

Water Committee Meeting

June 25, 2014

J.T. LANE: Good morning everyone. I apologize so much for my tardiness. I had a last minute emergency to deal with. So with that I guess we'll get started. Sheree with the role call to see if we have enough members here today.

SHEREE TAILLON: Dirk Barrios, Vern Breland (absent), Ben Bridges (absent), Robert Brou, Jeffrey Duplantis (absent), Greg Gordon (absent), Jimmy Guidry (absent), Jimmy Hagen (absent), Pat Kerr, J.T. Lane, Rick Nowlin (absent), Rusty Reeves, Chris Richard, Keith Shackelford, Cheryl Slavant (absent), Joe Young and David Constant. So we have exactly, I'm sorry, exactly nine.

J.T. LANE: Just barely. Thanks everybody. Started a little late, I will keep my remarks brief. I do want to welcome Joe Young and Dr. Constant to the committee as new members. Joe will be taking the place of Delos as the National Association of Water Companies member and Dr. Constant has graciously chosen to serve in the third position that was added to the recent bill by the legislature for the Office of Public Health. Mr. Young is senior project engineer at CH2M Hill and is currently serving as deputy program manager for East Baton Rouge sanitary sewer overflow program. Professional engineer with 19 years of experience. Thank you for bringing your expertise and knowledge to the committee. Dr. Constant holds the Humphreys T. Turner Professorship at the LSU college of engineering department of civil and environmental engineering and is currently head of the department of biological and agricultural engineering. He's held several administrative interim positions such as the associate dean of college of engineering and interim dean of the graduate school as well. You've got a lot of experience too and your research and scholarship capacity we can definitely learn from as we continue working on all the work that we have before us. Pretty exciting time. Last meeting I thought was really productive and so we're finally getting into a place where we're going to start feeling like we can get some wind in the sails and make some major progress. With that I guess we'll

move to the next agenda item which is approval of the minutes. Everyone should have received that from Sheree last week. Before we move for approval any questions?

RANDY HOLLIS: I have a comment. The young lady is doing a fantastic job of trying to figure out all of our dialects as well as what we're saying. As you read through the minutes there are a number of things like when we say the corps she spelled it c-o-r-e when it's actually c-o-r-p-s when we talk about the corps of engineers, those little things throughout the document. I don't think we need to spend our time to go through and correct all those things, but just with the understanding there are some corrections to the minutes that as we read these things five years from now we may look back on them and say didn't mean to say that, but I don't think we should take our time to correct every single word.

J.T. LANE: So we'll do our best to take some time to educate.

RANDY HOLLIS: But thank you for your efforts. Some of us actually do read through it.

J.T. LANE: With that, any other questions about it? Can I get a motion to approve the minutes?

SPEAKER: I move.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: I'll second.

J.T. LANE: Number 4, old business. Sheree I think gave you all a copy. For the first item under old business we just put this together to show everyone where we are with each part of I guess 10 state standards manual then go into our sanitary code. We just wanted everybody to know where we were with the process just to also see, I guess just looking at this eyeballing it we're maybe 30, 25 percent there based on some of the benchmarks we've reached in terms of the steps for each subcommittee report, presentation, discussion and what not. And so I just wanted everybody to be aware of that. This is the start if you're looking for it. Again, it was just really, wanted to give this to you guys to see the progress we have made to date. Are there any questions, anything on here that's inaccurate? Anything else you would like to see on it? I think this is probably a good way for us to keep tracking our benchmarks and then maybe after we have another meeting, I would like even

though the new legislation doesn't have a date in mind anymore it just sort of extended, left it open, I would like to maybe up to this meeting we talk about setting a goal for when we do want to complete our work so we know we're working up against something and have something we're shooting for. And of course that's a committee discussion. I think that's probably something we can handle in the next meeting. Just kind of see how this one goes. This really will be ideally with part A will be the first test of how in the process we go through completing one part to the end. With that, any questions or thoughts on this document, or does that sound like a good approach for everyone?

SHEREE TAILLON: And again, if anybody needs more dates for the subcommittee to meet please contact me. There have been no subcommittee dates in the past month, no one has met. For all these that are undone I'm assuming y'all are waiting to meet or what not. Just let me know when you need to meet.

JOE YOUNG: And to be able to get on the committee you just need to volunteer which one we would like to get on, or any particular process for that?

J.T. LANE: We had that discussion during one of the committee meetings and so that was the process or lack there of, but it worked. I guess the members that are here, does anybody need any additional assistance or do we have any gaps in the subcommittees?

SHEREE TAILLON: We just have part 12 grandfather clause, looking for a chair and some members.

J.T. LANE: And we all agree grandfather clause might be the last thing we do once we work through the other parts.

RUSTY REEVES: Delos was on a couple committees with Greg Gordon and I, and I believe one other one. May be a start.

J.T. LANE: Let's start with that.

JOE YOUNG: I can take his place for sure.

J.T. LANE: And we can either have a conversation after the meeting or get all those assignments where we are with those committee reports and what those subcommittees were and we can arrange, call,

or something you can check in with the chairperson to see where they might be with that particular subcommittee's section. Before we jump into part A and since this is sort of trying to keep this on track and we'll add that agenda item to the next meeting as far as what's our goal we want to set for ourselves to complete I guess the initial round of our work which is to promulgate the new code. I wanted you all to know as well, I didn't add this to the agenda, but I think it's pertinent to this, we are waiting on civil service approval on a new position to help staff the committee as well. Certainly we've learned a lot over the last year and I think that one thing that can help us with the amount of work, the volume of work that goes into this is having another able person to help do a lot of the drafting of the code documents that y'all get especially or provide any other assistance that any of the subcommittees may need. Do research, what not. I think we definitely need that. I think we're just waiting, have we got approval?

JAKE CAUSEY: We did get approval.

J.T. LANE: So we did get approval and it will be posted in the coming days. Just FYI wanted y'all to know that. So their full-time assignment will be to the committee until the bulk of this work is complete. All right, with that we'll go into part 8. Everyone received the, I'll say the near final documents based on the last committee's meetings discussion. I think that we captured everything. We did our best to go through all of the minutes and the notes that we had from the discussion. What we decided would change, not change, what we'd include for this currently in the sanitary code to avoid duplication. One of our main goals here is to clean up as much as we can as well. And so we went through that and provided then a marked-up and clean draft to all of you via email to represent the final draft for part 8. Now what I wanted to do, with that said, I just said we did our best to get everything and may be we did and may be there's a couple of things after y'all reread the drafts that you want to discuss and that's cool. My goal is Caryn is going to be, she has the draft open on her laptop and so what I was hoping that we could do for this meeting is for whatever those final tweaks may be we can go ahead and agree to them now, make them on the document, and then vote at the

end of that discussion if that's possible. Now if we do identify other issues that we think need more discussion, or research, or maybe another meeting of the subcommittee we can certainly take that route, but our goal is to try and get the draft completed today and a format that we can take a vote on and get this one behind us so we can focus on the others.

JAKE CAUSEY: I did want to mention one thing just to give everybody an idea of the structure. I think we mentioned this previously as far as creating a chapter 2 in part 12 that these standards would go in. And I guess the idea in chapter 2 there would be subchapter 1, subchapter 2, subchapter 3 that would generally line up with parts 1, 2, 3, 4 in 10 state standards just so there is kind of a consistency there and might make a little more sense. You see that at the top of the document chapter 2 subchapter 8 or part 8. That's kind of what we envision.

J.T. LANE: With that does everybody feel like they've had enough time to read through, and I guess what I would like to do is just open it up since we've spent a lot of time going through it in the side by side last time I guess I just want to open it up to see what everybody's thoughts are on the draft, is it ready, are there some tweaks, do you have questions about any of the language, is there something that we need to be more specific on or less specific on, and we'll just sort of go from there.

RANDY HOLLIS: Under 8.0 general I would like to strike the last sentence of that where it says valves and blow-offs shall be provided so that necessary repairs can be made with a minimum interruption of service. It's really too vague because we don't know what that really means as a design engineer. We have specified the distance between valves and distribution and transmission and it does state that all dead-ends shall have blow-offs. I would like to strike this sentence because I think it's covered elsewhere and I think this is too vague just in general.

JAKE CAUSEY: I will mention for everybody's reference this is a section that is in part 12 that we added as replacement language for what was in 10 state standards. So like when you compile a document relevant information that was in primarily chapter 3 part 12 I guess kind of our approach is we're consolidating it into each of these parts to eliminate that. 8.0 general that was in 2012 10 state

standards was eliminated. This language is what's in chapter 3 section whatever in part 12. Just so everybody knows that's where that came from. And probably was not included in any previous documents or even subcommittee review. I think they primarily focused on what was just in 10 state standards.

RANDY HOLLIS: I don't have a problem with the first part, it's the last sentence because it's just vague and covered elsewhere.

J.T. LANE: So Randy when you say it's covered elsewhere you mean just more further down?

RANDY HOLLIS: Within the section. We specify the distance between valves and I believe it also states that all dead-ends shall have blow-offs. So we have criteria later on that nails it down. This is vague that could be interpreted a number of different ways. Trying to avoid being vague and to nail these things down.

JAKE CAUSEY: I guess I'm not certain, I guess one question I would have is requiring valves, one valve every one mile does that constitute or equivalent of minimum interruption of service. I think one mile downtown here would be a major interruption of service so I don't know that those are equivalencies in that sense. Blow-offs I think, I guess this does probably relate more to the valving. Frankly it's not something I had looked at closely. We already had the language in part 12 and moved it here. I hadn't really digested it fully.

J.T. LANE: So Jake is that something though that the one mile is the minimum but if a closer proximity is required y'all would get that during plan review right and work with?

JAKE CAUSEY: I think the point is no closer proximity is required at all. That's what's being proposed here is that you're only required to have a valve every one mile no matter how many customers, no matter what, that's what would be required. Ten state standards had mentioned in rural areas not to exceed 1 mile, urban areas it was more every 5 to 700 feet, or tees and things, and all that was eliminated in the subcommittee report. And I guess perhaps the intent is to have more flexibility in a sense, but effectively eliminating any of those requirements. And though we may have a lot of

engineers here with great intentions and water systems who are going to say hey we're going to valve this thing in Downtown Baton Rouge more than one every mile. We get plans from engineers around the state, there's a lot of engineers doing work, there's a lot of utilities that aren't interested in spending money. I think when you look at it globally, statewide it's a different perspective than hey I'm an engineer this is my water system, I want to have this flexibility because we will not be able to require anything more than one valve per mile. That's I guess perhaps the topic.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: You could require it more frequently because that's the maximum not the minimum.

ROBERT BROU: In 10 state standards as Jake stated there was a lot of suggestions about at intersections certain spacing criteria. So I actually agree with him that this still doesn't mandate anything. Like you said Randy it's kind of vague, but at least it captures the intent that you should have adequate spacing of valves to minimize interruption. It isn't anymore stringent than 10 state standards was because they did not specify you had to, but at least it captures the intent. I don't see a problem with that at all the way the wording is. I understand your concern, but I think it's important to at least because we're silent on the issue other than the one mile for transmission.

JOE YOUNG: Being new to the committee in my mind the general section just outlines what's going to be included in further explaining some of the other details. The vagueness is probably good and then when you get to 8.2 or 8.3 it will further expand on what it means. So this general section is just kind of an introduction of what's further into the spec.

RANDY HOLLIS: My concern is that if we have something that's not nailed down, that's vague, you're going to have a dispute between an engineer and the review engineer with the state and you could be polarized. Each one is saying different things. I would have no problem at all with saying it is recommended that valves and blow-offs be provided. The problem shall is mandatory and so the design engineer for the state can say this is shall and I'm requiring these every 400 feet in a rural area. I'm trying to take out the vagueness. I agree we need valves more often, I'm just trying to eliminate a

vague area in a dispute that could happen.

ROBERT BROU: What about the suggestion to take out shall and state the intent that that is something that should be considered?

RANDY HOLLIS: I think if we can say it is recommended that valves and blow-offs be provided so that necessary repairs could be made with minimum interruption of service then that's a recommendation.

JAKE CAUSEY: Again, that's effectively the same as eliminating so for the purpose of plan reviews if you say recommended or eliminate the sentence that's the same. I agree that it's not specified. I guess you can make an argument that folks may argue, but I personally don't think, I don't see a reason that there would be disputes as Randy suggested. I don't believe we've ever had any disputes previously with that, but I think if you take the position of playing devil's advocate about every single little thing in here about what could be a dispute and kind of really say we don't absolutely have to do these things it's going to be tough.

J.T. LANE: And correct me if I'm wrong, but normally let's say the minimum would be whatever the frequency that they should be placed would be something that we would normally discuss in plan review. For instance, if y'all reviewed it and you felt it wasn't enough and you worked with the project engineer to address that issue and then the subsequent survey of the system to see if it's in compliance should be placed on that plan review, correct?

JAKE CAUSEY: Frankly there's no way we're going to look at valves. We've never looked at valve spacing during surveys. That's impossible, not a survey issue at all. I would say that maybe a situation occurred and there was a major interruption of service and some valve issue may be based on an event that occurred maybe a question is asked. It's something that's handled under plan reviews. Again, that's a part 12 chapter 3 requirement that's been in the sanitary code for many, many probably since the 70's and it's not been an issue to my knowledge. I don't see any reason it would be an issue in the future.

J.T. LANE: Back to Joe's point, this paragraph is meant to say this is a general synopsis of what you're going to find in the coming sections. There's nothing here that should be necessarily in this paragraph that's enforceable, it's really what follows it.

JAKE CAUSEY: I would say that anything that's written in part 12 I wouldn't disagree that it's in black and white is enforceable, it's not that it's not enforceable. I would agree that it is enforceable. It says shall be provided minimum interruption of service. It is what it is. Like I said, we haven't had issues with disputes about that particular issue before. Generally defer to the professional engineer who is designing and certifying the plans unless there is some obvious, egregious issue in what we're seeing and we work it out. I've never had a situation where we had to work it out.

RANDY HOLLIS: We're trying to write a standard that's good for 5 or 10 years from now when none of us are here. Can I call for a vote on this and we settle these as we go through? So I'm calling for a vote that whoever agrees with leaving it in say yes and whoever wants to take it out says no. Can we do that as we go through these? Just to resolve it so we can move forward.

J.T. LANE: I'm totally fine with that.

RANDY HOLLIS: I call for a vote.

J.T. LANE: This is on whether or not we're going to keep it as is. So if you vote yes you vote to keep it as is. This is for the sentence valves and blow-offs shall be provided so that necessary repairs can be made for minimum interruption of service.

JAKE CAUSEY: One thing Caryn reminded me, since David isn't here, about public comment period before each vote.

J.T. LANE: Anybody attending have any comments they would like to make about this before we vote?

SIDNEY BECNEL: I think that whole section that we took out of 12 and put in the new standard probably predates 10 state standards. Probably from the 50's or 60's, something like that. But when the 10 state standards came in it stated you needed a valve in a city or something at every intersection 500 feet or something like that. But if you page down to the current 8.3 that's being kicked around we've

eliminated the requirement in commercial districts for every 500 feet, something along those lines.

When we get to 8.3, I'm sure in a few minutes, so keep that in mind. Thank you.

J.T. LANE: The vote is on that last sentence 8.0 general section. Yes vote to keep it as is. Sheree.

SHEREE TAILLON: For 8.0. Dirk.

DIRK BARRIOS: Yes.

SHEREE TAILLON: Robert Brou.

ROBERT BROU: Yes.

SHEREE TAILLON: Randy Hollis.

RANDY HOLLIS: No.

SHEREE TAILLON: J.T. Lane.

J.T. LANE: Yes.

SHEREE TAILLON: Rusty Reeves.

RUSTY REEVES: Yes.

SHEREE TAILLON: Chris Richard.

CHRIS RICHARD: No.

SHEREE TAILLON: Keith Shackelford.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: No.

SHEREE TAILLON: Joe Young.

JOE YOUNG: Yes.

SHEREE TAILLON: And David Constant.

DAVID CONSTANT: Yes.

SHEREE TAILLON: We have six yeas.

J.T. LANE: So we'll stay as is.

RANDY HOLLIS: I have a question if I could ask Jake, and y'all probably know this, under the 8.1.1

standards and material section there are some exceptions, and this is just for my own quantification

that I don't know, and that is it states that lead free requirement shall be required except as follows and it lists service saddles and water distribution main gate valves that are 2 inches in diameter or larger under both of those. Does lead free not apply to any one of those? That's just a question because we are exempting them.

JAKE CAUSEY: Right, but I'm trying to think, frankly, the new low lead law verses the previous low lead law. The new one doesn't apply, but I'm pretty sure they would still fall under what they fell under previous to that. But yeah, that's exactly right because that's what's specifically written in state statute, and if I'm not mistaken it's specified in the federal law as well.

RANDY HOLLIS: I know hydrants for example, but I didn't realize service saddles and...

JAKE CAUSEY: You know hydrants exemption, as my understanding, was actually an interpretation EPA recently stated, but I think those items were actually named specifically in the law.

DIRK BARRIOS: Service saddle not in contact with the water.

RANDY HOLLIS: So the corporation stops would be included, but then gate valves larger than 2 inch are not included either?

JAKE CAUSEY: Those were, I think, as I recall, exact language verbatim and may be a manufacturing issue, I don't know. Those things that we listed were explicitly stated, not our interpretation.

RANDY HOLLIS: I do have a question 8.1.2. This is under permeation by organic compounds and I am so glad Dr. Constant is here. And the question came up what is considered contaminated soils and I agree that we should look at that, but when we state that anything that is 1/2 the maximum contaminate level set by the primary drinking water standards is considered contaminated. When you look at arsenic, for example, arsenic the limit is 10 parts per billion. That means if we detect arsenic in the soils of 5 parts per billion we have to take precautions. Soils in the general area like in Iberia Parish run into the parts per million in arsenic, very high. So that means that we're going to have to put in welded steel pipe everywhere. I don't think that's the proper reference guideline of half of the MCL primary drinking water standard cause I don't think we would ever put a gasket in.

JAKE CAUSEY: Yeah and that's fine. We were requested to define contaminated and just so you know where the 1/2 comes from that's the trigger that we use for more frequent monitoring for water systems. I can't say that I'm familiar with all the soils around the state and where organic compounds may exist and what levels. Metals generally would leach through pipes, probably one of the volatile things I think would. We're very open to defining this in the best way that makes sense. That was just sort of a trigger we can use for other purposes, very well may not make sense here.

RANDY HOLLIS: I think you can have organic arsenic. I just don't think that's even close to what we should be considering for soil contamination.

DAVID CONSTANT: We had this problem years ago cleaning up waste sites when something was put into the regs that was a number and certainly the MCL's are numbers or fractions there of you will have issues like what's been pointed out. A better approach is to approach it from a risk-based standard so that you can look at you may have a soil, at the site north of Baton Rouge we had zinc in the soil at higher than the NPDES permit limit so we had to treat the water. So it's better to take a risk-based approach and see if you have an exposure problem and see if you have a true risk rather than some set in stone number like MCL's because it may be present in the soil, but it's not mobile, it's not going to get in the water, and it's not going to be a contamination problem.

J.T. LANE: So that requires some environmental assessment to determine that risk? Be another something they have to do before they put the waterline in.

DAVID CONSTANT: I don't want to go there. Yes, and that's not good either.

RANDY HOLLIS: You have hit on something that's really good and that is could we somehow or another write this such as areas of known contamination by on-site assessments or something shall be addressed so that if we know it's there and it's pointed out, or if it's found during construction could be addressed.

JAKE CAUSEY: One thing I want to mention, our thinking was that all of the sort of metals that we regulate are inorganics so I think when they talk about organic compounds we're literally talking

about compounds that can leach through the pipe and so I think that's kind of the other thought was that if it's a compound that is organic I think that is an issue and we do need to look at that MCL. The inorganics I don't think pose that same risk. May be we could change some of that wording. I don't believe any of the metals that are regulated contaminants are inorganic or organics, they're all inorganic.

DAVID CONSTANT: You are referring to organics, what kind?

JAKE CAUSEY: It just says organics. In here it just says organics, it doesn't specify different kinds. I guess it would be inclusive or all, but typically are regulated organics or volatile, semi-volatiles.

DAVID CONSTANT: In any case as J.T. said, pointed out, that if we have something like this in here so then what are we going to do? You are going to have to assess every pathway. You have to know you are saying that when they are installing areas contaminated by organics stop there. How do we know it's contaminated by organics? We're out there getting vapor analysis, is that standard procedure?

J.T. LANE: Or may be the procedure should be that we check whatever is known today. I don't know if there is a way if DEQ has information check with them.

CHRIS RICHARD: Known to be contaminated by organic compounds somehow you don't have to go test a line.

J.T. LANE: I'm trying to find what known means, like whether or not you know, or again known might be that if DEQ has some reporting on it that indicates a problem then that may be a place, just stop there. In terms of unknown environmental impact.

JAKE CAUSEY: Yeah, I would agree. We don't certainly require water systems to go test soils when they're putting pipes in the ground. We don't require that. I think that this would typically be in a known situation.

PATRICK KERR: Why does that need to be in the regulation Jake? If there was an odor issue, if it's known, we design around it if we could, if it were known this was contaminated. Again, known to us

cause we're installing. We're telling you we're putting the pipe. If the department could review that against the DEQ database, I don't imagine that happening, but the only way we know there to be an organic, contaminated volatile organic is by odor when we are installing the pipe and so we do in fact rely on the rights of way not to be contaminated unless it's known to the local government, ground field site, or whatever. I guess my point I don't know this sentence even needs to be in the regulation. There's not a water system that I can imagine would install in a known contaminated area without taking proper preventive measures. We don't want our customers to complain of taste and odors. Who knows what these thresholds might be for various organics. If this goes in there and 10 years from now there's an exceedance of an MCL for an organic I think the water system is in peril of litigation in that a lawyer is going to say well somebody knew so it's known. You may not have known, but you should have known. And so I guess I'm just wondering what we're trying to accomplish here. Even in cases where organics do permeate pipe, and I'm not saying (inaudible) is a fix, but normally there's an odor issue right away with customers well before you meet the maximum contaminate level, well before health affects are an issue. If it's truly a volatile. I'm just trying to figure out what you are trying to accomplish.

JAKE CAUSEY: I guess a few things. Basically we're trying to accomplish that I don't know that there are not any pipes in the state that are installed in an area where organic groundwater contamination may occur. Certainly say prohibit it and say you can install pipes in areas where this occurs, but I think the point is you can, you can do it safely if you use these types of materials. And so I think it makes more sense to specify that. I do know that there are volatiles that you will not smell and will exceed MCL before that occurs. I think it's just generally straight forward. As it's written I think there's a concern about contamination and what does it mean and what levels. Again, MCL is a typical trigger we use to increase monitoring. You can make equal to MCL I guess. Again, this is only applicable in these situations and I think rightly so.

PATRICK KERR: My concern, again Jake, is we have trouble testing for these contaminants in our waters.

It's very difficult, very expensive to do this testing and I can't imagine having to do that on a large project 5, 10 miles length of the pipe we're putting into the ground. Also, say there's a spill of an organic after the fact, how are we going to deal with that? Other than isolate that and prove it's not a problem somehow.

JAKE CAUSEY: And we have responded to incidents like that, a traffic accident and somebody spilled something in a ditch and the waterline is volatile. They flush and we come out and we do samplings to verify it's not there, if it's there we get it out. And then the soil, DEQ requires all the soil to be remediated and the responsible party to do all the testing to make sure it's no longer there. I guess if for some reason it was something that couldn't easily be removed I would imagine there would be some waterline, or placement of impermeable pipe, or rerouting, or something if there was some long term contamination risk when an incident occurs and there's a response and hopefully a responsible party that would be paying for that.

PATRICK KERR: I'm sitting here thinking about the West Virginia issue. A system did all the right things. I think we can rely on the system to do exactly that and involve you in it.

J.T. LANE: So would the solution then be to say in areas known to be contaminated and then outline what the appropriate action is? You're saying that, for instance the smell test, if they smell it they're going to do something about it.

PATRICK KERR. Our guys aren't going to work in the trench. That's the first order of protection. If we run something like that, and we have in Baton Rouge, with underground storage tanks and things like that we cease work. No one wants to work in that environment which is self protecting. If we had an underground storage leak of a fuel tank tomorrow it would be the responsibility of the tank owner and the state to remediate that. If we have a water main running down the street near that I think it would be our responsibility to insure that the testing's done and make sure there's no impact outside of the property and things like that. I don't know how we'll prove to you that's not a problem unless we go out and take samples, unbelievably burdensome.

J.T. LANE: I think the problem is the state is really focusing on probably new construction projects and you're saying that there are incidents that happen that you have to respond to. That's another thing too.

PATRICK KERR: Again, we're protected by having to have a permit and when we install it if the department knows of contamination that permit should not be issued. That's not perfect but.

RANDY HOLLIS: Let me chime in on something. Years ago Keith and I worked on a job and we installed PVC pipe through an area with a contractor, wasn't us, it was a contractor installing it, and several years later complaints downstream of a gasoline smell. As we went upstream we found there was an old leaking gasoline tank. As the contractor laid through there nobody noticed there was any gasoline smell whatsoever and it was only after the fact it was found. I don't know that any permit you get is going to state that. I think that's an issue you have contractors working they're trying to get production and they're going to lay pipe. My problem with this is, and Pat said a minute ago a solution and I agree with that, but if you have 20, 30 gallons a minute going through a pipeline and if outside of that area you have something that's 1/2 of the MCL and it's seeping in at 1 ounce per day you probably couldn't even detect it. So what we're saying this is not the right criteria to use, in my opinion, to try and specify when you have to use pipes that are not permeable to organic compounds. So that's my problem. I have no problem saying if it is known or found that we have to do this. It's just not the right criteria to set when you have to do it.

J.T. LANE: Talking about the second half, first sentence?

RANDY HOLLIS: Yes.

DAVID CONSTANT: How about if it was worded where distribution systems are installed in areas contaminated by organic compounds at levels identified that pose a health risk then A and B.

JAKE CAUSEY: And that's fine. I think generally that's what was stated before what is contaminated is defined. That's how we got down this trail. That works.

DAVID CONSTANT: Just trying to avoid a hard number where you may have a problem or you may not

have a problem, but somebody's going to get a snoop full probably even if there's things they can't smell, probably things they can smell and that's going to be the trigger. Suggestion.

J.T. LANE: So you would say where distribution systems are installed in areas known to be contaminated by organic compounds at levels that pose a health risk.

DAVID CONSTANT: Because the MCL's will change and continue to change.

PATRICK KERR: And there's quite a number of organics that don't have MCL's.

DAVID CAUSEY: Right. Secondaries and stuff like that.

JAKE CAUSEY: I'll read it to you. Where distribution systems are installed in areas contaminated by organic compounds detected at levels known to pose a health risk. For distribution systems installed in areas contaminated by organic compounds detected at levels known to pose a health risk the following A, B.

J.T. LANE: Pat, since you joined us a little late what we're doing is as we go through this Caryn is making adjustments so we can then print fresh copies for everybody and try to get, our goal is to get a final vote on this today unless we identify other issues that need more time. We have that one. So right now it's just open. Randy if you have more, but it's open for anybody that has questions about any part of the document.

ROBERT BROU: Under 8.1.3 used materials. I guess it's really just a general statement. This sentence as written allows you to use used material. I feel if you're silent on the issue is a liable. I think this document really should focus on the things that are mandated or prohibited and not talk a lot about what it allows. I think you can strike the entire sentence and not change a thing.

PATRICK KERR: That's not quite true in that I can take a piece of sand cast lead joint pipe and put it in downtown. It's used pipe. I'm using an extreme example, but you could in fact take transite pipe out and reuse it elsewhere. I can't imagine anyone would. Provided they meet the above standards. So they have to meet today's standard. So that's the crux of this is today's standards.

ROBERT BROU: 8.1.4 with joints. This is saying that we should repair lead joint pipes using alternative

methods. Under the exceptions they are allowing lead so they actually conflict with 8.1.1 A2 exceptions and B1 and 2 as well.

RANDY HOLLIS: Robby, I think the reason of leaving that one in about the water mains previously used--

ROBERT BROU: I'm okay with that.

RANDY HOLLIS: You're okay with that? Never mind.

ROBERT BROU: His point was well taken. I have no problem with that at all. The leaded joints conflicts with previous exceptions under material standards. I move that we strike that.

JAKE CAUSEY: I'm fine with that. That was something we noted I think it just got lost in translation from the standards and the code to the subcommittee stuff.

J.T. LANE: Strike 8.1.4 in its entirety?

JAKE CAUSEY: The second sentence is something completely different.

PATRICK KERR: Well if you want to finish the second sentence and say or they will leak. I don't think we're going to do that.

JAKE CAUSEY: Some people use duck tape. I think it is important to have a standard that properly states that.

J.T. LANE: So keeping the second sentence?

JAKE CAUSEY: Yeah.

J.T. LANE: On 8.1.4.

ROBERT BROU: Yeah, I thought we had addressed material standards for what type of fittings and that we had to utilize, follow recommendations, manufacture's recommendations in here somewhere.

JAKE CAUSEY: Addresses transition joints.

ROBERT BROU: 8.7.1 specification of installation of water mains.

JAKE CAUSEY: Let me restate that. It's not that it doesn't address it at all. Certainly it's got to meet the low lead and all the applicable standards, but the point is is that a joint or coupling or whatever that's used to join dissimilar materials. It's got to be designed to join those two dissimilar materials is all

that it's stating. It still has to comply with the other material standards listed. It's got to be intended for that purpose. That's all.

J.T. LANE: We're going to keep the second sentence.

PATRICK KERR: Go on to pressure. Jake and I are going to disagree about this, I know. In a controlled environment where by design we drop pressure below 20 PSI and can ensure there's not infiltration to the pipe I don't think it's necessary to issue a boil water advisory. An example where we have by design flow into a hole that we dewater while we're making a repair there's not a risk of infiltration in that pipe and I don't think, I think we're doing a disservice to the public when we issue a boil water advisory when we should not. It's a sky is falling problem, the more that we do it the less they're going to be heeded. AWWA, and Jake and I have talked about this, has for the last several years been working on a matrix and the new C651 standards for chlorination, for disinfection that I think we can disagree the periphery about it. Studies have been done, pilot scale studies have been done. AWWA's demonstrating we can maintain integrity of the system with pressure lower than 20 and not scare the public or not force the public to become indifferent about telling them too many times to boil their water. I really think we need to work on this language some. If I am making a repair in a lot of cases the water is allowed to continue to flow, we excavate, have a clean hole, you can see the water is coming into the area, we keep the dirt soils out of the pipe by excavating below it, cut out whatever we need to cut out, replace and repair it. I would agree that we should take bac-t samples after the fact, but I don't think a boil water advisory is necessary. If we then find that those bac-t samples do indicate contamination over time I think the department should re-look at this, but you will find they will not. So may be we change it so that those are not (inaudible) samples, but after repair those samples are required samples and therefore going to our MCL for the month and are reportable to DHH. Right now I don't have to report those results to DHH. If we go out and make a repair we take the samples, we lift the boil advisory, we notify DHH that we issued the advisory and notify it's lifted, but we don't report those samples. All we report to DHH are those samples that are

required for routine monitoring. I think we can do better on this Jake. I'm really concerned, you know we issue an incredible number of boil water advisories. I have not had a single sample come back positive for bac-t after a repair in the years that we've been doing it. I would also tell you I think if we do get a positive sample it's a false positive, which does happen, somebody doesn't collect it well. We have to do better than this. I think we're doing a disservice to the public.

JAKE CAUSEY: What I can say is that boil water advisories when pressure in distribution systems drop below the standard 20 PSI from everything I'm seeing across the country is a standard public health protection that's been in place that we've always had. The standard procedure is to flush, disinfect, sample, you're sampling after the fact, after you've done all the things that you need to do. We expect that you would get a negative sample. The boil advisory is for the water being consumed during that process to protect the users. I don't see any way that I could support not issuing boil advisories when pressure drops below 20 PSI, I'm not aware of any states that allow that. We've always had it. I don't have any data to say it's unnecessary.

PATRICK KERR: I can't tell you that no other states, I can't tell you that other states regulate this as you are here. I can tell you that it's not the practice of water utility providers I speak to all over the country and it's not required of them by the department. In a controlled situation where the water system is making a repair or pulling off a cap and putting in a tee, a branch, something like that where they're actually controlling it, where the pressure is allowed to drop by design. There is not a threat to the public health and the way this is written any time it drops below 20 there's a problem. Now if you want to say an uncontrolled situation, for example if we lose power and the whole system goes down below 20 I'm with you on that. Not a problem.

J.T. LANE: What if we added something with the exception of repair and maintenance, something like that? How do we define controlled environment?

JAKE CAUSEY: That's the whole issue. I have the same concern. A controlled environment, the only customers affected are the folks within the area of repairs, typically, hopefully the right valves, not a

system wide issue, but just a limited number of customers. The pressure is still dropped even if it's controlled the pressure is dropped. The risk of contamination is that pressure drops, interconnections with these other customers, potential source of contamination, etc.

PATRICK KERR: As long as there's positive pressure and positive flow. Systems that have re-pressurization, I'm sure this building does for example, the water from this building should be checked back before it comes to our system. 20 pounds, 45 feet of head it's an awful lot in our environment. Again, we have not seen a problem. We do not get bac-t samples back positive. Maybe you can survey and ask water systems to provide bac-t sample results after repairs and take a look at it scientifically instead of just we think it might be a problem. I really do think there is a cost associated and that is telling the same customer, I hate to say it, repairs are made to the same parts of the system over and over again. That 2 miles of pipe that you put in in 1985 fails month after month, if not year after year. If it's a bad run of pipe it's a bad run of pipe and we deal with that. But the same customers do get the boil water advisories. And I'll give you a perfect example, Darrow. Darrow lived under boil water advisories because the way they were fed as consecutive system. They didn't heed those. They got them and said I don't care and that's the cost of this. When we issue a boil water advisory we want the people to know that we think there's a real threat to their health and this is not a real threat to their health if I go out and cut a hydrant arm and put a valve on it because it doesn't have one on it now. I take the system down, we continue to have positive flow, we make sure that we do that so there's not a problem with infiltration. And maybe we can put some language in there that it's by design or maybe a water system could have a standing permit that you guys would approve of our process for how we would do that without issuing a boil water advisory. Some language that requires that and then you could work with us. It could be statewide, a blanket permit, or it could be by water utilities. This is how we're going to make repairs, if we do this and this we don't have to do a BWA. If we can put something in here about that. And then we can get this through today and keep talking about exactly how we do it. But I think if a system is

capable of operating to support the public health you need to give us some latitude to do it regardless of the regulation stuff.

JAKE CAUSEY: AWWA made a presentation about the new standard, the new protocol they are working on in our state drinking water conference last year. There were definitely a lot of questions from other administrators. I was physically present, there were a lot of comments about repairs okay, but pressure drops below 20 that's our standard. Keep it up you don't have to issue boil advisories. I think that is something that the industry is working towards getting to and demonstrating. I'm not ready to just go jump on board ahead of the rest of the country and say this is the best thing since sliced bread. I definitely have reservations. I'm very interested in seeing more on it, more comments from other drinking administrators, and generally this looks like it's, I guess to some extent proven or accepted practice I would have a lot more confidence. My position, I'm not ready to go be the first one to tackle this.

PATRICK KERR: This is not the way it's being done. It may be the way drinking water administrators think it's being done, but it's not the way it's being done. And I just would hate to sign up for something that's going to cause the public an issue with public confidence in our system and also with public confidence in our ability to tell them their water may or may not be healthy to drink. The other way, we tell them all the time their water is safe to drink. If we start to routinely tell them it's not and we're wrong they're not going to think we're right about it being safe. They're going to say we don't know what we're talking about.

J.T. LANE: So when we issue a boil advisory we're very clear it's precautionary unless we know for sure there's a health threat. It's always precautionary because there is an unknown. We know the likelihood may be small, but we're just not as an agency going to take the chance and we emphasize that we're working really closely with the systems and that it is being done as a precaution in case.

PATRICK KERR: I'm telling you people are not listening when you start putting this many out. They're not. I have talked to people under boil water advisories, I do it all the time, and basically they'll ask

me questions. I go out on jobs where we're making repairs and people will come up to me and talk to me. What does this mean, it means we're telling you we're not sure your water is safe to drink and we recommend you boil it before consuming it. Well, would you boil yours? I can't answer that question for you. I don't know. I know exactly what happened here. Would I boil my water, I would never say this to a person who asked me that question, I would tell them if my water system told me I should boil my water I would boil my water. But knowing what's going on down in the hole I would never worry about boiling water, I shouldn't say never. I wish we could have boil water advisory that says you really need to listen to this one. Which is what we're going to end up having to do. This one's really important. This will be on the test, but we don't. We have one that says we make repairs, we're not sure of the integrity of the system, please boil your water.

J.T. LANE: We have no idea how many people do and don't on average. Don't have any survey data around that. I think that's largely why it's there. Does anybody else have any, on the committee, have any comments about this?

RUSTY REEVES: I understand perfectly where Pat's coming from and a lot of systems have the capabilities to control the distribution system. I think where Jake's scared is that 15 or 20 percent out there that don't have the valves in place and can't control it they are going to try to run under the same, and I am going to use a term here and I'm not promoting it, exemption or status, Pat's system run and I'm sure Robby and them have the capabilities to control and a lot of rural systems do, but some of your smaller rural systems not going to have that capability to keep 20 PSI, keep that positive flow. And I would, Pat's comments, I know those systems issue advisories once a month, once every three weeks and it does get to the point people are under a boil advisory all the time and won't pay it any mind. Somewhere probably do need to find a medium, but I can't give you the answer to what the medium is. To keep public trust.

JAKE CAUSEY: I'm definitely willing to stay engaged on that topic and see how the standard goes and continue to collaborate with drinking water administrators on that. That new standard is definitely

something that will when it comes out I'm sure will be a major topic of discussion. At this point in time today I don't feel like we're there. I agree that as far as Rusty was saying control and Pat's explained exactly how they control it and pumps and keep everything clean, etc. I do think we have a lot of systems there's a leak, turn that valve, turn that off and they just shut it down. And I understand it's not the same situation as what you are describing.

PATRICK KERR: This is not going to stop that. They're going to do it exactly the same way.

JAKE CAUSEY: They are issuing boil water advisories.

PATRICK KERR: No, they're not.

JAKE CAUSEY: We get probably 5 to 10 a week statewide.

PATRICK KERR: I have 5 to 10 breaks a week in Baton Rouge alone Jake and we issue boil advisories more often than not. They're not doing it and this regulation all it's going to do is punish the folks that are doing it right.

RANDY HOLLIS: Can I make a suggestion? Thank goodness I read the minutes because part of it said Randy will provide language and so later on in here I have language because I read the minutes and realized I needed to do something. My suggestion is I don't think we're going to resolve this today. I would like to suggest that we come back with some language about how we could look at controlled repair and see how we can put it in there and let's at least be able to look at something. Because I do agree and I think controlled repair should be addressed separately. Can we have some language that we can look at to see if we want to consider it what would it look like. And I'm not suggesting I write that because I am not the person to write it.

J.T. LANE: Is it possible to discuss that and have it ready today, or do you feel like you need another subcommittee meeting or?

RANDY HOLLIS: I haven't been to any of these meetings so how can we get that language to look at? What's the best way, does AWWA have that?

PATRICK KERR: I've shared with Jake and my suggestion is even they use a matrix, but it isn't passed yet

and it's a long process to get it passed. And it's a peer review vetted scientifically based standard that AWWA writes. But they do have some guidelines that already exist about controlled repairs. For example, AWWA says if I go to a section of pipe, if I go into an area, not a break, not a repair, to extend my facilities and need to install a tee I can go out, dig the hole, clean it all up, put my new watering equipment in, open the pipe without any pressure on the pipe, install the appurtenance that I need and a valve that's been chlorinated prior to installation. There's no dirt getting in the pipe, no solids getting in the pipe. Might a customer upstream have some backflow into the system, yes, but we also have a system in place to flush that pipe to get scouring velocities so that we remove any solids that we introduced and any contaminants that were introduced and then we put it back in service. In that scenario there's no requirement to do a bac-t sample. My suggestion is even in that case I'd like to wear the suspenders and do a bac-t sample. Interestingly bacteria, coliform bacteria there's only one way they'd have gotten introduced and that's if we got contaminated soil in the pipe. So we're not even checking for things that might be coming from people's homes. It's kind of a false test. So we're releasing this boil water advisory the only thing we're protecting them from is what we might have introduced at that repair, not from their neighbors who might have some chemical lab in their home. This doesn't protect them from that. I don't know that we're helping them by forcing this. If I issue a boil water advisory which we say the standard for taking you out from under this boil water advisory is a negative bac-t sample. I know of only one contamination event in our system and it was caused by a fire in a home and that resident happened to be doing some processes in his home that were not known to anyone, not illegal, but he's using metals, home chemist kind of thing. This wouldn't have prevented that from happening, it never will. I think we're trying to do something to make ourselves feel good as opposed to taking care of public health.

JAKE CAUSEY: I'll mention this is just talking about pressure. If I recall the water main repair procedures require flushing that would address anything that may be been introduced chemically. The overall concept of there's a pressure issue, you can have a pressure loss for many different reasons, but then

there's a main repair required, that procedure requires flushing. So there's a lot of different pieces to the puzzle when addressing these different things.

PATRICK KERR: I agree, I'm just saying a boil water advisory that's lifted because we get a negative total coliform rule sample doesn't affect the public health. It doesn't protect the public health from the real threats and flushing is what protects the public health from those real threats. Removing it from that system is what protects public health. If we get a backflow event from this building and we need a repair on North Boulevard and we flush it out and we then have chlorine residual that backflow event does not affect the public health. We'd be better off having no pressure so that we dewater and flush it even maintaining 5 PSI because then we have an open valve to keep that water coming in. What are we trying to protect the public from I guess is my question Jake? If it's bacteria I can do that with a clean hole. If it's backflow from a building I do that with flushing. What do you see as the threat?

JAKE CAUSEY: So yes, the threat is dependent on the circumstance, different things, but in general it's everything, right. Chemicals, bacteria, viruses, all the contaminants that can make people ill or cause death. The pressure is required for all the obvious reasons, the pressure drops there's concern about compromising integrity of the water. No we don't require you to flush your entire system and sample it for all the chemicals at every point on the system because that's extensive and costly. And we don't know that, I guess a lot of unknowns. So the coliform monitoring is typically the immediate threat more so than chemicals. Chemicals typically are more of a long term toxicity thing. Microorganisms are an immediate public health risk so coliform monitoring has generally been the standard. Is it foolproof, absolutely not, but it's the standard that's been used with respect to contamination from microorganisms. I would say generally widely accepted unless you know that there's some other contaminant then you can test for that.

PATRICK KERR: I think you're running with my point too far. If this were a pipe and I break into it and fill it with a bunch of nasty stuff and then flush it out completely and replace it with water from my

system this is not a threat to public health. If it's something that lingers in the pipe, I don't know some heavy metal, somebody introduced mercury into the system, the fact that I scared everybody with a boil water advisory and then 48 hours later lifted it because it didn't have bacteria contamination doesn't ameliorate that threat. So we're not fixing the problem. My point is if we're doing a controlled maintenance, controlled construction we know what caused it to drop we should be able to do it without a water advisory. I'll accede to having to pull a bac-t sample. I would also tell you if I found out somehow that a customer did have a problem and we had a backflow event, some kind of odor or something, we'd do a lot more than that. But a boil water advisory is a knee jerk reaction that doesn't protect public health and I think it's actually deleterious because they're going to stop listening. How many boil water advisories do you see on the news anymore? We issue them all the time there's never been one that made the news in Baton Rouge. Now if I had a system wide loss or an unplanned loss I'm sure it would and it should make the news. They're not news worthy and Jake I hope you can see that we need to have some kind of exception in here for controlled. And again, I can put all kinds of, I can't say what I'm thinking because it's a chemical everybody is talking about, something that will kill you, what you're suggesting here doesn't fix that. If somebody pumps something in this pipe on purpose this doesn't fix it. They pump it against 20 pounds of pressure, 40 pounds of pressure we have other methods of protecting our customers from those kinds of people and fortunately most of the organics are oxidized by chlorine and we monitor chlorine residuals throughout the system. Something you guys if there's one benefit to what you've asked us to do in moving our system monitoring around is that I think we have a better setup for a problem like that. It's not for bac-t, it's for other things. Jake, again, I think the state drinking water administrators are one part of the puzzle. I need to go talk to some more of them about it, but Louisiana shouldn't be issuing advisories that are unnecessary and that's exactly what we're doing here. I can keep talking or how do we resolve this? We have disagreement.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: I have a point I would like to make. It is a valuable discussion, a resolution needs

to be had and codified, but section 8.2 is for system design. Everything past the first sentence in 8.2.1 is operations. So this may not be the place for this particular language and discussion. But I'm not saying it doesn't need to be had.

JAKE CAUSEY: And I'll mention the reason it was added in the last meeting we were requested to provide a procedure right here.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: My apologies, I missed the last meeting.

PATRICK KERR: So what are we going to do?

J.T. LANE: So we have one of two options. We can reconvene the subcommittee to try to pull some language for the next meeting or we can, well actually that would be my recommendation, the subcommittee provide the language.

PATRICK KERR: Take that up in the actual when we talk about parts 1 and 3 for the design. So we can get this through with the first sentence.

J.T. LANE: So part 3 would be the best place?

PATRICK KERR: Not 10 state standards, when we get to the actual sanitary code in part 12.

JAKE CAUSEY: It's fine with me.

J.T. LANE: At this point what we will do is strike, so everything passed the first sentence. We will strike it and handle this in our next discussion. So from in events when the pressure drops below 20 PSI all the way down to the boil advisory can be lifted, that whole section.

PATRICK KERR: And we put that language or something like it in part 12 chapter 3.

ROBERT BROU: Before we move on I just want to say I agree with everything Pat was saying. My suggestion, if it makes DHH a little more comfortable with this, is to almost treat it as a reduced monitoring situation where you're taking your samples every time and if someone shows that they have a bad track record not controlling the situation and consistently having positive results following a repair you can go back to making them do a boil notice every time.

PATRICK KERR: Or what about having an MCL, you issue a boil water advisory until you're able to

demonstrate that reduced monitoring is required. Kind of like we do with lead and copper sampling. If there's an indicator you have a problem you continue to sample. Reduced monitoring you do it less often. Maybe that would be we require these samples be submitted to DHH and if more than 5 percent of your samples use total coliform rule are positive for coliform you are required to issue boil water advisories until such time DHH releases the requirement. We have some period of time, a year where we demonstrate it's not an issue and then we allow them not to issue boil water advisories, but rather just take the sample. That keeps the honest systems honest. You still have a problem with the dishonest systems aren't going to report. We have to fix that some other way. I think that's a great idea Robert.

J.T. LANE: Okay. What else?

RANDY HOLLIS: 8.2.4 dead-ends. The way that was left was dead-end mains shall be equipped with a means to provide adequate flushing. We did take out 2 1/2 feet per second, but even the word adequate. We can't put a flushing hydrant on the end of a 24 inch if it's a dead-end right now that will adequately flush it, I'm sorry. The word adequate is what I had a problem with there. I don't have a problem with to provide flushing, but I don't think the word adequate is the proper word.

PATRICK KERR: I think adequate is fine. Adequate might be the ability, adequate doesn't necessarily dictate velocity. It means you're going to use whatever's necessary to flush it affectively. If we have to pick a 24 we pick it. If a hose bend at the end of an 8 inch main is adequate it might be. Run it 24 hours a day, water is staying in the pipe. I don't think anybody would do that, but in fact a lot of the automatic flushing assemblies are 5/8th inch connections.

JAKE CAUSEY: I don't see a reason anybody's going to be trying to investigate adequate flushing in plan reviews, but generally make this comment, there's a difference between just dumping water and flushing cause I've seen systems that same assembly and they do not adequately flush their line with that assembly at all. It wasn't until they cracked some hydrants open and got some water moving with 2 1/2 feet per second velocities that they achieved flushing. I think this is just a general point

and nobody's going to be looking for calculations or any of that, just a general statement.

RANDY HOLLIS: We're fine. One on 8.5.2 air relief valve piping. What it says if used open end of an air relief pipe from automatic valves shall be extended to at least 1 foot above grade and provided with a screened, downward-facing elbow. Let's say that your air relief valve is above the BFE. But yet you're 10 feet above the ground. You have now asked us in this to extend the pipe from that air relief valve all the way down to 1 foot above which could be nine feet below BFE. So now if we have a flood you now have water that's come back in through the air relief valve. So a lot of air relief valves are fine with just two elbows on top of it so you can turn down the screen. I think requiring it to be extended to one foot above the grade is something we do not need to do because we are introducing something into the pipeline.

JAKE CAUSEY: So what was your recommendation?

ROBERT BROU: I took it as a minimum. You can never be less than a foot above ground. If you want to be 6 feet above. This is language straight out of 10 state standards we just put if used.

RANDY HOLLIS: But 10 states is not perfect.

J.T. LANE: We're making it perfect.

ROBERT BROU: You can never be less than a foot.

RANDY HOLLIS: Okay, you're right. It should be at least 1 foot above grade. If we want to put it right on top of the valve and not extend it at all we can do that.

ROBERT BROU: Yes.

RANDY HOLLIS: Misread it, sorry.

PATRICK KERR: 8.4.3. Why do you care what size the hydrant lead is? I don't have any hydrant leads that are the same size as my fire hydrant. My fire hydrant is 5 1/4 inch barrel and we connect with a 6 inch lead. Why do you care?

JAKE CAUSEY: That was recommended by the subcommittee.

ROBERT BROU: No, actually by the full committee. Subcommittee said leave it alone, no standard at all.

PATRICK KERR: Yeah, I don't understand. The hydrant lead is the force between the main and the hydrant, right.

JAKE CAUSEY: So I think basically this is centered around we're not putting a 6 inch fire hydrant on a 4 inch main.

PATRICK KERR: That's not what this says, this says lead. I can put a 6 inch lead on a 4 inch main. The lead is a branch that comes off the main to the hydrant. This says I can't, the way this is written I can put a 2 inch main and put a 5 1/4 double steamer on it by making sure the lead is big enough.

JAKE CAUSEY: I don't think that was the general thought process when it was discussed. The whole point was the requirement was you can only provide hydrants for fire protection on 6 inch and larger water mains. I think some folks indicated providing fire protection with smaller than 6 inch water mains, which I think is questionable, and so the point was we wanted to be able to maintain hydrants on our small lines, which is questionable. For some reason we got to the point if we have a fire hydrant that's the same size as the water main it's okay.

PATRICK KERR: It doesn't say main.

JAKE CAUSEY: Well, it's not my language.

RANDY HOLLIS: On 8.2.2 diameter which is it says the minimum size water main which provides fire protection and serving fire hydrants shall be 6 inch diameter. So we're specifying there the minimum size that we can use with a hydrant is 6 inch. So you couldn't put a 6 inch lead on a 4 inch main cause this would prohibit that.

PATRICK KERR: I'm just talking about this down here, that language is unnecessary. We do not have leads that are the same size as the hydrant barrel. I've never bought a piece of 5 1/4 inch pipe.

SHEREE TAILLON: In the minutes last time this is exactly what Randy said, he said why not simply say that hydrant leads shall match with the size of the hydrant installed. Putting in a 2 inch flushing hydrant, put in 2 inch lead, putting 6 inch it's a 5 1/2 inch, but you can say it shall match the size hydrant installed.

RANDY HOLLIS: And that's because the foot while it is 5 1/2 inches it accepts a 6 inch pipe.

PATRICK KERR: Why don't we say the hydrant leads shall be at least as large as the hydrant. Does that help you?

JAKE CAUSEY: Yeah, the same concept.

J.T. LANE: At least as large as the hydrant.

PATRICK KERR: The hydrant lead shall be at least as large as the hydrant.

JOE YOUNG: I had a question on how the distances are measured in 882, 883 and then on force mains 885. We say one is edge to edge and then outside to outside and then force main it doesn't say how it's measured. I didn't know if y'all discussed this before. Just I think we should be consistent on all three of them and probably from the outside to outside diameter is probably the best way.

JAKE CAUSEY: That's part of the imperfection in 10 state standards was that that language was included in previous sections, but not force mains. But we can include shall be measured edge to edge so it's very clear for everyone. In 885 it says there shall be at least, I don't know in each sentence is required 883.

PATRICK KERR: Same sentence, shall be measured edge to edge.

JAKE CAUSEY: Yeah, so we're just going to add that in 885 measured edge to edge.

J.T. LANE: Everybody fine with that? Caryn, do you have that language?

RANDY HOLLIS: Underwater crossings 8.9.2 and under that section there's a section C and the way 10 states, although Robby it's perfect, states that we should insert a small meter to determine leakage. Just not going to insert a meter at any kind of a crossing. And then it says Randy will provide provision. Okey-dokey. I have that and I will pass that out, what I came up with. I numbered this not so that we would number it in the code, it was just numbered so we could discuss these things. That's not intended to be numbered as you write the final. Number one says permanent easily accessible taps shall be located on both sides of the crossing. That's number one. So wherever we have a crossing we'll have a tap on both sides. Isolation valves on mains less than 24 inches in

diameter shall be located no more than 1/2 a mile on both sides of the crossing. This follows our one mile spacing for small diameter mains. Three, all other mains, services, taps, hydrants, or other devices located inside the limits of these isolation valves shall also have easily accessible isolation valves. If someone comes in and places a hydrant or service for a house or something within that limit then we have an isolation valve that you can shut off or whatever that's easily accessible. Permanent taps located adjacent to the crossing shall be compatible with hydraulic pressure testing equipment such that the crossing can undergo a pressurized leak test. Just like you pressurize mains you go to the tap, pressurize it up to 150 PSI or whatever and you'll see if it drops.

PATRICK KERR: You have to do a leak test. We don't do pressure test on a PE. It's what we do most of our underwater crossings with. How do you suggest we test PE?

RANDY HOLLIS: We do hydrostatically test PE in a number of locations.

PATRICK KERR: But they don't hold pressure.

RANDY HOLLIS: Ours do.

PATRICK KERR: I don't know, I'm just throwing it out there.

RANDY HOLLIS: Anyway, number five the permanent taps shall also be constructed of all metallic materials to the main to better facilitate leak detection equipment. Pat, you can address this, we have polyethylene tubing coming up. I would think that a metal type of connection would be better for the listening devices, doesn't matter?

PATRICK KERR: No, the pipe doesn't transmit the sound, an acoustic test does not affect it. So if we're doing acoustic leak testing on plastic pipe putting a copper tap wouldn't help at all.

RANDY HOLLIS: So that's not necessary.

PATRICK KERR: No, if you're doing PE or PVC acoustic leak detection's not capable in essence, there are instances where it is, but it just doesn't transmit the sound through the pipe wall. I would strike that all Randy, honestly.

RANDY HOLLIS: Number five can come out. Six it is permissible to have combination taps for both air

relief valve and a pressure tap provided the assembly meets the above criteria and the air relief valve can be isolated during the testing of the crossing. And then on seven large transmission mains 24 inches and larger must also have taps on both sides of the crossing for testing and leak detection, but the transmission main isolation valve spacing may be increased to 2 1/2 miles on either side of the crossing. That's to match the 5 mile limit we put on those. That's the way I tried to address the pressure testing and leakage testing on underwater crossing and we can go from there.

CHRIS RICHARD: On the underwater crossing bridge at 15 feet where is the 15 feet measured and a watercourse have to have water? For instance, if you have a cooling crossing that may be full today, but tomorrow it will be down again. It's two feet, the watercourse is only two feet wide and you're going to have that required on every crossing at the top of the tank. And the other one is this retroactive or is that grandfathering?

RANDY HOLLIS: I think the grandfathering is something we're going to talk about later. None of this is grandfather, all this is future design criteria.

DIRK BARRIOS: Also states not subject to valves. Above all this same part. South Louisiana you put a valve.

JAKE CAUSEY: I think not subject to flooding probably under normal conditions. I don't know that this has to be in there, but I think the point is you can access the valve.

DIRK BARRIOS: We took all this out of 10 state standards, the 10 state standards is an entirely different document. Again, 10 years down the road somebody else interprets it and you're trying to put in a crossing. Anywhere in the lower part of the state you're going to be subject to flooding.

PATRICK KERR: Can we fix that by saying 15 feet in width at minimum plug. So minimum in stream flow 15 feet we follow these things.

CHRIS RICHARD: Like a roadside ditch that's normally dry.

PATRICK KERR: So when the water level is at normal low is where we measure the 15 feet, if there's some slack as long as they get 12, it's slack, it's fine, it's measurable.

JAKE CAUSEY: I agree. I think that's the general intent here.

PATRICK KERR: I mean something's 150 feet wide once every 10 years. Let's just say at normal flow level, or at minimum flow level, whatever you want to throw in there.

RANDY HOLLIS: Robby to answer your question, or Chris, item B under that, this is probably intended to replace B and C. I would delete both B and C as written and we're trying to come up with something that would replace both of those.

JAKE CAUSEY: I would like to ask this question. I don't know how many utilities test underwater crossings or how frequently. I generally appreciate this as if there's a leak underwater crossing that you won't readily notice because it's flowing in the same water body where as otherwise you would notice it cause it would rise to the surface. The way I guess I saw it, call it the 10 state standards approach, where you had an isolation valve on each side and then on the upstream side a lot of cases may be either side fed either way a lot of times. But anyway, so an upstream side would have a cap on either side on both sides of that isolation valve so that basically it will isolate it and install a small 3/4 inch meter lead to water flow and it shouldn't flow. If it continues to flow it's obviously going in the stream, if the meter doesn't turn there's no leak. In my view that seems like a very quick thing an operator can do in the field without hauling a bunch of equipment. I guess my only concern is I think that though this is some more heavier duty testing with hydrostatic pressures and things. I guess I would hate to lose the simplicity of you have a tap on each side of this isolation valve, an operator less than an hour to get the meter in and measure leakage and be done verses going through a major procedure like this. I like that for at least effort. I don't know that anybody's actually doing it or not, frankly. I don't know that they're going to do this. I don't think that they really do anything until they start measuring their water loss.

RANDY HOLLIS: I guess I misinterpreted what someone wrote here, and this is from 10 state standards, when it says permanent taps to allow insertion of a small meter. I'm thinking of an insertion type 2 inch magnet you're putting into the pipe to try and figure out if you got a leak. So the word insertion

is not correct. If you're talking about something you can connect a hydrostatic unit and use a 3/4 meter to determine leakage that's fine with me.

JAKE CAUSEY: That's what I envisioned. We got a valve here, we got two taps, the guy can take a meter off his truck and hook up quickly and open those valves, water flowing or is it just holding. Pretty easily I think detect leakage that way verses if you don't have a tap on each side of the valve not going to be able to accomplish that.

RANDY HOLLIS: I was trying to read it literally the way it's written to insert a meter in the main line.

PATRICK KERR: You can reword it and say permanent taps shall be installed on each side of the valve closest to the supply source. Leave it at that.

RANDY HOLLIS: That's fine. I was trying to get away from an insertion meter, which is the way it literally reads.

PATRICK KERR: And that's a great way to do it.

J.T. LANE: Discuss what exactly the change should be, are we still trying to insert some language?

JAKE CAUSEY: Use Randy's language except I think that includes the valve issues. The permanent taps wherever it has language about permanent taps. Taps on each side of the supply side valve, or whatever. We'll delete five on Randy's handout.

PATRICK KERR: I think because if the spacing is every 5 miles then it's every 5 miles. If it's every mile it's every mile for smaller mains, doesn't matter what the watercourse is. We don't have to center the watercourse is my point. People that I think, I'm not going to say that, we should have valves on both sides anyway.

JAKE CAUSEY: B it says specifically valves shall be provided both ends water crossings. I think the point was that leads you to believe sort of immediately adjacent to the water crossing, not perhaps valve spacing previously identified. Separate deal here. Is that what you are getting at Randy?

RANDY HOLLIS: My concern is that we have a road that's 600 feet away from a water crossing, we have an isolation valve on a 24 inch. We get to the water crossing and we're going to have to put another

valve at the water crossing 600 feet away, 24 inch valve. I'm trying to avoid duplication of valves where we really don't need.

PATRICK KERR: Let me say this. An underwater crossing is no different than any other subterranean waterline. You're right, we don't see it come to the surface, but it's also buried 5 feet below the watercourse. We don't see a lot of our leaks coming to the surface. A lot of our leaks are storm drains, ditches. I'm not proud of this at all, but we just found an 800 gallon that's been leaking for 14 months. And somebody's been watching it go in a ditch and they finally decided to call us because mosquitoes are a problem. We don't pride ourselves in having leaks like that, but we're not going to fix it with this so if the 1 mile spacing is good enough for 8 inch and 5 miles is good enough for 24 we don't need that language. Or do you want that language?

JAKE CAUSEY: I felt like sort of the 10 state standards approach was have valves adjacent to the watercourse upstream side you're going to have taps on both sides. I think Randy's approach was to okay we're really only saying valve spacing minimum once every mile so why don't we just say as long as there's one within a 1/2 a mile on each side. That should normally fall within that, and if for some reason it didn't and it got disproportionate then maybe you have to put one. I think it was maybe a little bit of a compromise between the two ends.

PATRICK KERR: So you would just add to B Randy's language about within a 1/2 mile for 8 inch or 2 1/2 miles for 24 inch. You're defining the spacing. You're defining how long both ends are.

JAKE CAUSEY: I think generally falls within that anyway.

PATRICK KERR: If I have a loss problem the fact is that it's no more likely in a water crossing than it is anywhere else. If there's a mile between valves we can bypass that valve and check for leakage.

JAKE CAUSEY: He had included also other mains, services, caps, hydrants, or other things that have isolation valves. I think that's why they put the valves so close to the crossing to eliminate the other potential leak sources. So if you have a mile on each end you've got a whole lot of potential leak sources rather than just that stream. So maybe I guess we're kind of saying we're not going to make

you put it right next to it, you can go out a little further, but any connections you have within that you're going to have to be able to seal the leak.

PATRICK KERR: Which is a great way of saying put them right next to the water crossing.

JAKE CAUSEY: Perhaps so. You have the option though, you have more flexibility.

RUSTY REEVES: Where that comes into is that because you're going to use a small diameter meter, any service connection down there if Joe turned it on you could chase a leak and Joe's taking a shower. All these other valves in between that.

ROBERT BROU: The 10 state standards approach to this though is that for the most part they're laying their pipe in dry soil and this is unusual to go under a stream. If you're 5 feet or 4 feet below the ground you're in water table here. There is no difference running on side of a road or going underneath.

JAKE CAUSEY: So normally water leaks in mains will rise to the surface, if you're under a water crossing you're not going to see it. That's the general concept.

RANDY HOLLIS: And what has changed so much in our industry is we're not using underwater crossings anymore. Almost everything is directionally drilled polyethylene seamless piping. We're not seeing the leaks on crossings like we used to. When you try and write something so encompassing of everything you could think about I could have gone on another three pages.

J.T. LANE: We're going to define the spacing at the end for both sides and then what language from this are we going to incorporate?

JAKE CAUSEY: Primarily just the valve spacing aspects. Basically 2, 3, and 7 I think. Permissibility to have a combination tap for an air relief valve. The pressure tap which I don't think it's impermissible to begin with, but explicitly state that it is permissible.

RANDY HOLLIS: It's not uncommon to have an air relief valve right besides an underwater crossing.

JAKE CAUSEY: I don't think there's anything that will prohibit you from doing that anyway. Just wanted to make everybody clear on what's going to be included or not.

RANDY HOLLIS: To me it was like why have some regulator down the road say you can't combine you have to pressure tap and separate air relief valves. Just trying to think of everything.

JAKE CAUSEY: So 2,3,6, and 7. Incorporate 2,3,6 and 7.

DIRK BARRIOS: 8.9.1. Above-grade piping shall be adequately supported and anchored, protected from vandalism, damage, and freezing.

PATRICK KERR: We talked about that a lot. You can protect it from freezing by design, adequate flowing. It doesn't mean you have to put freeze protection on it, but if you put a main in that's subject to freezing and hang a 2 inch PVC pipe on a bridge crossing that's feeding one customer that's probably not a good thing. We're not defining what freeze protection is other than to say you should design it so it won't freeze. Adequate velocity is absolute good freeze protection. Is that cool?

DIRK BARRIOS: Again, just that it's vague. The whole fact of the matter it's vague. What is protecting it from freezing?

J.T. LANE: What if we inserted which could include a list, but not limited to?

JAKE CAUSEY: I was going to say if we could put in parenthesis IE or EG maintain adequate velocities, or what have you so we could list it's not an exclusive list, but it's at least a few examples. Including but not limited to. Velocity, insulation, is there something else that we want to include in that list? Heat trace. Include those three and not limited to.

RANDY HOLLIS: Under 8.11.2 booster pumps. Talks about booster pumps are allowable and where can't maintain 20 PSI. Says where the use of automatic pressure cut-offs is not possible such pumps must draw from a tank supplied with water from the distribution system. I guess the only problem I have there is through an air gap. And the problem with an air gap is once you drop the water over the top of the tank and you're aerating it and you stand the chance of losing chlorine residual. If you have a tank you have an atmospheric tank.

CHRIS RICHARD: Make it a vented tank, not a pressure tank.

RANDY HOLLIS: Absolutely, vented tank. I would prefer because of trying to maintain chlorine residuals,

emergency rule, we don't need air gaps spilling the water over the top.

PATRICK KERR: Another way to look at that Randy is we deal with that in the backflow prevention section and say that systems boosting their water pressure are required to have a backflow preventer. And so I think that's something that is a certain of ours. I think what this is trying to address is you don't have permission to draw my system down below 20 PSI, but the backflow prevention section says once the water goes in your plumbing it's not welcome back. And so we're going to take whatever steps to make sure you don't give it back to us. This is a new and huge burgeoning field unfortunately of private plumbing system protections, and hospitals, and convention centers, and all kind of folks. We need to prevent backflow, but I think DHH down the road has to also regulate those systems as public water systems.

JAKE CAUSEY: The air gap on the tank was for backflow protection because now you're in a back pressure environment. That's frankly the purpose. I mean we're maintaining potability of the water so that's not a concern, but the reason for the air gap is the environment with a pump and now you have a tank. And so basically we're saying maintain an air gap so we prevent backflow from back pressure.

PATRICK KERR: Let's not go there. Like a building like this that has I'm sure, state capital I know has booster pumps.

JAKE CAUSEY: We're not saying you have to have a tank.

ROBERT BROU: This is going to limit that they can't suck a negative pressure, so less about backflow and them drawing a negative pressure on your system.

PATRICK KERR: We just need to prohibit them from drawing our system down below 20.

ROBERT BROU: That's what it says.

JAKE CAUSEY: That's what it's saying, provisions must be made to limit the pressure on the suction side of the pump no less than 20. Then it says where in use of automatic pressure cuff-offs is not possible pumps must draw water from a tank supplied through a distribution center.

PATRICK KERR: An automatic pressure cuff-off might be a pressure regulated valve?

JAKE CAUSEY: We can probably clean the language up to state that.

PATRICK KERR: There's no installation that you couldn't put a pressure sustaining valve in.

JAKE CAUSEY: That would regulate the pump.

PATRICK KERR: That would cut off your supply to the pump. We do that at the Coca-Cola plant. They want a lot of water and we tell them you can have it, but you maintain 45 PSI. We put in a specific valve and set that. If they try to draw too much water they go to negative suction on the pumps. It's a perfect solution.

RANDY HOLLIS: That's my exact point. Let's say we're going to an atmospheric tank with a vent and we got a back pressure sustaining valve set for 20 PSI. Why do we have to go over an air gap?

JAKE CAUSEY: I think this was thought if you're going to put in a tank with an air gap you don't need a pressure sustaining valve necessarily to prevent backflow due to back pressure because the pump over pressurizes the plumbing system. You would have backflow, but you're still thinking in terms of, and I understand that, if they run that pump or put a huge pump and run it 24/7 they can still draw down the system and create that pressure so you may still want a sustaining valve.

PATRICK KERR: This is actually the opposite of what we want to do. If I put in an uncontrolled supply to that tank I can instantaneously drop the system pressure below 20 because the tank pressure, the head is less than 46 feet. So if I have an empty tank and I open it completely we can get instantaneous drop below 20 in the system. This does not protect the system from below 20 and this is the kind of language that ought to be in the premise of plumbing code, not in the system code. We just need to have something that says shall not draw system pressure below 20, period. You may not take our system below 20. No customer may draw our system down below 20. No fire department should be able to pull our system below 20. And that's just training operators.

JAKE CAUSEY: I agree completely. Tighten this up even further to say even if you're using a tank, any kind of pump whatsoever, you're going to have something that will cuff off the supply in a certain

pressure.

PATRICK KERR: Somewhere it ought to say that no customer, no one taking water from a public water supply system may reduce the pressure in that system to less than 20 PSI.

CHRIS RICHARD: What if you just go to where it says that to limit the pressure on the suction side not less than 20 PSI period end it there and delete the last section.

PATRICK KERR: But not just booster pumps. I hate to say it, but you go to a small system, and I've seen it happen, somebody's filling up a pond and the neighbors call cause they got low pressure and he's just got it running into the pond and that's taking it below 20.

JAKE CAUSEY: This is under booster pumps.

PATRICK KERR: I understand. If we covered it that no customer could take it below 20 we don't even need the booster pump language. The place for this booster pump language applies it to me when I put a booster pump in between consecutive parts of my own system I'm concerned about drawing the pressure down.

JAKE CAUSEY: This would apply to more than just you.

ROBERT BROU: A provision in 10 state standards that said no residential customers is allowed to have booster pumps. We were trying to say there are provisions that you can allow someone, you allow commercial to do it, so why wouldn't you allow.

JAKE CAUSEY: Under the same conditions. We're just trying to really iron out what those conditions are.

PATRICK KERR: So put it in two places and just say put it here no booster pump can go down below 20 and put it somewhere else where it says nobody can take it down below 20.

JAKE CAUSEY: I think there is a difference between making a general statement you can't do and then saying if you have a booster pump you have to have an actual device that guarantees that won't happen. Those are different requirements. I think this was basically saying you had to have some control in place that would prevent that from occurring rather than just saying shame on you. And

the control is you have a cut-off switch for a pump and then it basically said or if you can or don't have a cut-off switch you supply to obtain via air gap. But I understand in that situation it wouldn't necessarily prevent from over pumping.

PATRICK KERR: Can I give you the suggested language? Where permitted by the water supplier pumps that are used to draw water from a water supply distribution system or are placed in a system to increase the line pressure shall not reduce pressure at the tap to less than 20 PSI. And you can take everything else out. That is the shall not and then when we review plans, when a customer comes in and applies for service and we look at what they're doing we make sure they do not draw our system down below 20. We can't allow it. And actually some systems in our case we use 45 usually but.

JAKE CAUSEY: I guess the question is do you not want to strengthen this to say that customers who have booster pumps shall have an actual physical control in place that prevents that, or do you just want to believe that every water operator when they get an application for a booster pump is actually going to ask that question and ask them what controls they have in place.

PATRICK KERR: That's provision, that's in there. Provisions must be made, limited pressure, it will say at the tap, at the connection to the public water system.

JAKE CAUSEY: Okay, I thought we were eliminating that provision. I misunderstood.

PATRICK KERR: They can do whatever engineering solution they want. And we're also going to require a backflow preventer on that tap.

JAKE CAUSEY: Yeah, that makes sense.

SIDNEY BECNEL: Can I ask a question? This building has a big fire pump and I don't know we had a big discussion about a throttle valve so that they could keep pumping water even down to 15 PSI and still be in compliance. Do y'all regulate, but this is a state building, I guess you do. Did you get involved with that at all?

PATRICK KERR: We do the other side of that Sidney. They design the system for the flow we can provide at 20 PSI and then we already use 20 PSI for design. Basically in a normal condition this

system is designed that it will not draw our system below 20 PSI, it has to be, because the fire marshal requires that their calculations be made at 20 PSI or above. We do have that protection, but the water system is not managing it, the fire marshal is. They can not, for example, design a fire protection system at 15 PSI. The fire marshal won't let them do that. If they're going to draw the connection down below 20 the fire marshal makes them put in holding tanks, and all that stuff, and booster pumps.

SIDNEY BECNEL: So there should be, for example, a throttle valve, or whatever the fire man comes up with, right?

PATRICK KERR: Well, the way it's done actually is the siamese that you see on the end of the building is between the check valve, between the backflow preventer in the building is that siamese and what will happen is the fire truck pulls up to the main, pulls up to a hydrant, connects, goes over to that siamese and pressurizes the building and then that fire truck pump operator is required not to pull the system below 20. There's no mechanical limit on that though, he's watching a gauge. So this building could not pull us down below 20 with its pumps. It could do it, but it's designed not to.

SIDNEY BECNEL: But in this building there is actually a fire truck in the building. There's a fire pump. I don't know if it's a set limitation on it.

PATRICK KERR: I don't know if they have a suction cut-off or not, but it is designed for 20 PSI. Designed for that, is it perfect, no.

RANDY HOLLIS: There are many fire pumps in buildings like this that have a back pressure sustaining valve upstream to the pump that will prohibit the system from dropping below 20 and that is a throttling valve no matter what the pump is trying to do. But it's my understanding that the PIAL is now not recognizing those valves anymore because they can malfunction and starve the pump. So we're going to see some major changes in fire systems around the state where they no longer will allow you to put in a throttling valve upstream.

JAKE CAUSEY: That will directly conflict with this provision we are writing today.

RANDY HOLLIS: It will on fire pumps cause we've seen that in New Iberia and they have now prohibited the use of throttling valves upstream with fire pumps.

PATRICK KERR: If we were faced with that situation our answer would be you may not have fire service. I'm not going to go to a system wide boil water because somebody over cooked a bagel on the 50th floor.

RANDY HOLLIS: I agree, I'm just saying what's happened over there.

PATRICK KERR: We would not allow it. Water systems cannot because the code requires we maintain 20 pounds. We can not allow customers to do that to us.

CHRIS RICHARD: But you can put a cut-off and operate a BFD so you can reduce the suction requirements. There's ways around it.

PATRICK KERR: But the fire marshal doesn't care, they just want to put the fire out. Some of the things we weren't allowed to turn off customers where there's water flowing out the front door when we had a big freeze because the fire marshal wanted the pressure system in tact and we finally said sorry we're turning the water off.

JAKE CAUSEY: I think we have the language nailed down. I'm going to read it one more time. Where permitted by the water supplier pumps that are used to draw water from the water supply distribution system or are placed in a system to increase the line pressure shall not reduce the pressure at the tap. I don't know if that's clear in the sentence.

PATRICK KERR: At the customer connection.

JAKE CAUSEY: Below 20 PSI provision must be made to limit the pressure at the tap to not less than 20 PSI. I thought we would keep maybe to limit the pressure on the suction side of the pump.

PATRICK KERR: You can't measure cause there's friction. We could have 20 at the tap and 15 at the pump.

JAKE CAUSEY: So I guess the second sentence just says provision must be made to limit the pressure at the customer connection to not less than 20 PSI.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: To maintain it.

JAKE CAUSEY: Any benefit of putting examples in this sentence?

J.T. LANE: Then delete the rest of the paragraph?

JAKE CAUSEY: Yeah, then delete the rest of that paragraph.

J.T. LANE: What else? Any other issues? Anything else to discuss in the draft?

ROBERT BROU: Just a question on 8.1 3C all that language came straight out of part 12?

SHEREE TAILLON: Yes.

PATRICK KERR: Could we change portable to potable? And I think you may want portable, but fire departments don't keep their hoses in locked containers. We prevent backflow through the use of a backflow preventer. I agree with you what you're trying to do is sound, but I don't know how we're going to do that. People roll up with a fire hose basically and connect to the meter at the loading station and run it a couple of blocks along the ground. And that's kind of why we put that double check assembly on at the loading station. It's interesting that the hose is probably as much of a, whether it's in a locked container or not, I know the test they ran looking for the amoeba they found it present in a garden hose folks were using so putting it in a locked container wouldn't have fixed that. I think this is just a requirement that I don't know how we enforce. This doesn't do anything for us, I don't know. I know what you're saying Jake, I just can't, tightly enclosed cabinet shall have a cap to cover the nozzle. They don't, they just roll them up and put them in a truck. Which again is why we put a double check assembly on the loading station even though we make them do an over rim fill. Do we need that language?

JAKE CAUSEY: Water loading occurs for many different purposes, some potable, a lot non-potable I guess. There will be differences there. C was language in part 12, I'm sure it's been there a long time. I agree it's probably something that's not followed very well by contractors and such. Are you saying that elsewhere there's something or going to be something in here requiring a backflow preventer at water loading stations?

PATRICK KERR: I think we can address that with backflow's language, but a permanent water loading station that always spills over the rim should require, but if you connect to a temporary fire hydrant connection I think the hydrants are on a backflow preventer just because that line downstream has never maintained a potable water standard. You take that hose and you run water through it and then seal both ends of it, try to drain as best you can, not going to get all that water out, seal both ends and put in a container for six months. I don't want that water coming back in my system. I don't think we're protecting anything by doing this. But yeah, if you want me to put something in the language about backflow prevention.

JAKE CAUSEY: I think that relieves the concern about the hoses in the circumstances that you're describing.

PATRICK KERR: We'll do that. That's probably the place to fix it.

J.T. LANE: So we're going to take out C?

JAKE CAUSEY: Yeah, so remove C. C may need to be rewritten to address hoses used with potable.

PATRICK KERR: Now that is something that we ought to do when a school needs water and they take it from a fire hydrant.

JAKE CAUSEY: I think generally if we rewrite C to explicitly address that that would make sense. Just write the backflow so it's not necessarily applicable to a permitted station, but only when hoses are used or something like that.

PATRICK KERR: We'll figure something out.

JAKE CAUSEY: I guess for this we'll just reword C to be applicable only for hoses used for potable water.

PATRICK KERR: An example of that is all the tankers we filled to send to New Orleans. We worked with you guys and we were actually allowed to fill those from the bottom because they were certified clean before we put water in them.

J.T. LANE: Just a few more tweaks to make and we're going to reprint it and meet back here. So if it's okay with everybody we'll take a quick ten minute break to get the new draft and vote right after

that and more than likely adjourn. Is that cool? I think we have enough copies for the committee members. So this is the final text and what Caryn did was highlight the changes that we discussed. Everybody has a copy in front of them if y'all want to look at it. Okay. Any comments on the changes?

RANDY HOLLIS: A pet peeve subject, 8.9.2 underwater crossings. Try and incorporate what I think Pat and others were talking about where we say when crossing watercourses which are greater than 15 feet in width. I think y'all wanted to put in there the 15 feet at minimum river stage.

JAKE CAUSEY: We did forget that.

RANDY HOLLIS: And then under B, Dirk I think you pointed this out, under B the valves can be easily accessible, but to have a valve that is not subject to flooding is going to be really tough. I think you wanted to take out of that and not subject to flooding. Cause you can certainly find a valve if it's under two feet of water.

SHEREE TAILLON: We had said put after flooding but under normal conditions. Flooding under normal conditions.

RANDY HOLLIS: Okay.

PATRICK KERR: So don't put the valve in the water.

RANDY HOLLIS: And then I think I finally figured out what bothered me under C. Fifteen feet in width at minimum river stage or at measured low flow. And then under C can we change the word insertion, and I guess this has been my problem, permanent taps or other provisions to allow utilization of a small meter to determine leakage. Change insertion to utilization.

PATRICK KERR: How about use?

(council speaking simultaneously)

RANDY HOLLIS: No, not installation cause that means you install it inside. Use. I will now put a muzzle on myself. I make a motion we approve as amended.

DIRK BARRIOS: Something in parenthesis to clarify 8.9.1 freezing.

J.T. LANE: We'll put included but not limited to velocity, heat trace, insulation, etc.

ROBERT BROU: And then we're still going to work on wording for loading stations?

JAKE CAUSEY: We got that.

PATRICK KERR: C applies only to potable stations. They made that apply only to potable. It says potable water loading stations. C applies only to potable water.

RANDY HOLLIS: Now I make a motion that we approve as amended.

J.T. LANE: And you'll notice we put a version number at the bottom of the page which is really just a combination of numbers of the code and date, very ingenious. A motion to agree with that and with those four amendments. So 8.9.1 we'll add including but not limited to velocity, heat trace, insulation, etc. And then 8.9.2 underwater crossings we'll add at measured low flow, and then in B under the same section after flow add under normal conditions, and then in C instead of insertion put use. Randy if you want to make a motion.

RANDY HOLLIS: I make a motion as you have described the amended changes to subchapter 8.

ROBERT BROU: I second.

J.T. LANE: Any objections? Awesome. Our first one. Great job. So real quick on 6 clearly we're over our original scheduled time. I did want y'all to know Jeff did send us a request last night to forgo covering 6 since he couldn't be here. And so I was going to ask everyone if that was okay with them, we'll wait till next time. It seems like no objection to that. Are there any other comments y'all want to make?

ROBERT BROU: I would just like to get an update on emergency rule, where we are, have we made any efforts to finalize any provisions of the emergency rule? Due to expire at the end of July, right?

J.T. LANE: Yeah, it's going to be extended until we get the final rule together that's based on SB75.

JAKE CAUSEY: And I think again we wanted to do the surveillance monitoring we're going to do this summer. We wanted to have the best information that we could have before we try to do anything final.

ROBERT BROU: Seventy-five talks about the minimum residual level, there's a lot of other aspects to that emergency rule that I hadn't seen any movement to try to finalize, still looking to get more information, okay.

J.T. LANE: Yes. Any questions about that? Any comments from anybody else in attendance they would like to share?

SHEREE TAILLON: So for the next one in July part 1 and part 2 Keith and Dirk have both already turned in their reports so be prepared, if time allows, to go over those reports.

J.T. LANE: So at the minimum next meeting we'll cover 6, 1, and 2. All right, do I have a motion to adjourn?

RANDY HOLLIS: When is the next meeting?

J.T. LANE: July 23rd at 1:00, a Wednesday.

SHEREE TAILLON: I'll be sending out a request soon for August, September, and October dates.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: I move we adjourn.

RUSTY REEVES: I second.

J.T. LANE: Objections? Awesome.