

Evaluation of Canal Lining Projects in the Lower Rio Grande Valley

July 2009

By
Askar Karimov, Extension Associate
Eric Leigh, Extension Associate
Guy Fipps, Professor and Extension Agricultural Engineer

Rio Grande Basin Initiative
Irrigation Technology Center
Texas AgriLife Extension Service

Texas Water Resources Institute Technical Report
July 2009

EVALUATION OF CANAL LINING PROJECTS IN THE LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY OF TEXAS



Rio Grande Basin Initiative
Irrigation Technology Center
Texas AgriLife Extension Service

EVALUATION OF CANAL LINING PROJECTS IN THE LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY OF TEXAS

June 29, 2009

By

Askar Karimov
Extension Associate

Eric Leigh
Extension Associate

Guy Fipps, P.E.
Professor and Extension Agricultural Engineer

Texas AgriLife Extension Service
Irrigation Technology Center
Biological and Agricultural Engineering
2117 TAMU
College Station, TX 77843-2117
979-845-3977; <http://idea.tamu.edu>

SUMMARY

Since 1999, seven (7) irrigation districts in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas have installed six (6) different types of synthetic canal lining materials, totaling approximately 21 miles. In 2005, we began a program to track the long-term effectiveness and durability of these lining projects and to document the damage caused by such factors as UV, animal traffic, intentional and unintentional vandalism, and normal irrigation district operational and maintenance activities. Each project was evaluated using a visual inspection process during which performance/condition ratings were assigned.

Without question, the best lining system is a synthetic liner with a protective barrier of shotcrete. The synthetic liner significantly reduces seepage, while the shotcrete protects it from damage. This lining system needs little to no maintenance. There were two types of liners used: PVC and polyester. Each performed equally as well.

The performance of synthetic liners without a protective barrier varied dramatically. One important factor was the location of the project. Liners located in high traffic areas (people and animals) showed significantly more damage than those installed in remote areas. Damage was also common which appeared to be caused by mowing and canal cleaning operations.

The PVC alloy is the toughest of the 4 liners installed without a protective barrier, is more difficult to cut and less likely to be damaged by unintentional vandalism. We also observed that liners carelessly or improperly installed were more susceptible to intentional and/or unintentional damage. For example, liners which are not properly stretched leave folds which can easily be caught by machinery or pulled by children swimming in the canals.

Additional details are provided in this report, along with suggested considerations when planning a lining project. A summary of the findings for each individual lining project is presented in the Appendix B of this report which is published separately.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	i
INTRODUCTION.....	1
MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	1
LINING MATERIALS.....	1
EVALUATIONS AND SITE INSPECTIONS	2
SEEPAGE LOSS TESTS	4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	5
LINERS WITH A PROTECTIVE BARRIER	5
LINERS WITHOUT A PROTECTIVE BARRIER.....	7
CONSIDERATION WHEN PLANNING NEW LINING PROJECTS.....	13
LINING INSTALLATION	13
USE OF A PROTECTIVE BARRIER	17
MAINTENANCE	17
CONCLUSIONS.....	20
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	21
RIO GRANDE BASIN INITIATIVE	
APPENDIX A: TABLES AND LOCATION MAPS	A-1
APPENDIX B: PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS (PUBLISHED SEPARATELY)	

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. DESCRIPTION OF EACH LINING MATERIAL’S COMPOSITION.	2
TABLE 2. GENERAL PERFORMANCE RATINGS FOR CANAL LINERS.....	4
TABLE 3. RANGE OF THE PERFORMANCE RATING RESULTS BY LINING MATERIAL.	5
TABLE A-1. LOCATION, TYPE AND EXTENT OF LINING PROJECT IN FIVE DISTRICTS	A-1
TABLE A-2. LOCATION, TYPE AND EXTENT OF LINING PROJECTS FOR HCID No.1	A-2
TABLE A-3. YEARLY PERFORMANCE RATING BY PROJECT	A-3

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1. LINING PROJECTS BY MATERIAL TYPE: LOCATION MAP 1	3
FIGURE 2. POLYESTER CANAL LINER WITH A 3-INCH PROTECTIVE BARRIER OF SHOTCRETE OVERLAID.....	6
FIGURE 3. AQUATIC VEGETATION AND SEDIMENTATION CLOGGING A FARM OUTLET PIPE.....	7
FIGURE 4. WRINKLES IN A POLYPROPYLENE LINER FROM IMPROPER INSTALLATION.	8
FIGURE 5. CONCRETE SECTIONS POURED ON TOP OF A POLYPROPYLENE LINER.	8
FIGURE 6. PVC ALLOY LINER DAMAGED ON THE EXPOSED AREA.	9
FIGURE 7. PVC ALLOY LINING SEGMENT IN EXCELLENT CONDITION.	9
FIGURE 8. CUTS/TEARS IN A RUBBER LINER.	10
FIGURE 9. A RUBBER LINER DAMAGED POSSIBLY DUE TO VANDALISM.	10
FIGURE 10. POLYURETHANE LINING IS MATERIAL SHOWN DETACHED FROM THE CANAL.....	11
FIGURE 11. POLYURETHANE LINER IS SHOWN HANGING OFF THE CANAL WALL.	12
FIGURE 12. RESIDUE LEFT FROM A DETERIORATED POLYURETHANE LINER.....	12

FIGURE 13. ONE POLYURETHANE LINED SEGMENT IN EXCELLENT CONDITION AFTER 8 YEARS OF USE.	13
FIGURE 14. GLUES BEING APPLIED TO THE JOINTS OF A POLYESTER LINER.	14
FIGURE 15. IMPROPER INSTALLATION OF A POLYESTER LINER AROUND A GATE STRUCTURE.	14
FIGURE 16. CANAL LINER INSTALLED TOO LOW ON THE LEVEE.	15
FIGURE 17. WATER LEVEL HIGHER THAN THE CANAL LINER INSTALLED.	15
FIGURE 18. HORIZONTAL CUTS LIKELY DUE TO VANDALISM ON THE CANAL SIDEWALL.	16
FIGURE 19. VERTICAL CUT OR TEAR ON CANAL SIDE WALL CAUSED UNINTENTIONALLY.	16
FIGURE 20. SHOTCRETE BEING SPRAYED ONTO THE FIBROUS POLYESTER LINER.	17
FIGURE 21. A DISTRICT MAINTENANCE CREW REPAIRING A DAMAGE SECTION OF LINING.	18
FIGURE 22. REPAIR OF THE LINER JOINTS AROUND A STRUCTURE WITH GLUE.	18
FIGURE 23. SEDIMENTATION AT THE BOTTOM OF A LINED CANAL.	19
FIGURE A-1. LINING PROJECTS BY MATERIAL TYPE: LOCATION MAP 2.	A-5

EVALUATION OF CANAL LINING PROJECTS IN THE LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY OF TEXAS

INTRODUCTION

Water Losses from irrigation canals can be significant, and water districts are looking for more cost-effective methods for rehabilitating old, deteriorating canals other than relining with concrete or replacement with pipelines. Synthetic canal lining materials are showing promise as an alternative to more costly methods, but little information exists on the relative performance between different products, or on installation and maintenance procedures needed to ensure long life.

Since 1999, irrigation districts in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas have been experimenting with an assortment of canal lining materials. In 2005, we initiated a program to track the long-term effectiveness and durability of these materials and to document installation and maintenance procedures which will help ensure good performance. Each lining project was inspected multiple times to document the effects of such factors as UV damage, animal traffic, intentional and unintentional vandalism, and normal irrigation district operational and maintenance activities. A summary of the results from the first three years of inspections are presented in this report. Details on inspection results for each lining project are included in Appendix B which is published separately.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Lining Materials

Six different lining materials have been installed in seven (7) irrigation districts of the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas:

- polyester
- PVC
- polypropylene
- PVC alloy
- EPDM rubber
- polyurethane

Table 1 provides a generic description of each. Unlike the other materials, the polyurethane was manufactured on-site during installation using specialized equipment.

Table 1. Description of each lining material's composition.	
Material	Description
Polyester with protective barrier	A geocomposite consisting of two layers (top and bottom) of 8 oz/yd ² nonwoven polyester bonded to an olefinic copolymer geomembrane, 20 mil thick. The protective barrier consists of 2-3 inches of shotcrete.
PVC with protective barrier	Non-reinforced Poly Vinyl Chloride (PVC). The protective barrier consists of a wire mesh with 2.5 inches of shotcrete.
Polypropylene	A reinforced polyester scrim 16 oz/yd ² between polypropylene layers, 24 mil thick.
PVC Alloy	A polyvinylchloride blend, reinforced with a polyester scrim, 40 mil thick.
EPDM Rubber	A non-reinforced EPDM (ethylene propylene diene monomer), 45 mil thick.
Polyurethane	Two layers of 3-oz/yd ² , heat-bonded, non-woven geotextile saturated with liquid polyurethane, 40 mil thick.

The locations of the lining projects are shown in Figure 1. The Installation dates, extent and other details for the projects initiated in 2004 are given in Table A-1. In 1999, Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 1 initiated a program that included four (4) types of liners installed in 27 segments. Locations and details for these projects are provided in Figure A-1 and Table A-2.

Evaluations and Site Inspections

During each site inspection, projects were given a condition rating ranging from “excellent” to “serious problems” as defined in Table 2, and photographs and other information were collected to document observed problems. Our original plan was to conduct inspections every six (6) months. However, little change was observed over this time period, and succeeding inspections took place annually as follows:

- February 2005
- September 2005
- September 2006
- December 2007

Conducting inspections during the winter months when water levels tend to be the lowest have proved to be the most effective.




Figure 1. Lining Projects by Material Type: Location Map 1.

Table 2. General performance ratings for canal liners.	
Rating	Definition
Excellent	0%: no damage and no maintenance required
Good	0 – 5%: mild damage to top anchor and canal interior 1 to 2 significant repairs needed per year
Fair	5 – 20%: mild damage to top anchor and canal interior 3 to 5 significant repairs needed per year
Poor	20 – 50%: mild damage to top anchor and canal interior 6 to 10 significant repairs needed per year
Serious Problems	50 – 100%: mild damage to top anchor and canal interior 10 > significant repairs needed per year

Note: Percentages are based on the linear length of the lining project.

Seepage Loss Tests

Before and after seepage loss tests were conducted for Project #5 (see Table A-1) using the ponding test method. In this method, earthen dams are constructed at either end of the test segment. The test segment is then filled with water, and the rate and total water losses are measured over a 24–48 hour period (Leigh and Fipps, 2009). The time-line for these tests was as follows:

- pre-lining test - September 2002
- lining project completed - October 2004
- first post-lining test - November 2004
- second post-lining test - July 2005.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of our evaluations are summarized in Table 3. Projects are grouped into lining projects *with a protective barrier* and projects *without a protective barrier*. Without question, liners with a protective barrier performed the best and have required no maintenance, while the performance of the liners without a protective barrier has varied significantly. Additional details on evaluation results are provided in Table A-3 which gives the year to year performance rating for each project. Separate reports for each lining project are given in Appendix B (published separately).

Table 3. Range of the performance rating results by lining material.			
Material	No. of Projects	Total Miles	Rating
<i>with a protective barrier</i>			
Polyester with shotcrete	4	14.47	Excellent
PVC with shotcrete	1	2.61	Excellent
<i>without a protective barrier</i>			
Polypropylene	2	0.36	Excellent to Good
PVC Alloy	3	0.05	Excellent to Good
EPDM Rubber	8	2.04	Excellent to Serious Problems
Polyurethane	9	1.42	Excellent to Serious Problems

Liners with a Protective Barrier

The best performers were the synthetic liners with a layer of shotcrete. This system is effective as the liner reduces seepage losses dramatically, while the layer of shotcrete prevents damage to the liner. Five (5) projects extending over about 17 miles were implemented using this system with two different liners: polyester and PVC. The protective barrier consisted of 2 - 3 inches of shotcrete as shown in Figure 2.

To-date, these projects show no evidence of problems and have required no maintenance. No difference in performance was observed between the two types of liners. Hairline cracks developed in the shotcrete on a small stretch of Project #5, but no related problems have been observed.



Figure 2. Polyester canal liner with a 3-inch protective barrier of shotcrete overlaid.

An important consideration with this system is the ability of the shotcrete to adhere to the liner. The polyester liner has a rough surface to which the shotcrete readily adheres to, while surface of the PVC liner is slick, and a wire mesh must be used.

In seepage loss tests, we found that this lining system reduced seepage losses by 94% after eight months (Leigh and Fipps, 2006). Details are as follows:

- before lining, loss rate = $1.36 \text{ gal/ft}^2/\text{day}$ (134 ac-ft/mi/yr)
- one (1) month after installation, loss rate = $0.27 \text{ gal/ft}^2/\text{day}$ (24 ac-ft/mi/yr)
- eight (8) months after installation, loss rate = $0.09 \text{ gal/ft}^2/\text{day}$ (8 ac-ft/mi/yr)

Liners without a Protective Barrier

The performance of the liners without a protective barrier has varied significantly. Exposed liners are obviously more susceptible to damage caused by UV light, animals, and vandalism, as well as damage caused by the districts' mowers and maintenance activities. However, the amount of damage varied by the location of the project. Liners in remote areas have performed much better than those in urban or high traffic areas.

Installation and maintenance of the liners also appears to explain some of the variation in performance of these projects as discussed below. Another consideration with exposed liners is the potential damage that machinery can cause during normal district mowing operations and while cleaning out aquatic vegetation and sedimentation (Fig. 3).



Figure 3. Aquatic vegetation and sedimentation clogging a farm outlet pipe.

In general, of the four types of materials, the polypropylene and PVC alloy liners have been more durable and have experienced less damage. The performance of the other two liners, EPDM rubber and polyurethane varied significantly. While some projects are still in excellent condition, others have serious problems or have failed completely. Details are discussed below by type of liner.

Polypropylene

In two lining projects, polypropylene was applied on existing concrete canals (Project 4 and 9). To-date, these two lining projects are in excellent condition, with no visual damage. While Project 9 was also given a rating of excellent, we have concerns with the large amount of wrinkles which occurred during installation (Fig. 4). Wrinkles can reduce water flow, accelerate sedimentation, and provide loose material that can easily be damaged.

In Project 9, concrete sections approximately 1-foot wide were poured on top of the liner at a spacing of 500 feet (Fig. 5). The rationale is that the concrete sections will help keep the liner in place and provide access points for sediment removal. Our conclusion is that long-term evaluation is needed to determine if such sections are useful for these purposes.



Figure 4. Wrinkles in a polypropylene liner from improper installation.



Figure 5. Concrete sections poured on top of a polypropylene liner.

PVC Alloy

Three short sections of PVC alloy were installed in 1999 (Projects: 16, 22, 24), ranging in length from 38 to 148 ft. This material has performed well, requiring little maintenance, with no major damage observed. However, cuts and tears have occurred in the exposed area of the liner (Fig. 6) which could develop into larger problems if not taken care of in a timely manner. The overall performances for these small test segments are excellent to good. A section in excellent shape is shown in Figure 7.



Figure 6. PVC Alloy liner damaged on the exposed area.



Figure 7. PVC Alloy lining segment in excellent condition.

EPDM Rubber

The performance of the eight (8) projects using EPDM rubber has varied significantly. Two projects are in good to excellent condition (Project 13 and 1), while the remaining six (6) range from fair condition to serious problems, with one totally failing. EPDM rubber is very susceptible to vandalism and punctures caused by animals. It also appears that many cuts and tears initially occurred on the exposed areas where there is the most human and animal traffic (Fig. 8). Unless repaired in a timely manner, these tears may lead to increasing amounts of damage (Fig. 9).



Figure 8. Cuts/tears in a rubber liner.



Figure 9. A rubber liner damaged possibly due to vandalism.

Polyurethane

During 1999 - 2000, nine (9) short sections were lined with polyurethane (projects: 6, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, and 25), totaling 1.42 miles. The current condition of these projects varies from excellent to serious problems, with one section a total failure. Observed problems include the liner falling off the canal walls which was likely caused by a combination of severe UV damage, material defects, and vandalism (Fig. 10 and 11). In some segments, the top layer of the material has peeled off, while in others, the entire liner has worn off (Fig. 12). Figure 13 shows one lining project where the polyurethane project is still in great shape.

Unlike the other liners, the polyurethane was manufactured on-site by specialized machinery, and requires that the chemicals used to be properly handled. Several problems occurred during its manufacture and installation, including inconsistency in product thickness, which may account for the large variation in performance. In addition, little to no maintenance has occurred since installation.

The location of the section does not appear to be a factor. For example, projects 17, 18, 20, and 21 are all continuing test segments; while projects 17 and 21 are in excellent shape, projects 18 and 20 have serious problems.



Figure 10. Polyurethane lining is material shown detached from the canal.



Figure 11. Polyurethane liner is shown hanging off the canal wall.



Figure 12. Residue left from a deteriorated polyurethane liner.



Figure 13. One polyurethane lined segment in excellent condition after 8 years of use.

CONSIDERATION WHEN PLANNING NEW LINING PROJECTS

The installation procedures and equipment requirements vary from material to material, with details available from each manufacturer. Proper installation and maintenance is necessary for avoiding or reducing problems that may contribute to accelerated deterioration of the material.

Lining Installation

Important installation considerations include:

- the methods used to overlap and mend/seam the layers of lining material together
- the methods used for attaching the material to the canal walls, around structures, and to the top of the levee (top anchor)
- the total width of the liner and extension on top of the levee in relation to the normal and maximum operating depth of the canals

Liners need to be properly installed and stretched in order to prevent wrinkles. Wrinkles not only look unprofessional, but make the liner more susceptible to damage. Glues, liquid rubbers

resin, tar and types of metal pins are used to secure the material around the structures and at the joints (Figures 14 and 15).



Figure 14. Glues being applied to the joints of a polyester liner.



Figure 15. Improper installation of a polyester liner around a gate structure.

In one of early lining projects, the liner size was not planned properly to overlap and extend onto the top of the levee (Fig. 16). As seen in Figure 17, the operating depth of the canal was higher than the top of the liner. The water eventually got underneath this liner and caused it to float.



Figure 16. Canal liner installed too low on the levee.



Figure 17. Water level higher than the canal liner installed.

Most damage has occurred on the exposed areas of the liner and top side walls of the canal. Figure 18 shows a cut made with a sharp object (probably intentional vandalism) versus Figure 19 could have been a case of unintentional vandalism. In areas where kids are playing, swimming in the canals, or being mischievous, intentional and unintentional vandalism will occur. Vultures have been reported to pick at the seams on the EPDM Rubber; animal hoofs can cut some liners.



Figure 18. Horizontal cuts likely due to vandalism on the canal sidewall.



Figure 19. Vertical cut or tear on canal side wall caused unintentionally.

Use of a Protective Barrier

While the initial costs of a lining project using a use of a protective barrier such as shotcrete are higher, these costs may be offset by the reduction in costs of maintenance and repairs over the life of the project. An important consideration is the ability shotcrete to adhere to the liner. The polyester material has small fibers (similar to the harden side of Velcro) to which the shotcrete will stick when sprayed on to the liner (Fig.20). On the other hand, the PVC liner has a smooth texture to which the shotcrete will not stick, and a wire mesh needs to be used on the top of the liner to provide grip and added reinforcement. This application also increases labor and cost.



Figure 20. Shotcrete being sprayed onto the fibrous polyester liner.

Maintenance

A regular inspection and maintenance program is important so that repairs can be completed on a time basis. Once a tear or cut starts, it will tend to expand or be susceptible to further damage until it is repaired. Districts should consider having their personnel trained to performed the repair and maintenance which sometimes requires specialized equipment, and similar glues and adhesives used during the installation process (Figure 21 and 22). Removing sediment from lined canals may be more difficult due to the limitations of using heavy machinery, and may require increased manual labor (Figure 23).



Figure 21. A district maintenance crew repairing a damage section of lining.



Figure 22. Repair of the liner joints around a structure with glue.



Figure 23. Sedimentation at the bottom of a lined canal.

CONCLUSIONS

The best performers were the two types of synthetic liners (PVC and polyester) with a protective barrier of shotcrete, which have shown no problems to-date. All five (5) projects using a protective barrier were rated with a score of excellent since installation. The use of a protective barrier can extend the life of the lining project by preventing inadvertent damage and discouraging vandalism. The noticeable difference between the two types of liners was the ability of the polyester to hold the shotcrete in place on the canal sidewalls. The PVC liner required an additional support system using a wire mesh overlay serving as the attachment between the material and the shotcrete.

The performance of the synthetic liners without a protective barrier varied dramatically, ranging from excellent to having serious problems. Some were found to be more susceptible to such factors as installation problems, unintentional damage and vandalism.

Most of the damage to the synthetic liners occurred around the exposed areas of the liner near the top anchor attachments and top side walls of the canal. If the damage is not repaired in a timely manner, small tears can grow into larger ones. In general, exposed synthetic liners need more frequent inspections and regular maintenance.

In conclusion, the initial costs of a canal lining project will vary depending on the type of material and whether a protective barrier is used. For that reason, when planning a project, especially in areas of high traffic (animals and pedestrians), the district should consider if the short-term costs of adding a protective barrier will be more cost-effective compared to the long-term costs that will be incurred due to maintenance and repairs from the lining being damaged.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This material is based upon work supported by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, under Agreement No. 2008-45049-04328 and Agreement No. 2008-34461-19061. For program information, see <http://riogrande.tamu.edu>.

Martin Barroso Jr., GIS Specialist.

Photos in Figures 14, 15, and 20 are courtesy of Cameron County Irrigation District No.2.

Leigh, E., and Fipps, G. (2009, January). *Measuring Seepage Losses from Canals Using the Ponding Test Method* (Publication B-6218). College Station: Texas AgriLife Extension Service.

Leigh, E., and Fipps, G. (2006, February). *Water Loss Test Results for Lateral A Before and After Lining Hidalgo County Irrigation District No.2* (TWRI Report No. TR-328, 2008). College Station: Texas AgriLife Extension Service, Texas Water Resources Institute.

APPENDIX A: Tables and Detailed Location Map

Table A-1. Location, Type, and Extent of Lining Project in Five Districts.						
Irrigation District	Project #	Canal	Material Type	Total Length		Date of Installation
				feet	miles	
CCID #2	1	Canal C	Polyester overlaid by 2.0 inches of shotcrete	18,428	3.49	Jan-Nov 2004
	2	Canal 39	PVC overlaid with reinforced wire mesh and 2.5 inches of shotcrete	13,800	2.61	Jan 2005
	3	Canal 13	Polyester overlaid by 2.0 inches of shotcrete	19,570	3.71	Sept-Jan 2006-2007
Santa Cruz	4	Main Canal	Polypropylene	585	0.11	Nov 2004
HCID #2	5	Lateral A	Polyester overlaid by 3.0 inches of shotcrete	38,291	7.25	Sept 2004
Harlingen	6	Wyrick Canal	Polyurethane	1,102	0.21	Nov 2004
	7	Wyrick Canal	EPDM Rubber	6,282	1.19	Nov 2004
United	8	Mission Main	EPDM Rubber	1,490	0.28	Feb 2005
Delta Lake	9	Raymondville Canal	Polypropylene	1,339	0.25	Jan 2006

Table A-2. Location, Type, and Extent of Lining Projects for HCID No.1.					
Project #	Canal	Material	Segment Length		Date of Installation
			feet	mile	
10	East Main	Polyurethane	1,812	0.34	1999
11	East Main	Polyurethane	891	0.17	1999
12	East Main	EPDM Rubber	94	0.02	2000
13	East Main	EPDM Rubber	1,103	0.21	2000
14	East Main	EPDM Rubber	193	0.04	2000
15	East Main	Polyester overlaid by 3.0 inches of shotcrete	122	0.02	Sept 2007
16	East Main	PVC Alloy	36	0.01	1999
17	East Main	Polyurethane	827	0.16	1999
18	East Main	Polyurethane	827	0.16	1999
19	East Main	EPDM Rubber	141	0.03	2000
20	East Main	Polyurethane	206	0.04	1999
21	East Main	Polyurethane	44	0.01	1999
22	East Main	PVC Alloy	148	0.03	1999
23	East Main	Polyurethane	483	0.09	1999
24	East Main	PVC Alloy	42	0.01	1999
25	Lateral 18	Polyurethane	1,247	0.24	1999
26	Lateral 19	EPDM Rubber	200	0.04	2000
27	Lateral 19	EPDM Rubber	1,190	0.23	2000

Table A-3. Yearly Performance Rating by Project.

Project #	Material	Date of Installation	Performance Rating		
			2005	2006	2007
1	Polyester with 2.0 inches of shotcrete	Jan-Nov 2004	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
2	PVC with reinforced wire mesh and 2.5 inches of shotcrete	Jan 2005	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
3	Polyester with 2.0 inches of shotcrete	Sept-Jan 2006-2007	-	-	Excellent
4	Polypropylene	Nov 2004	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
5	Polyester with 3.0 inches of shotcrete	Sept 2004	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
6	Polyurethane	Nov 2004	Excellent	Good	Good
7	EPDM Rubber	Nov 2004	Fair	Poor	Fair
8	EPDM Rubber	Feb 2005	Excellent	Poor	Fair
9	Polypropylene	Jan 2006	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
10	Polyurethane	1999	Good	Fair	Fair
11	Polyurethane	1999	Poor	Serious Problems	Removed
12	EPDM Rubber	2000	Good	Fair	Fair
13	EPDM Rubber	2000	Good	Fair	Good
14	EPDM Rubber	2000	Good	Removed	-
15	Polyester with 3.0 inches of shotcrete	Sept 2007	-	-	Excellent
16	PVC Alloy	1999	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
17	Polyurethane	1999	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
18	Polyurethane	1999	Serious Problems	Serious Problems	Serious Problems
19	EPDM Rubber	2000	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
20	Polyurethane	1999	Serious Problems	Serious Problems	Serious Problems

21	Polyurethane	1999	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
22	PVC Alloy	1999	Good	Good	Good
23	Polyurethane	1999	Good	Good	Good
24	PVC Alloy	1999	Good	Good	Good
25	Polyurethane	1999	Excellent	Good	Good
26	EPDM Rubber	2000	Good	Fair	Serious Problems
27	EPDM Rubber	2000	Good	Fair	Serious Problems




Figure A-1. Lining Projects by Material Type: Location Map 2.

