

Informed Decisions Regarding Pipe Integrity

A Hazardous Liquids Pipeline Operator's Perspective

**A Panel #4 Presentation on Identifying Interactive
Threats & Understanding Options
PHMSA Risk Assessment & Recordkeeping Workshop
July 21, 2011**

**Presented by:
Richard M. Dalasio
Sunoco Logistics, L.P.**

Informed Decisions Regarding Pipe Integrity

Influence of Regulations and Standards

- Utilize accurate and relevant data
 - API 1163 - Consistency and reliability of ILI data
 - API 2611 - What data to consider at facilities
- Leverage various and disparate data sources
 - API 1160 - Need and process to integrate data
 - B31.8S - Need to integrate
 - 195.452 - Analyze all available data about pipeline integrity
- Identify and understand interactions between data
 - API 1160 - Mechanism narrative
- Prioritize efforts through risk based approach
 - 195.452 - Focus on HCA's

Informed Decisions Regarding Pipe Integrity

Data Compilation – Background Resources

- Construction Records
- Operating History
 - Pressures, flow rates, cycling regimes
 - Product history
 - Failure history
- Operations Staff
 - Leveraged knowledge of Field Staff, Operations, Integrity, etc.
- Subject Matter Experts
- Repair History
- Previous Inspection Results

Informed Decisions Regarding Pipe Integrity

Data Compilation – Current Inspection

- Risk Based Inspection Method Selection
(Hydrostatic Pressure Testing vs. In-Line Inspection)
 - Anticipated Threats
 - HCA Locations & Types
 - Line Volume & Modeling
- In-Line Inspection Data
 - Preferred over Hydrostatic Testing
 - Standard Suite - Deformation & Metal Loss tools
 - Specialized Tools used to address Specific Threats
 - ✓ SCC, Seam related issues, Residual stress, etc.

Informed Decisions Regarding Pipe Integrity

Data Compilation – Current Inspection

- Hydrostatic Pressure Testing
 - Re-qualify or raise MOP
 - Remove a line from the Risk Based Alternative
 - As a physical test of critical anomalies
 - Supplement other inspection methods
 - An option where technology is limited

- Elements of ECDA
 - Targeted inspection using ECDA methods
 - Provide additional data for integration
 - Not widely used for qualifying liquid pipelines

Informed Decisions Regarding Pipe Integrity Data Integration

➤ Cross-Disciplinary Stakeholder Meetings:

Sunoco Logistics Method

■ Risk Assessment Meetings (RAM's)

- ✓ Post-Inspection meetings discussing all facets of a pipeline's operation
- ✓ Lines reviewed with representatives of various departments
- ✓ Discuss potential risks and potential P&M actions

■ Continual Assessment Meetings (CAM's)

- ✓ Bi-annual meetings used to discuss the overall integrity program and mitigation strategies
- ✓ Review operational changes, industry findings, etc., that could affect line re-inspection schedules or methodologies

Informed Decisions Regarding Pipe Integrity Data Integration

➤ Numerical

■ Spatial Alignment

- ✓ Map the data to a common frame of reference to account for underlying spatial errors in the different data sets
- ✓ Weld alignment across ILI runs

■ Temporal Alignment

- ✓ Multiple ILI data set comparison (MFL, USWM, TFI, USCD, etc)
- ✓ CIS/CP measurement integration
- ✓ Relevance of compared data based upon when each data set was collected – the timeframe it represents

Informed Decisions Regarding Pipe Integrity Data Interpretation

➤ Thresholds

- Single attribute exceedance of a specified level
 - ✓ Depth, Failure pressure, Polarization, etc.
 - ✓ Code Defined & Company Defined

➤ Differential Analysis

- Identification of synergies and coincident events
 - ✓ Metal loss, geometry anomaly and ground disturbance
 - ✓ Depressed CP at external metal loss
- Identification of inconsistencies
 - ✓ Wrinkle bends in straight sections of pipe
 - ✓ Dents vs. appurtenances
 - ✓ Corrosion vs. mill anomalies

Informed Decisions Regarding Pipe Integrity Data Interpretation

➤ Differential Analysis (con't)

■ Map & Imagery Driven Analysis

- ✓ Corrosion at utility crossings
- ✓ Deformation alignment (roads crossings, farm fields, etc.)
- ✓ Internal corrosion at low spots

■ Pattern Recognition

- ✓ Linearly aligned anomalies - either metal loss or dents
- ✓ Mill anomalies
- ✓ Potential pipe type (joint lengths, seam identification)
- ✓ Identification of past relocation/replacement areas

Informed Decisions Regarding Pipe Integrity Data Gaps

➤ Defaults

- Knowledge driven (date of install, project specs, etc.)
- Worse than average, but not always “worst case”

➤ Historical Inference

- What was produced from the source at that time
- Inference from incomplete data sources

➤ Risk Based Prioritization

- Some data elements influence risk result more than others
- Probability of outliers cannot be reduced to zero

Informed Decisions Regarding Pipe Integrity Data Gaps

- Representative Sampling
 - Materials Testing & Research
- Data Review/Updating Process
 - Integrating ILI Data Findings
 - Integrating Field Results/Findings
- Training
 - Resolve Gaps Through Training/Education
 - Dissemination of Industry Knowledge

Informed Decisions Regarding Pipe Integrity Risk of Regulations

- Codification of complex relationships
 - Black/white uniformity to support unambiguous compliance audit
 - ✓ Creates artificial risk of non-compliance
 - ✓ Elevates secondary risk factors leading to misdirection of resources
 - ✓ Discourages consideration of secondary factors as their application is conditional
 - Influence on standards to use definitive language (“shall”) as opposed to conditional language (“may”)
 - ✓ Denies the fact that there is an enormous body of knowledge outside the standard that bears on decisions within the scope of the standard (i.e. Engineering Assessment)
 - ✓ Far too many possibilities that cannot be anticipated by definitive standards and regulations.

Informed Decisions Regarding Pipe Integrity

Panel #4: Identifying Interactive Treats & Understanding Options

Liquid Operator Work Group Members

- ❖ **Richard Dalasio (Sunoco Logistics, L.P.)**
- ❖ **Bruce Dupius (Transcanada Pipeline)**