

Surviving the Pour

Protection Considerations When Installing a Vapor Barrier Membrane for New Construction Buildings

> Eric Lovenduski, Principal & AARST Radon Professional Greenwich, New York and Denver, Colorado





Backstory – How We Got Here



Question from Client – "Can We 'Tailgate' The Concrete on the Vapor Barrier"?



"Competing Interests"

- Competing Interests
 - Clients
 - Contractors
 - Regulators
 - System Designers
- Limited Durability Data
- Cost and Schedule Concerns
- Design should work and meet industry standards
- Lack of standardization in VI industry compared to landfill industry





Problem Statement



- VI membranes improve efficiency of a VIMS by:
 - reducing leakiness of slab
 - (in some cases) reduce potential for diffusive flux through the slab
- Damage to the VI membrane during construction could negate its intended function



PROTECTION NEEDED?	NO PROTECTION NEEDED?
 VIMS needs to function properly Regulatory requirements may dictate robust design 	 Client pressures to save costs Contractor pressure for schedule Added construction challenges

Is damage during construction a legitimate concern?

Literature Review

- US Dept. of Interior Bureau of Land Reclamation, 2018 *Design Standards No. 13*
- GSE, 2002 Geomembrane Protection Design Manual
- Folkes, Hunter 1985 *Oil Spill Containment Liners for Artificial Drilling Islands*

Session 3B: Pollution Control Applications

FOLKES, DAVID J. D. R. Piteau and Associates, Golden, Colorado, USA HUNTER, J. STEVEN Esso Resources Canada Limited, Calgary, Canada

Oil Spill Containment Liners for Artificial Drilling Islands



Literature Review – Key Take Aways

- Vapor Barrier Puncture Causes
 - Aggregate/soil particles
 - Sticks
 - Boots
 - Equipment Tires/tracks
- Stress concentration at the point of contact between the geomembrane and the culprit object – GSE, 2002
- Required vapor barrier protection strength is a function of:
 - Exerted pressure
 - Shape of puncture object (angularity)
 - Scale factors for: installation damage, creep, chemical and biological degradation







Fig. 11. Geotextile support of geomembranes.

Membrane Protection

- GSE "Use of mechanisms, techniques, and materials to prevent membrane puncture to the extent that the primary function of the membrane is not compromised"
 - Advective flow
 - Diffusive transport
- Types of protection
 - Nonwoven Geotextile
 - Sand
 - Gravel
 - Thicker Membrane



VIMS Design Components



How will the membrane be used to control the VI pathway?



Thickness Required?



EPA (2008) commonly referenced

- recommends min 40 mil for passive barriers (HDPE)
- Several 20-30 mil barriers developed since then
 - EPRO EV40
 - LST NitraShield
 - Raven VaporBlock Plus
 - Stego Drago
 - CETCO VI-20

EPA (2008) has no barrier criteria for active systems

New advances – Newer composite membranes provide increased strength, flexibility, and diffusion control, including 20, 30, and 40 mil liner systems

*No product endorsements are made or implied by this presentation

Indoor Air Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Approx		
I DEP OF CONTENTS I DUPONOS I PURPOSE I PURPOSE I PURPOSE I DUPONOS I DUPONO	1 URANCE STATES AND A CONTRACT AN	
Cost Factore 30 cer Rick Communication and Stakeholder Involvement Contidentions 34 attr IFICATION OF GATION PERFORMANCE 10		

Key Points

- EPA 2008 thickness criteria are outdated
- Select barrier based on properties not thickness alone
- Active systems do not need (but benefit from) barriers

Common VIMS Design Concepts



Typical Protection Concepts



No Protection Concept

Concrete slab Vapor barrier Venting layer (e.g., 57 stone)

- Potential stresses can be on top and bottom of VIMS membrane
 - Loose aggregate above
 - Compacted aggregate below



Equipment Used During Construction

Typical Equipment

- Laser Screed 18,000 pounds
- Line Pump 1,500 pounds
- Concrete truck 65,000 pounds







Field Testing



Test Equipment



AASHTO #57 Stone



Item 4 "Crusher Run" Gravel



Telehandler - 16,000 pounds



Tractor Trailer Unloaded 20,000 pounds

Typical Equipment

- Laser Screed 18,000 pounds (~60 psi)
- Line Pump 1500 pounds (~ 5 psi)
- Concrete truck 65,000 pounds (~3,500psi)

Test #1



Gravel—VBM—Aggregate



Test Layout

- 16,000 lb telehandler, 2 passes. No turns
- 20,000 lb tractor trailer (unloaded) 2 passes. No turns



Vapor Barriers Tested



Test #1 Results



10 mil



15 mil



Key Points

- Neither intact
- Pinholes (psf)
 - 10 mil 81
 - 15 mil 33
- Unlikely to achieve goal

Test #1 Results



20 mil

20 mil + 3oz Geotextile









Key Points

- Pinholes (psf)
 - 20 mil 21
 - 20 mil + 3oz/yd2 geo –
 - 30 mil 2.4
- Protection geotextile may be "worth" more than 10 mils of thickness

Test #2



Gravel–VBM



Test Layout

- 16,000 lb telehandler,2 passes. No turns







Test #2 Results



10 mil

15 mil

20 mil



Test #1 Results



20 mil + 3oz Geotextile

30 mil





Key Points

- Pinholes (psf)
 - 20 mil + 3oz/yd2 geo 0
 - 30 mil 0
- However...

Real World Problems

- Plan for the real world
- Concrete aggregate under screed outriggers
 - Test 1 scenario (item 4 over membrane)
- Screed needs to turn
 - Torque on membrane



Conclusions

- Understand purpose and intent of VIMS design
- Membrane selection not based on thickness alone
- Understand construction environment
- Forces imparted on membranes occur from above and below
- Landfill industry has done significant research on vapor barrier membrane protection
- Protection geotextile above and below membrane is cheap "insurance"
- Construction CQA is critical





THANK YOU!

Eric Lovenduski Principal AARST Radon Professional <u>elovenduski@geosyntec.com</u> 518-258-3859