

**Plumbing Board**  
**Product and Code Review Committee – Meeting Minutes**  
**March 23, 2010 – 9:30 a.m.**  
**Department of Labor and Industry**  
**443 Lafayette Road No., Saint Paul, MN 55155-4344**  
[DLI.CCLDBOARDS@State.MN.US](mailto:DLI.CCLDBOARDS@State.MN.US)

**Committee Members Present:**

John A. Parizek  
Lawrence Justin  
Allen Lamm

**Staff Present:**

Mary Miller  
Jim Peterson  
Cathy Tran

**Board Members Present:**

James Kittelson

**Committee Members Absent:**

Jim Lungstrom,  
Karl Abrahamson

**Visitors:**

Chuck Higgins  
Jay Stenklyft  
Grant Brekke  
Brian Soderholm  
Shane Urness  
Jeff Thomas  
Kevin Campana  
Brad Erickson  
Bob Nicol  
Jim Ingle

**Visitors via Teleconference:**

Silvano Ferrazo  
Mark Kuykendall

**I. Call To Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Justin at 9:35 a.m. Announcements were made and introductions were done.

**II. Approval of Meeting Agenda**

Parizek made a motion, seconded by Lamm, to accept the Agenda. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

**III. Regular Business**

- A. Since Lamm was not present at the December 1, 2009 meeting and Abrahamson and Lungstrom are not present for the March 23, 2010 meeting, clarification on

if the December 1, 2009 minutes can be voted on was requested of staff. Later in the meeting, staff (Miller) noted that the Committee could vote on the minutes with those present. Parizek made a motion, seconded by Justin, to accept the 12/1/09 Meeting Minutes. The vote was 2 aye, 1 abstention (Lamm) and the motion passed.

- B. Expense Reports – Parizek stated he will review the expense reports and Per Diems when receives. Later in meeting, John found them in order and declared them approved.

#### **IV. Special Business**

##### A. RFA's

- 1. **4715.0810. Go Aerosol Spray Weld for PVC pipe. (File PB0042 submitted 6-22-09. reviewed at 12/1/09 PCRC meeting)**

Presented by Jeff Thomas and Bob Nicol.

Committee Chair reviewed the letter sent to the presenter with the presenters responses. The responses were listed on the screen for those present to review. The following is a synopsis of the responses (responses in *italics and underlined*; Committee comments to Presenters responses are underlined):

- 2. Provide confirmation that it meets NSF-14 (the product was noted to meet NSF-61 – but does it meet 14?) *We have not been tested to NSF 14 which I understand is a combination of potability and performance criteria. We were informed by our testing agency that we would not need to retest until November of this year. We currently meet ASTM D-2564 and NSF/ANSI-61.*
- 3. Provide documentation on which pipe diameters the product is listed for. *As noted on the label this product is recommended for 6" diameter pipe and smaller.*
- 4. Presenter to submit two (2) copies to DLI of the most current copy of ASTM F656 (Standard Specification for Primers for use in Solvent Cement Joints of Poly Vinyl Chloride (PVC) Plastic Pipe and Fittings), ASTM D3138 (Solvent Cements for Transition Joints Between Acrylonitrile-Butadiene-Styrene (ABS) & Poly Vinyl Chloride (PVC) Non-Pressure Piping Components) and ASTM D2564 (Standard Specification for Solvent Cements for Poly Vinyl Chloride (PVC) Plastic Piping Systems). Please be aware of the copyright on the standards. *One copy provided.*  
Committee requested presenter to receive approval from ASTM so copies may be made for Plumbing Board review.
- 5. If the intent of the Presenter is for the product to be allowed for use on ABS, please submit two (2) copies to DLI of the most current copy of and ASTM 2235 (Standard Specification for Solvent Cement for

Acrylonitrile-Butadiene-Styrene (ABS) Plastic Pipe and Fittings) Please be aware of the copyright on the standards. Do not request use for ABS in Minnesota.

6. Confirm that ASTM F656-96a was the current standard when tested in 2008 (CTL Report #08310389COL). CTL is an ASTM listed lab and used most up to date standards at the time of testing.
7. Present the RFA on the new form (refer to <http://www.dli.mn.gov/pb.asp>). The form submitted was still on outdated form.  
Committee directed the Presenter to resubmit on the updated form.
8. Refer to Plumbing Code section 4715.0860 Subp. 6 - Transition Couplings – a mechanical joint is called for in this section. If the Presenters intent is to use transition cement in lieu of coupling, this section needs to be addressed. We do not intend for the cement to be used in lieu of mechanical coupling.

Presenter the proceeded into their presentation. They noted the following:

- A. Code calls for 2 step process (Primer first then glued). The product is a one step that supplies both steps in one movement.
- B. Setup time is fast – set-up within 90 seconds.
- C. Question concerning if temperature affects set-up time: Presenter noted that cold temperature does affect set-up time but not excessively. Compared to existing, less time.
- D. Question was asked on the number of 2” joints per can. Presenter noted that in a 11 oz can, 240 joints on average.
- E. Submitted a letter from ASTM stating that NSF 14 is superseded by 61. **Clarification of this statement was done at the 6/15/10 meeting; refer to 6/15/10 PCRC meeting minutes.**
- F. Reiterated that it meets the codes two step process.

DLI Comments:

- A. ASTM 2885 is the joining standard for PVC calling for the two-step process. Does not see where the product is listed as meeting this standard. Thus would be varying from the installation standard for PVC. Staff asked presenter if a standard on this product is being written. Presenter noted that they are on docket for 2011, but it takes time.
- B. Staff asked if the product has an IAPMO IGC classified listing for one-step process? Presenter noted that they do not.
- C. Staff asked if the product has a patent or any competition. Presenter noted that they have patented the delivery system. Staff asked if there are any concerns on a proprietary product? Discussion followed on this.
- D. Staff has concerns on if the product meets NSF-14. The presented letter from ASTM noted that NSF-14 was superseded by NSF-61. **Clarification of this statement was done at the 6/15/10 meeting; refer to 6/15/10 PCRC meeting minutes.** Minnesota Plumbing Code 4715.0810

subp. 2 specifically notes NSF-14. To acknowledge that NSF-14 was superseded by NSF-61, the Code will need to be changed to note this. Recommended to make this change wherever NSF-14 is listed. Clarification of this statement was done at the 6/15/10 meeting; refer to 6/15/10 PCRC meeting minutes.

- E. The DLI interpretation is that it does not meet code section 4715.0810 Subp. 2 due to separate steps called for in the section. DLI prefers a separate standard be provided for the product, but one is not available so a mixture of standards will need to be considered. DLI noted that the Code section 4715.0810 may need to be revised to include this product in the "Exception" section since the product does not meet the body of the code.

Committee Comments:

- A. Committee asked if CPVC one step standards is specific to CPVC. Presenter and Staff noted that the standard is specific to CPVC.
- B. Committee asked if product can be used in any position? Presenter noted that it can.
- C. Not presently Listed in national codes. Plumbing Board is accepting products only that are listed in the national Codes.

Public Comments: None

Committee Chair noted that there are still enough questions by Staff and Committee members that moving this onto the Board premature.

Motion was made by Parizek, seconded by Lamm:

- A. The Committee agrees with the products concept.
- B. Presenter to meet with Staff (Tran) to work on language in order for product to meet the State of Minnesota Plumbing Code.
- C. Since Presenter is working on a new Standard and Minnesota Rules will be opened in 2011, draft language will be based on a new Standard being available. Board action would be completed when standard is available.
- D. More information/clarification is needed concerning NSF-14/61.
- E. Need ASTM Standards copy infringement for Plumbing Board distribution.

Vote -           Aye - 3  
                  Nea - 0  
                  Abstain -0

Anticipate Presenter to appear at the June 15, 2010 PCRC meeting with updated RFA/language. Submitted copies were handed back to the Presenter so they may be updated.

The agenda was Suspended to discuss approval of Meeting Minutes. (see Item IIIA above). Miller reviewed by-laws and nothing is specifically listed concerning this issue. As long as there is a Quorum, a vote can be made.

**2. 4715.1115. Exterior Grease Interceptors by Schier Products in conjunction with Green Turtle (Proceptor). (File PB0037, submitted 1-15-09; reviewed on 1-28-09, 4-29-09, 6-23-09, 9-22-09 and 12/1/09 PCRC meetings and 10-20-09 Plumbing Board meeting.)**

Silvano Ferrazzo (Green Turtle) participated via teleconference (Presenters).

Committee Chair reviewed the letter sent to the presenter with the presenters responses. The responses were listed on the screen for those present to review.

DLI General Counsel has reviewed the proposed language and made recommendations to accommodate possible Revisor requests and copyright rules.

There were some additional revisions recommended by DLI Staff, Committee members and the Presenters that were discussed.

Public Comments: None.

Motion was made by Justin, seconded by Lamm:

Revised language to the RFA as listed at the meeting.  
Recommendation for approval to Plumbing Board.

Vote -           Aye - 3  
                  Nea - 0  
                  Abstain -0

Anticipate Presenter to appear at the April 20, 2010 Plumbing Board meeting. All submitted items are available electronically and has been sent out to Board members. New language will be sent to Board members prior to the Board meeting. Recommend at least one public copy be made available at the Board meeting.

**3. 4715.2790 (New section) Siphonic Roof Drains (File PB0044, submitted 8-23-09.)**

Presented by Jay Stenklyft of Tyler Pipe/Wade Drain.

Committee Chair reviewed the letter sent dated January 12, 2010 to the presenter. The Presenter met with DLI Staff to coordinate language and Staff submitted their "Staff Draft 3/8/10" for Committee review. The Presenter submitted a letter dated 3/19/10 with recommended revisions to

the "Staff Draft 3/8/10" language with supporting documentation on their recommendations. The submittals were all listed on the screen for those present to review.

Extensive discussion followed concerning the language. The Staff Draft 3/8/10 language indicated below is considered as all new language but is not underlined. The discussed revisions to the Staff Draft 3/8/10 language below are shown as "~~strikethrough~~" for deleted items and "underlined" for new.

Discussed Subp. 1 with recommended revisions agreed upon by Staff and Committee members:

**Subp. 1 General requirements.** In lieu of sizing the storm drainage system from conventional methods as described part 4715.2710, the roof drainage may be designed as an engineered siphonic roof drainage system when approved by the administrative authority, including meeting and provided all the conditions of Subps. 2 and 3 are met.

Discussed Subp. 2A with recommended revisions agreed upon by Staff and Committee members:

A. The system must be sized on the basis of a minimum rate of rainfall of four inches per hour;

Discussed Subp. 2D. There were major differences between the Staff Draft 3/8/10 language (noted below ~~strikethrough~~) and Presenter recommended revisions (noted below underlined). Staff and Presenter shall meet to further review the language based on the Committee discussion. Below

D. ~~The roof when designed for water accumulation for controlled flow, the roof must be for the maximum possible water accumulation in accordance with the Minnesota Building Code, Chapter 1305 and 4715.2780, subpart 1 C.~~ Confirm with the structural engineer the roof loading is capable of supporting a siphonic roof drainage system.

Discussed Subp. 2E with reason for recommendation. The Standard allows 1 1/2". Staff and Presenter shall meet to further review the language based on the Committee discussion.

E. Minimum ~~roof drain and~~ pipe size must be 1 1/2 ~~2~~-inches. All other pipe size and cleanouts in the drainage system must be designed and installed in accordance with ASPE 45.

Discussed Subp. 2I with differences between the Staff Draft 3/8/10 language below and Presenter recommended revisions. Staff and Presenter shall meet to further review the language based on the Committee discussion.

- I. The transition from siphonic drainage system to gravity piping system must be properly sized and made at the proper location ~~exterior~~ of the building acceptable to the Administrative Authority. The system may transition to gravity inside the interior of the building as long as the gravity system complies with all measure acceptable to a standard gravity system acceptable to the Minnesota Building Code. Regardless of interior or exterior transition points, venting in accordance with standard gravity system requirements must be implemented. ~~shall not connect to any gravity drainage system inside the building.~~ The gravity portion of the building storm sewer system receiving the siphonic roof drainage system must be sized for a rainfall rate in accordance with Minnesota Rule 4715.2710. Maximum velocity at gravity discharge point shall be 3 ft/s.

Discussed Subp. 2J with recommended revisions agreed upon:

- J. All plans, specifications, and calculations must be submitted to the Administrative Authority, signed, and sealed by the designing engineer. The submitted calculations must include ~~minimum~~ performance data for the drainage system for the required rainfall rate, including the minimum and maximum calculated operating pressures and velocities verifying that the design solution is within the operating parameters required by the design standard. All performance data must be reported as the extreme maximum and minimum calculations and shall not be presented with "averaged" data.

Discussed Subp. 2K with differences between the Staff Draft 3/8/10 language below and Presenter recommended deletion. Covered Staff's published concerns (dated 3/23/10) on using Siphonic for the overflow/emergency. Staff and Presenter shall meet to further review the language based on the Committee discussion.

- K. ~~Secondary roof drainage system must not be a siphonic roof drainage system.~~

Discussed Subp. 3A concerning the differences between the Staff Draft 3/8/10 language below, Presenter recommended revisions and Committee discussion. After Committee, Staff and Presenter discussion, the below revisions were agreed on:

- A. ~~The siphonic drainage system must be tested at least 1 1/2 times the working negative and positive pressure of the system. Siphonic roof drainage pipe work is to be tested to ensure the system is free of product and installation defects. Accordingly, the pipe work of a siphonic roof drain system is to be tested to the identical standards of a gravity system as per the Minnesota Plumbing Code. The engineer of record's stamp of approval ensures a siphonic roof drainage system complies with the operating requirements identified in this Minnesota Plumbing Code. All materials approved by ASPE 45 were chosen specifically because their characteristics will safely accommodate the range of operating negative pressures and velocities inherent in a Siphonic System. Testing as per ASPE Standard 45.~~

Public Comments: None

Motion was made by Justin to approve language as revised and pass on to Plumbing Board with recommendation for approval. There was no second, thus motion died for lack of a second.

Motion was made by Parizek, seconded by Lamm:

Staff and Presenter shall meet and further coordinate/work on language on Subp. 2D (especially concerning controlled flow definition), 2E (minimum pipe size), 2I (transition to gravity) and 2K (secondary system especially with transition to gravity) to resolve differences and present to PCRC at the June 2010 meeting.

Vote -           Aye - 3  
                      Nea - 0  
                      Abstain -0

4. **4715.0420 Stainless Steel Pipe meeting ASTM A240 by Easyflex (File PB0041 submitted 5/26/09; reviewed at 9/22/09 PCRC meeting).**  
Mark Kuykendall (EasyFlex) participated via teleconference (714-258-2600 x109). Jim Ingle from Energy Saving Systems was present.

Committee Chair reviewed the letter sent to the presenter.

Presenter covered product. Has been used overseas for 20 years and in the US the last few years. To accommodate the pressure loss due to the corrugation, the pipe interior diameter is increased so as to match the flow volumes of typical metal pipe.

DLI comments:

- A. Committee member asked how Staff would classify the compression fitting? Staff noted that they would consider it a mechanical fitting.
- B. 1061 push fit is listed in their installation manual. Minnesota has restrictions to only copper to copper only, no other material in Minnesota.
- C. Presenter needs to reference IAPMO IGC 233-09 in 4715.800 Subp. 8 of their RFA.
- D. Fittings stamped with UPC and standard NSF-61.
- E. Since Presenter is requesting product to be used for Water Distribution Pipe, RFA will need to add this to section 4715.0520.

Committee Comments:

- A. Lightning strike/electrical bonding issues? Presenter noted that there have been no problems; typically not exposed. Bonding is noted in installation manual (page 10).
- B. Shield/coating specifically for underground? Yes, provides additional protection. 50 year pipe warranty.
- C. Threaded Fittings: Manufacturer makes fittings and pipe; NPT threads only.
- D. Concerning the 1061 fitting, will other push fit fittings (1061) work on Easyflex? Presenter replied no.
- E. Can 1061 Push fit fitting for the corrugated pipe fit on copper pipe? Presenter replied no; a larger OD.
- F. Are there other manufacturers? Presenter replied yes in the world, not in US. More will be coming to the US in the future.
- G. Appears to be “system”; concern on mixing and matching manufacturer products.
- H. Can the fitting be reused? Presenter replied yes.

Public Comments: None

Motion was made by Justin, seconded by Lamm:

Presenter shall review the RFA and add the following:

- A. Include language for IGC 233-09 in 4715.0800.
- B. Address adding 2C(c) to 4715.0520.
- C. Coordinate with Staff (Cathy Tran) on how to include language concerning installation as a “system”.

Anticipate Presenter to appear at the June 15, 2010 PCRC meeting with updated RFA/language. Submitted copies were handed back to the Presenter so they may be updated.

Vote -           Aye - 3  
                       Nea - 0  
                       Abstain - 0

**V. Open Forum**

There were no requests for Open Forum

## **VI. Discussion**

Upcoming RFA's will be passed on to the PCRC. The RFA's will be distributed by the Executive Committee.

Board will be starting some new committees that will be addressed at the next Board Meeting.

## **VII. Announcements**

- A. Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting:  
June 15, 2010 – 9:30 a.m. – Minnesota Room, DLI

## **XI. Adjournment**

A motion was made by Parizek, seconded by Lamm to adjourn the meeting. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Lawrence Justin*

Lawrence Justin