

STP-PT-011

INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT OF STRESS CORROSION CRACKING IN GAS PIPELINE HIGH CONSEQUENCE AREAS



Currently in preview, click buy full version

STP-PT-011

INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT OF STRESS CORROSION CRACKING IN GAS PIPELINE HIGH CONSEQUENCE AREAS

Prepared by:

R. R. Fessler
RZEK Consulting, Inc.

A. D. Batte
Macaw Engineering Ltd.

M. Hereth
PPIC

ASME STANDARDS
TECHNOLOGY, LLC

Date of Issuance: October 31, 2008

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by ASME and the ASME Standards Technology, LLC (ASME ST-LLC).

Neither ASME, ASME ST-LLC, the authors, nor others involved in the preparation or review of this report, nor any of their respective employees, members, or persons acting on their behalf, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe upon privately owned rights.

Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by ASME ST-LLC or others involved in the preparation or review of this report, or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of the authors, contributors, reviewers of the report expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of ASME ST-LLC or others involved in the preparation or review of this report or any agency thereof.

ASME ST-LLC does not take any position with respect to the validity of any patent rights asserted in connection with any items mentioned in this document, and does not undertake to insure anyone utilizing a publication against liability for infringement of any applicable Letters Patent, nor assumes any such liability. Users of a publication are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any such patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, is entirely their own responsibility.

Participation by federal agency representative(s) or person(s) affiliated with industry is not to be interpreted as government or industry endorsement of this publication.

ASME is the registered trademark of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

No part of this document may be reproduced in any form, electronic retrieval system or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

ASME Standards Technology, LLC
Three Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016-5990

ISBN No. 978-0-7918-3183-0

Copyright © 2008 by
ASME Standards Technology, LLC
All Rights Reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	viii
Abstract	ix
1 SUMMARY	1
2 BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES	2
3 APPROACH	3
4 TASK 1 - CLARIFICATION OF ISSUES	4
5 TASK 2 - RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS	6
5.1 Question 1: On what basis should HCAs and Segments be defined as SCC-susceptible?	6
5.2 Question 2: How should SCC-susceptible HCAs and Segments be prioritized for assessment?	6
5.3 Question 3: Where Hydrostatic Testing, SCC DA or Crack Detection have been chosen as the assessment methods, what are the appropriate re-test intervals?	7
5.4 Question 4: What is the appropriate procedure for Hydrostatic Testing?	8
5.5 Question 5: When using SCC DA, where is the best place to dig and how many digs should be conducted?	8
5.6 Question 6: How should crack severity be defined and how should severity determine what kinds of remedial actions are appropriate?	9
5.7 Question 7: What additional preventive and mitigative measures are appropriate for SCC Condition Monitoring, and how are they to be used to enhance confidence in the management of SCC?	10
6 TASK 3 - INDUSTRY AND PEER REVIEWS	12
7 TASK 4 - INTERACTIONS WITH DOT/PHMSA	13
8 TASK 5 - INTERACTIONS WITH ASME	14
9 CONCLUDING REMARKS	15
Appendix A - Field Experience of SCC in Gas Transmission Pipelines	16
Appendix B - Definition of SCC Susceptible HCA's and Segments	39
Appendix C - Prioritizing SCC Susceptible HCA'S and Segments	48
Appendix D - ReAssessment Intervals	57
Appendix E - Hydrostatic Test Procedure	80
Appendix F - Dig Locations for SCC DA	84
Appendix G - Number of Digs for SCC DA	101
Appendix H - Crack Severity	103
Appendix I - Issues Related to Predicting Failure Pressure	112
Appendix J - Issues Related to Estimating Remaining Life	122
Appendix K - Condition Monitoring	132
Acknowledgments	141

Abbreviations and Acronyms	142
----------------------------------	-----

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Summary of Information Provided by the JIP Participants and Other Operators.....	19
Table 2 - Effect of Proximity to Compressor Discharge on Failure Frequency (Datasets 1-6, 9).....	22
Table 3 - Proportion of Hydrostatic Tests Failing due to High pH SCC in Each Valve Section (Dataset 2).....	22
Table 4 - Effect of Operating Stress on Failure Frequency for High pH SCC (Datasets 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9).....	23
Table 5 - Frequency of In-Service Failures due to High pH SCC in the last 40 Years (Datasets 1, 3, 4, 5, 9).....	23
Table 6 - Age of Pipelines When In-Service or Hydrostatic Test Failures Occurred due to High pH SCC (Datasets 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9).....	23
Table 7 - Effect of Proximity to Compressor Discharge on High pH SCC Found by Excavation (Dataset 11).....	24
Table 8 - Effect of Pipe Diameter and Operating Stress on High pH SCC Found by Excavation (Dataset 11).....	25
Table 9 - Occurrence of In-Service Ruptures and Leaks due to Near-Neutral pH SCC (Datasets 6, 7, 9).....	26
Table 10 - Influence of Proximity to Compressor Discharge on In-Service Failures due to Near- Neutral pH SCC (Datasets 6, 7, 9).....	26
Table 11 - Age at Which In-Service and Hydrostatic Test Failures Have Occurred due to Near- Neutral pH SCC (Datasets 6, 7, 9).....	27
Table 12 - Proximity of Near-Neutral pH SCC Hydrostatic Test Failures to Compressor Discharges (Datasets 6, 7, 9).....	27
Table 13 - Relationship Between Coating Types and Near-Neutral pH SCC “Hits” from Excavations (Dataset 12).....	28
Table 14 - Proximity of Near-Neutral pH SCC “Hits” to Compressor Discharges (Dataset 12).....	28
Table 15 - Effect of Pipeline Age on Near-Neutral pH SCC Found by Excavation (Dataset 12).....	29
Table 16 - Effect of Op. Stresses on Near-Neutral pH SCC Found by Excavation (Dataset 12).....	29
Table 17 - Effect of Coating Type on Near-Neutral pH SCC Found by Excavation (Dataset 13).....	29
Table 18 - Proximity of Near-Neutral pH SCC “Hits” to Compressor Stations (Dataset 13).....	29
Table 19 - Effect of Pipeline Age on Near-Neutral pH SCC Found by Excavation (Dataset 13).....	30
Table 20 - Effect of Op. Stress on Near-Neutral pH SCC Found by Excavation (Dataset 13).....	30
Table 21 - Distribution of Near-Neutral pH Stress Corrosion Crack Depths and Lengths Found by Excavation (Dataset 12).....	30
Table 22 - Distribution of Near-Neutral pH SCC Colony Depths and Lengths Found by Excavation (Dataset 13, Asphalt-Coated Pipe Only).....	31

Table 23 - Summary of Near-Neutral pH SCC Results Obtained from ILI Crack Detection (Dataset 14)	31
Table 24 - Illustrative Example of Tier 1 Protocol.....	55
Table 25 - Illustrative Example of Tier 2 Protocol.....	56
Table 26 - Case Studies of Valve Sections with SCC and Multiple Hydrostatic Tests.....	66
Table 27 - Summary of Comparisons of Prediction from this Method with Actual Service Experiences	68
Table 28 - Various Ways to Calculate Flow Stress	73
Table 29 - Percent of Valve Sections Not Experiencing Failure Following First High-pH SCC Hydrotest (Based upon 38 valve sections)	76
Table 30 - Percent of Valve Sections Not Experiencing Failure Following First NN-pH SCC Hydrotest (Based upon 11 valve sections, all tested >100% SMYS).....	76
Table 31 – RRF Topic Weights.....	86
Table 32 – Graded Scale of RRF.....	87
Table 33 – Graded Scale for Secondary Stress.....	88
Table 34 – RRFs for Drainage.....	89
Table 35 – RRFs for Tier 1 and Tier 2	91
Table 36 - Summarized Illustration of Relative Risk Factors for Site Selection – Tier 1	95
Table 37 - Summarized Illustration of Relative Risk Factors for Site Selection – Tier 2	96
Table 38 - Factors to Consider in Prioritization of Segments and in Site Selection for SCC DA (from NACE RP0204-2004).....	97
Table 39 - Examples of Maximum Lengths of Category Zero Cracks.....	105
Table 40 - Summary of Crack Severity Categories and Mitigation	107
Table 41 - Cases for Sensitivity Study.....	123
Table 42 - Predicted Failure Times for Category 1 and Category 2 Cracks, Using SURFFLAW, CorLas and PAVER	124
Table 43 - Life Predictions for Category 3 Cracks (Using SURFFLAW)	128
Table 44 - Information Sources and their Relevance to Changes in SCC Risk	134

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 - Questions Arising During SCC Integrity Management.....	5
Figure 2 - Substituting the Average Crack Growth Rate for the Actual Variable Rate	61
Figure 3 - Using Failure Pressure to Represent Flaw Size	62
Figure 4 - Extrapolating the Maximum Prior Crack Growth Rate to Establish the Interval for the Next Re-Test.....	63
Figure 5 - Establishing Subsequent Intervals Based upon Previous Intervals.....	64

Figure 6 - Effects of Hydrostatic Test Pressure and Flow Stress on Length of Subsequent Intervals Between Re-Tests for an X52 Pipeline Operating at 72% SMYS	65
Figure 7 - Comparison of Service History with Predictions of this Method for Case 6	67
Figure 8 - Comparison of Service History with Predictions of this Method for Case 1 (Symbols are as described for Figure 7).....	68
Figure 9 - Log-Secant Failure Diagram for 30-inch-diameter, 0.312-inch wall-thickness X52 Pipe with a Flow Stress of 71,240 psi and a 2/3-size Charpy Energy of 20 ft.-lb.	71
Figure 10 - Ratio of Next Interval to Sum of Previous Intervals for Pipe in Figure 9 and Depth-wise Crack Growth with Constant Growth Rate.....	72
Figure 11 - Hypothetical Re-Test History to Illustrate Modification to Method Following a Re-Test Failure.....	74
Figure 12 - Illustration of Modification to Re-Test Intervals Following a Re-Test Failure	74
Figure 13 - Flaw Sizes that would be Critical at Various Pressures for Pipe from Figure 9	77
Figure 14 - Sequence of Failure Pressures in a Hydrostatic Test in which 20 Rupture Initiated at Stress-Corrosion Cracks.....	82
Figure 15 - Relation of Severity Categories to Crack Lengths and Depths (Schematic).....	104
Figure 16 - Aspect Ratios of Small, Shallow Cracks [2]	117
Figure 17 - Aspect Ratios of Coalesced Cracks Adjacent to In-Service and Hydrotest Failures [4]..	117
Figure 18 - API 579/ASME FFS-1 Guidance for Assessing the Interaction of Coplanar and Non-Coplanar Cracks [16]	118
Figure 19 - Comparisons of Predicted and Actual Failure Pressures for SCC-Containing Pipes using Different Prediction Methods [22]	119
Figure 20 - PAFFC Full-Scale Validation Data for SCC [6].....	120
Figure 21 - Comparisons of Failure Predictions using PAFFC and NG-18, for a 24 in. x 0.344 in. x X52 Pipe with 30 ft.-lb. Toughness	121
Figure 22 - Comparison of Predicted Lifetimes from CorLas and SURFFLAW for Category 1 and Category 2 Cracks.....	125
Figure 23 - Comparison of Predicted Lifetimes from PAFFC and SURFFLAW for Category 1 and Category 2 Cracks	125
Figure 24 - Comparison of Predicted Failure Times for Various Size Cracks in X52 Pipe of Typical Toughness	126
Figure 25 - Comparison of Predicted Failure Times for Various Size Cracks in X65 Pipe of Typical Toughness	126
Figure 26 - Effect of Wall Thickness on Predicted Lifetimes for Surviving Cracks in X52 Pipe with a Charpy Toughness of 20 ft.-lb. Assuming a Crack Growth Rate of 0.012 inch per year.....	129
Figure 27 - Effect of Toughness on Minimum Wall Thickness Consistent with the Projected Lifetimes for X52 Pipe Assuming a Crack Growth Rate of 0.012 inch per year.....	130
Figure 28 - Effect of Actual YS on Minimum Wall Thickness Consistent with the Projected Lifetimes for X52 Pipe Assuming a Crack Growth Rate of 0.012 inch per year.....	130

Figure 29 - Minimum Wall Thickness to Meet Two Projected Lifetimes for Category 2 Cracks 131
Figure 30 - Overall Flowchart for SCC Condition Monitoring..... 136

Currently in preview, click buy full version

FOREWORD

In response to concerns about managing the threat of stress corrosion cracking (SCC) in high-pressure gas transmission pipelines, and in the light of recently introduced legislation concerning integrity management plans focusing on high consequence areas (HCAs), a group of five major gas transmission companies initiated a joint industry project (JIP) in January 2006 to develop technical rationales to support the key processes of SCC integrity management, including hydrostatic testing, in-line inspection (ILI) and SCC direct assessment (DA). These partner companies include Spectra Energy (formerly Duke Energy Gas Transmission), El Paso Pipeline Group, Panhandle Energy, TransCanada Pipelines Ltd. and Great Lakes Gas Transmission.

Established in 1880, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) is a professional, not-for-profit organization with more than 127,000 members promoting the art, science and practice of mechanical and multidisciplinary engineering and allied sciences. ASME develops codes and standards that enhance public safety, and provides lifelong learning and technical exchange opportunities benefiting the engineering and technology community. Visit www.asme.org for more information.

The ASME Standards Technology, LLC (ASME ST-LLC) is a not-for-profit Limited Liability Company, with ASME as the sole member, formed in 2004 to carry out work related to newly commercialized technology. The ASME ST-LLC mission includes meeting the needs of industry and government by providing new standards-related products and services which advance the application of emerging and newly commercialized science and technology and providing the research and technology development needed to establish and maintain the technical relevance of codes and standards. Visit www.stllc.asme.org for more information.

ABSTRACT

This report includes a compilation of results obtained through a series of white papers developed as part of a gas transmission company JIP addressing specific issues related to SCC in gas pipeline HCAs. This report presents the overall project approach, findings and outcomes. The overall outcome of the JIP has been the development and collation of a significant body of supporting information, made available to pipeline operators and to the pipeline industry, providing the basis for sound decision making regarding the issues to be addressed when managing the integrity of pipelines that are potentially subject to the threat of SCC. In particular, this report includes:

- A review and update of SCC experience in 130,000 miles of high-pressure gas pipelines.
- Validation of the ASME B31.8S criteria for determining segments and HCAs most likely to be susceptible to high pH SCC.
- Demonstration that the modified ASME B31.8S criteria also are applicable to near-neutral pH SCC.
- Development of guidelines and algorithms for prioritizing pipeline segments and HCAs for SCC assessment, and for selecting excavation sites most likely to show evidence of SCC.
- Development of guidance for conducting SCC hydrostatic tests.
- Development of a categorization scheme for determining crack severity and mitigation response.
- Development of a method for determining the intervals between re-tests when using hydrostatic testing, ILI or SCC DA to manage SCC.
- Provision of guidance for determining how many excavations are necessary during SCC DA.
- Development of a process for utilizing condition monitoring activities for SCC management when low levels of SCC are experienced.
- Identification of revisions to improve the existing ASME B31.8S guidance for SCC.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1 SUMMARY

In response to concerns about managing the threat of stress corrosion cracking (SCC) in high-pressure gas transmission pipelines, and in light of recently introduced legislation concerning integrity management plans focusing on high consequence areas (HCAs), a group of five major gas transmission companies initiated a joint industry project (JIP) to develop technical rationales to support the key processes of SCC integrity management, including hydrostatic testing, in-line inspection (ILI) and SCC direct assessment (DA).

The JIP commenced in January 2006. This report summarizes the overall approach adopted during the JIP and presents the findings and outcomes obtained in a series of white papers addressing the specific issues that were identified by the JIP Steering Committee.

The overall outcome of the JIP has been the development and collation of a significant body of supporting information, made available to pipeline operators and to the pipeline industry, providing the basis for sound decision making regarding the issues to be addressed when managing the integrity of pipelines that are potentially subject to the threat of SCC. In particular, the JIP has delivered the following:

- A review and update of SCC experience in 130,000 miles of high-pressure gas pipelines, incorporating data extending over more than 50 years and including 87 in-service ruptures and leaks. This database represents a substantial proportion of the relevant operating experience in North America.
- Validation of the ASME B31.8S criteria for determining segments and HCAs most likely to be susceptible to high pH SCC, and demonstration that the modified ASME B31.8S criteria also are applicable to near-neutral pH SCC, based on the accumulated service experience.
- Development of guidelines and algorithms for prioritizing pipeline segments and HCAs for SCC assessment, and for selecting excavation sites most likely to show evidence of SCC, using the accumulated service experience and latest research information.
- Development of guidance for conducting SCC hydrostatic tests so as to deliver optimized benefits for SCC integrity management.. These test conditions may differ from those for hydrostatic tests conducted for other operational reasons.
- Development of a categorization scheme for determining crack severity and mitigation response, based on predicted failure pressure and estimated remaining life at the operating pressure. The sensitivity of crack severity to input parameters (pipeline attributes, crack growth rate and assumptions made during calculations) has been examined.
- Development of a method for determining the intervals between re-tests when using hydrostatic testing, ILI or SCC DA to manage SCC.
- Provision of guidance for determining how many excavations are necessary during SCC DA.
- Development of a process for utilizing condition monitoring activities for SCC management when low levels of SCC are experienced, consistent with the requirements of “Other Technology” for Integrity Management.
- Identification of revisions to improve the existing ASME B31.8S guidance for SCC and preparation of alternative wording for consideration and balloting by the ASME Committee.

2 BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

As pipeline companies prepare integrity management plans for SCC, they are faced with the challenge of complying with the regulatory requirements of US Federal Regulation 49 CFR Part 192 Subpart O and, at the same time, minimizing the risk of failures due to SCC. In some cases, the required procedures may not be optimally effective to reduce such risks and, as such, they may divert resources from more effective procedures. In other cases, it is not obvious what specific procedures would be most cost effective for the industry to employ to comply with the regulations. Some of the most important questions relate to the most effective way to deal with a large number of high-consequence areas (HCAs), and determining appropriate procedures and re-test intervals for hydrostatic testing, in-line inspection (ILI) or SCC direct assessment (SCC DA).

While it is recognized that each pipeline company must have individual integrity management plans that are tailored to the specific characteristics and history of the pipeline system, a common approach to some of the key issues would be beneficial in dealing with the regulatory agencies, as well as providing guidance for developing an effective integrity management plan. Such an approach would draw upon the key processes of integrity management outlined in ASME B31.8S, including:

- Defining the basis for SCC susceptibility
- Prioritizing HCA segments susceptible to SCC
- Selecting the appropriate assessment method and assessment location for each segment
- Defining mitigation of SCC when found (including assessing the severity of the SCC)
- Determination of and basis for reassessment interval
- Determination of additional preventive and mitigative measures.

In response to these issues, five major gas transmission companies initiated a joint industry project (JIP) to develop a common approach to managing stress corrosion cracking in HCAs for natural gas transmission. The five companies are:

- Spectra Energy (formerly Duke Energy Gas Transmission)
- El Paso Pipeline Group
- Panhandle Energy
- TransCanada Pipelines Ltd.
- Great Lakes Gas Transmission.

The overall aim of the JIP has been to develop the technical rationale to support each of the key processes identified above. Emphasis has been placed on the need for operators to show consistency in their technical approach to SCC management, particularly regarding the development of compliant solutions for HCAs where SCC is a threat of concern. Technical consistency does not imply a uniform response, but rather a consistent framework enabling each operator the flexibility to adopt an approach tailored to the attributes and SCC history of each line. The rationale has been based, to the extent possible, on scientific knowledge of SCC, analytical models of behavior of pipe containing stress-corrosion cracks and field experience from as many companies as possible.

It has been intended from the outset that the rationale will be made available for use by operators in establishing their respective plans for managing SCC in HCAs. It has also been intended that the JIP will develop any materials required to support the technical rationale, such as modifications to completed recommended practices and standards.

3 APPROACH

The JIP commenced in January 2006 and has been managed by BIZTEK Consulting, Inc. (Dr. Raymond Fessler), with Dr. David Batte (Macaw Engineering Ltd.) and Mr. Mark Hereth (PPIC) as technical advisers and project team members. The project has consisted of the following tasks.

- Task 1. In consultation with the JIP Steering Committee, establish which issues should be addressed and whether the technical rationale is already strong enough or whether more data or analyses are needed. For those answers for which there is insufficient technical justification, determine what additional data or analyses are needed and possible, and whether the participants can provide any necessary additional field data.
- Task 2. Prepare a “white paper” addressing each identified issue, including, where necessary, analysis of additional field data or construction/refinement of predictive models. Each white paper is thoroughly discussed and finalized in conjunction with the JIP Steering Committee.
- Task 3. Present the provisional outcomes of the JIP at meetings with industry experts (operators and technical consultants) to provide detailed technical scrutiny of the findings and their implications and build a broader consensus across the industry.
- Task 4. Present the provisional outcomes of the JIP at meetings with DOT/OPS/PHMSA to provide updates and understanding of the findings and their implications for the integrity management of gas pipelines.
- Task 5. Identify needs or opportunities for modifying and improving the existing guidance and legislation and develop technology packages to support changes.

4 TASK 1 - CLARIFICATION OF ISSUES

The initial discussions with the JIP Steering Committee identified seven questions that are faced by operators seeking to implement sound SCC management practices in line with integrity management regulations. These questions were of particular concern because, in each case, the existing regulations and guidance leave the decision on precisely how to proceed at the discretion of the operator. The seven questions are set out below, and their significance in the context of the integrity management process is illustrated schematically in Figure 1:

- Question 1: On what basis should HCAs and segments be defined as SCC-susceptible?
- Question 2: How should SCC-susceptible HCAs and segments be prioritized for assessment?
- Question 3: Where hydrostatic testing, SCC DA or crack detection ILI have been chosen as the assessment methods, what are the appropriate re-test intervals?
- Question 4: What is the appropriate procedure for hydrostatic testing?
- Question 5: When using SCC DA, where is the best place to dig and how many digs should be conducted? (This question was subsequently divided into two parts.)
- Question 6: How should crack severity be defined, and how should severity determine what kinds of remedial actions are appropriate?
- Question 7: What additional preventive and mitigative measures are appropriate for SCC condition monitoring, and how can they be used to enhance confidence in the management of SCC?

A further question concerning the performance of ILI tools for detecting and sizing SCC was deferred pending future developments in ILI technology.