

Foundation for Cross-Connection Control and Hydraulic Research
University of Southern California
Manual of Cross-Connection Control
10th Edition

Manual Review Committee
19 June 2003

PHCC Training Facility
2869 Glenview Ave.
LA, CA 90039

Draft Meeting Synopsis

Dr J. J. Lee, Director, welcomed all members of Manual Review Committee (MRC) and visitors at 9:10am. Committee roster distributed. Those in attendance:

MRC:

Henry Chang
Ernest Havlina
Lloyd Huff

Sam Johnson
J.J. Lee
Brad Noll

Paul Schwartz
Patrick Sylvester

Visitors:

Rand Ackroyd – Watts/ Rand Eng.
Arthur Butters – Watts
Larry Crane - FCCCHR
Jon Furrer – Febco, SPX Valves

Mike Lueck - Midwest Inst.
Jim Purzycki - BAVCO
Gordon Reel – Conbraco Ind.
Bill Sitton – Conbraco Ind.

- Paul Schwartz updated MRC with current EPA activity. Handed out minutes from stakeholders meeting in Washington DC on 16 May 2003.
- Patrick Sylvester updated MRC regarding the Foundation's AWWARF Project #2611, which has been published by AWWARF. Foundation has been informed that the project will only be available to AWWARF subscribers.
- Paul Schwartz informed the MRC that the AWWARF Research Advisory Council Infrastructure Reliability Workgroup is developing subjects for 2004's RFP's. There are several cross-connection control projects being considered.
- Patrick Sylvester updated MRC regarding the Foundation's residential survey project in Davenport, Iowa. One hundred eighty-eight of the surveys have been completed, and this data has been provided to UC Berkeley as part of their WET study. The FCCCHR has prepared a draft report of the cross-connection control survey data, and may be posted on the FCCCHR web page when completed.

- Due to a lack of a MRC member quorum, no official business could be conducted. Minutes from 15 April 2003 meeting will be considered for approval at the next MRC meeting.

Old Business

Item #970506 and BPMA #15 – Field Evaluation Failure Rates - Staff prepared report at the last meeting which updated data from Field Evaluations conducted under the 9th Edition in the H and VU orientations. Based on this information Sections 10.2.1.2.a and 10.2.1.3d have been modified to reflect the following:

Laboratory Evaluation includes the Cycle Test in the H and VU orientations
Field Evaluation will require three assemblies in acceptable field sites,
including

- One (1) flowing H orientation
- One (1) flowing VU orientation

Recommendation: So that it is clearly understood that a total of three assemblies are required, it was suggested that the orientation of the third site be shown at the discretion of the manufacturer.

Item 30030401 - RP Field Test Procedure – Modification has been made to better address the possible effects from disc compression when closing the No. 2 SOV.

Additional information is to be added to 10.2.1.4 and Appendix to help prevent the No. 2 check valve from being backpressured during the closure of #2 shutoff valve. Direction of flow test is required during the Field Evaluation, but not in the normal field test procedure.

Item #20000201 - Bleed Valve Arrangement - Staff is preparing additional guidelines for Section 9 so that it will be referenced to the Appendix. The Appendix will then contain the detailed construction of the bleed valve arrangement, and the restrictions for use (i.e., fitting size, needle valve c_v , etc.).

BPMA #13 - Material Discussion – General discussion regarding the use of ISO 6509 (Dezincification test) as a supplement to the 79% minimum copper alloy specification. Brad Noll to review this issue in more detail with BPMA, and then provide BPMA response to MRC in approximately two weeks.

Suggestion made to add some qualifying conditions for equivalent alternate materials. Staff requested that BPMA provide suggestions for this subject too.

Also discussed the use of alternate materials with protective coatings, referencing an example of the hard chrome plated brass ball in a ball valve. BPMA will review issue and provide suggestions.

There was general agreement from the manufacturers in attendance that the balance of Section 10 could be balloted even if the above material issues are not ready.

Item #970502, #20000202, BPMA #1 - Test Kit Standard – Draft of Field Test Kit Standard was distributed to attendees. Many of the letter comments received have been incorporated into this draft. General discussion of the draft provided the following suggestions:

10.3.2 – Hysteresis error definition include “lightly tapping the field test kit to eliminate friction error”.

10.3.3.3 – Allowance for dual scales

10.3.3.7 – Allowance for markings to be screened on dial, and lettering size 10 or 12 pt font.

10.3.4 – Change hose length to minimum of three (3) feet.

10.4.2.2.1 – Accuracy test be performed at atmospheric and MWWP only. Allow use of water or air as pressure source.

10.4.2.2.2 – Add clarification to test so that hydrostatic pressure is applied to entire Field Test Kit (i.e., gage, fittings, hoses, etc.) in each of the configurations (i.e., 2, 3, 5 needle valves).

10.4.2.2.3 – Add clarification that accuracy is being tested immediately following the bleeding of hot water through field test kit.

10.4.2.2.4 - Add clarification for expected outcome of test. Leakage, fogging, accuracy?

10.4.2.2.5 – Add clarification for rates (psi/sec) of pressure changes

10.4.2.2.6 – Add rationale for each of the flow configurations.

Staff explained that the Appendix will contain a recommended guideline for periodic testing, including accuracy verification and leakage (i.e., hoses, needle valves, etc.). This will help to provide some guidance for periodic testing of field test kits.

BPMA #10 – Size of Testcocks – It had been requested at a previous meeting that the data/report be provided which supports the Staff recommendation (to maintain the 3/4” testcocks for 6” assemblies). General discussion about the 3/4” testcock being needed for bypassing during the field test of an RP, and the flushing of fouling materials. Handouts provided from previous meetings.

Sections 1-8 Portions of these revised draft sections were handed out to the MRC. Staff requested review and feedback.

Timeline of activities

- Staff to prepare draft of Section 10 for review and balloting by manufacturers by 1 July 2003.
- Ballot comments compiled by Staff, and materials prepared for MRC review.
- Schedule General MRC meeting
(Tentative Aug-Sept 2003 timeframe)

Adjourned 1:54 pm