

NATIONAL BOARD INSPECTION CODE TASK GROUP INTERPRETATIONS

MINUTES

Meeting of July 11th, 2022 Indianapolis, IN

These minutes are subject to approval and are for the 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

Chair Sieme called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM Pacific Time in Fletcher Place on the second floor of the hotel.

2. Roll call of Members and introduction of Visitors

Secretary Hellman called roll of the Members and held introductions of visitors

3. Check for a Quorum

Secretary Hellman verified a quorum was reached. (Attachment 1)

4. Awards/Special Recognition

5. Announcements

- The National Board will be hosting a reception on Wednesday evening from 6:30pm to 8:30pm in City Way Gallery.
- The National Board will be hosting breakfast and lunch on Thursday. Breakfast will be served from 7:00am to 8:00am, and lunch will be served from 11:30am to 12:30pm. Both meals will be served at the hotel in Market Table.
- This meeting is the last at which items can be approved for inclusion in the 2023 NBIC edition.

6. Adoption of the Agenda

- **a.** The following revisions were made to the Agenda:
 - i. Start time corrected
 - ii. Added the Resignation of Patricia Becker
 - iii. Added the Resignation of Robert Weilgoszinski
 - iv. Added nomination of Mr. Derby to INTERP TG
- b. The agenda was unanimously accepted, as revised.

7. Approval of the Minutes of the January 17th, 2022 Meeting

The minutes are available for review on the National Board website, <u>www.nationalboard.org</u>. The Minutes were motioned, seconded, and unanimously approved.

8. Review of Rosters

a. Membership Nominations

i. Mr. Robert (Bob) Derby would like to be considered for INTERP Task Group membership. – He was UA for INTERP TG Membership.

b. Membership Reappointments

None

c. Officer Nominations

d. Resignations

- i. Patricia Becker is resigning from the INTERP Task Group
- **ii.** Robert Weilgoszinski is resigning from all NBIC Committees, Sub Committees, and Task Groups

9. Interpretations

Item Number: I20-78 NBIC Location: Part 3, 3.3.3 s) & 3.4.4 d) No Attachment

General Description: Repairs and Alterations of Tube Bundles

Subgroup: Repairs and Alterations

Task Group: Paul Shanks

Explanation of Need:

Submission is for R Certificate Holders we provide Repair Inspection services for. NBIC Part 3, 3.3.3 s) seems to allow to be a repair, but under 3.4.4 d) where the dimensions change it might be classified as an alteration.)

July INT TG Action: P. Shanks presented that this is still being held back. Progress Report till 21-12 is resolved.

July Meeting Action: P. Shanks presented that this is still being held back. **Progress Report** till 21-12 is resolved.

January INT TG 2022 Meeting Action: P. Shanks presented that this is still being held back. **Progress Report** till 21-12 is resolved.

July INT TG 2022 Meeting Action: A new Action Item will be submitted to address this item. This will be an Intent Interp once the new Action Item is approved. This is a PR.

Item Number: I21-39 NBIC Location: Part 3, 3.3.2 e) No Attachment

General Description: Routine repair scope

Subgroup: Repairs and Alterations

Task Group: P. Shanks (PM), P. Gilston

Explanation of Need:

Some R-certificate holders and AIAs are making huge (100 square feet) weld metal buildup type routine repairs on the basis that the components being built up are only 5" tubes and 3.3.2 e) 1) says welded repairs to 5" tubes are routine. As 3.3.2 e) includes "shall be limited to" shouldn't exceeding any one of the listed limitations preclude the routine repair approach.

INT TG January 2022 Meeting Action: P. Shanks presented and issues with weld buildup vs corrosion resistance weld overlay and what is a routine repair to pipe < 5" per 3.3.2 e). The proposal was revised, and a Committee's question and answer were drafted. The proposal was Approved. M. Toth abstained.

July INT TG 2022 Meeting Action: This will be addressed at SG tomorrow. This was a PR.

Item Number: I21-60 NBIC Location: Part 3, 3.4.5.1 b) No Attachment

General Description: UDS requirements for repairs and alterations for Divisions 2 & 3

Subgroup: Repairs and Alterations

Task Group: G. Galanes (PM), B. Morelock

Explanation of Need:

Is it the intent of interpretation 19-14 to prohibit the R-Certificate holder from recreating a UDS while still allowing the user to create the UDS? If yes, could the R-Certificate holder serve as the user's designated agent to recreate the UDS? Although this interpretation applies specifically to alterations, would this interpretation also be applicable to performing repairs (see 3.3.5.2(a))?

INT TG January 2022 Meeting Action: G. Galanes presented. B. Morelock indicated that Division 3 requirements may have an impact on this item and will hold it back to make changes. **This was a PR**.

INT TG January 2022 Meeting Action: T. Sieme presented that this interpretation will be addressed by A22-12. A motion to Closed w/No Action was Unanimously Accepted (UA) (Inquirer has already been contacted)

Item Number: I21-75 NBIC Location: Part 3, 3.3.2 e) 1) Attachment 2

General Description: Routine Repairs

Subgroup: Repairs and Alterations

Task Group: C. Hopkins (PM), S. Frazier

Explanation of Need:

The wording "but does not include nozzles to pressure-retaining items" could lead into interpreting the nozzle as a whole including the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI.

INT TG January 2022 Meeting Action: Neither Mr. Hopkins or Mr. Frazier were present to report on the item. This was a PR

INT TG July 2022 Meeting Action: T. Sieme presented. This proposal failed LB due to lack of PM response with a vote of 14-2. The proposal was revised after discussion. **The proposal was UA as revised.**

Item Number: I21-79 NBIC Location: Part 3, 3.3.3(h)(2) No Attachment

General Description: Mechanical Replacement of Shell or Head

Subgroup: Repairs and Alterations

Task Group: B. Schaefer (PM), M. Quisenberry

Explanation of Need: This interpretation and corresponding Code revision (A21-80) would provide clarity to NBIC users and address whether mechanical replacement of these components is considered a repair.

INT TG January 2022 Meeting Action: M. Quisenberry presented a PR

INT TG July 2022 Meeting Action: M. Quisenberry presented a PR

New Interpretation Requests:

Item Number: I22-14 NBIC Location: Part 3, 3.2.2 b) and c) No Attachment

General Description: Overlaid Replacement Parts

Subgroup: Repairs and Alterations

Task Group: T. McBee (PM), M. Carlson, D. Kinney, M. Quisenberry, P. Gilston, J. Ferreira

Explanation of Need: Replacement parts that are documented using a Manufacturer's Partial Data report that have been inspected by an Authorized Inspector may still be supplied as a replacement part under paragraph 3.2.2 b) and therefore not require a Hydro test per Paragraph 3.2.2 e). Panels made from Overlaid tubes and for single overlaid tube Dutchman that contain only weld overlay, where the overlay is not considered to be pressure retaining when the overlay is not considered part of the strength of the boiler tube per ASME Section I PW-44. May be supplied as replacement parts under paragraph 3.2.2 b). The purpose of the overlay is to extend the life of boiler tubes in the waste to energy corrosive environment from external wear.

July 2022 Meeting Action: T. McBee presented. Additional members added to task group. This was a PR.

10. Future Meetings

- January 2023 Charleston, SC
- July 2023 TBD

11. Adjournment @ 2:40 PM by Chair Sieme.

Respectfully submitted,

Terrence Hellman

Terrence Hellman, TG Interpretations Secretary

INTERP TG Attendance - July 11, 2022

MEMBERS:	Interest Category	In Person	Remote	Not In Attendance
Seime, Trevor	Jurisdictional Authorities	X		
Kinney, Donald	Jurisdictional Authorities	X		
Becker, Patricia	Manufacturers	х		
Boseo, Brian	General Interest	X		
Carlson, Michael	Jurisdictional Authorities		х	
Galanes, George	Users	X		
Gilston, Philip	Authorized Inspection Agencies	х		
McBee, Timothy	Authorized Inspection Agencies	x		
Moore, Kathy	National Board Certificate Holders	x		
Quisenberry, Michael	National Board Certificate Holders	х		
Toth, Marty	General Interest		х	
Underwood, Robert	Authorized Inspection Agencies	X		
Valdez, Rick	Manufacturers			X
Wielgoszinski, Robert	Authorized Inspection Agencies			X

VISITORS:	Email	In Person	Remote	
Creaser, Eben	Eben.creaser@gmail.com	Х		Committee Member (In-person)
Kinney, Don	don.kinney@labor.nc.gov	Х		Committee Member (In-person)
Morelock, Brian	morelock@eastman.com		Х	Committee Member (In-person)
Seime, Trevor	tsseime@nd.gov	х		Committee Member (In-person)
Simmons, Timothy	tsimmons@boilermakers.org			Committee Member (In-person)
Spuhl, Raymond	RAYMOND SPUHL@HSB.COM			Committee Member (In-person)
Troutt, Rob	rob.troutt@tdlr.texas.gov	Х		Committee Member (In-person)
Wadkinson, Melissa	melissa.wadkinson@fulton.com	Х		Committee Member (In-person)
Kleiss, Jeff	jkleiss@lochinvar.com		Х	Committee Member (Remote)
Bierl, Craig	Cbierl@chubb.com		Х	Visitor (In-person)
Ferreira, Jon	JONATHAN_FERREIRA@HSB.COM	Х		Visitor (In-person)
Polick, Patrick	patrick.polick@illinois.gov	Х		Visitor (In-person)
Ponce, Luis	lponce@nationalboard.org	Х		Visitor (In-person)
Scribner, Gary	gscribner@nationalboard.org			Visitor (In-person)
Zalusky, David	david.zalusky@cna.com			Visitor (In-person)
Dacanay, Julius	julius.j.dacanay@hawaii.gov			Visitor (Remote)
Khssassi, Aziz	aziz.khssassi@rbq.gouv.qc.ca		Х	Visitor (Remote)
King, John	Johnking@chubb.com		Х	Visitor (Remote)
Murray, Patrick	PWMurray19@Gmail.com			Visitor (Remote)
Sanghavi, Vishal	vishal.sanghavi@arcosa.com			Visitor (Remote)
Schaser, Matt	mschaser@e2g.com		Х	Visitor (Remote)
Shah, M. A.	abmindustrialservices@gmail.com			Visitor (Remote)
Triplett, Andrew	triplettal@ornl.gov		Х	Visitor (Remote)
Turner, Clark	cturner@cpmt.com			Visitor (Remote)
Bates, Jonathan	·	Х		Visitor
LeSage, Donnie		Х		Visitor
Shanks, Paul				Visitor
			Х	Visitor
	1			



Item No. 21-75 Subject/Title Routine Repairs Project Manager and Task Group Source (Name/Email) Logan Somers / Isomers@harder.com Statement of Need The wording "but does not include nozzles to pressure-retaining items" could lead onto interpreting the nozzle as a whole including the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. Background Information When discussing scheduling of repairs this information is used by the owner to determine when the unit may be brought down for repair based on the availability of the Inspector. Proposed Question May the identical replacement of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle off a PRI be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of 3.3.2 when only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Proposed Reply No Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is, replaced, and not the web your attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Proposed Reply No Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of proposed to the PRI? Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of Pari 3 Section 3.3 (e) (1) when patitive proposed and not the web your attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Pari 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1). Committee's Question 2 Committee's Reply 2		PROPOSED INTERPRETATION
Subject/Title Routine Repairs Project Manager and Task Group Source (Name/Email) Logan Somers / Isomers@harder.com Statement of Need The wording "but does not include nozzles to pressure-retaining items" could lead onto interpreting the nozzle as a whole including the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. Background Information When discussing scheduling of repairs this information is used by the owner to determine when the unit may be brought down for repair based on the availability of the Inspector. Proposed Question May the identical replacement of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle off a PRI be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of 3.3.2 when only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Proposed Reply No Committee's Question 1 May the in-therial replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well ont attaching the nozzle to the PRI, and when-the nozzle meets the requirements for flande connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well ont attaching the nozzle to the PRI, and when-the nozzle meets the requirements for the base and pipes in Part 3.3.3.2 e117 May the in-therial-replacement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle, MPS & for Units Propriet in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (a) (11) when neither postwold heat Ireatment nor NDE other than visual is required and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (a) (1).	Item No.	
Routine Repairs Project Manager and Task Group Source (Name/Email) Logan Somers / Isomers@harder.com Statement of Need The wording "but does not include nozzles to pressure-retaining items" could lead onto interpreting the nozzle as a whole including the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. Background Information When discussing scheduling of repairs this information is used by the owner to determine when the unit may be brought down for repair based on the availability of the Inspector. Proposed Question May the identical replacement of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle off a PRI be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of 3.3.2 when only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Proposed Reply No Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well with the requirements of tubes and pipes in Part 3.3.3.2 of 11? May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well and the included replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well and the included replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of part 3.3.3.2 of 11? May the identical replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair the considered and not the point attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1).	21-75	
Project Manager and Task Group Source (Name/Email) Logan Somers / Isomers@harder.com Statement of Need The wording "but does not include nozzles to pressure-retaining items" could lead onto interpreting the nozzle as a whole including the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. Background Information When discussing scheduling of repairs this information is used by the owner to determine when the unit may be brought down for repair based on the availability of the Inspector. Proposed Question May the identical replacement of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle off a PRI be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of 3.3.2 when only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Proposed Reply No Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well the in-kind replacement in land of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle needs like in the proposed proposed in a condense on with the requirements of Part 3.3.3 2 (a) (1) when poly the flange is replaced, and not the well the repair when not the proposed pr	Subject/Title	
Source (Name/Email) Logan Somers / Isomers@harder.com Statement of Need The wording "but does not include nozzles to pressure-retaining items" could lead onto interpreting the nozzle as a whole including the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. Background Information When discussing scheduling of repairs this information is used by the owner to determine when the unit may be brought down for repair based on the availability of the Inspector. Proposed Question May the identical replacement of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle off a PRI be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of 3.3.2 when only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Proposed Reply No Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the wei of in attaching the nozzle to the PRI.1 and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3.3.3.2 e)117 May the identical replacement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle, NPS 5 (DN 125) in dismeter or smaller, off attached to a PRI.1 and when the requirements of Part 3.3.2 e)117 when the provised heat fleathent nor NDE other than vicual is required and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1).	Routine Repairs	
Statement of Need The wording "but does not include nozzles to pressure-retaining items" could lead onto interpreting the nozzle as a whole including the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. Background Information When discussing scheduling of repairs this information is used by the owner to determine when the unit may be brought down for repair based on the availability of the Inspector. Proposed Question May the identical replacement of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle off a PRI be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of 3.3.2 when only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Proposed Reply No Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the welloint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. if and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3.3 2 en 117 May the identical replacement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle. NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI to considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1) when noither postweld heat treatment nor NDE other than visual is required and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1).	Project Manager and 1	ask Group
Statement of Need The wording "but does not include nozzles to pressure-retaining items" could lead onto interpreting the nozzle as a whole including the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. Background Information When discussing scheduling of repairs this information is used by the owner to determine when the unit may be brought down for repair based on the availability of the Inspector. Proposed Question May the identical replacement of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle off a PRI be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of 3.3.2 when only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Proposed Reply No Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well oint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. If and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3.3.2 en 117 May the identical replacement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle. PNS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1) when posither postweld heat freatment nor NDE other than visual is required and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1).	Source (Name/Email)	
The wording "but does not include nozzles to pressure-retaining items" could lead onto interpreting the nozzle as a whole including the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. Background Information When discussing scheduling of repairs this information is used by the owner to determine when the unit may be brought down for repair based on the availability of the Inspector. Proposed Question May the identical replacement of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle off a PRI be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of 3.3.2 when only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Proposed Repty No Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the we joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. if and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3.3.3.2 e/11? May the identical replacement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle, NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI to considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 section 3.3.2 (i) (1) when replace in section of the proposed and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1).	,	s@harder.com
Background Information When discussing scheduling of repairs this information is used by the owner to determine when the unit may be brought down for repair based on the availability of the Inspector. Proposed Question May the identical replacement of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle off a PRI be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of 3.3.2 when only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Proposed Reply No Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the wel ionit attaching the nozzle to the PRI. if and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3. 3.3.2 e111? May the identical replacement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle, NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI to considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (I) when petitive postweld heat treatment nor NDE other than visual is required and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1).	Statement of Need	
When discussing scheduling of repairs this information is used by the owner to determine when the unit may be brought down for repair based on the availability of the Inspector. Proposed Question May the identical replacement of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle off a PRI be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of 3.3.2 when only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Proposed Reply No Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. If and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3, 3.3.2 e111? May the identical replacement in king of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle, PS (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI to considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1) when neither postweld heat treatment nor NDE ather than visual is required and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1).	The wording "but does rattaching the nozzle to t	not include nozzles to pressure-retaining items" could lead onto interpreting the nozzle as a whole including the joint he PRI.
on the availability of the Inspector. Proposed Question May the identical replacement of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle off a PRI be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of 3.3.2 when only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Proposed Reply No Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well ionit attaching the nozzle to the PRI. If and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3. 3.3.2 e11? May the identical replacement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle, PSO (bN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI to considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1) when neither postweld heat treatment nor NDE either than visual is required and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1).	Background Information	on
May the identical replacement of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle off a PRI be considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of 3.3.2 when only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Proposed Reply No Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. if and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3, 3,3.2 e)1)? May the identical replacement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle, NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI to considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1) when neither postweld heat treatment nor NDE other than visual is required and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1).		
Proposed Reply No Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well oint attaching the nozzle to the PRI- if and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3, 3,3,2 e)1)? May the identical replacement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle, NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI- if end when the requirements of Part 3,3,3,2 (e) (1) when neither postweld heat treatment nor NDE other than visual is required and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3,3,2 (e) (1).	l .	
Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI- if and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3. 3.3.2 e.11? May the identical replacement in kind of a vasited flange at the end of a nozzle. NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI to considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1) when neither postweld heat treatment nor NDE other than visual is required and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1).	Proposed Question	
Committee's Question 1 May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. if and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3.3.3.2 e)1)? May the identical replacement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle. NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI to considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (a) (1) when neither postweld heat treatment nor NDE-other than visual is required and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1).	May the identical replac	
May the in-kind replacement of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the well joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI. if and when the nozzle meets the requirements of tubes and pipes in Part 3, 3,3,2 e)1)? May the identical replacement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle, NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter of smaller, off attached to a PRI to considered a routine repair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 Section 3,3,2 (e) (1) when neither postweld heat treatment nor NDE other than visual is required and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3,3,2 (e) (1). Committee's Question 2	May the identical replace requirements of 3.3.2 w	
Yes Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1). Committee's Question 2	May the identical replace requirements of 3.3.2 w	
Rationale The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1). Committee's Question 2	May the identical replace requirements of 3.3.2 w Proposed Reply No Committee's Question May the in-kind replace joint attaching the nozel Jay the identical replace considered a routine place.	then only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Interest of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the weld be to the PRI. If and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3, 3,3,2 e)1)? Interest of a flange at the end of a nozzle. NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI be pair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 section 3,3,2 (e) (1) when neither posselved heat treatment nor NDE.
The replaced flange would be considered a fitting in the category of Part 3 Section 3.3.2 (e) (1). Committee's Question 2	May the identical replace requirements of 3.3.2 w Proposed Reply No Committee's Question May the in-kind replace ioint attaching the nozzl May the identical replace considered a routine regether than visual is requirement.	then only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Interest of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the welf to the PRI. If and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3, 3,3,2 e)11? Interest in skind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle, NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI busin in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 section 3,3,2 (e) (1) when neither posteried heat treatment nor NDE.
	May the identical replace requirements of 3.3.2 w Proposed Reply No Committee's Question May the in-kind replace ioint attaching the nozilla May the identical replace considered a routine reputher than visual is requ	then only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI? Interest of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the welf to the PRI. If and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3, 3,3,2 e)11? Interest in skind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle, NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI busin in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 section 3,3,2 (e) (1) when neither posteried heat treatment nor NDE.
Committee's Reply 2	May the identical replace requirements of 3.3.2 w Proposed Reply No Committee's Question May the in-kind replace joint attaching the nozy May the identical replace look and the identical replace onsidered a routine reg	1 ment of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the welk to to the PRI; if and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3, 3,3,2 e)11? ement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle, NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI by a pair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3, 3,3,2 e)(11) when neither postweld heat treatment nor NDE- ired and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI?
	May the identical replace requirements of 3.3.2 w Proposed Reply No Committee's Question May the in-kind replace joint attaching the nozzi May the identical replace considered a routine regether than visual is required. Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange wo	1 ment of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the welce to the PRI. If and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3. 3.3.2 e)11? ement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle. NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI-bit pair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3. Section 3.3.2 (a) (1) when neither postweld heat treatment nor NDE littled and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI?
	May the identical replace requirements of 3.3.2 w Proposed Reply No Committee's Question May the in-kind replace ioint attaching the nozzi May the identical replace considered a routine regulater than visual is required. Committee's Reply 1 Yes Rationale The replaced flange wo Committee's Question	1 ment of a flange connected to a nozzle be considered a routine repair when only the flange is replaced, and not the welce to the PRI. If and when the nozzle meets the requirements for tubes and pipes in Part 3. 3.3.2 e)11? ement in kind of a waisted flange at the end of a nozzle. NPS 5 (DN 125) in diameter or smaller, off attached to a PRI-bit pair in accordance with the requirements of Part 3. Section 3.3.2 (a) (1) when neither postweld heat treatment nor NDE littled and only the flange is replaced and not the joint attaching the nozzle to the PRI?

CODE INTERPRETATIONS

Requests for code Interpretations shall provide the following:

a) Inquiry

Provide a condensed and precise question, omitting superfluous background information and, when possible, composed in such a way that a "yes" or a "no" reply, with brief provisos if needed, is acceptable. The question should be technically and editorially correct.

b) Reply

Provide a proposed reply that clearly and concisely answer the inquiry question. Preferably the reply should be "yes" or "no" with brief provisos, if needed.

c) Background Information

Provide any background information that will assist the committee in understanding the proposed Inquiry and Reply Requests for Code Interpretations must be limited to an interpretation of the particular requirement in the code. The Committee cannot consider consulting type requests such as:

A review of calculations, design drawings, welding qualifications, or descriptions of equipment or Parts to determine compliance with code requirements;

A request for assistance in performing any code-prescribed functions relating to, but not limited to, material selection, designs, calculations, fabrication, inspection, pressure testing, or installation; or

A request seeking the rationale for code requirements.