

# CROSS TALK

QUARTERLY BULLETIN

FOUNDATION FOR CROSS-CONNECTION CONTROL RESEARCH  
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
University Park, Los Angeles, California 90007

VOLUME 4 / NUMBER 4 / APRIL 1971\*



## New Developments

While it is too early to suggest that some or all of the new devices now in development will reach approval in their present specific form it certainly is of interest to all water and health agencies that there are actually in the "hardware stage" a number of new backflow prevention devices. Some

look very promising in their expectations of having very low overall head-loss characteristics. One manufacturer is experimenting with an all plastic device in the smaller sizes which is also of a unique design. Thus, within a fairly reasonable time, if present indications of manufacturer interest

continues, it seems safe to predict that there will be additional lines of devices on the market which will meet the Specifications of the Foundation as set forth in the *Manual of Cross-Connection Control*- 4th Ed.

## Please Help!

We have commented on this problem in earlier issues of *Cross Talk* and in many of the seminars that have been given around the country. BUT, "the problem installations" are still being made which will ultimately make both the customer and the water agency rather unhappy. We refer to service protection where only a single device is allowed to be placed on a critical service. This is one where the customer can not tolerate the interruption of water service for even a few minutes except on rare occasions which are very carefully scheduled. Everyone ought to know and realize that *all* backflow prevention devices must be periodically tested in order to guarantee their continued high standard of original performance. To do this requires that the device be placed under a *no-flow condition*. This can

only mean that the service is shut off for a period of time sufficient for the test - unless, of course two or more backflow prevention units have been installed in parallel.

Water agencies are urged to determine *before* a backflow preventing unit is ordered into a service just how critical are the needs of the customer. If there is even the slightest question about need for uninterrupted service then the customer should be very carefully appraised of the alternatives of a single vs a manifolded backflow prevention installation. In many cases the cost of the two alternatives is almost a stand-off. And, certainly the intrinsic value of not having to shut off the service in a case like this would have a fairly high value. There is one other "plus" that ought to be considered when thinking about a manifold-

ed vs a single installation. That is the seldom considered matter of ease of maintenance. Smaller units have lighter weight components which can not be overlooked when thinking about maintenance in cramped or difficult locations.

Also, it certainly should not be necessary to comment on the solution that many customers want in all seriousness - one of building into the installation a valved off by-pass! A brief discussion about the reasons for the backflow preventer is usually enough for them to understand why such a solution is not acceptable.

Hence, we again urge all water and health agency personnel to *please* help get the message across about the value of a manifolded backflow prevention system.

## Court Cases

There are a number of court cases that we have heard about in recent weeks. Some of these have been settled by decisions of the courts; others have been settled out of court; and still others are still in the courts. We

would appreciate information on these cases when it is possible for the information to be released. If there are news or other types of press releases we would like to have copies of them so that proper reference can be made

in the *Manual* and also in *Cross Talk*. If you have information that can be released please send it to the Director of the Foundation.

Thank you.

## Aqueduct Protection

In recent months the Foundation has received inquiries from wholesale water agencies about acceptable means for providing backflow prevention protection for systems involving pipe sizes up through 96 inch! At first glance one tends to blink and ask - "What did you say?" No matter what

the pipe size may be - anything above about 16 inch begins to pose a real problem when it is necessary to provide cross-connection control measures. And, the solution is usually a unique one that is tailored to fit the particular conditions. In one case the agency had the solution pretty well in hand before the Foundation was called in. In the other case the problem is

still somewhat up in the air; but, further work may provide the degree of protection desired. These unique problems are commented on here primarily to suggest to our readers that once in a while backflow prevention problems can come in rather large sizes. And, the Foundation does give the Member the benefit of a specialized experience.

## Adoptions

We have heard directly that the states of Washington, Oregon, New Jersey and South Carolina through their State Health Departments have adopted the Specifications in essence and the List of Approved Backflow Prevention Devices as the only acceptable listing of double-check and re-

duced pressure principle devices for the protection of potable water supply systems in the respective states. The "grapevine" tells us that other states have also adopted our "List". We appreciate the positive action of these states; and, we would welcome a note of confirmation from any state, county or local agency which has adopted our specifications and "List"

of approved devices. From those about whom we do not have direct information we would like to have the name of the cognizant person and his office address so that we might be able to keep them posted on the changes that occur. After all, it can be embarrassing to be among the last to learn of new developments.

## To Blow The Whistle

In a recent issue of Cross Talk we were commenting on the effect of the granting of approvals under the 4th Edition of the *Manual of Cross-Connection Control* and the reasons why the approvals are now being made for only three years at a time. It wasn't planned this way; but, we now have a situation where a device was ap-

proved under an earlier set of specifications and is now being found to be unsatisfactory at the time that the device is installed at a new site. Information feeding into the Foundation clearly indicated that something in the manufacture of this device had gone sour. Consequently we wasted no time in stepping in and calling a halt to further assembly of this particular size of device until further

field inspections could be made to pinpoint the problem. A prompt solution was found and the malfunctioning devices were corrected. In this way the Foundation is continuously alert to the maintenance of the high standards that provide the water utility industry and health departments with a reliable list of approved backflow prevention devices.

## A New Name

The recent issue of the *List of Approved Backflow Prevention Devices* showed a new name for an old line manufacturer; and, we thought it

might be helpful to also note it here. The Sparling Meter Company has now separated from the Hersey-Sparling Meter Company with the result that the BEECO and Hersey lines of backflow prevention devices will

henceforth be produced and marketed by HERSEY PRODUCTS, Inc. The product remains the same - only the name is different.



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING  
UNIVERSITY PARK  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007

Non-profit Org.  
U. S. Postage  
PAID  
Permit No. 2075  
Los Angeles, Calif.