Issue 43 – UV pressure life test

D. Purkiss gave some background on the ballot that was issued in May 2007. The proposal in the ballot was that the 80% pressure requirement be removed, and instead that the language state that the test must run “without equipment failure.” He stated that for UV equipment, hydrostatic testing and pressure drop testing are currently required. He also explained that life tests are most often conducted in the field at commercial pool facilities where the normal operating pressure is well below the 80% of maximum working pressure. He also explained typical failures that include non-routine maintenance like replacing bulbs and wipers.

In response to the negatives that were received, D. Purkiss proposed making the language more clear that all process treatment equipment must pass a hydrostatic pressure and pressure drop test. He also proposed making it clearer what equipment failure means (by including examples). One suggestion during the balloting process was that the efficacy test (Annex H) be performed after the life test or perhaps at least halfway through that test. This issue is currently being discussed by the UV/MS2 task group, and whatever change they come up with could be applied to UV and other process equipment. However Dave noted that while this seems like a good idea it would be a major change affecting all process equipment and therefore needs to be treated as a separate issue from the pressure requirements.

J. Murphy stated that intensity is proportional to efficacy and proposed doing an intensity result at the end. He stated that the net result after life test might then be measurable. A. Osinski explained her comment from the ballot, stating that her concern is that the equipment does need a pressure test; while she understands that there are other tests being done, she also expressed that she did not feel that the requirement of 1.5 times the operating pressure is high enough. Tony Leigh gave some background information to the JC regarding the test parameter, stating also that it is widely used in Europe. D. Purkiss recommended that a separate issue paper address the issues concerning the hydrostatic pressure test.

S. Barnes shared his observations of floor cleaning systems, which he found most often fail due to cyclic loading, not static pressure. He stated that this warrants separating the test from the efficacy issues.

D. Purkiss stated that he would respond to comments, and re-ballot considering the recommendations of the JC. He proposed also changing the pressure requirements for all process equipment, making it clear that all equipment receives a hydrostatic pressure and pressure drop test, but removing the 80% max pressure requirement for the life test of these products.