of contact between the GM and the GCL, were not considered in the development of the analytical solution employed.

2.2 Previous interface transmissivity studies carried out on composite liners made with GCLs

Various situations were tested in the past in order to evaluate the effect of a smooth GM in contact with the GCL (Harpur et al. 1993, Barroso et al. 2006, 2010). Harpur et al. (1993) verified that under steady-state conditions, the most significant fraction of the flow takes place along the interface between the GM and the cover geotextile of the GCL, through the cover geotextile, and along gaps between the cover geotextile of the GCL and the bentonite. A less important amount of fluid percolates through the bentonite and below the GCL. Barroso et al. (2006, 2010) examined the influence of the hydraulic head, pre-hydration of the GCL and confining stress on the GM-GCL interface transmissivity. The results obtained by those authors showed that it is difficult to establish general trends expressing the influence of pre-hydration, confining stress and hydraulic head on the interface transmissivity. Nevertheless, it seems that, regarding the flow rate, it is important to take into account both the initial water content of the specimen and the confining stress (Barroso et al. 2006). The confining stress affects differently the flow rate, depending on the initial water content of the specimen. In fact, the flow rate in pre-hydrated GCLs is about one order of magnitude larger in tests under a confining stress of 50 kPa than in tests under 200 kPa. On the other hand, for non-pre-hydrated specimens, the flow rates are similar for the two confining stresses under steady-state flow conditions (Barroso et al. 2006).

The situation where a textured HDPE GM was used in contact with the GCL was also evaluated (Barroso et al. 2008). Results showed that tests were reproducible and that the texture had a small impact on flow rates obtained at steady-state, although, at the beginning of the tests, larger flow rates were obtained with smooth GMs than with textured ones. This suggests that, at the early phases of the tests, the water flows more easily at the interface when experiments smooth GMs are used. The texture seems to reduce the space available at the interface for the water flow. However, with time, the sodium bentonite in the GCL swelled resulting in a better contact between the GM and the GCL.

More recently, the effect of the nature of the bentonite in the GCL, sodium or calcium bentonite, leading to different flow rates in the GCL was evaluated (Mendes et al. 2010). Those authors concluded that the nature of the bentonite and the manufacturing process of the GCLs studied did not affect the GM-GCL interface transmissivity when steady-state flow conditions were reached. They did also notice that for hole diameters in the range 4 to 10 mm the diameter of the hole in the GM did not significantly influence the flow rate through the GM-GCL composite liner: the expansion of the sodium bentonite was effective in blocking the puncture in the GM, yielding to a significant reduction on the flow rate. The results suggest that GCLs containing sodium bentonite, whose hydraulic conductivity increases due to cation exchange, can still maintain a good performance in a composite liner in terms of GM-GCL interface transmissivity.

2.3 Materials tested

Two GCLs containing respectively sodium and calcium bentonite are tested in this study in contact with a B-GM. The first one GCL 1 is a needle punched sodium bentonite whose upper geotextile is woven and its carrier is non woven needle-punched. For the second GCL noted GCL 2, both geotextiles on the two faces of the GCL are woven. The bentonite contained in this GCL is an activated calcium bentonite obtained with an ionic process exchange commonly known by the term activation which consists generally by adding from 5 to 10% of sodium carbonate. The bentonite is

fixed with geotextiles by stitching. Views of GCLs tested are presented in Figure 2. The mass per unit area of dry bentonite on GCL specimen was calculated. GCL characteristics are summarized in table 1. The B-GM, according to the fabric presentation made in Table 1 exhibit two sides with different aspects: a polymeric film is located on one surface whereas a sand layer is encountered at the surface of the second side. These layers are different in terms of their roughness as the polymeric film face (Figure 3) is smoother than the other one made with a sand impregnation (Figure 4).



(a) (b)
Figure 2. View of tested GCLs: (a) GCL 1; (b) GCL 2

Table 1. Properties of GCLs

GCL	Upper GTX	Carrier GTX	Bentonite nature	Bonding	Measured total dry mass per unit area of bentonite on specimen (kg/m ²)
GCL 1	Woven	Non woven	Granular sodium	Needle punched	≈ 5.83
GCL 2	Woven	Woven	Powdered calcium	Coated	≈ 8.10

Table 2. Properties of B-GM

Composition			
(i) Designation	(ii) Functionality	(iii) Unit	(iv) Values
Glass-mat	Reinforcement	(v) g/m ²	(vi) 50
Non-woven geotextile	Reinforcement	(vii) g/m ²	(viii) 400
Oxidized bitumen	Binder	(ix) g/m ²	(x) 7310
Sand	Surface finish	(xi) g/m ²	(xii) 217
Polyester antiroot film	Under surface finish	(xiii) g/m ²	(xiv) 15
Thickness (on finished product) (EN 1849-1)	mm	5.6	




Figure 3. Polymeric film side of BGM



Figure 4. Sand layer side of BGM

2.4 Apparatus description and set up

Transmissivity tests are carried out in an apparatus specially designed to measure the flow rate in a composite liner, as shown in Figure 4. As previously described by Touze-Foltz (2002), Touze-Foltz et al. (2002), Cartaud and Touze-Foltz (2004) and Barroso et al. (2006), Barroso et al. (2008), Barroso et al. (2010), Mendes et al. (2010) it consists of a Plexiglas cell basically composed by four parts: (i) a bottom plate which supports the soil and applies the confining stress; (ii) a 200 mm inside diameter base cylinder, 80 mm high, to accommodate the CCL and the GCL specimen; (iii) a top coarse granular drainage layer; and (iv) an upper cylinder that accommodates the granular layer.

In the experimental setup, the B-GM, exhibiting a circular hole, is located on the GCL. To assemble the test, initially the base soil, simulating a CCL, is compacted in the bottom cylinder of the equipment with the upper side contacting a rigid metallic plate in order to ensure a smooth CCL surface underneath the GCL. The final thickness of the CCL is about 6 cm. The internal walls of the bottom cylinder are lubricated before soil compaction, in order to minimise friction between the CCL and these walls during the tests. Once the test cell is closed, the B-GM is ensuring the watertightness of the upper part of the cell. When the flow rate is important, it is noticed at the downstream side of the cell but when flow rate is not visible to the trained eye, readings are made at the upstream side of the cell.




Figure 5. Interface transmissivity test apparatus (from Mendes et al., 2010)

In order to get comparable results between the various testing configurations presented in the literature and tests performed in this study, a 4 mm diameter hole in the coating was used, and a 50 kPa load and a 0.3 m hydraulic head applied. The CCL layer used is similar to the one from previous studied performed by Barroso et al. (2006, 2008) and Mendes et al. (2010) (see Table 3).

Table 3. Properties of the base soil used (adapted from Barroso et al. 2006)

Percent fines (%)	Percent clay (%)	Atterberg limits ASTM D 4318		Proctor modified ASTM D 1557		K_{CCL} (m/s)
		ω_L (%)	ω_P (%)	ω_{OPT} (%)	γ_{dmax} (KN/m ³)	
73.6	40.5	54.2	23.7	13.6	19.1	8×10^{-11}

K_{CCL} : hydraulic conductivity of the soil composing the CCL; PI: plasticity index; ω_L : liquid limit; ω_{OPT} : optimum moisture content; ω_P : plastic limit; γ_{dmax} : maximum dry density.

3 RESULTS

As can be noted, flow rate along the B-GM-GCL interface decreases gradually versus time during 300 hours for each GCL and each case (rough face and smooth face in contact with the GCL) (Fig. 5). Afterwards the flow rate does no longer evolve. This corresponds to steady state. Table 3 shows flow rate, hydraulic conductivity and interface transmissivity results obtained at steady-state. Hydraulic conductivities are obtained using results of previous tests carried out in oedopermeameter cells using NF P 84-705. Apparent interface transmissivities are calculated using the analytical solution proposed by Touze-Foltz et al. (1999) (Equation 1). A comparison of flow rates obtained in composite liners according to the side in contact with the GCLs was performed. Results show that the smoother side in contact with the GCL gives rise to lower flow rates than for the rougher side in transient state for each GCL tested (Fig. 5).




Figure .5 Comparisons between interface transmissivity results of the two faces of the bituminous GM

This could be explained by the fact that the rough side allows the storage of a larger quantity of water at the interface with the GCL, than the smooth side of the B-GM. B-GM-GCL contact may also present interface irregularities so water could have preferential flow paths between the B-GM and the GCL. Once pores were filled and the bentonite is swollen, results were no longer affected. So at the end of the tests, flow rates are similar for both configurations and for the two GCLs tested

at steady state. As shown, in Table 2, flow rate obtained are between $5.04 \times 10^{-11} \text{ m}^3 / \text{s}$ and $5.22 \times 10^{-11} \text{ m}^3 / \text{s}$ for GCL 1 and between $2.69 \times 10^{-11} \text{ m}^3 / \text{s}$ and $3.14 \times 10^{-11} \text{ m}^3 / \text{s}$ for GCL 2. It is thought that these minor differences for each GCL can be associated to the difference on the contact quality between the two configurations at steady state. These results agrees with the one from tests carried out by Barroso et al. (2010) on smooth and textured GMs.

Table 4. Values of final interface transmissivity calculated by the analytical solution

Test	Q (m ³ /s)	K _{GCL} (m/s)	R (m)	θ (m ² /s)
GCL 1- smooth side	5.22×10^{-11}	1.77×10^{-11}	0.1	1.08×10^{-10}
GCL 1- rough side	5.04×10^{-11}	1.77×10^{-11}	0.1	1.04×10^{-10}
GCL 2- smooth side	3.14×10^{-11}	6.90×10^{-10}	0.1	5.96×10^{-11}
GCL 2- rough side	2.69×10^{-11}	6.90×10^{-10}	0.1	5.03×10^{-11}

Q, the flow rate; K_{GCL}, hydraulic conductivity of the GCL in steady-state; R_c, radius of the wetted area; θ, interface transmissivity calculated by the analytical solution.

Figure. 6 gives a synthesis of the various interface transmissivity data obtained from the literature with HDPE GMs in contact with the GCL and from this study. All data corresponding to the two configurations (rough side or smooth side of the B-GM in contact with the GCLs) are located under the GM-GCL contact condition defined by Barroso et al. (2006) linking the interface transmissivity θ to the hydraulic conductivity of the GCL K_{GCL} according to Equation 6:

$$\log \theta = -2.2322 + 0.7155 \log K_{GCL} \quad (6)$$

This result shows the efficiency of this B-GM/GCL composite liner to reduce interface transmissivity and flow rates along the interface due to the high quality contact insured by the B-GM which creates a good adhesion with the upper geotextile interface of the GCL.




Figure 6. Synthesis of transmissivity data obtained in the literature for GCLs in contact with GMs and for B-GM in contact with GCLs obtained in this study

As shown in Table 5, hydraulic conductivity and interface transmissivity results obtained in this study are in the range of previous results obtained on HDPE GM in contact with GCL which confirm the possibility to change HDPE GMs in composite liners by bituminous ones without any account for chemical and mechanical compatibility.

Table 5. Synthesis of hydraulic conductivity and transmissivity data obtained in the literature for GCLs in contact with GMs and for B-GM in contact with GCLs obtained in this study

Auteurs	Range of measurement of K_{GCL} (m/s)	Range of measurement of θ (m^2/s)
Touze-Foltz et al. (2002)	$1.00 \times 10^{-11} / 3.00 \times 10^{-11}$	$4.54 \times 10^{-11} / 1.16 \times 10^{-8}$
Barroso et al. (2006)	$1.07 \times 10^{-11} / 4.33 \times 10^{-11}$	$2.48 \times 10^{-12} / 1.97 \times 10^{-10}$
Barroso et al (2008)	$3.70 \times 10^{-11} / 3.70 \times 10^{-11}$	$1.44 \times 10^{-11} / 3.7 \times 10^{-11}$
Barroso et al. (2010)	$1.1 \times 10^{-11} / 4.10 \times 10^{-11}$	$7.8 \times 10^{-12} / 1.40 \times 10^{-11}$
Mendes et al. (2010)	$1.6 \times 10^{-11} / 5.8 \times 10^{-08}$	$1.9 \times 10^{-11} / 3.7 \times 10^{-11}$
B-GM-GCL (this study)	$1.77 \times 10^{-11} / 6.90 \times 10^{-10}$	$5.03 \times 10^{-11} / 1.08 \times 10^{-10}$

4 CONCLUSION

The work performed in this study aims to quantify flow rate measurements through composite liners defined by a defective B-GM presenting two sides (a rough side defined by a sanding and a smooth side made with a film) and two different GCLs. Tests are performed under a 50 kPa confining pressure and a 0.3 m constant hydraulic head in an interface transmissivity test cell. The B-GM-GCL composite liner has shown a performance in terms of flow rates and interface transmissivity comparable to the one obtained for HDPE GM-GCL composite liners. For all cases, data are located under the GM-GCL contact condition. This provides information on the possibility from a hydraulic point of view to use B-GM in association with a GCL for hydraulic applications, where there is no question regarding chemical and mechanical compatibility between the GM and the liquid to contain.

REFERENCES

- AFNOR. EN 14150. 2006. Geosynthetic barriers — Determination of permeability to liquids.
- AFNOR. EN ISO 10318. 2006. Geosynthetics — Terms and definitions.
- AFNOR EN 14196. 2004 Geosynthetics. Test method for measuring mass per unit area of clay geosynthetic barriers.
- AFNOR NF P 84-705. 2008. Geosynthetic clay liners -Determination swelling, flow and permeability geosynthetic clay liners with oedopermeameter Essai de caracterisation and performance tests. 3-23. (In French).
- AFNOR EN ISO 9863-1. 2006. Geosynthetics — Determination of the thickness at specified pressure. part 1 : individuals layers.
- Alonso. E. Degoutte. G. & Girard. H. 1990. Results of seventeen years of using geomembranes in dams and basins. **Proceedings of the 4th international conference of Geotextiles, Geomembranes and Related Products:** 437-442. The Hague
- Barroso, M., Lopes, M., Bergamini, G. 2010. Effect of the waste pressure on fluid migration through geomembrane defects. **Proceedings 9th International Conference on geosynthetics:**959-962. Guaruja.
- Barroso. M., Touze-Foltz. N., and von Maubeuge. K. 2008. Influence of the textured structure of geomembrane on the flow rate through geomembrane GCL composite liners. **EuroGeo4, paper number 86.**
- Barroso. M., Touze-Foltz. N., von Maubeuge. K. and Pierson. P. 2006. Laboratory investigation of flow rate through composite liners involving GCLs. **Geotextiles and Geomembranes, Vol. 24:** 139-155.

- Benchet, R., Numitor, G., Ferretti, P. 2011. Partitioned waterproofing of a double archway work made by bituminous geosynthetic barrier. **Rencontres géosynthétiques 2011**: 65-72. Tours. (In French).
- Breul, B., Herment, R. 1995. BGMs protect road foundation soils. **Rencontres 97 géotextiles et géomembranes**: 75-78. Reims.
- Breul, B., Herment, R. 1997. BGM waterproof lining to Manes storage reservoir. **Rencontres 97 géotextiles et géomembranes**: 164-167. Reims.
- Breul, B. & Herment, R. 1998. Bitumen geomembranes in irrigation- case histories from a range of climates. **Proceedings of the 6th International Conference of Geosynthetics**.: 1133-1138. Atlanta. GA.
- Breul, B. & Herment, R. 1995. Les géomembranes bitumineuses dans la protection des sous-sols contre la pollution routière. **Revue Générale des routes et des aérodromes**. 734 p. (In French).
- Breul, B. & Eldrige, T. 2009. Two case histories of dams waterproofing in South America with BGMs. **Proceedings Rencontres Géosynthétiques 2009**: 223-232. Nantes. (In French).
- Breul, B., Huru, M., Palolahti, A. 2008. Use of bituminous geomembrane (BGM) liner for agnico eagle mine in Kittila (Finland). **Proceedings of The 4th European Geosynthetics Conference**. Paper number 245. Scotland.
- Breul, B., Reinson, J., Eldridge, T., Stenson, G., Harman, Al. 2006. Bituminous geomembrane in extremely cold conditions. **International Conference of geosynthetics**: 395-398. Rotterdam.
- Brown, K.W., Thomas, J.C., Lytton, R.L., Jayawickrama, P. and Bhart, S. 1987. Quantification of Leakage Rates through Holes in Landfill Liners. **United States Environmental Protection Agency Report CR810940**. 147 p. Cincinnati.
- Cartaud, F. Touze Foltz, N. 2004. Influence of geotextiles at the interface of landfill bottom composite liners". **Geosynthetics conference**. Munich
- Coppinger, J., Farrell, E.R., Cherrill, H., Stenson, G., Breul, B., Caquel, F., Giroud, J.P. 20020. **International Conference of Geosynthetics**: 921-926. Delmas.
- Domange, G. 1983. The use of bituminous geomembranes in canals reclaiming. **Proceedings of the Colloque sur l'étanchéité superficielle des bassins, barrages et canaux**: 263-266. Paris. (In French).
- Duquenois, C., Girard, H., Mathieu, G., & Tognetti, D. 1995. River and canals lining using geomembranes. **Proceedings of the Rencontres géotextiles et géomembranes '95**: 93-99. Beaune. (In French).
- Etienne, D., Breul, B. & Herment, R. 1995. The use of bituminous geomembranes for rehabilitating the navigation canal watertightness. **Proceedings of the Rencontres géotextiles-géomembranes '95**: 93-99. Beaune. (In French).
- Fagon, Y., Flaquet-Lacoux, V., Girard, H. & Poulain, D. 1999. Record of 10 years of use of geosynthetic sealing devices in French navigable canals. **Proceedings of the Rencontres géosynthétiques '99**: 187-192. Bordeaux (In French).
- Faure, B., Itty, J. 1999. Waterproofing by using bituminous geomembrane on a maturation clinkers area. **Proceedings of the Rencontres géosynthétiques '99** Volume 2. Bordeaux. (In French).
- Flaquet-Lacoux, V., Malascrabes, M. & Poulain, D., Girard, H., & Lino, M. Rehabilitation of the watertightness of navigable canals using geomembranes. **Igénierie Numéro Spécial**: 159-167.
- French geosynthetics committee (CFG). 2011. Evaluation of the contact between geosynthetic clay liners and geomembranes in terms of transmissivity. 84 p.
- Girard, H., Lefranc, M. & Tisserand, C. 1996. Waterproofing and rehabilitation of dams by geomembranes in France. **Proceedings of the 1st European Geosynthetics Conference Eurogeo 1**: 945-952. Maastricht.
- Harpur, W.A., Wilson-Fahmy, R.F and Koerner, R.M. 1993. Evaluation of the contact between geosynthetic clay liners and geomembranes in terms of transmissivity. **Proceedings of the 7th GRI Conference on Geosynthetic Liners Systems: Innovations, Concerns and Design**. IFAI: 138-149. St. Paul.
- Imbert, B., Breul, B., Herment, R. 1997. More than twenty years experience with bituminous geomembrane under railway ballast. **Rencontres 97 géotextiles-géomembranes**: 35-39. Reims.
- Imbert, B., Carcenac, J.P. 1997. Ditch-Coating by bituminous geomembranes- two pilot sites. **Rencontres 97 géotextiles-géomembranes**: 49-57. Reims. (In French).
- Mendes, M. J. A., Touze-Foltz, N., Palmeira, E. M. et Pierson, P. 2010. Influence of structural and material properties of GCLs on interface flow in composite liners due to geomembrane defects. **Geosynthetics International**. Vol. 17:34-47.
- Marchiol, A., Romero, M.A., Benneton, J.-P., Dumas, Ph. & Gautier, J.-L. 2006. Examination of a bituminous geomembrane after 12 years of use as a cover for a waste storage area. Proc. **Rencontres Géosynthétiques**: 123-132 2006. Montpellier. (In French).

- Ossena. G., Breul. B. & Herment. R. 1997. Design and construction of impervious cap to low level nuclear waste repository. Cover system by geosynthetic clay liner in Hautes Gayeulles municipal waste landfill. **Rencontres 97 Géotextiles-Géomembranes. Vol. 2:** 150-156. Montpellier. (In French).
- Peggs. I. 2008. Prefabricated bituminous geomembrane: a candidate for exposed geomembrane caps for landfill closures. **Proceedings of The first Pan American Geosynthetics Conference and Exhibition:** 191-197. Cancun.
- Potié. G. 1999. Bitumen geomembranes in canals. **Proceedings of the Rencontres géosynthétiques '99. Vol 2.** Bordeaux. (In French).
- Potié. G., Steiner. B., Ailloud. G. & Matichard. Y. 1997. Storage capping with geosynthetics liners for industrial waste landfills. **Rencontres 97 Géotextiles-Géomembranes. Vol.2:** 117-123. Reims. (In French).
- Poulain. D., Girard. H., Mine. C. & Potié. G. 1997. Waterproofing of the selvet dam with a geomembrane. **Rencontres 97 Géotextiles-Géomembranes:** 142-148. Reims. (In French).
- Tisserand. C. 1983. Reservoir of Guazza, a large reservoir of unprotected membrane. **Proceedings of the Colloque sur l'Étanchiété superficielle des bassins. Barrages et canaux:** 87-89. Paris.
- Touze-Foltz. N. 2002. Evaluation of the hydraulic transmissivity in soil liner-geomembrane interfaces. **Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Geosynthetics. Vol. 2:** 799-802. Nice.
- Touze-Foltz. N., Darlot. O., et Barroso. M. 2002. Experimental investigation of the influence of the pre-hydration of GCLs on the leakage rates through composite liners. **Proceedings of the International Symposium on Geosynthetic Clay Barriers:** 265-274. Nuremberg.
- Touze-Foltz. N., Rowe. R. K. and Duquennoi. C. 1999. Liquid flow through composite liners due to geomembrane defects: Analytical solutions for axi-symmetric and two-dimensional problems. **Geosynthetics International. Vol 6:** 455-479.