
From: Matt Raysin <M_RAYSIN@gcdcwws.com>
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2014 3:30 PM
To: Prysby, Mike (DEQ)
Subject: RE: Contract S-4002 100% and S-4003 90% Submittals - MDEQ comments
Attachments: 02513 Steel Pipe_REV4 - REVISED 7-10-2014.docx

Here it is. Sorry.

From: Prysby, Mike (DEQ) [mailto:PRYSBYM@michigan.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2014 2:49 PM
To: Matt Raysin
Subject: FW: Contract S-4002 100% and S-4003 90% Submittals - MDEQ comments

Matt,

What is the status of the revised spec. or addendum that spells out the weld testing methodology? (based on your June 25th message below) Issuance of the Act 399 permit for Contract S-4002 is pending receipt of the revised spec or addendum.

Michael Prysby, P.E.
 District Engineer
 Office of Drinking Water and Municipal Assistance
 517 290-8817

From: Gotham, Daryl (DEQ)
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2014 2:41 PM
To: Prysby, Mike (DEQ)
Subject: FW: Contract S-4002 100% and S-4003 90% Submittals - MDEQ comments

Mike,

I received this message and the responses to Steve B.'s questions on the Surge Analysis. I never did receive the revised spec that Matt mentioned in the following message.

Daryl

From: Matt Raysin [mailto:M_RAYSIN@gcdcwws.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2014 4:38 PM
To: Prysby, Mike (DEQ); Gotham, Daryl (DEQ)
Cc: Bloemker, Jon (DEQ); Busch, Stephen (DEQ); Osborn, Larry (LOSBOURN@wadetrim.com); John O'Malia; Elgar Brown (cbrownbear@broadstripe.net); Mike Winegard; Ed Tharp (Ed.Tharp@aecom.com)
Subject: RE: Contract S-4002 100% and S-4003 90% Submittals - MDEQ comments

That sounds great. Yes I was informed of the testing methodology yesterday. I discussed this with American yesterday and I believe we are doing the magnetic particle testing. Once this is verified I will let you know and send the revised spec. These will either be in the addendum or on the original spec if we get it out prior to bidding. One way or another it will get placed in the spec.

As for the surge. Yes I spoke to the PM team yesterday and they are in the process of responding. I do not see any problems with providing a quick response.

From: Prysby, Mike (DEQ) [<mailto:PRYSBYM@michigan.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2014 2:40 PM
To: Matt Raysin; Gotham, Daryl (DEQ)
Cc: Bloemker, Jon (DEQ); Busch, Stephen (DEQ); Osborn, Larry (LOSBOORN@wadetrim.com); John O'Malia; Elgar Brown (cbrownbear@broadstripe.net); Mike Winegard; Ed Tharp (Ed.Tharp@aecom.com)
Subject: RE: Contract S-4002 100% and S-4003 90% Submittals - MDEQ comments

Matt,

We do not have an objection with KWA wanting to use the more conservative leakage formula for the pipeline as opposed to the formula provided in AWWA C-604. We are also not opposed to the exclusion of the welded joints in the formula; however, since this results in a much lower leakage tolerance.... all welded joints need to be properly tested. The specification should clearly state an acceptable testing methodology such as radiography, sonograms, or magnetic particle testing.

Finally, it is our understanding that we will be receiving a response from Genesee County concerning our questions/comments from the updated surge analysis.

Michael Prysby, P.E.
 District Engineer
 Office of Drinking Water and Municipal Assistance
 517 290-8817

From: Matt Raysin [mailto:M_RAYSIN@gcdcwws.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2014 6:05 PM
To: Gotham, Daryl (DEQ); Prysby, Mike (DEQ)
Cc: Bloemker, Jon (DEQ); Busch, Stephen (DEQ); Osborn, Larry (LOSBOORN@wadetrim.com); John O'Malia; Elgar Brown (cbrownbear@broadstripe.net); Mike Winegard; Ed Tharp (Ed.Tharp@aecom.com)
Subject: RE: Contract S-4002 100% and S-4003 90% Submittals - MDEQ comments

I would like to revisit the conversation this morning regarding the pressure test. The new leakage method based on AWWA 604-11 the 66" pipe would allow 55 gal/mile leakage in a 2 hour period. The current specified method in section 02315 would allow roughly 0.2 gal/mile leakage in a 2 hour period depending on the pressure (150 to 350 psi) and the (J) number of joints 1 per mile to 12 per mile (welded joints do not count so only the valves count on the 66" line, but if you count the hydrants, and air release valves, which are not normally counted, it could be 6-12 per mile depending on the section). Note that you would have to have about 165 joints per mile (an average of 1 joint every 32 feet) @ 350 psi to equal the 55 gal per 2 hours allowed by the new formula. For 150 psi, it would have to have the equivalent of 252 joints per mile to get the 55 gal leakage in 2 hours that is allowed by the new method. The current specification indicates to test at the pressure equal to the pressure class listed on the drawings, where the new version would say test at no more than 125% of the working pressured. The working pressure is not defined anywhere so is that the pressure class of the pipe, or the pressure within the pipe that is expected during operation?

The 60" would be somewhat similar to the 66", except the pressures would be lower on the 60" pipe.