



Date Distributed: November 13, 2014

THE
NATIONAL
BOARD
OF BOILER AND
PRESSURE VESSEL
INSPECTORS

SUBCOMMITTEE REPAIR AND ALTERATION

MINUTES

*Meeting of October 21, 2014
Columbus, Ohio*

*These minutes are subject to approval and are for Committee use only.
They are not to be duplicated or quoted for other than Committee use.*

The National Board of Boiler & Pressure Vessel Inspectors
1055 Crupper Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43229-1183
Phone: (614)888-8320
FAX: (614)847-1828

1. Call to Order – 1:30 p.m.

Chairman George Galanes called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Attendance

Mr. Scribner took roll call and a quorum was established.

3. Announcements

Mr. Scribner briefly reviewed the four possible resolutions to choose from. He also reviewed the agenda and explained the layout of grouping the comments by person and type. All editorial comments would be voted on in a group by person and all substantive comments would be voted on individually.

4. Adoption of the Agenda

There was a motion to approve the agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

5. Public Review Comments

6. Part 3 Editorial PR Comments (Commenter Name: Nathan Carter)

PR15-0105 - Part 3, 1.8.2a)

On the fifth line down, the term, “Quality Assurance Manual” is shown for the first time in the document. In the next sentence, “QAM” is used. Suggest adding “QAM in Parenthesis right after “Quality Assurance Manual” as shown here: “Quality Assurance Manual (QAM).”

PR15-0101 - Part 3, 1.8.4 b)

On the 3rd line, “its” is written, but there is not such word. The possessive form of “it” is “its”.

PR15-0159 – Part 3, 1.8.4 d)

On the second line, “assure” is used incorrectly. It should read “ensure”. To “assure” a person of something is to make him or her confident of it. To “ensure” that something happens is to make certain that it does.

PR15–0102 - Part 3, 1.8.5 c)

On the second line, “assure” is used incorrectly. It should read “ensure”. To “assure” a person of something is to make him or her confident of it. To “ensure” that something happens is to make certain that it does. Also, sixth line down, “details” should be “detail”.

PR15-0103 - Part 3, 1.8.6.2 c) 6)

On the first line, “assure” is used incorrectly. It should read “ensure”. To “assure” a person of something is to make him or her confident of it. To “ensure” that something happens is to make certain that It does.

PR15-0131 - Part 3, 1.8.6.2 g) 5)

On the fourth line down, “data report” should read “Manufacturer’s Data Report”

PR15-0133 - Part 3, 1.8.6.2 j) 2) d

In parenthesis is listed “i.e.” and you are limiting the list to those listed. What about fusing, forming, bolting procedures? Consider changing the “i.e.” to e.g.”.

PR15-0128 - Part 3, 1.8.6.2 p)

Last line, the “Authority for Application” should be lowercase to be consistent with the rest of the NBIC.

PR15-0106 - Part 3, 1.8.7.2 a)

First line, “Authority” should be lowercase to be consistent with the rest of the NBIC.

PR15-0108 - Part 3, 1.8.7.2 b) 1)

Second Line. “Owners” is possessive. If it is a single Owner, then it should read, “Owner’s”.

PR15-0109 - Part 3, 1.8.7.2 c) 1)

Third Line. Should “Jurisdictional” be “Enforcement” instead? Also, change “Regulatory Jurisdiction” to “Regulatory Authorities”? This would then be in compliance with the language found in ASME Section XI,

IWA-1310, which reads, “regulatory and enforcement authorities having jurisdiction at the plant site.”

PR15-0129 - Part 3, 1.8.7.2 c) 2)

The reference in Brackets “[see 1.8.7 j)]” does not exist.

PR15-0116 - Part 3, 1.8.7.2 n) 1)

See the reference in brackets on line two. “[See NBIC Part 3, 1.8.7 n)2)]”. This reference does not exist.

PR15-0118 - Part 3, 1.8.7.2 n) 2)

See the reference on line one. “in NBIC Part 3, 1.8.7 n)1)...”. This reference does not exist.

PR15-0137 - Part 3, 1.8.7.2 n) 2)b)

First line. “Data reports” should read, “Manufacturer’s Data Reports”.

PR15-0115 - Part 3, 1.8.8.1

Third line from the bottom. Rewrite the sentence removing “this Section including paragraph 1.8.9” and replace it with “NBIC Part 3 1.8.8 and 1.8.9,”. It could avoid confusion and reads much cleaner.

PR15-0117 - Part 3, 1.8.8.2 d)

On the first line, “assure” is used incorrectly. It should read “ensure”. To “assure” a person of something is to make him or her confident of it. To “ensure” that something happens is to make certain that it does.

PR15-0138 - Part 3, 1.8.8.2 f)

On the first line, should “detect” be changed to “define”?

PR15-0110 - Part 3, 1.8.8.2 h)

On the first line, “assure” is used incorrectly. It should read “ensure”. To “assure” a person of something is to make him or her confident of it. To “ensure” that something happens is to make certain that it does.

PR15-0113 - Part 3, 1.8.8.2 n)

In the fourth line down, “ANII” is used for the first time in Part 3 and is also not defined. It is recommended to type out “Authorized Nuclear In-service Inspector (ANII)”.

PR15-0123 - Part 3, 1.8.9)d)

Second line. Consider replacing “Jurisdiction” with “Enforcement” to comply with 2013 Edition of Section XI. A Jurisdiction is a USA State or Canadian Province and doesn’t make sense if repaired internationally.

PR15-0111 - Part 3, 5.13.5.1 title block

Capitalize “Category of Activity” to comply with how it is written on the NR-1 Report. Also hyphenate “rerating” to “re-rating” to be consistent with the NBIC.

PR15-0112 - Part 3, 5.13.6.1 title block

Capitalize “Category of Activity” to comply with how it is written on the NR-1 Report. Also hyphenate “rerating” to “re-rating” to be consistent with the NBIC.

- There was a motion to respond to all of Mr. Carter’s editorial comments with a response of #1, Accepted, changes are incorporated. The motion was unanimously approved.

PR15-0114 - Part 3, 1.8.7.2 q)

Third line down. Replace “with” with “within”. It reads better.

- There was a motion to approve responding to Mr. Carter with response #4, “Rejected for the following reason: The current wording is correct.” The motion was unanimously approved.

7. Part 3 Editorial PR Comments (Commenter Name: Alex Garbolevsky)

PR15-0322 - Part 3, 1.8.6.2 b) 2)

“Owners” should be “Owner’s” [singular possessive].

PR15-0323 - Part 3, 1.8.6.2 c) 6)

“Owners” should be “Owner’s” [singular possessive].

PR15-0324 - Part 3, 1.8.8.2 i)

“Certificate Holders” should be “Certificate Holder’s” [singular possessive].

PR15-0325 - Part 3, 2.5.3.6

1st sentence: “post weld” should be “postweld” to be consistent with ASME Code style and usage. Subparagraph a): “5” NPS” should be “NPS 5” and “1/2” or less” should be “1/2 in. or less”, respectively. Both units should be metricated.

PR15-0326 - Part 3, 5.13.6.1

Line 5: Insert “of the” between the words “owner” and “nuclear”. Consider capitalizing “owner”.

Line 40: “defined” should be corrected to “identified”.

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Garbolevsky editorial comments with response #1, “Accepted, changes are incorporated.” The motion was approved with one abstention.

8. Part 3 Substantive PR Comments

PR15-0104 - Part 3, 1.2 (f)

It is recognized that “DOT” is the US Department of Transportation. “DOT”, however, is used throughout, but is not defined in Part 3. Since the NBIC is an International Standard, in my opinion this should be defined. As this section is the first occurrence of “DOT” in Part 3, this could be handled by the following change, which would also inherently limit the text to the DOT by the inclusion of “i.e.”. Part 3, 1.2 (f) : “the Competent Authority, i.e. the US Department of Transportation (DOT), shall....”

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #2, “Accept in principle, a new action item has been opened.” The motion was unanimously approved.

PR15-0130 - Part 3, 1.8.7.2 g)

This section does not address the situation when the Owner subcontracts the repair/replacement for Category 2, only when the Owner performs the repair/replacement activities.

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #2, “Accept in principle, a new action item has been opened.” The motion was unanimously approved.

PR15-0125 - Part 3, 1.8.7.2 n)2)f) (1/2) (Nathan Carter)

The personnel qualification programs and documents listed do not comply with 2013 Edition Section XI. Only CP-189 and the ACCP Certification program is listed in IWA-2310, with the exception of SNT-TC-1A, which is valid only until recertification is required, which is a 5 year recommended maximum per SNT-TC-1A 2006. As a result, I interpret IWA-2310 to mean SNT-TC-1A is being discontinued and is no longer valid for new Certifications. Also, the ASNT NDT Level II and III programs are not recognized as acceptable for stand-alone use by any current ASME BPV Construction Code, but historically, it may have been. I am assuming that is what is inferred by the term “ASNT”.

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #2, “Accept in principle, a new action item has been opened.” The motion was unanimously approved

PR15-0127 - Part 3, 1.8.7.2 n)2)f) (2/2) (Nathan Carter)

Fourth line down. “Radiographs may be microfilmed or digitally reproduced”. Consider making the following addition at the end of the sentence, “in accordance with the requirements listed in the latest Edition of ASME Section V, Article 2, Mandatory Appendix VI.” This Mandatory Appendix is titled, “MANDATORY APPENDIX VI DIGITAL IMAGE ACQUISITION, DISPLAY, INTERPRETATION, AND STORAGE OF RADIOGRAPHS FOR NUCLEAR APPLICATIONS.” It provides rules for the proper considerations in digitizing analog radiographs and storage requirements, etc.

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #2, “Accept in principle, a new action item has been opened.” The motion was unanimously approved

PR15-0126 - Part 3, 1.8.8.2 j) (Nathan Carter)

In the third bullet, consider adding “brazing and fusing” in addition to welding.

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #2, “Accept in principle, a new action item has been opened.” The motion was unanimously approved

PR15-0157 - Part 3, 2.5.3.6 c) (1/2) (Nathan Carter)

Quantify humid environment. Humid is a relative term. What is Humid to an R-Certificate Holder in North

Dakota may not be to an R Certificate Holder in southern Georgia. I understand the intent here, but really the R-Certificate holder needs to understand Relative Humidity vs. Dewpoint and the concern for Condensate forming on the post repaired “cold” tubes. Also, the repair may occur during the day when the humidity is acceptable, but during the night (potentially when the repair location is not being manned), the temperature may approach the dew point resulting in condensation, which may evaporate off of the tubes before the day shift resumes and nobody knows of the moisture contamination. If you state in the code that a Moisture Barrier Coating is required to be applied after the repair, this concern is mitigated.

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #2, “Accept in principle, a new action item has been opened.” The motion was unanimously approved

PR15-0158 - Part 3, 2.5.3.6 c) (2/2) (Nathan Carter)

After the weld repair is completed and the R-1 signed, how is the requirement that the repair region be kept

from humid or moist environments to be verified, if for instance there is a delay in the return to service after this specific repair? During consideration of this item, presentations discussed the use of Moisture Barrier Coatings as being adequate to protect the repair region. If this is an adequate solution, which reduces risk, why not list the use of a moisture barrier coating as recommended at the very least, if not requiring its use?

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #2, “Accept in principle, a new action item has been opened.” The motion was unanimously approved

PR15-0156 - Part 3, 2.5.3.6 c) 5)d (Nathan Carter)

Filler Metal 82, Inconel Welding Electrode 182, and INCO-WELD A are all Brand names for consumables sold by Special Metals. EPRI P87 is a Brand name, I believe licensed to be sold by Metrode at least. Why are the consumable classifications and Code Cases by themselves not sufficient. Without an “e.g.” in the parenthesis after each classification, it can be read that these Brand names are required, which would restrict trade by not allowing other manufacturers from supplying consumables to those classifications and Code Cases.

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #2, “Accept in principle, a new action item has been opened.” The motion was unanimously approved

PR15-0501 - Part 3, 2.5.3.6 c) 5)d (Mark Kincs)

The proposed language references Code Case filler metals acceptable for consideration as F-No. 43 for welding performance qualifications only (ref. Code Cases 2733 & 2734). Also, the accepted F-No. 43 materials, as presented, allow supply by a single manufacturer only. The following alternative language is proposed.

“Filler metals shall be austenitic, nickel-based consumables limited to ASME Code Case 2733, Code Case 2734, or one of the following F-No. 43 materials listed in ASME Section IX: ERNiCr-3, ENiCrFe-2, or ENiCrFe-3.”

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Kincs with response #2, “Accept in principle, a new action item has been opened.” The motion was unanimously approved

PR15-0119 - Part 3, 3.3.4.9b) (1/2) (Nathan Carter)

What about for a brazed boiler, should tube plugging by brazing be considered for inclusion? I have no knowledge of its use.

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #2, “Accept in principle, a new action item has been opened.” The motion was unanimously approved

PR15-0124 - Part 3, 3.3.4.9b) (2/2) (Nathan Carter)

If it was found necessary for strength calculations to be performed, why not require for the certificate holder to have the welds examined by at least VT and possibly MT/PT? The welds will be visually examined by the Inspector per NB-263, but why not make the certificate holder also VT them?

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #4, “Rejected for the following reason: The current wording is acceptable.” The motion was unanimously approved.

PR15-0120 - Part 3, 5.13.5.1 31. (Nathan Carter)

1. What about Category 3 repairs/alterations, etc? What if it was performed to an International Code other than Section III or XI? Per the instruction, there isn’t a way to address this situation.
2. Also, hyphenate “rerating” to “re-rating” to be consistent with the NBIC.

- This comment was divided into 2 separate comments that were voted on together. There was a

motion to respond to the first part of the comment as #2, “Accept in principle, a new action item has been opened.” and the second part of the comment as #1, Accepted, changes are incorporated. The motion was unanimously approved.

PR15-0121 - Part 3 – S3.5.5 b) (Nathan Carter)

My comment refers to Section VIII, Division 1, Part UGI-79 and UGI-80 referenced on the last line. After reading these paragraphs in whole, I do not understand why only some of the subsections are listed and not the whole of UGI-79 and UGI-80. In my opinion, all of UGI-79 and UGI-80 should be included.

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #2, “Accepted in principle, a new action item has been opened.” The motion was unanimously approved.

PR15-0136 - Part 3 – S6.14.1 (Nathan Carter)

Fifth line down. “Registered Inspector” is used but is not defined in Part 3. Use of the term “Inspector” and “Registered Inspector” is also used interchangeably in the current published text not under review. Consistency is needed in this Supplement.

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #2, Accepted in principle, a new action item has been opened.” The motion was unanimously approved.

PR15-0122 - Part 3 – S6.14.1 f) (Nathan Carter)

I understand the intent for numerous repairs throughout the life of a Transport Tank using one nameplate under the conditions listed. Do you really mean for infinite “alterations and modifications” to be allowed under a single nameplate/stamping? Please reconsider this.

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #2, “Accept in principle, a new action item has been opened.” The motion was unanimously approved

9. Part 3 Reject PR Comments (Commenter Name: Nathan Carter)

PR15-0134 - Part 3, 1.8.6.2 h) 2)

Line reads, “Welding, brazing, and fusing materials shall be identified and controlled.” To avoid any confusion, consider replacing “materials” with “consumables”.

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #4, “Rejected for the following reason: “Materials” is the term used in NCA 4000.

PR15-0135 - Part 3 – S3.5.7 and S3.5.7.1

Why are the headings being published with no content?

- There was a motion to respond to Mr. Carter with response #4, “Rejected for the following reason: The headings that are listed were included in the public review document because they were moved within the text but not changed.” The motion was unanimously approved.

10. New Business

11. Future Meetings

January 19-22, 2015, Orlando, Florida
July 21-24, 2015, Columbus, Ohio

12. Adjournment

Respectfully Submitted,
Robin Hough
:rh

P:\WebEx\October 2014\Part 3 - Repairs and Alterations\Part 3 Repairs and Alterations - Minutes - October 2014.doc