Meeting Minutes

I. Introductions and Record of Meeting Attendance

Chairman Mark Etter called the meeting to order at 9:38 am. There were 142 individuals counted in attendance.

II. Approval of Agenda

No corrections or additions were requested for the agenda. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting

No corrections or additions were requested for the previous meeting minutes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. Announcements

An announcement was made to recognize Carlos Davila for his 40 years of service to API. Ron Merrick was also recognized for his 30 years of service.

V. Standards Activity

- API 594

- API 600
  - James Hebert provided an update. An announcement was made that Mike Bush is no longer on the task group. Six Task Group meetings had been held since Spring 2019 meeting. Tech ballot 4959 closed on 11/11. Received 96 total comments from 24 individuals.
    1. 23 editorial
    2. 35 general
    3. 38 technical
iii. Task Group meeting to be held Wednesday morning at 8 with a plan to work through all technical comments.

- API 602
  ii. Trace Scrivner provided an update
      1. Received 58 comments
      2. 7 of which are planned to be discussed in the Task Group meeting. Two main issues to be covered are (1) Applicable Materials and (2) Type testing per API 624.

iii. Task Group meeting to be held Wednesday 10am-12pm. Anticipating a ballot to be release the 1st quarter of 2020.

iv. 
- API 603
  i. 9th Edition published September 2018

- API 621
  i. 4th Edition published October 2018

- API 622
  i. 3rd published October 2018
  ii. Rich Davis to submit SS1 form to API for an addendum

- API 623
  i. 1st edition published September 2013
  ii. Steve McJones provided an update
  iii. Third ballot closed 9/3/1019
  iv. 32 Affirmative, 2 Negative, 4 Abstain, 5 DNV, 21 comments
      1. 9 negative comments
      2. 11 affirmative
      3. 1 non-voter comment
  v. Met the consensus
  vi. Discussion took place on “Should non API 622 packing be allowed when specified by Purchaser”?
      1. Comment received to allow use of non API 622 packing for API 623 globe valves, as specified by purchaser
      2. Type test valve design with API 622 packing in accordance with API 624
      3. James Hebert stated two comments were received on the packing section during technical ballot of API 600 and prefers to align the standards with the same wording as much as possible.
      4. Gil Perez stated the intent is to allow users to specify other packing materials that may not have been tested previously by the manufacturer. First, you make sure the valve is qualified to be low-e through type testing to API 624. Second, you then allow the change of
the packing but still allow API 600 compliant when a non-API 624 or 622 packing is used

5. Steve McJones asked how this situation is currently addressed. Gil Perez clarified current practice would require API 600 to be removed from the nameplate.

6. Gil continued that it takes several months to qualify a new packing. The API 624 task group is working to re-word that document to allow a different packing to be used as an extension of the qualification. Another situation is that high temp service applications may need a different packing that is non-API 622 compliant.

7. Luke Chou stated that customers in global projects at times don’t want API 622 packing but want an API 600 valve.

8. Steve McJones asked about 2 scenarios. Non-API 622 packing vs a different API 622 packing. Gil clarified both scenarios happen. Steve raised a concern that too much flexibility may dilute the standard.

9. Ray Bojarczuk commented he see’s two options: (1) – lower the standard temperature of API 600 (which he’s not in favor of), or (2) – is to give option for API 624 requirement when specified.

10. Trace Scrivner commented the proposed wording for API 600 is the best we’ve had to date to allow for the options. Users want to know it’s an API 600/602/623 valve but gives options for different packing.

11. Steve McJones stated API 623 needs to be approved first since it is due before API 602 and 600.

12. James Hebert presented the wording from the Technical ballot 5.13.1 and 5.13.2.
   a. Comments were received to change the wording to “Packing that meets the qualification range of API 624...”

13. Steve McJones proposed to keep 5.13.1 as balloted and 5.13.2 to be per the comment on the ballot.

14. Ron Merrick commented that temperature is one change, but the request for PTFE packing is required as well in certain applications.

15. Ray Bojarczuk commented this wording still has conflict with the 1000°F limit.

16. James commented that a note may be added to the Packing row of the materials table which specifies low e packing may reduce to lower temperatures.

17. Gil Perez agreed with Ray’s comment and stated a valve assembly has two temperature limits, the valve and the packing.

18. Rodney Roth stated this topic was discussed 4 years ago when a presentation was made. Oxidizing environments affect graphite under 1000°F service.
19. James Hebert commented that gaskets and bolting have the same concern. The API 600 task group felt this note in the material table was best way to address.
20. Steve McJones and James Hebert clarified no negative comments were received regarding these sections on the API 623 ballot.
21. The marking section was reviewed to show which valves would be marked API 624 and which would not.
22. Luke Chou asked if he could propose a motion to adopt the same wording for API 623 as was on the API 600 technical ballot.
23. Malcolm Gilcrest stated he would prefer to have users specify when API 624 compliance is a requirement.
24. James Hebert stated the intent was to make API 624 as the base requirement.
25. Ray Bojarczuk commented if that is the intent, lower the temperature of the base requirement.
26. James Hebert stated that was discussed within the API 600 task group, and asked Greg Johnson about the history of the temperature rating. Greg stated he thought it used to be 800°F.
27. Gil Perez commented he doesn’t think there is enough data on where the 1000°F requirement is on the valve. Where is it measured? He commented there isn’t enough published data to see how the temperature degrades from process flow to the packing. Recommend not to change the wording. The temperature should be specified as the fluid temperature.
28. Luke Chou motioned that API 623 / 602 / 600 have the same wording.
29. Rodney Roth commented the standards all have the same temperature limits.
30. Mani Pilla commented some valve materials allow use to 1500°F.
31. Steve Mcjones stated a concern that a lowered temperature would not reach agreement prior to the due date. Temperature was not commented on during the technical ballot of API 600.
32. David Bayreuther seconded Luke Chou’s motion. Stated the proposed wording makes it clear and closes the gap for when a different packing is needed. Stated the one open item of concern is the temperature and agreed with Gil Perez’s comment to possibly specify what that temperature is.
33. Ray Bojarczuk commented PTFE is typically limited by users to 450°F. Sometimes may stretch to 550°F. If temperature to 800°F, the PTFE fillers still have a concern. Concerned that if a valve is not fully rated to 1000°F there may be issues with an API 622 packing that contains PTFE fillers.
34. Greg Johnson offered a possible solution of having three options for seal types to address different temperature ranges.
35. Rich Davis stated there are packings that can reach 1000°F but have not been low-e tested yet.
36. James Hebert asked if any users would use carbon steel valve in 1000°F service?
37. Ray Bojarczuk stated it’s a matter for consistency, not what users typically do.
38. Greg Johnson stated the temperature changed 1000°F at around the same time the change from asbestos packing occurred.
39. Mark Etter commented all standards state 1000°F, and that when a 1000°F valve is needed, he would specify a 1000°F valve.
40. Malcolm Gilcrest reiterated that API 624 should be an as specified option.
41. Mark Etter stated the majority of valves used are API 624 compliant, below 800°F in low-e service.
42. Steve McJones commented 80% are less than 800°F and low-e requirements. Users would be required to modify those purchasing requirements to state the specification for API 624 compliance.
43. Rodney Roth stated his experience is users are writing special requirements for high temp service. His recommendation is to drop the standard temperature.
44. James Hebert commented, what temperature does the packing see and reiterated Gil Perez’s previously discussed point.
45. Luke Chou made a motion for API 623 to discuss the temperature during their task group meeting and to align the wording.
46. Lee Fang questioned if the temperature is required on the nameplate. Luke Chou clarified yes, the nameplate is required to have the temperature. Lee asked what the concern is if temperature has to be on the nameplate?
47. Ken Felder stated that 1000°F and API 624 on the nameplate is a contradiction.
48. Mark Etter stated that this discussion leads him to believe the temperature should be changed to 800°F.
49. Luke Chou revised his motion to align the wording od API 600 / API 623 / API 602 and to lower the temperature from 1000°F to 800°F. The motion was seconded.
50. Discussion then began.
51. Mark Etter suggested to separate the motion into two sections.
52. Malcolm Gilcrest asked if any low-e packings do not contain PTFE. Representatives from Kitz stated there are graphite packings that do not contain PTFE but do comply with API 622.
53. A comment was made that API standards don’t specify non-oxidizing or oxidizing service.
54. Ray Bojarczuk stated as long as you have the user specify 624, it would solve the issue.
55. James Hebert stated we still need to address 1000°F.
56. Ray Bojarczuk commented you don’t need to change the temperature if you make it user specified.
57. James Hebert commented that it doesn’t seem correct for a valve standard to not match the majority of valves that are used.
58. Gil suggested the removal of 1000°F requirement. There are other areas we can address safe operating temperatures, and re-word the standard so it doesn’t make people think the valve is automatically rated to 1000°F.
59. Luke amended motion to have API 623/602/600/603 to align the wording regarding the low emission packing requirement.
60. The motion was seconded.
61. Discussion then continued.
62. Ray Bojarczuk commented that he’s not sure API 603 should be added since it addresses it separately.
63. Luke Chou amended the motion to align low emission packing requirement language of API 600 / 602 / 623 and review API 603 to see if it can adopt similar language.
64. The motion was seconded by Rich Davis.
65. The motion carries unanimously.
66. Steve McJones suggested for the task groups to meet together to discuss the final wording. Mark Etter stated the task groups would also work together to discuss the temperature concerns that had been discussed.

vii. A second comment from the ballot regarding the body disc guiding requirement.

1. The requirement was to have body guided designs for all valves.
2. Comment was from Luke Chou on the ballot. Luke asked if issues with non-guided valves have been see on 8” and smaller class 150 valves. He discussed the feasibility on adding guides on small bore class 150 globes which may require qualification of new or revised casting patterns. He also commented that body guides may not be as effective on those sizes.
3. Ray Bojarczuk confirmed they have had issues on bores NPS 8 and smaller. Not positive on pressure class of the issues. Ray comment that ASME B16.34 is still available if body guides are not preferred by the manufacturer.
a. Another ExxonMobil representative confirmed they had issues on Class 150 globes.
b. James Hebert confirmed on NPS 8 Class 150 as well. Possibly smaller.
c. Ken Felder confirmed they have had issues on small bore globe valve.
d. Ron Merrick commented that a user in the room has had issue on globe they were involved with. Stated the issue is related to how close the disc is to the seat.
e. Mike Donoghue commented that polling of end users for the requirement was that issues were typically for NPS 6 Class 150 and larger.
f. Steve McJones asked if Luke Chou would withdraw his negative.
g. Luke confirmed the negative would be withdrawn for this specific comment, but negative was for other comments as well regarding the low-e requirement.
h. Steve McJones commented the body guide requirement would move forward within the Task Group.

4. The Task Group Group meeting is to be held Wednesday morning at 8:30am

- API 624
  - Mark Etter stated a task group meeting is scheduled on Tuesday 1:30 pm. (This update was provided at the beginning of the Quarter Turn and Quality Meeting).

VI. New Business

Mark Etter stated Greg Johnson had requested a new group to be formed with the goal to harmonize the wording between standards

VII. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled to take place in New Orleans, LA on April 20, 2020.

VIII. Adjournment

A motion of adjournment was made, seconded, and unanimously passed. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am. James Hebert clarified we shouldn’t adjourn since the GGC and Quarter-turn meetings were combined. Motion was withdrawn. Planned time to reconvene at 1:30 pm to start the Quarter-turn and Quality portion of the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason Legendre