

Catalog No. L51816e



Reliability-based Prevention of Mechanical Damage to Pipelines

Contract PR-244-9729

Prepared for the
Offshore/Onshore Design Applications Supervisory Committee
Pipeline Research Committee

of
Pipeline Research Council International, Inc.

Prepared by the following Research Agencies:

C-FER Technologies

Authors:
Qishi Chen
Maher Nessim

Publication Date:
August 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	ii
List of Figures and Tables	iv
Executive Summary	vii
Acknowledgement	xi
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Terms of Reference	1
1.2 Rationale	1
1.3 Reliability-based Approach	1
1.4 Previous Work	2
1.5 Reliability Model	2
2. SUMMARY OF EXISTING INFORMATION	4
2.1 Study by Transportation Research Board	4
2.2 Study by Gas Research Institute	5
2.3 Survey by the Office of Pipeline Safety	6
2.4 Summary	7
3. IMPACT FREQUENCY MODEL.....	8
3.1 Fault Tree Model	8
3.2 Application to Impact Frequency	9
3.3 Probability Calculation	10
4. INDUSTRY SURVEY.....	12
4.1 Survey Process	12
4.2 Survey Responses	13
4.3 Excavation Activities	13
4.4 Awareness of Pipeline Location	15
4.5 Notifications	16
4.6 Response to Notifications	18
4.7 Surveillance and Protection	19
5. ANALYSIS OF SURVEY DATA	21
5.1 Derivation of Basic Event Probabilities	21
5.2 Test Case	24
5.3 Comparison with Historical Data	25

Table of Contents

6.	PUNCTURE DUE TO MECHANICAL IMPACT.....	26
6.1	Impact Load	26
6.2	Puncture Resistance	28
6.3	Puncture Failure Probability	28
7.	EFFECTIVENESS OF PREVENTION METHODS	30
7.1	Effect of Damage Prevention on Reliability and Expected Costs	30
7.2	Selected Cases and Associated Cost Inputs	31
7.3	Evaluation Based on Failure Probability Reductions	32
7.4	Evaluation Based on Economic Risk Reduction	34
8.	CONCLUSIONS	35
8.1	Recommendations	35
8.1.1	Identification of Pipelines Requiring Improved Damage Prevention	35
8.1.2	Effectiveness of Prevention Options for Existing Pipelines	35
8.1.3	Effectiveness of Prevention Methods for New Pipelines	36
8.1.4	Summary	37
8.2	Recommendations for Future Work	37
9.	REFERENCES	39
 APPENDICES		
	Appendix A Survey Questionnaire	A.1
	Appendix B Summary of Survey Results	B.1
	Appendix C Probability of Excavations not Being Detected by Patrols	C.1
	Appendix D Data of Excavation Equipment	D.1

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figures

- Figure 1.1 Combined reliability model.
- Figure 3.1 A simplified fault tree model.
- Figure 3.2 Fault tree for mechanical interference by a third party during excavation.
- Figure 3.3 Minimal cut sets.
- Figure 5.1 Probability distribution of excavation depth.
- Figure 5.2 Cumulative probability of time to excavate based on survey data (P_{t_exc}).
- Figure 5.3 Probability that an unnotified excavation will not be detected by patrols.
- Figure 6.1 Probability distribution for excavator weight.
- Figure 6.2 Distribution of specified excavation depth for backhoes.
- Figure 6.3 Relationship between excavation force and excavator weight.
- Figure 6.4 Relationship between excavation force and specified backhoe excavation depth.
- Figure 6.5 Comparison of Equation [6.4] with test data by EPRG and Battelle.
- Figure 6.6 Puncture failure probability for different types of equipment.
- Figure 6.7 Puncture failure probability for pipelines with different sizes and grades.
- Figure 7.1 Failure probability of selected cases.
- Figure 7.2 Reductions in failure probability achieved by improving maintenance methods from below average to average.
- Figure 7.3 Reductions in failure probability at \$10/km per year spent on improving maintenance methods from below average to average.
- Figure 7.4 Reductions in failure probability achieved by improving maintenance methods from average to above average.

List of Figures and Tables

- Figure 7.5 Reductions in failure probability at \$10/km per year spent on improving maintenance methods from average to above average.
- Figure 7.6 Reductions in failure probability for different construction measures (X52 NPS 14 line in class 1 area).
- Figure 7.7 Reductions in failure probability at an expenditure of \$10/km per year (X52 NPS 14 line in class 1 area).
- Figure 7.8 Reductions in failure probability for different construction measures (X70 NPS 30 line in class 3 area).
- Figure 7.9 Reductions in failure probability at an expenditure of \$10/km per year (X70 NPS 30 line in class 3 area).
- Figure 7.10 Expected loss due to mechanical damage.
- Figure 7.11 Reductions in expected loss achieved by improving maintenance methods from below average to average.
- Figure 7.12 Reductions in expected loss at \$10/km per year spent on improving maintenance methods from below average to average.
- Figure 7.13 Reductions in expected loss achieved by improving maintenance methods from average to above average.
- Figure 7.14 Reductions in expected loss at \$10/km per year spent on improving maintenance methods from average to above average.
- Figure 7.15 Reductions in expected loss for different construction measures (X52 NPS 14 line in class 1 area).
- Figure 7.16 Reductions in expected loss at an expenditure of \$10/km per year (X52 NPS 14 line in class 1 area).
- Figure 7.17 Reductions in expected loss for different construction measures (X70 NPS 30 line in class 3 area).
- Figure 7.18 Reductions in expected loss at an expenditure of \$10/km per year (X70 NPS 30 line in class 3 area).

Tables

- Table 3.1 Symbols of fault tree model.

List of Figures and Tables

Table 3.2	Basic events for impact frequency model.
Table 4.1	Excavation notification as a function of adjacent land use (North America).
Table 4.2	Excavation notification as a function of class location (North America).
Table 4.3	Excavation notification as a function of adjacent land use (overseas).
Table 4.4	Excavation notification as a function of crossing.
Table 4.5	Distribution of excavation depth.
Table 4.6	Cover depth.
Table 5.1	Distribution of excavation depth.
Table 5.2	Probability for basic events.
Table 5.3	Basic event probabilities for the test case.
Table 5.4	Minimal cut set probabilities for the test case.
Table 5.5	Sensitivity of input probabilities in “achievable range”.
Table 5.6	Breakdown of failure causes and comparison with historical data for buried communication cables.
Table 5.7	Comparison of impact frequency with historical data.
Table 6.1	Summary of input variable distributions.
Table 6.2	Summary of model error distributions.
Table 6.3	Average ultimate tensile strength.
Table 7.1	Prevention options for existing pipelines.
Table 7.2	Cost increments for prevention actions in class 1 area.
Table 7.3	Cost increments for prevention actions in class 3 area.
Table 7.4	Cost increments for new construction options.
Table 8.1	Recommendations for effective prevention methods.