

Proceedings of

Pipelines Research Needs Symposium Saturday, June 22, 2013

In Conjunction with ASCE 2013 Pipeline Conference

Fort Worth, TX

Edited by Dr. Mohammad Najafi, P.E., F. ASCE

Graduate Research Assistants: Sahar Habibzadeh, S.M. ASCE Vinayak Kaushal, S.M. ASCE

Publication Date: November 8, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword1
Agenda2
Water Research Foundation Pipeline Research: Ongoing Work, Future Directions
A Study on Underground Container Freight Transport System of China National Convention and Exhibition Center
Pipeline Asset Management Specific to Gas Pipelines: Issues and Needs
Improving Transmission Pipeline Design, Operations and Maintenance
The Interactive Pipe Broadband Electro-Magnetics (BEM)
Pipe Condition and Earthquake Damage The Information
That Is Not Currently Recorded
Pipeline crisis: Why Research Matters
Integrity Management in Piping Infrastructure Systems
Pipeline Research Needs: Material Properties and Operational Surge in Pipeline Failures
Staged Construction Modeling of a Large Diameter Steel Pipe Using 3-D Nonlinear Finite Element Analysis
Future Conveyance System and Asset Management Research Needs through the LIFT Program
Water Conveyance Infrastructure Research Needs
Energy Pipeline Challenges & Related Research
Pipeline Corrosion Prevention What is Needed?
Pipeline Research Needs for Future Practice
Improvement-A Designer's Perspective
Development of Asset Management Certification and a Living Lab
14 th International Trenchless Technology Research Colloquium Lab
Appendix A
Presentations
Appendix B
Breakout Sessions
Appendix C
Biography of SpeakersC-1
Appendix D
Symposium Attendee ListD-1

Appendix E	
List of Acronyms	E-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1. Relationship between China National Convention and Exhibition Center and	
Neighboring Road Network	. 16
Figure 2.2. Underground Container Freight Transport (UCFT) System	. 21
Figure 2.3. Horizontal Routes Of Underground Container Freight Transport	. 21
Figure 2.4. UCFT Logistic Parks	. 22
Figure 2.5. Cross-section of UCFT Tunnel	. 23
Figure 2.6. UCFT Convention and Exhibition Zone	. 24
Figure 2.7. Mainlie Tunnel and Branch Lines of UCFT	. 25
Figure 2.8. China National Convention and Exhibition Center	. 26
Figure 3.1. Results of the Tool Indicating 62% Wall Loss in over a Hundred Different	. 30
Figure 3.2. Results of the Tool Indicating 62% Wall Loss in over a Hundred Different	. 31
Figure 3.3. Confirmation of the Pipe having 6 leaks with Defects up to 1" in Width	. 31
Figure 3.4. Confirmation of the Pipe having 6 leaks with Defects up to 1" in Width	. 32
Figure 3.5. Joint Coating not Properly and Adequately Applied to the Joint	. 32
Figure 3.6. Repair Method for Corroded Joint	. 33
Figure 3.7. Example of Poor Pipeline Coating during Jeep Testing	. 33
Figure 3.8. Example of Poor Pipeline Coating during Jeep Testing	. 34
Figure 3.9. Pipeline Damaged due to a Paralleling Bore during the Reaming Stage	. 34
Figure 3.10. Formation of Hydrates Causing Ice Type Crystals to Form in the Pipeline	. 35
Figure 8.1. Datasets Needed to Properly Determine the Likelihood of Failure in the Piping	
System	. 61
Figure 8.2. Threat Interaction Mechanisms	. 62
Figure 8.3. Scenario Analysis to Determine the Most Effective Risk Management Strategy	62
Figure 9.1. Vertical Loading and Loss of Pipe Support Leads to "Circular" or Circumferential	
Break in Cast Iron Pipe	. 67
Figure 9.2. Internal Pressure Increase and/or Surge Leads to Longitudinal Crack Propagation	
From Corrosion Flaw in Cast Iron Pipe	. 68
Figure 9.3. Longitudinal Split of Rivet Steel Pipe	. 68

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Agenda	2
Table 2.1. Comparative Analysis of the Three Schemes	. 18
Table 4.1 Developments and Failures	. 39

Foreword

These proceedings present results of the ASCE Pipelines Research Needs Symposium held on Saturday, June 22, 2013, in Fort Worth, Texas in conjunction with the ASCE Pipelines Conference 2013. The Symposium was sponsored by HDR Engineering, Inc., Water Research Foundation and Freeze and Nichols. The Symposium provided a forum for presenting and discussing pipeline technologies, processes and techniques that are in use or under development. The presented technologies came from research institutions, universities, consulting/engineering companies, government agencies and associations.

The Symposium included presentations by seventeen speakers on pipeline technologies. Five separate breakout sessions were subsequently held to develop strategies to assist emerging technologies become accepted in the marketplace. Each session addressed two technologies and included facilitators, a report leader, and a recorder to capture information during each breakout session.

The presentations include the following topics:

- Underground Container Freight Transport System
- Pipeline Asset Management
- Pipeline Design, Operations and Maintenance
- Interactive Pipe Broadband Electro-Magnetics (BEM)
- Pipe Condition and Earthquake Damage
- Staged Construction Modeling of a Large Diameter Steel Pipe
- Future Conveyance System and Asset Management Research Needs
- Water Conveyance Infrastructure Research Needs
- Energy Pipeline Challenges & Related Research
- Pipeline Corrosion Prevention
- Trenchless Technologies

Attendees included a strong cross section of practitioners, suppliers, researchers, academia and students. Each of these groups has an important role to play in the advancement of pipeline technologies.

Our industry needs a continuing friendly and objective forum where people from within and outside of the industry can showcase new technologies. It is our hope that that this type of forum can continue to serve this role and support the advancement of the pipeline profession.

We are very appreciative of the many individuals who graciously contributed their time to make this Symposium a success.

James Thomson Symposium Co-Chair Mohammad Najafi, P.E. Chair, ASCE Pipeline Research Committee and Symposium Chairperson

Agenda

ASCE Pipelines Research Needs Symposium

The Worthington Renaissance Hotel, Fort Worth, TX, Saturday, June 22, 2013

Table	1.	Agenda
-------	----	--------

	Time	Topic	Speaker	Organization
	8:00 A.M.	Welcome and Introduction	and Dr. Mohammad on Najafi	
	8:10 A.M.	Goals and Objectives	James Thomson	Symposium Co-Chair
izations	8:30 A.M.	Water Research Foundation Pipeline Research: on-going work, future directions	Frank Blaha	Water Research Foundation (WRF)
\Government Organi	8:45 A.M.	Werf - Future Conveyance System and Asset Management Research Needs through The Lift Program - Overview	James Thomson	Symposium C o - Chair
Research		Water Conveyance Infrastructure URE Research: an EPA/ORD Perspective	Mike Royer	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)

	Time	Topic	Speaker	Organization
Government anizations	9:15 A.M.	A Summary of Common Energy Pipeline Challenges and Related Research	Robert Smith	Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administratio n (PHMSA)
Research/(Org	9:30 A.M.	Pipeline Corrosion Prevention: What is Needed?	James A. Hart	NACE International – The Corrosion Society
9:45 A.M.		Shanghai Municipal Underground Container Freight Transport System of China National Convention and Exhibition Center	Dr. Kesi You	Shanghai Municipal Engineering Design Institute Co., Ltd.
line Owners Pe	10:00 A.M.	Pipeline Asset Management Specific Oil and Gas Pipeline: Issues and Needs	Jonathan Faughtenberry	Oasis Petroleum
Pipeli	10:15 A.M.	Improving Transmission Pipeline Design, Operations and Maintenance	David Marshall	Tarrant Regional Water District (TRWD)
10:30 A.M. BREAK WITH REFRESHMENTS			ſS	

	Time	Topic	Speaker	Organization
10:45 A.M.		New Developments in Pipeline Condition Assessment Technologies	Xiangjie Kong	Pure Technologies
on and Assessn	11:00 A.M.	The Interactive Pipe: Broadband Electro- Magnetics (BEM)	Martin Roubal	Rock Solid
on Investigatio	11:15 A.M.	Advancement of Acoustic Condition Assessment Methods	Marc Bracken	Echologics
Conditi	11:30 A.M.	Pipe Condition and Earthquake Damage and The Information That is Currently Not Recorded for Research Needs	John Black	Opus International Consultants
Lunch with Keynote Speaker	12:00 P.M.	Pipeline Crisis: Why Research Matters	Dr. Neil S. Grigg	Colorado State University

	Time	Topic	Speaker	Organization
pue	1:00 P.M.	Integrity Management for Piping Infrastructure	Ernest Lever	Gas Technology Institute
onsultants a Designers	1:15 P.M.	Research Needs of Material Properties and Operational Surge in Pipeline Failures	Dr. Graham Bell	HDR Engineering, Inc.
Dipe Co Pi N Pi 1:30 P.M. in D		Pipeline Research Needs for Future Practice improvements – A Designer's Perspective	Dr. Sri Rajah	HDR Engineering, Inc.
	1:45 P.M.	Development of Asset Management Certification and A Living Lab	Dr. Tom Iseley	IUPUI
vcademics	2:05 P.M.	Water and Wastewater Research Needs Identified at 14 TH ITT Research Colloquium	Dr. Mark Knight	University of Waterloo
A	2:25 P.M.	Staged Construction Modeling of A Large Diameter Steel Pipe Using 3-D Nonlinear Finite Element Analysis	Dr. Ali Abolmaali	The University of Texas at Arlington
	2:45 P.M.	BREAK WITH	REFRESHMENTS	

	Time	Topic	Speaker	Organization
ut Sessions	2:55 P.M.	Breakout Session Introduction and Objectives James Thomson		Symposium Chair
Breako	3:00 P.M.	 Pipeline Failures Pipeline Inspection and Monitoring Pipeline Materials, Corrosion and Biofilm Pipeline Asset Management and Sustainability Trenchless Technologies 		
	4:00 P.M.	Presentation by Small Groups		
	4:40 P.M.	Conclusions & Recommendations		
	4:50 P.M.	Closing Remarks		
	5:00 P.M.	Conclusion of Symposium		

Paper No. 1

Water Research Foundation Pipeline Research: Ongoing Work, Future Directions

Frank Blaha and Jian Zhang, Water Research Foundation 6666 W. Quincy Avenue, Denver, CO 80235 Emails: <u>fblaha@waterrf.org</u> and <u>jzhang@waterrf.org</u>

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-1, for a copy of presentation

1. Water Research Foundation Pipeline Research: Ongoing Work, Future Directions

Frank Blaha and Jian Zhang, Water Research Foundation 6666 W. Quincy Avenue, Denver, CO 80235 Emails: fblaha@waterrf.org and jzhang@waterrf.org

Background

The Water Research Foundation (WaterRF) was started in 1966 as a division of the American Water Works Association (AWWA). The WaterRF became independent of AWWA in 1984, when the organization established an independent funding mechanism and a separate Board of Trustees. While the name of the organization and our logo have changed a few times through the decades, our focus has not – advancing the science of water through a centralized research program. The WaterRF has worked with a variety of professional partners to identify, prioritize, fund, manage and communicate scientifically-valid research across the globe. The WaterRF is a 501(c) 3 non-profit organization that carefully invests and leverages research dollars to tackle an array of issues related to the treatment and delivery of clean drinking water. Since 1966 the organization has managed over 1,000 research studies valued at more than \$500 million. The primary source of funding for the WaterRF has been, and remains, voluntary contributions from over 950 water utilities in the United States, Canada, Europe, Australia, and North Asia. The utilities that support our program are considered "subscribers" and benefit from our research through early access to the research reports and findings, as well as, frequently, involvement in projects of particular interest to those utilities. In addition, the WaterRF also has a number of consulting and manufacturing companies that also support our program and are subscribers.

Research Programs

The WaterRF subscribers guide our work in almost every way, and play a substantial role in setting the research agenda for the WaterRF. At this time we have three primary research programs:

1. Focus Area Program – addresses broadly relevant subscriber issues to be solved with a strategically targeted, multi-year research response. This area of work currently consists of ten focus areas, and 60% of our annual research funding.

2. Emerging Opportunities Program – tackles subscriber challenges and opportunities as they develop throughout the year, and are typically smaller in monetary value (\$50,000 or less) and one year or less in length. This area of research currently represents 20% of our annual research funding.

3. **Tailored Collaboration Program** – allows for partnerships with and among utility subscribers on research that maybe be more targeted or regional in impact and which involves cost-sharing between the utilities and the WaterRF (WaterRF matches utility dollars committed to the project). This area of work also currently represents 20% of our annual research funding.

A fourth research program also exists, termed the "Facilitated Research Program" but while a few projects are active under this program, the program is being re-defined and re-focused. No research moneys are committed to the Facilitated Research Program.

While the exact details vary, there are some commonalities amongst these research programs in how the worthy and valuable research projects are identified. The greatest commonality is that volunteer committees approve a given project for funding, and these committees are dominated by subscribers to the WaterRF. The WaterRF staff can participate in these discussions and deliberations, but staff has no vote in the decisions. The decisions are ultimately made by the volunteers. Some of the volunteer committees are considering wide-ranging research ideas from many different categories, this being the case for the Focus Area Program or the Tailored Collaboration Program overall. Other committees are simply considering which proposal received in response to a solicitation is the superior proposal, since the selected research teams are typically identified through a competitive proposal process. Many projects are reviewed and impacted by multiple volunteer committees before the project starts.

For instance, in the case of a Focus Area, each Focus Area has a committee of volunteers (Technical Advisory Committee) that helps identify a broad range of projects for funding consideration every year. These projects are guided by the overall goals of the Focus Area, but projects vary year by year depending on other active WaterRF projects and results from research conducted outside the WaterRF. The suggestions of the Technical Advisory Committee for each Focus Area are brought to the Focus Area Council (FAC) which oversees the Focus Area Program. The FAC decides which of the suggested projects from across all the Focus Areas will be funded. While it is an unlikely outcome, it is possible that the FAC could be so compelled by the identified needs and projects in one Focus Area to put all the Focus Area funding in a given year into that one area (approximately \$3 million in total Focus Area funding for 2013 projects).

Once a (Focus Area) project has been selected for funding, a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) is formed of, typically, 3 to 4 volunteers that will review and modify the Request for Proposals prior to release, select the winning research team, and follow the project as peer reviewers throughout the project period. Most WaterRF projects have an in-kind match requirement, typically at 25% of overall project funding, but this does vary. The idea of the in-kind match requirement is largely to encourage utility involvement and support for the project. By having utilities involved in the research it is believed that the projects stay more focused on issues of relevance to water utilities, thus helping to provided more value to the utilities, and that the utilities tend to stay more active in the WaterRF programs.

The Infrastructure Funding Gap

Managing the physical infrastructure (the assets) of a water utility is critically important, since water utilities are among the most capital intensive of all utilities (Olstein, et al, 2009). A major part of this capital is invested in the buried utility infrastructure, especially the transmission and distribution system, which is also among the most long-lived of all utility infrastructure. Nonetheless, these systems begin deteriorating as soon as they are installed, yet utilities have not typically banked money for replacement of this infrastructure on an ongoing basis. Inevitably the assets reach the limit of their lifespan, and there is concern that a large number of assets across the country will be reaching their effective life in the near future, placing a huge burden on the water utilities in terms of funding the renewal of those deteriorated assets.

In a recent EPA study of drinking water infrastructure replacement needs, out of total water system replacement needs of \$334.8 billion over the next 20 years, \$200.8 billion of need (60%) is in the transmission and distribution area, with much of this need being associated with pipe

renewal (USEPA 2009). The EPA has termed this need the "Infrastructure Funding Gap" since the funding necessary to address these needs is not immediately available.

Infrastructure and Pipes Research at the WaterRF

Most of the pipes research has been done as part of a slightly broader area of infrastructure research. Through the years the infrastructure area of research has received approximately 25% of overall funding, which has resulted in nearly 100 completed projects in this area of work. This work has included a broad range of subjects and topics, but much of it has been focused on pipe deterioration mechanisms, pipe failure prediction, and pipe longevity predictions. We have worked on programs to help utilities better plan possible future replacement needs.

For instance, the KANEW program was one of the earlier ones (which continues in existence as an expanded and more comprehensive program than that described in the WaterRF study) published in 1998 and completed by Roy F. Weston, Inc., the University of Karlsruhe, and the Philadelphia Water Department. This project modified and applied to North American water systems an existing computer model that was initially developed by the University of Karlsruhe. This modified model forecasted pipe rehabilitation needs and rates as a function of pipe material, pipe 4 technology, environmental stresses, based on an expert learning system from previous experience with similar pipe.

In creating the Focus Areas in 2011 and 2012, the volunteers felt that infrastructure work under the Focus Area should emphasize condition assessment and risk management techniques, since these ideas, when thoughtfully applied, seem likely to significantly decrease the gap between projected buried infrastructure renewal needs at water utilities and committed funding. Thus, the "Infrastructure Focus Area" is defined as:

Water Utility Infrastructure: Applying Risk Management Principles and Innovative Technologies to Effectively Manage Deteriorating Infrastructure: By 2017, provide utilities with tools and strategies to optimize the use of condition assessment and risk management in making infrastructure renewal decisions and the use of innovative renewal techniques.

Objectives:

- 1. Increase the use and understanding of risk assessment approaches for evaluating the need for renewal of deteriorating assets, particularly pipe assets.
- 2. Increase the use and understanding of condition assessment approaches for evaluating the need for asset renewal, especially pipe assets.
- 3. Provide research on improved condition assessment technologies for evaluating the condition and possible need for renewal of deteriorating assets.
- 4. Increase the use and understanding of the full range of renewal technologies and provide research on improved renewal technologies for more cost-effective asset renewal.
- 5. Increase the understanding of deterioration mechanisms of different assets with an eye towards extending the life of these assets and improved condition assessment and renewal technologies.
- 6. Aid the field testing and case study documentation of condition assessment and renewal techniques to better establish the value of these techniques.

For 2013 the funded projects under this Focus Area are:

- 1. Project 4490: Practical & Visual Guide to Common Pipe Failures: Understanding and Classification of Pipe Failures (What to Look for and Why it is Important). This project will try to aid utilities in capturing valuable information on pipe failures based on pipe and environmental conditions that can be noted when the pipe is being repaired. These data will be put into perspective so that they can be effectively used in developing a long-term pipe renewal program. Proposals are due July 10, 2013, funding level is \$100,000.
- 2. Project 4498: Potable Water Pipeline Defect Condition Rating System. This project will try to aid utilities by developing suggested standard defects and scores for those defects to allow improved assessment of the condition of a given pipeline, and to make more 5 consistent evaluations between various pipelines. Proposals are due August 7, 2013, funding level is \$300,000.

Of course, other projects relevant to buried infrastructure can be identified in our other research programs, but the focus and nature of the projects is not predictable since the project ideas are brought to us by other parties. In 2012, for instance, in addition to two buried infrastructure-relevant focus area projects we also funded the following buried infrastructure-relevant projects under other programs:

Three projects funded under the Aging Water Infrastructure program with the EPA:

- 1. Project 4465: Environmental Impact of Asbestos Cement Pipe Renewal Technologies
- 2. Project 4473: The Assess-and-Fix Approach: Using Non-Destructive Evaluations to Help Select Pipe Renewal Methods
- 3. Project 4485, Durability and Reliability of Large Diameter HDPE Pipe for Water Main Applications

Two Tailored Collaboration projects:

- 1. Project 4471: Leveraging Data from Non-Destructive Examinations to Help Select Ferrous Water Mains for Renewal
- 2. Project 4480: Development of an Effective Asbestos Cement Distribution Pipe Management Strategy for Utilities

The totality of infrastructure-related projects at the WaterRF (seven projects funded in 2012) is clearly a more valuable and compelling set of projects than the two Focus Area projects alone. The relevant infrastructure projects identified through other funding schemes is indicative of utility interest in this topic of managing buried infrastructure.

The Future for Infrastructure and Pipes Research at the WaterRF

As in the stock market, past performance is not a guarantee of future returns, but it seems clear the WaterRF will stay substantially involved in infrastructure research. The Infrastructure

Focus Area continues to 2017, where that would be the last year in which funding of projects under the Focus Area would be considered. Projects funded in 2017 might not be completed until 2019 or 2020, depending on the scope and nature of these projects. Also, the infrastructure area of work also continues to be an important area of concern for water utilities as expressed by utilities responding to a recent WaterRF survey to ascertain their needs. Clearly, work will continue on trying to understand and predict the failure of pipes, as well as renewal methods, including innovative approaches, that can help address the infrastructure funding gap.

However, it would appear that as we go forward there will be more buried infrastructure projects oriented around a common goal and/or activity, which will put this work into a more comprehensive context. This will partly be driven by risk concerns associated with our buried 6 infrastructure such as expressed in the recent National Academy of Sciences (NAS) study *Drinking Water Distribution Systems: Assessing and Reducing Risks* (2006). In this report it was suggested that three "integrities" are necessary for distribution systems to pose minimal risk of waterborne disease outbreaks, namely, physical integrity, hydraulic integrity, and water quality integrity. While we have emphasized in this paper the infrastructure work to date that has focused on physical integrity of the distribution system, considerable resources have also going into work related to the other two integrities, but much of this work has been done on a project-by-project basis, with little unification of long-term vision and goals. We believe that this will change as we go forward. A prime unifying concept will be risk management. Risk management concepts will be used to help avoid huge and catastrophic failures of buried infrastructure, but risk management will also be used more comprehensively to help manage hydraulic and water quality integrity of the distribution systems.

As the Revised Total Coliform Rule (RTCR) and the Distribution System Rule were discussed by the Federal Advisory Committee in 2007 and 2008, the need for further distribution system research, in areas related to the three integrities was highlighted. These research needs were expressed in a continuing research partnership between the EPA and the WaterRF, the Research and Information Collection Partnership (RICP), formally entered into in January, 2009 through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the two groups, and as expressed in a research plan completed in April 2010. This partnership is continuing at this time, and while personal expectations were low of a partnership that had no committed funding and no special priority placed on the needed work, it seems that the partnership has been reasonably successful in encouraging reasonable and important work to be completed, and providing a means to discuss how the results of that work might be applied and made practical.

Partly because of the RICP, work continues on issues related to pressure management of distribution systems, and the relationship of pressure management to waterborne disease outbreaks (ongoing work related to the cost and effectiveness of boil water orders) but also the relationship of pressure management to main breaks. Empirical evidence from various research projects indicates that lowering higher pressures, and attenuating pressure fluctuations, results in both less lost water as well as fewer main breaks. Work in this area continues, especially considering what might be considered the best pressure monitoring approaches for the distribution system. There is interest in improving our understanding and applications of pressure and pressure transient knowledge to better manage our distribution systems.

The Federal Advisory Committee of 2007 and 2008 also expressed that "excellence" programs associated with the distribution system should be promoted. One such program is the Partnership for Safe Water (PSW) which recently expanded a near 20-year program focused only on encouraging excellence in filtration plant operations into a two-pronged program that also includes encouraging excellence in distribution system operations. The distribution system 7 program only became active this year, but it is based upon the results of a WaterRF study that was cofounded by PSW that reviewed and suggested optimization criteria for distribution systems. The WaterRF study suggested that there should be three optimization variable that can be measured, and for which goals were established, with these variables being breaks and leaks as a measure of the physical integrity of a distribution system, and disinfectant residual as a measure of the water quality integrity of a distribution system (Friedman, et al, 2010).

References

- Friedman, M., et al, 2010, Criteria for Optimized Distribution Systems, Water Research Foundation, Report 4109.
- Olstein, M.A., et al, 2009, Improving Water Utility Capital Efficiency, Water Research Foundation, Report 91257.
- USEPA, 2009, Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey and Assessment, Fourth Report to Congress, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, EPA 816-R-09-001.

Paper No. 2

A Study on Underground Container Freight Transport System of China National Convention and Exhibition Center

Fan Yiqun, Yu Mingjian and You Kesi, Shanghai Municipal Engineering Design Institute (Group) Co., Ltd<u>.</u>, Shanghai, China, 200092 Email: <u>fanyiqun@smedi.com</u>

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-16, for a copy of presentation

2. A Study on Underground Container Freight Transport System of China National Convention and Exhibition Center

Fan Yiqun, Yu Mingjian and You Kesi, Shanghai Municipal Engineering Design Institute (Group) Co., Ltd., Shanghai, China, 200092 Email: fanyiqun@smedi.com

Abstract

With respect to adverse effect of freight transport of China National Convention and Exhibition Center on transport and environment of Shanghai Hongqiao CBD, three different technical schemes for logistic system of the Center are presented. Through comprehensive analysis, comparison and selection in light of construction investment, project risk and environmental impact, underground container system is chosen as the mode of transport of freights on show, and conceptual designs of underground container system for the convention and exhibition center are further expanded. The results show that traditional logistic modes fail to meet freight transport requirement of China National Convention and Exhibition Center, which calls for innovative ideas and the development of a new mode of freight transport. The underground container freight transport system is more advantage in such aspects as guaranteed effective transportation of convention & exhibition goods, reduced impact on road network, and environmental protection.

Keywords: convention and exhibition logistics; underground container freight transport system; comprehensive benefit analysis; motor driven container railway transportation equipment; transportation tunnel

Introduction

China National Convention and Exhibition Center is located to the east of Zhuguang Road and to the south of Songze Elevated Road within Hongqiao CBD and has an area of some 1500 mu, as shown in Figure 1. It comprises exhibition venue, comprehensive supporting facilities and logistic supporting facilities. The floorage of exhibition venue, which will be the world's largest exhibition venue by exhibition area, is approximately 500,000 m²; the floorage of comprehensive supporting facilities is about 300,000 m², and the floorage of logistic supporting facilities is about 200,000 m². It is a national key project involving cooperation between the Ministry of Commerce PRC and Shanghai Municipal People's Government and is included in the list of Shanghai major projects. After completion, China National Convention and Exhibition Center will be used for large specialized exhibitions scheduled by governments, e.g., biannual "China (Shanghai) Exposition" based on East China Fair and China International Industry Fair, and may also undertake international leading trade fairs like Bauma and CeBIT in Germany and establish exposition brands.



Figure 2.1. Relationship between China National Convention and Exhibition Center and Neighboring Road Network

Due to its immense exhibition area, China National Convention and Exhibition Center has to endure the transportation of 200,000 persons and 3,000 trucks per day in the worst-case scenario. According to traffic analysis of China National Convention and Exhibition Center under current planning, neighboring Zhuguang Road, Laigang Road, Middle Xujing Road and Songze Avenue provide a total of 22 lanes in two directions and total capacity reaches 15,000pcu/h. Peak flow of passenger cars (including taxi) to and from China National Convention and Exhibition Center will be up to 15,000pcu/h. With the addition of peak flow of passenger cars from supporting zone and neighboring vehicles in transit, regional roads will be fully saturated and unable to withstand traffic load of the convention and exhibition. In addition, large quantities of freight transport will inevitably generate a great deal of exhaust gas and noise and increase carbon emissions, thus affecting the construction of Hongqiao CBD as a national low-carbon demonstration area. Therefore, it is especially important to conduct systematic research on logistic schemes of China National Convention and Exhibition Center, guarantee efficient transport of exhibition logistics and reduce environmental impact on neighboring road network.

Three technical schemes are presented to cope with adverse impact of convention and exhibition logistics on transport and environment. The underground container system is determined as the best convention & exhibition cargo transport scheme based on comprehensive benefit analysis, and further expand the conceptual designs of underground container freight transport system.

Freight Transport Requirement Analysis of China National Convention and Exhibition Center

With reference to transport requirement features of Shanghai World Expo and other domestic and international large-scale conventions and exhibitions, freight transport requirement of China National Convention and Exhibition Center during exhibition move-out is predicted below:

(1) Traffic flow prediction

Calculated according to 50 trucks/10,000 m^2 of exhibition area during move-out of a typical large-scale convention and exhibition, China National Convention and Exhibition Center will attract 2,500 trucks of various types per day. With reference to 100 trucks/10,000 m^2 of Canton Fair on the date of move-out, China National Convention and Exhibition Center will attract 5,000 trucks on the move-out day.

(2) Parking berth prediction of truck waiting zone

To avoid unauthorized parking of freight vehicles in large numbers during exhibition move-out, a truck waiting zone with sufficient area must be set up. It is forecast that truck waiting zone for China National Convention and Exhibition Center will need 5000 berths or total parking area being around 500,000 m² (100 m²/berth). In order to reduce traffic impact and noise from trucks in large numbers, the truck waiting zone shall be built where there is low environmental and traffic sensitivity.

(3) Transportation requirement prediction in the worst scenario

China National Convention and Exhibition Center with an exhibition area of $500,000m^2$ can simultaneously hold 2~3 large-scale exhibitions with at least 150,000 m² each, and the moveout and overlapping of different exhibitions will most likely result in the conflict and superposition of passenger and vehicle flow in large quantities.

In the worst scenario, the period of large-scale consumption exhibitions will overlap that of large-scale specialized exhibitions and China National Convention and Exhibition Center will receive the transportation of 200,000 persons and 3,000 trucks each day. Traffic organization of exhibition visitors and goods is rather difficult.

Logistic Schemes for China National Convention and Exhibition Center

According to location and surrounding environment of China National Convention and Exhibition Center, the following schemes are put forward through research: Scheme 1, 2 truck marshaling yards and truck-only lanes will be built on existing Minbei Road and Laigang Road, and trucks will first gather and queue in marshalling yard before entering the convention and exhibition zone via Minbei ground road and Laigang special ground road; Scheme 2, based on Scheme 1, an underground truck-only road will be built beneath Minbei Road with transport route unchanged; Scheme 3, an underground logistic system and a logistic park will be constructed to process goods before transporting them into convention and exhibition zone via freight logistic lane. The detailed three schemes are as shown in Table 2.1.

Comparison items	Scheme 1: ground freight-only road	Scheme 2: underground freight- only road	Scheme 3: underground container freight transport system
Facilities	Truck marshalling yard + Minbei truck-only road + truck waiting zone + Laigang special road 1.ground road: Minbei truck-only road (2 lanes); Laigang truck-only road (4 lanes) 2.Truck marshalling yard: 5000 berths 3.Truck waiting zone: 1000 berths	Truck marshalling yard + Minbei underground truck-only road + truck waiting zone + Laigang special road 1.ground road: Laigang truck-only road 2.underground road: Minbei underground truck-only road 3.Truck marshalling yard: 5000 berths 4.Truck waiting zone: 1000 berths	Logistic park + underground logistic system + facilities in convention and exhibition zone + parking zone + Laigang special road 1.ground road: Laigang truck-only road (4 lanes) 2.Minbei and Laigang underground logistic lane (7 km) 3.Logistic park: 18 gantry cranes and corresponding means of horizontal transport 4.Convention and exhibition zone: 14 vertical shafts, 14 cranes
Occupation of land	Total area: 728,000 m ² 1.Ground road: 128,000 m ² 2.Truck marshalling yard: 500,000 m ² 3.Truck waiting zone: 100,000 m ²	Total area: 704,000 m ² 1.ground road: 104,000 m ² 2.Truck marshalling yard: 500,000 m ² 3.Truck waiting zone: 100,000 m ²	Total area: 204,000 m ² 1.ground road: 104,000 m ² 2.Truck marshalling yard: 100,000 m ² 3.Truck waiting zone: 100,000 m ²

 Table 2.1. Comparative Analysis of the Three Schemes

Comparison items	Scheme 1: ground freight-only road	Scheme 2: underground freight- only road	Scheme 3: underground container freight transport system
Risk	High operating risk, low technical, organizational management risk Given particularities of convention and exhibition logistics including heavy traffic load and limited time during dismantling and arranging an exhibition, it is most likely that trucks will queue outside the convention and exhibition venue before entry. Additionally, exhaust gas, vibration and noise from convention and exhibition trucks will exert big environmental.	High operating risk, low technical, organizational management risk At the section of Minbei road, the adoption of underground road will reduce environmental impact. Other same as Scheme 1	High technical, organizational management risk, low operating risk Convention and exhibition underground logistic system will be the first of its kind in China and elsewhere and require innovative containerization integrated technology and model of organization management involving convention and exhibition third-party logistics.

Table 2.1 shows that three schemes are feasible in terms of construction. Compared with Scheme 1 and Scheme 2, Scheme 3 featuring the adoption of underground container freight transport system has the following 3 unique advantages: (1) ensuring efficient and safe container collection and distribution, (2) alleviating regional traffic pressure, cutting energy consumption and reducing environmental damage, (3) improving convention and exhibition center's collection and distribution system through close combination with large-scale convention and exhibition center. However, Scheme 3 calls for high investment. Scientific and objective evaluation of logistic schemes shall focus on comprehensive system analysis, which looks at the change in distribution of interests of the whole incurred by change in logistic link from the angle of the entire value chain. Despite certain increase in underground logistic investment and operating costs, such logistics might not result in considerable increase of the exhibitors' total cost and will instead bring about external effects and added value. The above mentioned increase in investment and operating costs may be offset by exhibition organizers' exhibition incomes. Through comprehensive analysis, Scheme 3 has the optimal effect.

Conceptual Design of Underground Container Freight Transport System for China National Convention and Exhibition Center

State-of-the-art on Underground Container Freight Transport System

Most of earlier researches on underground logistic transport system are restricted to the application of small-diameter pipeline logistics. For instance, Royal Mail Ltd used to build a 37 km-long track dedicated to transport of correspondences and parcels, which processes more than 4 million pieces of postal mail and parcel from 9 counties during daily peak period. A research team of the University of Bochum in Germany constructed an underground transport pipeline (maximum diameter: 1.6m) between downtown area and industrial park in Ruhr District. In the pipeline a pill shaped transport box is used to carry cargo and the box is driven by a traditional 3-phase motor to run in a driverless condition along the pipeline route and under supervision by a radar monitoring system.

Thanks to further development of related technologies in recent years, especially the research and application of underground tunneling machine, the research of underground logistic transport system has evolved toward the development of large-diameter underground tunnels and the importance of underground container freight transport system is increasingly recognized. There are relevant research projects underway in other countries including Port of New York and Port of New Jersey in the US, Port of Antwerp in Belgium, Port of Tokyo in Japan and Ruhr Industrial District in Germany, and there is conceptual design of technical feasibility and economic feasibility. With critical underground horizontal transport technology, such schemes as Pneumatic Capsule Pipeline (PCP), Conveyors Belt, Cargo Cap, Save Freight Shuttle and Automated Guided Vehicle (AGV) are presented.

In 2006~2008, a research team of Shanghai Municipal Engineering Design Institute (Group) Co., Ltd., based on analysis of driving forces for the development of underground container freight transport system, studied the possibility and technical & economic feasibility of developing underground container freight transport system in Shanghai and put forward possible routes like Yangshan Port ~ Luchaogang logistic park and Yangshan Port ~ Waigaoqiao Port. In

2008~2010, with respect to the transport of Shanghai municipal domestic waste, the conception of using underground container freight transport system for garbage transfer was proposed.

Conceptual Design of Convention and Exhibition Center's Underground Container Freight Transport System

General layout of Underground Container Freight Transport System

The underground container freight transport system means a logistic system where containerized cargo shuttles automatically in a large-diameter underground passage to realize container transportation between ports, between inland cities, and between a port and an inland city, which can be effectively connected to ground terminals and bring about such benefits as high efficiency, low cost and environmental friendliness.

In logistic system of China National Convention and Exhibition Center, the underground container freight transport (UCFT) system comprises three subsystems including logistic park, transport tunnel and exhibition venue, as shown in Figure 2. First of all, convention and exhibition freight vehicles gather at logistic park, where containerized cargo is unloaded before being transferred via underground tunnel to convention and exhibition venue for hoisting and devanning. General layout of underground container logistic route in China National Convention and Exhibition Center's convention and exhibition venue is shown in Figure 2.2.



Figure 2.2. Underground Container Freight Transport (UCFT) System





Delivery Means of UCFT

Container horizontal transport equipment for underground logistic system of China National Convention and Exhibition Center may adopt tractor + semitrailer, motor tractor + container flat car, battery driven AGV, motor driven container railway transportation equipment, etc. Through comprehensive comparison, linear motor driven container railway transportation equipment is adopted due to its benefits like excellent climbing capacity, small curve radius, flexible route and low pollution. The system adopts 40t standard containers and 1~3 vehicles per group for cargo transport.

Logistic Park

Logistic Park comprises freight yard, transit zone, comprehensive supporting service zone, parking lot and vehicle repair zone. Floor arrangement of UCFT logistic park is shown in Figure 2.4.



Vanning time of each train is 18 minutes. Considering 1.0-minute departure interval, 18 gantry cranes are needed; each site of gantry crane will have 140 containers, which will be placed on both sides of transportation track and cover $70m\times25m$; the area of freight yard and transit zone combined is approximately 50,000 m² (including roads in freight yard).

Transport Tunnel

According to the requirement of container transport vehicle, the cross-section of transport tunnel is shown in Figure 2.5.



Figure 2.5. Cross-section of UCFT Tunnel

According to the working conditions of dismantling and arranging an exhibition, 2500 containers have to be transported within 16 hours and the departure interval of trains operating in opposite directions on the same route is 1.15 minutes, which exceeds 1.0 minute. Therefore, the system meets the requirement. In addition, according to research scheme of underground container freight transport system in Belgian ANTWARP Port, a total of 2776 containers can be handled per day in opposite directions, with vehicle running speed of 7km/h, departure interval of 33s and train operating interval of 66s. The cut and cover method is proposed for construction.

Convention and Exhibition Zone

At convention and exhibition zone, exhibition halls and container stacking zones are alternatively arranged and transport tunnels pass through exhibition halls and container stacking zones in order; vertical transport shafts are erected in the center of container stacking zone to allow the crane to lift containers to the ground for devanning; containers are unpacked at the stacking zone and goods are sent via ground handling equipment to corresponding exhibition booths. Floor arrangement of UCFT convention and exhibition zone is shown in Figure 2.6.



Equipment of convention and exhibition zone falls into basic configuration and gross configuration, detailed as below:

Basic Configuration:

- Considering 6.0-minute loading/unloading cycle by gantry crane, 30,000 m² service area and the hoisting of 270 containers within 16 hours, hoisting speed of gantry crane shall be 3.5 minutes. Therefore, one vertical shaft shall be equipped with two gantry cranes.
- If the area of exhibition hall exceeds 30,000 m², the number of vertical shafts shall be increased.
- Given 90-minute devanning time limitation, 24 containers may be arranged at ground temporary freight yard beside shaft and on both sides of the doorway of exhibition hall.
- Two cranes may be deployed on both sides of the shaft. For double-layer arrangement, the cranes may be deployed in the upper and lower layers.

Gross configuration:

- Each vertical shaft is equipped with 1 crane and the number of containers that can be hoisted is: (16*60/6=) 160
- The number of vertical shafts required for the hoisting of 2500 containers at exhibition venue is: (2500/160=) 16, and 16 cranes need to be deployed
- Devanning time is 1.5h, and the number of devanning cycles that can be done at devanning site beside shaft is: (16h/1.5h) =11
- The number of containers being devanned simultaneously at exhibition venue: (2500/11~=) 230
- Supposing the footprint of each container is 50 m², the total area of devanning site is: (230*50=) 11500 m²

Gross configuration is based on ideal conditions, but different exhibition halls have different area. Therefore, the configuration of facilities varies for various exhibition halls.

Relationship between Mainline Tunnel and Branch Lines of Convention and Exhibition Zone

The relationship between mainline tunnel and branch lines of UCFT convention and exhibition zone is shown in Figure 2.7.





Mainline transport tunnel has branch lines; branch lines are connected to vertical transport shaft and intended for temporary emplacement of containers so that the crane can lift the containers to the ground for devanning; containers are unpacked and goods are unloaded at the stacking zone before being transferred via ground handling equipment to corresponding exhibition booths.

Conclusions

Based on freight transport requirement analysis of China National Convention and Exhibition Center and with due consideration of influencing factors like surrounding environment and road network, three logistic system technical schemes are put forward. Through scheme comparison and selection, the scheme featuring the underground container freight transport system is chosen due to its optimal effect. This shows traditional logistic schemes fail to meet the freight transport requirement of China National Convention and Exhibition Center and that the development of underground logistic system, a new mode of freight transport, has considerable comprehensive benefits: for Hongqiao CBD as a whole, the adoption of underground logistic mode to solve traffic problem of the exhibition center will help relieve the huge pressure of exhibitions on regional road transport; and this scheme will also greatly reduce carbon emissions, save energy and remarkably improve regional neighboring environment. For the convention and arranging an exhibition; the setting of logistic park will not only deal with the storage of early cargo but also regulate peak value of freight transport requirement; due to the saving of supporting zone dedicated for unloading and forwarding, the entire scheme will considerably increase intensive land use.

The following points shall be paid attention to in future research of underground logistic scheme for convention and exhibition center:

(1) Convention and exhibition is not a sheer market or commodity economy but an experience economy. Its purpose is to secure exhibitors' participation in future exhibitions. Therefore, the analysis of customer value involves not just money cost and value but also time, spiritual, physical and psychological values.

(2) The advantages of the scheme on social environmental and other public benefits shall be highlighted.

(3) Scientific and objective evaluation of logistic schemes shall focus on comprehensive system analysis, which looks at the change in distribution of interests of the whole incurred by change in logistic link from the angle of the entire value chain.

(4) Underground convention and exhibition logistic system will be will be the first of its kind in China and elsewhere and require innovative containerization integrated technology and model of organization management involving convention and exhibition third-party logistics.

Postscript

This paper was finished in April 2011. After the completion of solicitation of schemes from home and abroad, the scheme is changed as follows: convention and exhibition complex is placed in the center of project site in a radial "four-leaf clover" pattern, which divides the site into 4 parts, namely eastern, western, southern and northern squares according to the relationship between building access and environment, as shown in Figure 2.8. Such change deviates from the foregoing design scheme but basic principles remain unchanged.



Figure 2.8. China National Convention and Exhibition Center

References

- Qian Qihu, Guo Dongjun. Introduction on Urban Underground Freight Transport System [M].Beijing: The Communication press, 2007
- Willy Winkelmans, "Redressing the Balance between Demand for Mobility and Supply of Transport by Means of New Modes of Transportation", ISUFT 2008, Arlington.
- Willy Winkelmans and Johan Van Wassenhove, UCM (Underground Container Mover) (Denys NV) a technological and transport-economic solution for sustainable development of seaports, ISUFT2010, Shanghai.

- Guo Dongjun, Yu Mingjian, Chen Zhilong, The Preliminary Study on Underground Container Transportation System(UCTS) for Yangshan Port in Shanghai, ISUFT 2008, Arlington.
- Guo Dongjun, Chen Zhilong, Xie Jinrong, Zhao Ziwei, A comparison of different container transport modes in Yangshan deep Water Port, ISUFT 2010, Shanghai.
- Yu, M.J., Fan, Y.Q., Plan and Conceptual Design of Urban Underground Domestic Waste Transfer Logistics System. ISUFT 2010, Shanghai.
- Fan Yiqun 1, Pei Qi, Key Issues Studies in Design and Construction of Transfer Station and Terminal of Municipal Underground Environment Freight Transport System: a Case Study in Shanghai, ISUFT 2010, Shanghai.
- Shanghai Municipal People's Government. The Detail Planning of China National Convention and Exhibition Center, 2012 Shanghai Municipal People's Government. The Structural Planning of Hongqiao Business District.

Paper No. 3

Pipeline Asset Management Specific to Gas Pipelines: Issues and Needs

Jonathan Faughtenberry, P.E., Senior Facility Engineer/Project Manager, Oasis Petroleum, Inc., 1001 Fannin Street, Ste. 1500, Houston, TX 77002 Email: jfaughtenberry@oasispetroleum.com

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-25, for a copy of presentation

3. Pipeline Asset Management Specific to Gas Pipelines: Issues and Needs

Jonathan Faughtenberry, P.E., Senior Facility Engineer/Project Manager, Oasis Petroleum, Inc., 1001 Fannin Street, Ste. 1500, Houston, TX 77002 Email: jfaughtenberry@oasispetroleum.com

Abstract

In the United States today there are over 210 natural gas pipeline systems which encompass over 305,000 miles of interstate and intrastate transmission pipelines. With this many miles of gas pipelines, there are over 11,000 delivery points, 5,000 receipt points, 1,400 interconnection points, 24 hubs or market centers, and 49 locations where natural gas can be imported/exported via pipelines throughout the U.S. If all the natural gas pipelines in the U.S. were connected to each other they would stretch to and from the moon almost three times. With this many miles of natural gas pipeline assets in the ground and flowing, there comes the requirements and challenges of trying to properly maintain these infrastructure assets. There are requirements for properly maintaining these assets as defined by the Department of Transportation (DOT) CODE 192, but any good pipeline operator will maintain these assets to insure a safe and suitable design pipeline system. The challenges of pipeline asset management present themselves in several different forms, but can be broken down in to 4 main threats which are external corrosion, internal corrosion, 3rd party damage, and construction defects. This presentation paper will discuss those threats, how and why they occur, what the current methods are for detecting and preventing these threats, and the current research needs for improved asset management of natural gas pipelines.

Introduction

Proper asset management of natural gas pipelines begins with following the DOT 192 and 195 minimum requirements for asset management of gas pipelines. The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) is a branch of the federal government that is responsible for regulating and ensuring the safe and secure movement of hazardous materials to industry and consumers by all modes of transportation, including pipelines.

PHMSA is the author of the DOT 192 and 195 pipeline codes. DOT 195 is the code requirement for transportation of hazardous and/or combustible liquids by way of pipeline, and DOT 192 is the code requirement for the transportation of combustible and/or hazardous gases by way of pipeline. These codes are what set the minimum standards for proper asset management of gas pipelines and have set the standard for certain operational practices to be implemented in order for sufficient asset management of pipelines.

However, along with knowing the minimum DOT code requirements for asset management of gas pipelines, it is also very important to know the threats that endangers a gas pipeline system, how and why the threats occur, what the current methods are for asset management of a gas pipeline systems, and current research needs for asset management of a gas pipeline system. The top four threats to a gas gathering pipeline are internal corrosion, external corrosion, third party damage, and construction defects.

General Discussion & Case Studies

Internal corrosion is one of the main threats to a gas pipeline due to the compounds that are found mixed in with the natural gas. These compounds mainly consist of bacteria from the well flowback, saltwater from the ground formation as a result of the wellbore drilling, hydrocarbons, and oxygen. These four components can attack the inner walls of a pipeline if proper asset management techniques are not implemented. Case study A which is a 24" natural gas pipeline called the Winscott to Grace Lateral, is an example of what can happen to the inner walls of a gas pipeline if the proper facilities such as pigging are not in place to prevent bacteria and water build up in the pipeline.

After running an inline inspection tool (ILI) on the 24" Winscott to Grace pipeline, the results of the tool indicated 62% wall loss in over a hundred different locations throughout a one mile length of pipe (figure 1 & Figure 2). The cause of this wall loss has not been confirmed, but the initial investigation by the ILI tool indicates that the pipeline was installed without any pigging capabilities for 24 months. Since the pipeline was not pigged for over 24 months, the pipe set idle/dead leg and allowed bacteria scaling and water to build up in the pipe and corrode the inner walls of the pipe. This form of pipe design and installation is known as a dead leg because it does not have any pigging facilities to flush out water, and inject chemicals to kill bacteria. The solution to repair this issue was to replace a mile of 24" pipe.



Figure 3.1. Results of the Tool Indicating 62% Wall Loss in Over a Hundred Different



Figure 3.2. Results of the Tool Indicating 62% Wall Loss in Over a Hundred Different

Case study B, is an example of internal corrosion that occurs when the proper asset management of facilities are in place, but not utilized. Case study B is four 12" pipelines, which were discovered to have 6 leaks after a pipeline patrol indicated a gas leak along the pipe right of way. Once the leak was detected during pipeline patrol, an ILI tool was run through the pipe and confirmed that the pipe had 6 leaks with defects up to 1" in width (figure 3 and figure 4). Since the pipeline had sufficient pigging facilities in place, it was determined that proper operation and maintenance activities were not being practiced for this stretch of pipe by verification of a lack of operation and maintenance records. The combination of low flows, non-pigging operation, and lack of chemical injection allowed the buildup of water and bacteria which ultimately corroded the pipe. The solution to repair this issue was to replace over a mile of 12" pipes.






Figure 3.4. Confirmation of the Pipe having 6 Leaks with Defects up to 1" in Width

External corrosion is another top threat to natural gas pipelines. The case study presented herein for external corrosion is an example of a 12" pipeline that was determined to have 50% wall loss after running an ILI tool through the pipe. After exposing the pipe at the location of the wall loss it was determined that the wall loss was due to improper application of joint weld coating. As shown in figure 5, the joint coating was not properly and adequately applied to the joint and/or the joints were coated to quickly causing hydrogen gas to build up during the drying of the paint not allowing a sufficient joint coating. Therefore, this lack of joint coating application exposed the iron pipe allowing a direct corrosion point. The proper asset management technique that could have avoided this situation is to have good field inspection and acceptance of field joint coating applications, and proper training of how to apply field joint coatings. The repair method for this corroded joint is a clock spring composite wrap (figure 3.6).



Figure 3.5. Joint Coating not Properly and Adequately Applied to the Joint



Figure 3.6. Repair Method for Corroded Joint

The third major threat to a natural gas pipeline is material defects. These material defects are due mainly to poor mill quality/production and/or poor handling once received at the construction site. Material defects such as cracked pipe or insufficient pipe coating can cause major problems to the pipe such as internal and external corrosion. Figure 3.7 and Figure 8 shows an example of poor pipeline coating during jeep testing that led to the discovery of a cracked pipe. It was concluded that there was insufficient mill quality oversight and testing due to a lack of inspection at the mill. The mitigation method for this insufficient pipe was to quarantine the pipe and send it back to the mill.



Figure 3.7. Example of Poor Pipeline Coating during Jeep Testing



Figure 3.8. Example of Poor Pipeline Coating during Jeep Testing

The fourth main threat to a natural gas pipeline system (if proper asset management operations are not in place for pre-construction activities) are construction defects. Figure 9 shows a pipeline that has been damaged due to a paralleling bore during the reaming stage. It was determined that a reamer caused the mechanical damaged during the reaming stage of a paralleling horizontal directional drilling installation of a 12" pipe. This could have been prevented by the use of proper field line locates and as-built records. The repair method for this damage was to replace 47.5 feet of 12" pipe. In addition, several other threats can be avoided which pose a problem to proper asset management of pipelines such as avoiding wyes which hinder sufficient pigging operations, fittings designed with radiuses less than 1.5 x D that hinder pigging operations, and random heavy wall pipes that hinder pigging operations. These type of defects can be avoided by proper design, oversight during purchasing, and good field inspection.



Figure 3.9. Pipeline Damaged due to a Paralleling Bore during the Reaming Stage

Another threat to natural gas pipelines is the formation of hydrates when hydrocarbon gases occur in the gas composition usually greater than 1180 British Thermal Units or BTU. When hydrocarbon gases greater than 1180 BTU occur in the gas composition hydrates can form when pressures increases, temperature decreases, and low flows occur. Under these circumstances, hydrates can form causing ice type crystals to form in the pipeline (figure 3.10). These hydrates clog the pipe, and cause for an insufficient pipeline system. Most hydrates are discovered when there is a pressure drop in the pipeline, low flows occur, or an ILI or pig run discovers the hydrates. Proper asset management to prevent these type of issues is to maintain low system pressures by adding adequate compression where needed, methanol injection, proper pigging, and to maintain temperature and pressure under the dew point requirement for the gas.



Figure 3.10. Formation of Hydrates Causing Ice Type Crystals to Form in the Pipeline

Causes of Pipe Rehabilitation

With each of the four threats presented, each case study required some type of pipe rehabilitation. To summarize what the causes of pipe rehabilitations are, they can be grouped into three main categories which are lack of field and procurement inspection, poor O&M processes, procedures, and documentation, and improper design of gas pipelines. Where most material defects occur are at the mill inspection level when there is a lack of mill inspection along with improper delivery documentation. If the proper delivery documentation is provided, then the checks and balances are in place to insure good quality assurance of mill inspections. In turn, materials then should not be delivered to the site with defects because proper mill inspection occurred.

If there is improper procurement inspection, and a defective material is delivered to the site, then a second quality assurance check and balances should occur and that is at the field level site inspection. These type of quality assurance checks and balances are in the form of an eye ball inspection, pipe jeeping, and non-destructive testing such as X-Ray and Hydro testing. However, even if an acceptable pipe is delivered to the site a lack of construction oversight on handling of the pipe can occur causing the pipe to be damaged. Therefore, good asset

management of pipes is always having good inspections on the pipe assets at all times (procurement and field handling).

Poor O&M process, procedures, and documentation can endanger the quality of a gas pipeline. Good asset management of a gas pipeline system always involves a good O&M process, procedure, and documentation, and is a requirement by DOT 192 Code. The most common reason for poor O&M procedures is usually not having a regular pigging schedule or no pigging of the pipeline at all which allows for water, hydration, and bacteria build up, dead legs in the pipe system, poor system operation management, and no chemical treatment of the pipeline system to prevent bacteria or hydration formation build up.

Improper pipeline designs can lead to pipe rehabilitation. The more common improper pipe designs are fittings designed to a bend that is less than a 1.5 x the diameter of the pipe. A pipe bend that is less than 1.5 x the diameter of the pipe will not allow a pig to negotiate the turn and will get stuck at the bend. Wyes that have angles less than 30 degrees can make running a pig through the intersection very difficult if not impossible, this in turn creates an unpiggable section of pipe. Dead legs as discussed previously, are bad design standards that create major internal corrosion issues. The design of the pipe wall thickness should also incorporate some type of corrosion allowance which helps maintain the life of the pipeline. Also, there should be a consideration for temperature, pressure, and flows in the design of the pipeline to help with pipe flushing and hydrate formation. Good design practices are a critical piece to proper gas pipeline asset management.

Current Pipeline Maintenance & Inspection Methods

Good pipeline asset management involves knowing the latest technologies for maintenance and inspection. Current methods for gas pipeline maintenance are the following:

- Pigging Procedures
 - Pigging is a method where a brush/foam/heavy duty plastic tool is pushed down the pipe by using backpressure from the flowing gas.
- Cathodic Protection
 - The two main methods for gas pipeline cathodic protection are impressed current and sacrificial anodes.
- Good O&M process, procedures, and documentation
 - Best way to insure proper asset management of a pipeline system
- Chemical Treatment
 - Two main methods for gas pipeline chemical injection are methanol injection which prevents hydration build up, and anti-bacteria agents for preventing bacteria build up in the pipe.

Current methods for pipeline inspection are the following:

- Caliper Pig
 - Pigging tool that determines wall thickness and pipe ovality
- Gyro Pig
 - Determines pipe profile and bends through the use of a gyroscope. It helps to verify HDD bend radiuses, and determine exact profile of the pipe.

• Gauge Plate

- Determines Pipe Ovality and Damage to Pipe Wall
- Magnetic Flux Leakage
 - Determines changes in wall thickness by inducing magnetic flux in in pipe to detect changes in amplitude due to wall thickness change, and it is an inferred measurement.

• Ultrasonic

• Determines wall thickness by use of a transducer to send and receive sound waves. The difference in time of flight determines wall thickness.

Research Needs

Although there are several very sound methods for insuring good gas pipeline asset management, there is always room for improvement. There are current research needs in the following areas:

- More Research in Pigging Technologies
 - Develop pig designs that allows chemical batch treating for biocide and inhibitors that helps coat the entire internal circumference of the pipe.
 - More improved low flow/pressure pigs
- More research in developing better remote monitoring of rectifiers to assure consistent CP. Tie into SCADA.
- More research on improving design of system to alleviate Hydrate and Liquid build up.
- More advancement in remote pipe monitoring
- Ways to protect existing pipe from 3rd party damage
- Improvement in predicting bacteria build up in pipeline systems
- Research in best ways to optimize O&M on pipeline systems

Conclusions

In summary, the most current methods for proper asset management of gas pipelines are proper pigging procedures, proactive approach to O&M, good procurement and field inspection, acceptable ILI tools and operations, good design practices to allow for superior O&M procedures. Proper asset management of gas pipelines begins with knowing the DOT 192 code requirements, knowing the threats to a gas pipeline system, knowing how to prevent the threats to a gas pipeline, knowing the current methods and technologies for proper gas pipeline asset management, and knowing the future needs for developing new gas pipeline asset manage technologies.

References

U.S. Dept. of Energy, "About U.S. Natural Gas Pipelines (2007/2008)", U.S. Energy Information Administration, Washington, DC.

Interstate Natural Gas Association of America, "Pipeline Facts 2013", INGAA, Washington, D.C.

Paper No. 4

Improving Transmission Pipeline Design, Operations and Maintenance

David Marshall, Engineering Services Director Tarrant Regional Water District, Fort Worth, Texas Email: <u>david.marshall@trwd.com</u>

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-38, for a copy of presentation

4. Improving Transmission Pipeline Design, Operations and Maintenance

David Marshall, Engineering Services Director Tarrant Regional Water District, Fort Worth, Texas Email: <u>david.marshall@trwd.com</u>

The Tarrant Regional Water District is a raw water wholesale supplier in north central Texas, supplying 70 cities with a total population base of 1.8 million people. The District owns four reservoirs, uses three reservoirs owned by others and operates 187 miles of large diameter transmission pipelines. Almost 90% of the water delivered is to Tarrant County, encompassing Fort Worth and the surrounding metropolitan areas. This year we will deliver about 370,000 acre feet of water. About 70% of that water is delivered from two reservoirs 75 miles southeast of the county. The elevation increases by 440 feet through the pipeline route, requiring high horsepower pumping. The pipeline system has to be near 100% reliability to ensure there is no disruption in service.

The system has been built over the last 40 years, and the development and failures shown below.

Pipeline	Year Finished	Diameter - length	Max Pressure, psi/ material	Number of failures
Cedar Creek	1972	72" – 68 miles 84" - 6 miles	225 psi/E301	9
Richland Chambers	1988	90" - 72 miles 108: - 6 miles	225 psi/E301	14
Benbrook	1998	90" – 11 miles	100 psi/E301	0
Eagle Mountain	2008	96" – 10.5 miles 84" – 10.5 miles	225 psi/Steel	0

 Table 4.1. Developments and Failures

Failures of the two lines were investigated, root causes found, and mitigated to the extent possible. Problems included high transient pressures, embrittlement of the prestressing wire, corrosion of the prestressing wire, and thrust restraint design. There are many damaged pipe in the system, and TRWD prioritizes pipe replacement based on damage, remaining strength and risk. Engineers from Simpson, Gumpertz and Heger developed models for TRWD to use to evaluate remaining strength and risk. To date, over 160 damaged segments have been replaced. There are over 800 damaged segments remaining, many which can provide service for some time to come.

Working through these problems, it became apparent that the design methodology developed in the AWWA standards and manual of practices in use at the time of design did not accurately predict the behavior of the pipelines. Working with the standards committee, the design of thrust restraint in M-9 was changed to a method that worked for the very soft soils in north Texas. The limit states design method in the current standard C-304 has been shown to be very effective, as shown in a study sponsored by the Water Research Foundation. The revised standard for prestressing wire, ASTM 648, ensures that embrittlement is no longer an issue. Solving our problems for thrust and determining remaining strength was done using finite element analyses using observed pipe condition and actual soil strengths.

Currently, TWRD is working on a joint transmission project with Dallas Water Utilities that consists of 84" to 108" diameter pipe over 149 miles. This project is through 20 different geologic outcrops along the alignment. The design is being developed for steel pipe and prestressed concrete cylinder pipe. We are working with the University of Texas at Arlington to explore using modified native backfills and controlled low strength materials developed from native soils. We are also working with them using finite element analyses to evaluate pipe and trench systems.

Based on the experience of TRWD, I offer these ideas toward improving the robustness of transmission pipelines:

Design – The design needs to balance reliability and cost. Transmission mains need to be very reliable. Equations for design are generally empirical, with coefficients estimated based on experience. The same equation is used for all diameters. Consideration should be given to develop standards for using three dimension finite element analyses for pie and trench systems. The software tools are available and there have been a great deal of studies published. Life cycle cost and reliability may be improved through enhanced structural design.

The applicability and performance of equations used to determine pipe wall thickness for static and dynamic loading needs to be explored to verify they produce the same degree of reliability for all pipe diameters and trench widths. Some questions to consider are:

Does ring theory apply to large diameter pipes or should they be treated as thin shells? Will the deflection be elliptical or can there be local deformations?

Resistance to collapse from vacuum is calculated by ring deflection. If a pipe does not deflect as assumed through ring deflection, could collapse occur at a much lower vacuum?

Should the stiffness of the mortar lining be used? In 40 years will that mortar lining still have the same characteristics or will carbonation decrease the strength? Trench backfill system analysis needs to be site specific based on measured parameters. Trench wall material and support for large diameter pipe can vary widely both vertically and longitudinally. Work done by UTA on CLSM has shown that stopping the clsm at 70% of the pipe height creates localized stress points that may lead to snap buckling. Full scale testing should be developed to explore vertical changes in trench wall strength to help guide trench width. Some questions to consider are:

- 1. Will vertical trench wall material changes result in non-uniform soil reaction, especially for rock/soil interfaces in the trench wall and create high localized stresses on the pipe wall?
- 2. Can backfill be developed using differing materials in different vertical zones to improve performance and reduce costs?
- 3. Trench width generally has a minimum based on constructability. For softer soils, a wider trench is required. There should be a way to optimize sidewall strength while minimizing width.

4. Coatings

Coating systems determine the life of a pipe. As coatings age and become permeable, corrosion or corrosion mitigation requirements increase. Designing for a century of life of a transmission main requires the coating system to perform flawlessly as the system ages. Questions to consider are:

- a) What measurement should be used for flexible coating acceptance? Pull offs measure adhesion but not permeability.
- b) What tests can be used for estimating the coating life. Glass transition temperatures may bias results for many polymer coatings.
- c) Will micro-cracking of mortar coating always heal, or will carbonation eventually make pathways of high permeability?
- d) How does the grout perform in non-welded joints over decades? Would a shrink wrap system provide for a longer life?

5. Installation

Conservatism in design may be consumed by the installation. Uniformity in the trench bottom is assumed. Small variations will add to the stress in the pipe through beam action. Compaction is also assumed to be uniform. Haunch support is critical and is the most difficult to achieve with traditional backfill methods. Exploration of installation variation could benefit designers and owners to understand the degree of conservatism that should be placed in design and what alternative methods for installation could be cost effective. UTA will be piloting a system for high accuracy measurement of pipe deflection. If successful, this should be used to explore large diameter flexible pipe installations to document deflection as it is found in the field. This information then could be used in design to develop proper factors of safety for non-elliptical deflection.

6. Operations

Operational upsets lead to extreme conditions for pipelines. Overpressure from leaking isolation valves and operator errors can lead to damage to long lengths of pipe and failure. Power failures and equipment failures can lead to transient events. Designs must include some provisions to help mitigate overpressure. Surge valves or altitude valves at strategic locations would help insure low volume extreme pressure events could be mitigated. Performance of these systems needs to be documented to ensure recommendations work. Transient analyses provide some guidance for design. Transient models do not reflect the full event, just the first low pressure wave and returning high pressure wave. There is still room for improved transient wave analyses.

Right of ways do not remain static. During design factors such as right of way use and future land use need to be considered. Long term differential settling resulting in shear is a concern. Pipes enclosed in tunnels under roads naturally have a point exiting the tunnel where differential support over decades may create stress. When roadways are widened, the force points will change. In our clay soils, this settlement may take decades to stop. The San Jacinto Monument is a great case to observe settlement over time. Settlement was rapid over the first two years, and then proceeded linearly for the next 4 decades until finally slowing to a total displacement of about a foot. Studying installations would help define what needs to be accounted for in design. Operating conditions change over time. Most pipelines see increasing demands resulting in higher pressures and flows increase over time. Internal surfaces become rougher, resulting in high friction. Designs need to account for the life of the line and planners need to understand the eventual reduced capacity and pressures that the line can withstand as it ages. Guidance based on actual systems need to be documented for improved design and planning.

7. Maintenance

Owners must take responsibility for an active maintenance program to make the system last. Funding is always an issue. Australia and New Zealand require asset management as part of their full cost of service. There are software programs available for guidance and numerous publications. There are still opportunities to refine best management practices looking solely at transmission mains and develop their cost to help support agencies to fully fund their systems.

Understanding what needs to be done needs to come from successful utilities. Support for this work needs to be developed in the industry. Data collection is always a hurdle. Defining practices and collecting the costs associated with them needs to be deliberate. Having staff time available to accumulate the information is always hard. A great deal of work needs to be done to define proper maintenance and justify the costs associated with it.

Transmission system reliability needs to be first and foremost in design, operation and maintenance. The failure of a system impacts a large population. The capitol costs for transmission is very high but failing to provide the proper factor of safety can plague a utility with interruptions. Transmission mains need to be considered as long term assets and designed sustainably, taking into account conductions that could occur decades from now. There is still a great deal to explore in large diameter pipe design that will optimize the resources required for a successful project.

Paper No. 5

Broadband Electro-Magnetics (BEM)

Martin Roubal (Geophysicist B.Sc. (Hons.)), Rock Solid Group Pty. Ltd., 11/7 Commercial Court, Tullamarine, Australia 3043 Email: info@rocksolidgroup.com.au

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-45, for a copy of presentation

5. Broadband Electro-Magnetics (BEM)

Martin Roubal (Geophysicist B.Sc. (Hons.)), Rock Solid Group Pty. Ltd., 11/7 Commercial Court, Tullamarine, Australia 3043 Email: info@rocksolidgroup.com.au

Abstract

How many different pipe condition technologies and corrosion experts do you have at your company? Ultrasonics, Magnetic Flux Leakage, Radiography, etc....and all the different people and companies that are required to drive these service. I bet it's quite a list. But what if there was a technology and device which you could provide to a pipeline that would allow it to develop a virtual brain. Something that would allow the pipe to tell you how stressed it feels and more importantly warn you that it is coming to the end of its life and needs a revamp or a replacement? This presentation describes the integration of BROADBAND ELECTROMAGNETICS (BEM) into a pipeline network and the benefits of empowering pipelines for self-assessment. Create "THE INTERACTIVE PIPELINE".

Keywords: Non-Destructive Testing (NDT), Pipes, Bridges, Ferrous, Non-ferrous, Surface, Underground, Hardware, Software, Manager, Owner, Remote

Introduction

Pipelines are the lifeblood of industry supplying necessary products and materials as well as removing waste. These networks ensure efficient and environmentally sustainable means of transportation to and from destinations, some of which may even occur in treacherous and inhospitable environments, in relative safety.

As long as these arteries provide a dependable service, ensuring management, employees, customers, suppliers, and partners have access to products and materials wherever and whenever required, the business runs smoothly and efficiently.

However, allow one of these pipelines to fail unexpectedly and the whole operation will at best be disadvantaged, at worst will be brought to a standstill. Such an event can not only paralyze the operation but can also extend beyond the operation itself and cause untold harm if the failed system is not rapidly brought under control. Since pipes often lie in treacherous, inhospitable and difficult-to-get-to environments, taking action to contain or repair failures can be difficult. Proactive awareness is the best solution leaving little to chance.

Asset Management

Asset management or condition inspections are routinely undertaken within clear limits developed partly with the service provision and partly by the need to continue operation unabated. External and internal inspections and testing is classically undertaken with human intervention, thus commonly limited to locations which can be accessed by technicians, in-pipe inspectors or divers. In some cases humans have been replaced with remotely operated vehicles (ROV) or pipeline inspection gauges (PIG). These tools provide a means of delivering the inspection technology to specific locations. Where they are fitted with video cameras actual CCTV footage can be obtained for visual assessment at any location filmed. However, getting inspection teams, ROV's or PIG's to desired locations can be difficult, time consuming and costly.

The result of these inspections, especially where they are in locations, not easily to get or not accessible, means that little or no information is collected and asset managers have to make do with what they get. It is also quite impractical to undertake the inspections from inside the network because that slows down or stops transport of the conveyed product for a set period of time resulting in a drop in revenue or loss of service. Left unchecked the pipe owner is potentially left with predictably damaging results.

BEM Technology Background

BEM technology falls under the umbrella group of devices commonly referred to as 'pulse EM' systems. This technique is derivative of geophysical equipment which has been used in the Australian exploration industry for more than 90 years and is therefore based on well-established physics principles. RSG's background knowledge of this technology and experience in its use in the exploration industry has allowed it to modify the technology for NDT inspections, suitable for acquiring detailed information about the current condition of surface or sub-surface pipelines as well as other infrastructure such as tanks and bridges.

It can be said that the fields of geophysics and non-destructive testing has merge. The point of commonality is the field of physics. At one end are geophysical techniques such as seismology, magnetics and electromagnetics while at the other end are non-destructive testing techniques such as ultrasonics, magnetic flux leakage and eddy currents. From a physics view point these techniques are based on the same principles.

Although it may seem at first glance that material testing and mineral exploration are worlds apart, the fact is that identical physics is used for exploration geophysics as for non-destructive testing (NDT).

- Seismology = Ultrasonics
- Magnetics = Magnetic Flux Leakage
- Electromagnetics = Eddy Current

Having used and evaluated many of the commercially available devices, which make use of the physics principles described above (UT, MFL, Eddy Currents), and identifying the short comings of each technique, RSG embarked on a process of developing its own technology some 25 years ago.

The development of this BEM was not the result of wanting to develop technology for the sake of it. It costs many millions of dollars to bring technology to the market so it is not something considered lightly. BEM was developed because existing and available techniques and devices could not give the level of detail and data confidence required for assessments of assets without misrepresentation or unacceptable commercial risk.

Many of the devices used as NDT are actually destructive because they have some level of impact on the pipeline. Hence to call these techniques NDT is really a misrepresentation. To not remove coatings or linings or to not 'polish' surfaces for good sensor contact means yielding low confidence data. Furthermore, acquiring data using frequency dependent devices in regions know to be 'infested' with stray fields, potentially altering recorded frequencies unexpectedly, give rise to recording of inaccurate results. These limitations added up to unacceptable commercial risk for RSG.

External Inspections

External pipe wall condition assessments are typically carried out on all types of ferrous pipelines to explore the integrity of the ferrous pipe wall. Tunnel wall inspections have also been undertaken with this technology. Pipe scanning is undertaken using HSK (Hand Scanning Kit) non-destructive testing (NDT) technique. Individual readings are taken along the surface of a pipe. With the aid of a temporary paper grid wrapped around the outside of the pipe allowing for accurate positioning of each reading taken. Following post survey data processing this allows a presentation of results

Advantages

- Scanning is not limited by the diameter of the pipe or shape of the pipe component (egelbow).
- The equipment has the ability to survey through thick coatings (25mm+/1"+) of materials such as paint, tar or concrete commonly found on many buried and exposed pipelines.
- The line does not have to be taken off-line, as readings are taken from the outside of the pipe. The technique scans through the full wall of the pipe registering corrosion or flaws within the full wall thickness.
- Negligible effect of outside stray current fields potentially contaminating resulting data.
- Where stray fields are identified these can be clearly seen in captured data variations in
- Data capture parameters are possible since the device is non-frequency dependent.

In-Line Inspections

Internal pipe wall condition assessments have been carried out on any diameter of pipe 2" upwards. Continuous data can be recorded along extensive lengths of pipeline. During in-pipe data acquisition the NDT probes are either winched, rodded or manually pushed (where pipe diameter allows manned entry) through the pipe. Due to the large volumes of data recorded as part of any scan, distances surveyed along smaller diameter pipes are typically 1,000's feet per day while in large diameters only 100's feet per day can be scanned. Data acquired is generally represented graphically or as color contour plots. The graph below is actual data collected along a series of cast iron pipe sections.

Advantages

- Ideal for extensive pipe surveys where the probe can be inserted into pipe hatches or cuts eliminating the need for extensive excavations or physical pipe sampling.
- Typically the pipe needs to be dewatered, cleaned and off-line for surveys.
- In special circumstances the PIG can be operated in full or partially filled non-pressurized pipelines eliminating the need for total dewatering of the pipeline.
- Can survey through all known internal linings including thick layers of cement.
- Can survey through thick and uneven tuberculation in water pipes.
- Probes can be customized to fit a variety of pipe diameters starting as small as 2".

The Interactive Pipe

The scale of operations, length of pipeline networks and breadth of environments the networks are expected to operate in, make traditional inspection costly and often haphazard.

Equipping pipes with a means of being able to interact directly with their asset manager has the potential of reducing the need for arbitrary inspections or inspections in hostile environments while at the same time allowing inspections in places previously inaccessible. Smart computing will allow asset managers to be virtually everywhere along the network, virtually all the time.

Benefits of an Interactive Pipe

To anyone who's gone out to assess a pipeline, or tried to located that elusive corrosion location with a 10mm probe head and miles of pipe to inspect or has attempted to organize the inspection locations into a week's program, the benefits of pipes that continuously report their state will be apparent.

Sensor Installation

Antennae consist of sensors which emit or receive signal responses. These sensor are little more than coils of wire housed in a plastic casing. The size of the sensor can be altered depending on the size of the target or the pipe under inspection but essentially the antennae wrap around the outside of the pipe and can be permanently bonded to the pipe. There is no need to remove or damage the pipe coating and the antennae can be fitted to new pipes or existing pipes can be retrofitted.

Pipe Access

Unlike routine inspections, access to the pipe at any location is required only once at the time of initial installation. The pipe can then be submersed, buried, insulated, elevated high overhead, basically located anywhere without the need for further access. Installation can occur prior to pipe placement or laying where the pipe is new or a new section of pipe is being considered. If retrofitting is considered then one-off access to the desired location is required by manned access, divers, via excavations or when the pipe cladding is removed. At no time does the pipe need to be off-line so installation has little if any impact on service.

Full Circumferential Scanning

By strapping or attaching the antennae about the full circumference of the pipe information can be obtained for the entire circumference at each scan period. The positioning of the antenna ensures 100% surface coverage of the pipe section with BEM sensors. Data is available for the entire pipe for the section scanned.

Scanning Through Coatings

Since BEM is a truly non-destructive and non-invasive technique and does not require the metallic surface to be prepared or exposed in any way to allow for scanning, the technique is ideal for scanning through protective coatings. Even where the pipe is being retrofitted and surface corrosion products exist there is no need to remove these to allow for inspection by BEM signal. In many cases the removal of surface corrosion products can actually be detrimental to the pipe health because its removal exposes new fresh metallic surfaces to attack. Simply pick your location, undertake a superficial surface clean and the pipe is ready to start reporting on its state of health.

Frequency of Scanning

The frequency of scanning at any one location is driven by the asset manager who programs the activation software as desired. Corrosion, abrasion or alteration of pipe walls is a

relatively slow process compared to the potential scanning frequency so it is reasonable to expect many hundreds or even thousands of scans to occur before pipe changes are recorded. However, because the scan is activated by the scanning software, emission and reception of the data is done by the permanently installed antennae, data is recorded automatically to a central PC by recording software, analysis software undertakes the basic analysis of the data and the system can issue regular plots and reports, the scanning frequency can be virtually continuous with the pipe reporting its condition somewhere along the pipe length all the time.

BEM Signal Emission & Reception

When it is time for the pipe to report its condition, the driving software MetCon[©], which resides on the central PC, will issue a command to the electronics to send a pulse to the transmitter in a specific antenna. The transmitter emits the signal which 'energizes' the pipe wall under inspection (underneath the transmitter foot print). In a number of milliseconds the receiver, also housed in the specific antenna, responds to the emitted signal and sends the received signal back to the electronics where the data is digitized and send over 10's, 100's or even 1,000's of feet of cable to the central PC to be recorded and stored. This is all run and managed with the aid of MetCon[©].

Data Processing & Analysis

When MetCon[©] receives and stores the recorded data on the central PC it proceeds to make a 'handshake' with MetProc[©], the processing software. During this 'handshake' the recorded data is passed over for processing. MetProc[©] processes and analyses the captured data against imbedded databases of known and recorded samples of the pipe material.

Data Plotting, Reporting & Management

The processed and analysed data is now ready to be reported on. This is achieved by a 'handshake' between MetProc[®] and the plotting and reporting software MetPlot[®]. When the processed and analyzed data is received, MetProc[®] can provide the data in a number of graphical plots or models. These can either be made available to the asset manager or archived and MetPlot[®] can be programmed to sound the alarm when the recoded, processed, analyzed and modelled BEM response approaches or reaches a predetermined level or value.

Accessible 24/7 from Anywhere

The Pipe Awareness System is fully integrated and automated allowing the use of BEM technology to scan pipeline infrastructure anywhere at any time without the need for human intervention. The associated MetCon[©], MetProc[©] and MetPlot[©] software activate the scanning process, record and process the captured data or analyze and report the results. All of this is done remote of the location where the scanning is taking place. The central PC can communicate the results via a cloud-based application that's accessible at any time, from any Web browser. You can instantly view the results and share them with colleagues, customers, suppliers, and partners. You can monitor pipe condition in real time on your smartphone or tablet, even if you're halfway around the world from the inspection site.

Scalable

Whether you are looking to monitor a 6" or 60" ferrous pipe, the empirical components of the system can be scaled to suit. No matter how many pipes of varying diameters you have, the

BEM system can be scaled up or down to meet your requirements. There's no limit to the number of antennae you can connect together at any location.

Conclusion & Summary

In order to meet today's demands for non-destructive, accurate, cost-effective methods of evaluation, a clear understanding of a broad range of NDT methodologies is essential to allow one to take advantage of what the technologies offer. Using existing, modified and new techniques, such as BEM, an appropriate and cost-effective assessment program can be designed to suit a range of under and above-ground pipes, conduits, tunnels, and other structures. BEM is now commonly applied to studying and assessing ferrous water main supply pipes, sewers and gas lines. It can be used in both surface, and in-pipe systems. One of the main benefits provided by this technique is its ability to survey *through* ferrous pipe external coatings or internal linings. To date, successful surveys have been conducted through coatings in excess of 4" thick.

Recent enhancements to the BEM technologies have also increased their sensitivity. New probe configurations for medium-large diameter pipes are becoming available as the inventory of probe increases allowing for detailed in-pipe inspections and the possibility to construct a project specific probe is there. A need to understand the condition of extensive pipeline assets at any given moment can be met by a BEM system having the attributes to allow for this. With years of global application in pipeline inspections this tested technique is now supported with software allowing for the scanning and data collection, processing, analysis and reporting of any pipe anywhere at any time.

It is now possible to equip a critical network with an inspection capability for pipelines to virtually report their bill of health, regardless of whether the asset owner or manager is on site or on the opposite side of the world. The time for 'THE INTERACTIVE PIPE' is here.

Paper No. 6

Pipe Condition and Earthquake Damage The Information That Is Not Currently Recorded

J R Black, Technical Principal, Pipeline Materials Opus International Consultants Ltd, Christchurch New Zealand Email: John.r.black@opus.co.nz

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-54, for a copy of presentation

6. Pipe Condition and Earthquake Damage The Information That Is Not Currently Recorded

J R Black, Technical Principal, Pipeline Materials, Opus International Consultants Ltd, Christchurch, New Zealand Email: John.r.black@opus.co.nz

Introduction

In the aftermath of any major earthquake event, there is immense pressure on utilities and their operators to make repairs and to get systems working again. At these times, pipe failure repairs are undertaken by multitudes of contractors, many totally unfamiliar with the normal procedures and record keeping. In the haste to make essential repairs and restore service, some unique opportunities to investigate pipe condition, cause of failure and failure modes can be lost. Also, little (if any) information is recorded, especially during the initial response phase.

The damaged pipes are loaded directly on trucks and consigned to landfill or they are stockpiled in random heaps for disposal. By then, it is usually too late to identify where they came from and impossible to tell what is earthquake damage and what is damage caused by excavation and repair works.

There is much valuable information on failure modes and cause of failure that can be gained from even a brief, informed examination of the failure as it is exposed and repairs are made. Photographic records of failures is generally poor and many photographs that are taken are out-of-focus and under-exposed.

This writer's opinion is that that with only minimal additional cost, a significant amount of valuable information could be recorded that could lead to improved designs and better selection of pipe materials and jointing systems. How this information can best be recorded appropriately is a subject for further research.

Detailed Examination of Failed Pipes & Fittings

Only a few Christchurch earthquake damaged pipes and fittings failures were examined and investigated in reasonable detail by the writer and no others carried out any of this work. The examinations that were undertaken showed that there were other significant contributing factors that resulted in failure, aside from the direct earthquake effects. These examinations also highlighted that many of the pipe failures that occurred could have been easily prevented and the amount of earthquake damage minimised.

These other factors include:

- The pipes were of poor quality and probably should never have escaped the manufacturer's quality assurance checking,
- The pipes have been poorly installed,
- The design did not have sufficient flexibility and allowance for differential movement.

Poor Installation Pipeline Inventory Records

When checking the details of failed pipelines in the GIS system (e.g. year installed, pipe material and recorded diameter), a number of anomalies were found which indicate a need to check and verify the GIS data. Even well managed networks can have significant numbers of anomalies in their asset records.

Earthquake response and recovery repair works provide a unique opportunity to gather information on large tracts of the piped networks over a relatively short period of time. Provided the repair data is complete, reliable and consistently recorded, the information can be used to confirm and/or revise the records.

All utilities have their own standard systems and forms, be they paper copy or in electronic format. The prime goal is to keep them simple and to minimize the amount of unnecessary data generated. Sometimes essential data is not recognized on the paper forms or when using electronic data capture, there may be insufficient fields for the range of information needed for out-of-the-ordinary issues.

It is not uncommon to find in pipeline inventory records that similar pipe materials are identified in many different ways. As an example, polyethylene pipes in New Zealand can be called up in GIS systems as any of the following; PE, HDPE, Alkathene, polythene, poly pipe, PE 80, PE 100. Sometimes these descriptors are "correct" (e.g. Alkathene [LDPE], PE 80 and PE 100) but more often than not, they are just different generic descriptors that have been used for PE pipe. Similar issues also exist for most of the other common pipe materials.

Therefore, an essential first step in rationalizing record keeping is to standardize on materials identification and making sure that staff have the training necessary to reliably record the information.

Pipe material identification can also be a source of problems. It is frequently assumed that it is easy to distinguish between the different pipe materials. Nothing could be further from the truth for many pipe types. Without appropriate training and experience it is easy to get-it-wrong and even experienced maintenance operators do not know the difference between some of the trickier pipe materials.

Some General Observations and Comments

Based on over 40 years of experience with piped network design, operation, maintenance, condition assessment and cause of failure investigations, it is the writer's opinion that:

- Field record forms are usually inadequate for dealing with anything that is out-of-theordinary and earthquake response and recovery work certainly falls into this category.
- When it comes to recording pipe failures (be they routine maintenance or emergency repairs) there is rarely a process in place to adequately record what happened or guidelines for retaining samples for future examination.
- Photographs of sufficient quality of the failed pipe or fitting are seldom taken.

- It is usually assumed that maintenance personnel fully understand all of the pipe materials in the networks they are maintaining and that they will make the right decisions without fail.
- Maintenance operators are usually under-valued and under-trained.
- There is an industry need (world-wide) to train key maintenance personnel in these areas:
 - Ways to reliably identify pipe materials,
 - How to record information gained from repair works,
 - Basic condition assessment principles, ,
 - How to decide when to take samples for expert examination,
 - How to package such samples for safe transit (if they need to be forwarded for assessment).

Research Needs

Improvements to processes for recording pipe failures can usually be made in even the "best" utility systems. A research program, carried out jointly with utilities asset management and maintenance personnel, would help to improve data capture as well as improving preparedness for the next earthquake emergency. The training needs for maintenance personnel (including the need for "refresher" coursed to keep up to date with new pipe materials and equipment) should also be considered.

The outcomes of this research would also benefit day-to-day operations and could be used to provide information for reliably updating and correcting asset inventory records as well as providing valuable resource material for future research.

Some of the aspects that the research could address include:

- Checking of asset inventories for reliability and consistency (by interrogating and challenging existing records).
- Rationalization of pipe descriptions in the inventory (eliminate multiple names for the same material).
- Confirmation of pipeline install dates (sometimes a default date is used in data entry and is rarely corrected).
- What information should be recorded by maintenance personnel? (Remember to keep it simple, so don't record unnecessary data).
- How should it be recorded? (Paper copy or electronic format).
- How much checking is necessary before changes to asset inventories should be made?
- How to set up appropriate systems to change incorrect records? (Consider who owns the data and who can make changes).
- Determine if maintenance personnel need additional training.
- Find out if suitable training courses are available and if not, it may be necessary to start your own using suitably experienced and qualified experts who understand all of the pipe materials.
- Identify who should be trained (e.g. leading hand, foreman, or overseer?)

Conclusions

By implementing the outcomes from such a research and improvement program, utilities should be able to keep better records of the next emergency. The knowledge available from better record keeping will also be useful for future earthquake damage research. Serious consideration should also be given to identifying appropriately experienced pipe experts (pipe whisperers) that can be used during the response and recovery phases to assist with the assessment of pipe condition and cause of failure.

Paper No. 7

Pipeline crisis: Why Research Matters

Neil S. Grigg, Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523 Email: <u>neilg@engr.colostate.edu</u>

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-67, for a copy of presentation

7. Pipeline crisis: Why Research Matters

Neil S. Grigg, Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523 Email: <u>neilg@engr.colostate.edu</u>

A crisis in pipelines?

If a crisis is a crucial situation or a turning point, then the slow-changing condition of pipelines may not qualify as one, but the term "creeping crisis" might apply because, if nothing is done to improve the overall condition of pipelines, the consequences will be significant. What would these consequences be? Increasing water main breaks, sewer failures, gas main explosions, and bursts in oil pipelines are a few examples. If you add up the potential consequences of inaction, the condition of pipelines is seen as needing attention to avoid undue risk to the public and environment and a buildup of financial commitments for future generations.

Whose job is it to fix this problem? Should it be by federal action, both by appropriations and regulations? Should it be local responsibility? What role should industry play? As in other infrastructure issues, it is really "all of the above" because the pipeline industry has many parts and scenarios.

Will research be useful to resolve the problem?

It will take a lot of money to make progress on this issue, but can research help as well? Some may argue that pipeline issues involve mainly practical problems and don't require research as much as they do good and skillful work. Others will say that pipelines are increasingly high tech and high risk, and that research is needed to push the envelope. Both answers will be correct, and therein is the riddle of pipeline research.

Pipeline research is like that in other fields which require complex equipment to meet multiple needs and requires attention to technology, management, materials, equipment, scenarios, rules and procedures, and risks. A few examples of these fields include medical research to develop tools and methods, product development and marketing, transportation systems to improve mobility, and social research to strengthen families. In all cases, the key issue is *integration* of discoveries and practice. It is really just an extension of the maxim that it is easy to develop ideas, but the hard part is putting them into practice and making a profit at it.

This also raises the question of whether pipeline research is basic or applied, comprises research *and* development, and is adequate along the spectrum of research-to-practice? To make research management adequate, what is the best model? Should it be government research? After all, the technology for the Internet was developed this way? Should it be academic research? Should it be industry cooperative research, as for example the WaterRF, WERF, or EPRI?

It is difficult to answer that question because pipeline research involves multiple players, including federal agencies, water and gas and oil associations, vendors who develop products and services, and consultants who seek improved tools to apply to client work, among others.

Trends in the organization of industry cooperative research

People have always studied problems to find solutions and better methods. The experiments of Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Edison with electricity should be known to every school child. However, as increasingly-complex technological problems emerged, it became clear that new approaches to the organization of research were required. One of these was the creation of the National Science Foundation, which followed World War II development of advanced weapons systems. Vannevar Bush's book *Science, the Endless Frontier* tells this story.

As a result of WWII research, the nation started to seek organized research approaches to other problems, such as in the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, which created a new intergovernmental research program. In that same decade, AWWA initiated its research foundation, now named the WaterRF, and the electric power industry was soon to launch EPRI, in 1973. EPA was created from existing programs in 1970, and its research program grew to embrace multiple media and regulatory missions. WERF came in 1989 to address water quality and related issues. The Gas Technology Institute was created by merger of the GRI, created in 1976, and the Institute of Gas Technology, which had been created in 1941. PHMSA was created in 2004. Clearly, these cooperative research programs, ventures and partnerships are continuing to emerge. What will be next? What kind of payoffs come from this approach to research?

It is difficult to pinpoint major advances, but areas of work familiar to me are asset management, causes of pipe breaks, corrosion mechanisms, surveys and inquiries about pipeline issues, tools for condition assessment, accounting methods for water losses, management frameworks, like "knowledge management," and BMPs, such as distribution systems optimization. While most of these involve synthesis of work, rather than fundamental new advances, they create knowledge and make it available to the pipeline community.

Is the knowledge useful? Some allege that researchers don't care about usefulness, and are unconcerned with messy details. The researchers might complain that practitioners ignore research and refuse to implement reforms, but the practitioners might counter by deriding the research as ivy tower. Is it a fundamental problem, or simply a misunderstanding? Given the divergent incentives of researchers and practitioners, the conclusion seems to be that it is fundamental and that research-practice gaps will be difficult, but important, to overcome. Of course, there are always technology agents, who see both the need for research and for its application.

Another important issue in cooperative industry research is competition. How do you juggle the tension between shared knowledge to advance the public interest and proprietary knowledge to advance the profit motive?

What to do?

If pipeline research can make a difference in mitigating problems and avoiding consequences, what should be done? Obviously, it depends on which industry and which role to play. In the case of the water industry, we see slow change but high stakes in public health and deferred maintenance. In oil and gas, we see aging infrastructure, environmental conflicts, and increasing networks of pipelines that track today's energy boom.

Depending on who you are, you must first determine the boundary conditions of the problems you address. As a researcher, mine are defined by areas where I might succeed in research. If you are a research organization, then the boundary conditions are formed by your industry and its major issues. In any case, we must identify problems clearly to find solutions.

Should we try to make it happen or let it happen? Whose job is it to figure that out? In any case, we must make a business case for our research programs by identifying the important problems, recruiting industry advocates, getting good researchers, and planning research-to-practice transitions.

Rather than a cost-benefit calculation, it will be success stories that carry the day. Champions are needed, like Harry Hopkins, who headed up FDR's WPA program. It is the job of research organizations to bridge the gaps and organize the advocacy.

At the end of the day, research matters because society depends on technology advancement. Pipeline work is a shared inter-industry activity for both profit and public good. It deals with many subjects, synthesis and basic work. It should be innovative but practical. To succeed we should foster cooperation and work through the challenges. It is important work and worth doing.

Paper No. 8

Integrity Management in Piping Infrastructure Systems

Ernest Lever, R&D Director, Infrastructure Gas Technology Institute, Des Plaines, IL 60018 Email: <u>Ernest.Lever@gastechnology.org</u>

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-81, for a copy of presentation

8. Integrity Management in Piping Infrastructure Systems

Ernest Lever, R&D Director, Infrastructure Gas Technology Institute, Des Plaines, IL 60018 Email: <u>Ernest.Lever@gastechnology.org</u>

GTI is the leading research, development and training organization addressing energy and environmental challenges to enable a secure, abundant, and affordable energy future. For more than 70 years, GTI has been providing added value to the natural gas industry and energy (nuclear water pipes) markets by developing technology-based solutions.

General

- GTI and its predecessor research institutes have been serving the gas market since 1941
- GTI commercialized over 500 products, provided over 750 licenses and produced over 1,200 patents

GTI Structure

- GTI research program is aligned with the industry's value chain from exploration to delivery infrastructure
- GTI has trained and certified over 60,000 energy professionals in gas distribution and transmission and in ASME nuclear water piping systems and others
- GTI has about 250 employees with 60% scientist and engineers and 44% with advanced degrees

GTI Focus on Piping Infrastructure and Integrity Management

- GTI customers include local distribution companies and the government agencies that regulate the activities of gas and nuclear water utilities.
- GTI has developed a full understanding of the performance characteristics of steels and plastics in:
 - Oil and gas gathering lines
 - Oil and gas transmission lines
 - Processed water lines
 - Gas distribution lines
 - Water lines in conventional and nuclear power plants.
- GTI continues to develop integrity management and risk assessment systems for all the above applications.

GTI Expertise in Polyethylene

- As early as 1952, GTI performed research on plastic pipe and on metal pipe for utility use.
- GTI published 237 reports and software packages on plastic pipe use in gas distribution systems (1997-2005).
- GTI was among the early drivers of advancement in polyethylene science along with Osaka Gas, Tokyo Gas, British Gas and Gaz de France.
- The gas industry focus on public safety and in-field failure modes of polyethylene lead to millions of dollars being channeled to research projects carried out by the above listed organizations.

- GTI research programs led to the full understanding of the behavior of Polyethylene materials and led to the continuous improvement and understanding of its material properties.
- Key to this understanding was the understanding of the Slow Crack Growth (SCG) failure mechanism and the development of the PENT test to quantify a polyethylene material's SCG resistance, all carried out under GTI research projects.
- All of the polyethylene knowledge developed by the gas industry has made its way into potable water applications through ASTM, ASME, ISO and AWWA standards.

Current State-of-the-art in Gas Piping Integrity Management

- Focus research programs on developing detailed understanding of the causal mechanisms in system failure
 - o Basic scientific research to understand the physics and chemistry
 - Intelligent use of existing data
 - o Develop probabilistic models for each failure mechanism
- Define the correct datasets needed to properly determine the likelihood of failure in the piping system



Figure 8.1. Datasets Needed to Properly Determine the Likelihood of Failure in the Piping System

- Rigorously address threat interactions
 - Develop proper calculus to properly combine multiple threat mechanisms acting simultaneously

- Combine consequences of failure with likelihood of failure to determine the risk associated with each section of the system



Figure 8.2. Threat Interaction Mechanisms

- Run scenario analysis to determine the most effective risk management strategy



Figure 8.3. Scenario Analysis to Determine the Most Effective Risk Management Strategy

Conclusions

- Balanced lifecycle management demands a full understanding of risk inherent in the system.
- Uncertainty needs to be explicitly addressed.
- Proper data needs to be collected.
- Intelligent probabilistic models are needed to support decision making processes in complex piping systems subject to multiple threats, constraints and sometimes conflicting objectives.

Paper No. 9

Pipeline Research Needs: Material Properties and Operational Surge in Pipeline Failures

Graham E.C. Bell, PhD, PE, HDR|Schiff, 431 W. Baseline Rd, Claremont, CA 91711 Email: <u>Graham.Bell@hdrinc.com</u>

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-91, for a copy of presentation

9. Pipeline Research Needs: Material Properties and Operational Surge in Pipeline Failures

Graham E.C. Bell, PhD, PE, HDR|Schiff, 431 W. Baseline Rd, Claremont, CA 91711 Email: <u>Graham.Bell@hdrinc.com</u>

Abstract

The forensics and investigations of pipe breaks focuses on strength of materials. Pipe breaks or failures have more to do with fracture mechanics and loading than is generally recognized in the industry. Pipeline design focuses on strength of materials and forensics assumes that material strength is a good predictor of material failure. This paper highlights the need to research and understand pipe materials, fracture mechanics and surge loading in order to understand and ultimately prevent pipeline breaks and failures.

Pipe Failures/Breaks and Material Properties

Pipelines leak, blowout, or catastrophically fail when the mechanical/structural demands of the system exceed the mechanical/structural capacity of the pipeline at the time when the leak or blowout occurs. When a pipeline is new, catastrophic failures are not common because design practices use known design conditions along with engineering safety factors to insure that capacity exceeds demand when the pipeline is fabricated and installed. By definition, prior to the failure, the capacity always exceeded demand. Over time, both demand and capacity change. Damage to the pipeline during installation, operation, and interaction with the internal and external environments accumulates over time and reduces pipe capacity. Damage accumulation as a function of time reduces capacity of the system.

Demand generally increases with community development and time. We demand more of our aging pipes and infrastructure as the age. Capacity decreases as material properties and condition deteriorate due to environmental and operational degradation mechanisms. For example, from the soil environment, corrosion removes sound metal and reduces the mechanical/structural capacity of the pipeline where the corrosion occurs. From the operation standpoint (depending on the pipe material), pressure transients, spikes, or surges can result in damage accumulation and reduction of mechanical/structural capacity.

Many engineers make the assumption that material strength relates to pipeline failure or breaks. Strength of materials is useful for design purposes, but not necessarily to predict failure. In design, the "material strength" of a material is reduced by the factor safety to give the design allowable stress. The assumption is that the factor of safety contains sufficient margin to prevent failure of the system during its lifetime. However, the time dependent failure of pipes is due to the non-uniform accumulation of damage which reduces the local capacity of the pipe. Whether loss of local capacity results in eventual failure is determined by the fracture mechanics and the properties of the pipe material.

Fracture mechanics is the field of mechanics concerned with the study of the propagation of cracks in materials. It uses methods of analytical solid mechanics to calculate the driving force

on a crack and those of experimental solid mechanics to characterize the material's resistance to fracture and failure.

Fracture mechanics was developed during World War I to explain the failure of brittle materials. Experiments on glass fibers suggested that the fracture stress increases as the fiber diameter decreases. Hence the uniaxial tensile strength, which had been used extensively to predict material failure, could not be a specimen-independent material property. A.A. Griffith suggested that the low fracture strength observed in experiments, as well as the size-dependence of strength, was due to the presence of microscopic flaws in the bulk material.

Cast iron (CI) is a brittle material. Cl is a more brittle material compared to steel or ductileiron pipe materials. Brittle materials are not necessarily "weak" or lacking in strength. That is to say that when uniaxial tension is applied in a uniform fashion, the stress required to failure the material is not necessarily small by comparison to other materials. However, the amount of energy (force times displacement) required is much less than other more ductile/less brittle materials. There are two primary types of breaks that occur on CI pipe, so called beam or "circular" breaks and longitudinal splits or breaks. The type and morphology of each type of break is consistent with the loading and brittle failure characteristics of the material. Fundamentally, cracks propagate perpendicular to the applied stress. For a circular break, the applied stress is vertical (beam loading) and the crack will propagate circumferentially around the pipe creating a circular profile.

For steel pipe, the material properties are such that beam breaks are much less likely, since the thin and flexible steel pipe wall tends to locally buckle (rather than cause a circumferential crack to form and propagate). When steel pipe loses vertical support, the pipe defects from a circle to an oval and then eventually locally buckles and may "pull away" from rivets or push on type joints. In general, steel pipes do not suffer from circular beam breaks.

Longitudinal splits or breaks are the result of internal radial pressure resulting in longitudinal crack growth from an initiating flaw location. For cast iron, as for any brittle material, a critical flaw or initiation site is needed along with corresponding stress intensity. Internal pressure generates radial stresses, which once above the critical stress intensity cause longitudinal crack growth. Flaws are initially due to casting imperfections which do not change over time. Corrosion is not uniform and external corrosion flaw sizes increase over time and eventually reach critical flaw size and limit pipe life.

The same general morphology of longitudinal splits applies to steel pipe breaks. In general, thinning of the steel usually due to external or internal corrosion creates an initial flaw. Internal pressure provides radial stress that propagates along the longitudinal crack. However, steel is usually not a brittle material so the crack propagates a short distance and then runs out of energy. The process is repeated over time until stresses build up locally or, due to operations or surges, allow further propagation and eventual failure.

Although some research has been done on fracture mechanics and tolerance of pipe line materials (Ivanova, 1978; Habibian, 1994; Atkinson et al., 2002), more is need to relate the

microscopic material conditions to the macroscopic behavior observed as individual leaks and patterns of breaks in systems (Agbenowosi, 2000; Andreou, 1986; Bardet, et al., 2010).



Figure 9.1. Vertical Loading and Loss of Pipe Support Leads to Circular or Circumferential Break in Cast Iron Pipe

Surge and Pipe Failures

Similar to the assumption that material strength is sufficient to understand failures there is a general belief that pressures and loads inside and outside of pipes are constant and that surge is an aberration. Typical water industry instrumentation has insufficient temporal response to accurately record surge events. Within the last 10 years, rapid response transient pressure monitoring systems have been developed to give pipeline operators detailed information about transient pressures within a pipeline. Allowing operational impacts to be noted and could be used in conjunction with other pipeline monitoring systems to prevent accumulation of pipeline damage (Stroeble et al., 2010). Research, development and implementation of these monitoring technologies may be our best program for understanding and ultimately mitigating pipeline breaks and failures.


Figure 9.2. Internal Pressure Increase and/or Surge Leads to Longitudinal Crack Propagation from Corrosion Flaw in Cast Iron Pipe



Figure 9.3. Longitudinal Split of Rivet Steel Pipe



Figure 9.4. Surge Events due to Valve Closing on Prestressed Concrete Cylinder Pipe

References

- Agbenowosi, N. 2000. "Mechanist Analysis Based on Descision Support System for Scheduling Optimal Pipeline Replacement," *Ph.D. Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.* Blacksburg, VA.
- Andreou, S.A., D.H. Marks and R.M. Clark, 1986. "Predictive models for pipe break failures and their implications on maintenance planning strategies for deteriorating water distribution systems," *Ph.D. Dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology*. Cambridge, MA.
- Atkinson, K., J.T. Whiter, P.A. Smith and M. Mulheron. 2002. "Failure of Small Diameter Cast Iron Pipes," Urban Water, 4, p. 263.
- Bardet J.P., D. Ballantyne, G. Bell, A. Donnellan, S. Foster, T. Fu, S. Foster, J. List, R. G. Little, S. Palmer, and T. D. O'Rourke, 2010. "Expert Review of Water System Buried Pipe Breaks in the City of Los Angeles." USC Center on Megacities, Sonny Astani Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering Viterbi School of Engineering, University of Southern California.
- Habibian, A. 1994. "Effects of temperature on water main breaks," ASCE Journal of Transportation Engineering, Vol. 120, No. 2, pp. 312-321.
 Ivanova, N.G. 1978. "Resistance to Fracture of Gray Cast Iron Pipe," Metallovenenie I Termischeskaya Obrabotka Metallov, No. 7, pp. 25-28.
- Stroeble, A., G.E.C. Bell, and P. Paulson. 2010. "PCCP Damage During Depressurization/Pressurization Cycles," Proceedings of ASCE Pipelines Conference, Keystone, CO.



Staged Construction Modeling of a Large Diameter Steel Pipe Using 3-D Nonlinear Finite Element Analysis

Ali Abolmaali, Mojtaba Salehi Dezfooli, Mohammad Razavi

Author did not submit the paper

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-100, for a copy of presentation

10. Staged Construction Modeling of a Large Diameter Steel Pipe Using 3-D Nonlinear Finite Element Analysis

Ali Abolmaali, Mojtaba Salehi Dezfooli and Mohammad Razavi The University of Texas at Arlington, TX, 76019 Email: <u>abolmaali@uta.edu</u>

Studying the pipe behavior during backfilling is one of the priorities before designing and installing pipelines. Design limitations are introduced by American Water Works Association (AWWA) for flexible and rigid pipes. These limitations are for both service and ultimate designs. Several backfill and embedment material are used in different conditions. Estimating pipe behavior in different backfill conditions during installation is an essential task to accomplish.

This study, in general, targets prediction of the performance of a steel pipe during backfilling and after the installation, using developed Finite Element Analysis model. Thus far, the results of developed FEM model for different trench condition show that the FEM model can predict the behavior of the steel pipe in field test.

Several steel pipes were instrumented and installed in soil box (rigid trench) to evaluate the pipe behavior. Then the FEM model was developed using the data obtained from soil box tests. The FEM analysis algorithm considered material, geometric, and contact nonlinearities. The material non-linearity consisted of elasto-plastic constitutive law for steel. The geometric nonlinearity included the large deformation analysis for soil and steel pipe materials. Finally, the contact nonlinearity included the contact elements used at the interface between the pipe and soil and different soil layers during sequential layered construction. The analysis algorithm accommodated the time dependent response of soil-pipe model. This was done by using scaled mass dynamic analysis through total Lagrangian formulation.

Based on the results, three field tests (flexible trench) were designed with different trench width and backfill material. The developed FEM model successfully predicted the field test results. Ultimately, the essential design parameters selected for sensitivity study and the developed FEM model will be used to generate different trench and backfilling condition to evaluate pipes performance. The results of sensitivity study will be used to develop design equations and nomographs for different conditions.

Future Conveyance System and Asset Management Research Needs through the LIFT Program

Walter Graf, Program Director, Infrastructure Management Water Environment Research Foundation Alexandria, VA Email: <u>wgraf@werf.org</u>

Author did not submit the paper

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-149, for a copy of presentation

Water Conveyance Infrastructure Research Needs: An EPA/ORD Perspective

Michael D. Royer, Physical Scientist, Urban Watershed Management Branch, Water Supply & Water Resources Division National Risk Management Research Laboratory U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Edison, NJ 08837 Email: <u>Royer.michael@epa.gov</u>

Author did not submit the paper

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-160, for a copy of presentation

Energy Pipeline Challenges & Related Research

Robert Smith, Research Program Manager, U.S. DOT/PHMSA Email: <u>robert.w.smith@dot.gov</u>

Author did not submit the paper

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-171, for a copy of presentation

Pipeline Corrosion Prevention What is Needed?

James A. Hart, Program Manager NACE International Oil & Gas Industry Email: jim.hart@nace.org

Author did not submit the paper

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-184, for a copy of presentation

Pipeline Research Needs for Future Practice Improvement-A Designer's Perspective

Sri Rajah, Ph.D., P.E., P.Eng., M.ASCE, HDR Engineering, Inc., Chair, Pipeline Location & Installation Technical Committee Email: <u>sri.rajah@hdrinc.com</u>

Author did not submit the paper

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-187, for a copy of presentation

Development of Asset Management Certification and a Living Lab

Dr. Tom Iseley, P.E., Professor, Purdue School of Engineering & Technology, IUPUI Chair, Buried Asset Management Institute-International Email: <u>dtiseley@iupui.edu</u>

Author did not submit the paper

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-195, for a copy of presentation

14th International Trenchless Technology Research Colloquium Lab

Dr. Mark Knight, University of Waterloo Centre for Advancement of Trenchless Technologies Email: <u>maknight@uwaterloo.ca</u>

Author did not submit the paper

Refer to Appendix A, Page A-202 for a copy of presentation

Appendices

Appendix A

Presentations













































































Comparative analysis of the three proposals			Proposal 3 has the optimal effect!
Occupation of land	Proposal 1 truck-only ground road	Proposal 2 underground truck-only road	Proposal 3 underground logistic system
Occupation of land	Total area: 728,000 m² ① ground road: 128,000 m² ② Truck marshalling yard: 500,000 m² ③ Truck waiting zone: 100,000 m²	Total area: 704,000 m ² ① ground road: 104,000 m ² ② Truck marshalling yard: 500,000 m ² ③ Truck waiting zone: 100,000 m ²	Total area: 304,000 m² ① ground road: 104,000 m² ② Truck marshalling yard: 100,000 m² ③ Truck waiting zone: 100,000 m²
Environmental impact	Big environmental impact (1) Exhaust gas, vibration and noise from trucks will impact greatly on CBD (2) Annual carbon emissions of 89000t (3) impact on the goal of building a national low-carbon CBD	median environmental impact (1) lower impact on CBD (2) Annual carbon emissions of 89000t (3) impact on the goal of building a national low-carbon CBD	Lowest environmental impact ① No impact on CBD ② The near-term annual carbon emissions of 58000t ③ impact will be negligible given high carge containerization in the long run.
Efficiency	Low	Low	High
Investment (unit: hundred million yuan)	0.82	6.69	11.91
Risk	High operating risk, low technical, organizational management risk	High operating risk, low technical, organizational management risk	High technical, organizational management risk, low operating risk






































ipelines and Trenchless Construction & Renewals: A Global Perspective June 22, 2013, Ft Worth, TX



ASCE PIPELINE RESEARCH NEEDS SYMPOSIUM INTERNAL CORROSION CASE B

WHAT WENT WRONG

- Low flow conditions and lack of pigging allow water to build up and bacteria to harbor
- Low flow conditions prevent chemicals intended to kill bacteria and inhibit corrosion from being spread throughout the pipeline

Preventive Activities

- Follow a pigging program
- Follow a chemical injection program

Mitigation Method

- Pipe replacement
- Reduced MAOP and hydrotest to confirm fitness for service





pelines and Trenchless Construction & Renewals: A Global Perspective June 22, 2013, Ft Worth, TX



ASCE PIPELINE RESEARCH NEEDS SYMPOSIUM **EXTERNAL CORROSION** WHAT WENT WRONG • Most joint weld coatings fail due to issues with preparation of pipe, training of personnel, or lack of inspection Could be due to hydrogen gas building up • because joints are coated too quickly **Preventive Activities** • Training on coating application • Inspection of applied coating

Mitigation Method

• Clockspring composite wrap See: Joint Weld Coating Advisory Bulletin



ipelines and Trenchless Construction & Renewals: A Global Perspective June 22, 2013, Ft Worth, TX









Pipelines and Trenchless Construction & Renewals: A Global Perspective June 22, 2013, Ft Worth, TX









Pipelines and Trenchless Construction & Renewals: A Global Perspective June 22, 2013, Ft Worth, TX

































































































































































































































































































































GEOMETRIC, MATERIAL, AND CONTACT NONLINEARITIES GEOMETRIC NONLINEARITY ${}^{b}_{s}S_{ij} : 2^{nd}$ Piola Kirchhoff Stress Tensor ${}^{b}_{i}\tau_{ij} : cauchy Stress Tensor$ ${}^{b}_{o}\tau_{ij} : Physical Stress Tensor$ ${}^{b}_{o}S_{ij} = \frac{{}^{o}\rho}{{}^{b}\rho} X_{i,m} \tau_{mn} X_{j,n}$ FOR ISOTROPIC MATERIAL: ${}^{b}C_{ijrs} = \lambda \delta_{ij} \delta_{rs} + \mu (\delta_{ir} \delta_{js} + \delta_{is} \delta_{jr})$ λ AND μ ARE LAMÉ CONSTANTS: $\lambda = \frac{E}{(1 + \nu)(1 - 2\nu)} \quad \mu = \frac{E}{2(1 + \nu)}$ Pipelines and Trenchless Construction & Renewals: A Global Perspective June 22, 2013, Ft Worth, TX

$$\begin{array}{c} \hline \textbf{GEOMETRIC, MATERIAL, AND CONTACT}\\ \hline \textbf{NONLINEARITIES} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{LARGE DEFORMATION} \\ \textbf{For Total Lagrangian:} \\ \int_{o_V} {}_{o}C_{ijrs - o}e_{rs} \, \delta_o e_{ij} \, d^o V + \int_{o_V} {}_{o}^t S_{ij} \, \delta_o \eta_{ij} \, d^o V = {}^{t+\Delta t}R - \int_{o_V} {}_{o}^t S_{ij} \, \delta_o e_{ij} \, d^o V \\ \textbf{For Updated Lagrangian:} \\ \int_{t_V} {}_{t}C_{ijrs - t}e_{rs} \, \delta_t e_{ij} \, d^t V + \int_{t_V} {}_{t}^t S_{ij} \, \delta_t \eta_{ij} \, d^t V = {}^{t+\Delta t}R - \int_{t_V} {}^{t}\tau_{ij} \, \delta_t e_{ij} \, d^t V \\ \textbf{Material Nonlinearity Only (M.N.O):} \\ \int_{V} C_{ijrs} \, \Delta e_{rs} \, \delta e_{ij} \, dV = {}^{t+\Delta t}R - \int_{V} {}^{t+\Delta t}e_{ij} \, \delta e_{ij} \, dV \end{array}$$

Pipelines and Trenchless Construction & Renewals: A Global Perspective June 22, 2013, Ft Worth, TX

GEOMETRIC, MATERIAL, AND CONTACT
NONLINEARITIESLARGE DEFORMATIONIf explicit time integration is considered:For TL: $tR = \int_{oV} tS_{ij} \delta_{0}^{t} \varepsilon_{ij} d^{o}V$ For TL: $tR = \int_{vV} tT_{ij} \delta_{0} \varepsilon_{ij} d^{v}V$ For UL: $tR = \int_{V} tT_{ij} \delta_{0} \varepsilon_{ij} d^{t}V$ For M.N.O: $tR = \int_{V} t\sigma_{ij} \delta e_{ij} dV$ Pipelines and Trenchless Construction & Renewals: A Global Perspective June 22, 2013, Ft Worth, TX











MATERIAL NONLINEARITY FOR STEEL						
YIELD CRITERIA:						
	${}^{t}F({}^{t}\sigma_{ij}-{}^{t}k)=0 \Rightarrow$					
${}^t\sigma_{ij}$ = Current Stress State tk = Function of Plastic Strain	THUS, ^T F=0 THROUGH PLASTIC DEFORMATION					
FLOW RULE						
	$de^P = {}^t \lambda \frac{\partial G}{\partial \sigma_{ii}}$					
G: POTENTIAL FUNCTION	*					
If $G(\sigma_{ij}) = {}^tF$	$de^{P} = {}^{t}\lambda \frac{\partial {}^{t}F}{\partial \sigma_{ij}}$					
HARDENING RULE						
 ISOTROPIC HARDENING KINEMATIC HARDENING COMBINED HARDENING 						
Pipelines and Trenchless Construct	tion & Renewals: A Global Perspective June 22, 2013, Ft Worth, TX					



























SOIL BOX TESTS SPECIFICATIONS						
	TEST 1					
		· PFA GRAVEI				
			-			
		TO 14: ORDINARY B	ACKFILL SC	DIL		
		GE. I LA GRAVEL				
	EDD	IADV OF TECT DECID TO 5				
	Summe location	D	B6	B6	B6	
% Lime added		Control (0% lime)	6% lime treated	3% cement+10 % fly ash treated		
		MDD*, pcf	108.1	98.6	105.6	
ENGINEERING TESTS	Standard Proctor	OMC** (%)	16.2	19.0	17.0	
	UU Triaxial	Undrained Cohesion, C _n , kPa	98.0 (14.5)	160 (23.2)	220 (31.9)	
		Angle of internal friction, o	8.1°	25.8°	36.9°	
	UCS	Unconfined compression strength, kPa	156.6 (22.7)	425.0 (61.7)	725.0 (105)	
ELASTIC MODULUS, kPa	Confining pressure = 50 kPa		3900 (565.6)	24492.3 (3552.4)	150,000.4 (21755.6)	
	Confining	g pressure = 100 kPa	4350 (630.9)	53963.9 (7826.9)	175,000.0 (25381.6)	
	Confining pressure = 150 kPa		4530 (657.03)	53101.3 (7701.8)	229,166.7 (33237.8)	
All values in paranthesis an * MDD is Maximum dry d ** OMC is Optimum mois * SOIL	re in psi units ensity ture content SPECIFICATIONS FROM	M GEOTECHNICAL REPORT				


































































































Pipelines and Trenchless Construction & Renewals: A Global Perspective June 22, 2013, Ft Worth, TX


















































































COTTO All Pipeline Sys Reported Cause of Incident	SIO stems:	n: Corro %	Sion In Fatalities	cident	Details: 19 Property Damage	92-2011 % of Property Damage
EXTERNAL CORROSION	797	7.7%	10	69	\$329,645,057	5.9%
INTERNAL CORROSION	753	7.3%	13	6	\$222,118,708	3.9%
UNSPECIFIED CORROSION	291	2.8%	1	11	\$8,340,845	0.1%
Total:	1,841	17.9%	24	86	\$560,104,610	10.0%
			12163	Carlor and Carlor		
				1		











Prog	ram Objec	tives
Developing Technology	Strengthening Consensus Standards	Promoting Knowledge
ostering the levelopment of new echnologies so that opeline operators can mprove safety performance and nore effectively address regulatory equirements.	Targeting and feeding new knowledge into the process of keeping standards relevant to their purpose.	Generating and promoting general knowledge to decision makers.



ASCE PIPELINE NEEDS ST Performa	RESEA YMPOS		ecord (since 2002)
Event Type	Events Held	Stakeholders Reached	Fostering Development of New Technologies
Blue Ribbon Panel	2	39	Number of projects developing new technology: 70
Gov/Industry R&D Forums	5	995	Number of tech developments now in the commercial market: 20 Number of projects demonstrating new technologies: 38
Interagency Coordination Meetings	13	101	Number of U.S./Foreign Patent applications resulting from projects: 19
R&D Workshops/Conferences	14	2135	
Safety Advisory Committees	1	30	Strengthening Regulatory Requirements and Consensus Standards
Website Usage Metric Measure Total Number of Hits 17,535,705 Average Number of Hits/Month 147,358 Files Downloaded (since 1/01/2008) 996,975			Number of projects strengthening new/revised Industry Standards: 63 Number of project results used to revise Consensus Standards: 4 Number of Consensus Standards revised by project results: 3 Number of projects addressing NTSB Recommendations: 8 Promoting Knowledge for Decision Makers Number of projects promoting knowledge to decision makers: 128
Logic modeling us to determine best	ed		Number of final reports publicly available: 142 Number of conference/journal papers presented: 80 Performance metrics all
attainable & susta metrics	inable	e htti	publically available at: ps://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/rd/performance.htm -17 -

ASCE PIPELINE R	ESEARCH NPOSIUM					
Research	Knowledge Is Shared!					
Researcher Name	Project Title					
1. Stress Engineering Services	Deepwater GOM Pipeline Damage Characteristics & Repair Options					
2. Edison Welding Institute, Inc.	Advanced Welding Repair and Remediation Methods for In-Service Pipelines					
3. Battelle Memorial Institute	A New Approach to Control Running Fracture in Pipelines					
4. Pipeline Research Council International	Pipeline Integrity Management for Ground Movement Hazards					
5. Battelle Memorial Institute	Integrity Management for Wrinklebends and Buckles					
6. Battelle Memorial Institute	Model Modules to Assist Assessing and Controlling Stress Corrosion Cracking					
Wow! Final reports for these projects were collectively downloaded over 15,000 times from the PHMSA website. We've been tracking this information since January 2008 with over 996,000 downloads via all facets of our program website - https://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/rd/						

Pipelines and Trenchless Construction & Renewals: A Global Perspective June 22, 2013, Ft Worth, TX





































ASCE PIPELIN CONFEE Pipelines and Trench	RENCE less Construction & Renewals: A Global Perspective						
Uncoordinated Research	 Inconsistent and material specific design approaches, standards, and guidelines. Results in Unnecessary Confusion for Practicing Engineers Extremely Difficult to Develop, Maintain and Update Design, Construction and O&M Standards and Guidelines. 						
Undocumented Research	 Lack of Research Funds for Adequate Documentation Inadequate or No Documentation Failure to Disseminate Lost Data and Documentation Intentional Withholding of Information To Gain Competitive Advantage 						
Reluctance to Improve Design Practices	 Until a Widespread Issue is Recognized 						
Passive Approach to Codes/Standards Development	Lack of Proactive Practice Improvements						
ASCE PIPELINES 2013 Pre	ASCE PIPELINES 2013 Prepared for Teaching & Educational Purposes Only; No Other Use Permitted 5						



Inconsis	CONF	NES 2013 RENCE	cification	Systemas	for pe	Installat	on
				SOIL DESCR	IPTION		
		Crushed Stone or Rock	Coarse Grained Soil (Little or No Fines)	Coarse Grained Soil with Fines	Fine Grained Soil (Low Plasticity)	Fine Grained Soil (High Plasticity)	Organic Silt, Clay, Peat
STD. SOIL CLASSIFICATION	USCS (1)	GW, GP	GW, GP, SW, SP	GM, GC, SM, SC	ML, CL	MH, CH	OL,OH, PT
SYSTEMS	AASHTO ⁽²⁾		A1, A3	A2, A4, A6	A2, A4, A6	A5, A7	A5, A7
ASTM	D2321	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class V
STANDARDS	C1479		Category I	Category II	Category II/III	Category IV	Category IV
STANDARDS	D2774		Gravels & Sands	Sands & Gravels			
ASCE DESIGN MANUALS	ASCE 15-98 (3)		Gravelly Sand	Sandy Silt, Silty Clay	Sandy Silt, Silty Clay	Silty Clay	
	M9 (Concrete)		Category I	Category II	Category III	Category III	
	M11 (Steel)		GW, GP, SW, SP	GM, GC, SM, SC	ML, CL	MH, CH	OL,OH, PT
AWWA DESIGN	M23 (PVC)	SC1	SC2	SC3	SC4	SC5	SC5
MANUALS ⁽⁴⁾	M41 (DIP)		Clean Sand, Clean Gravel	Coh-Gran, Sand Silt	Clay 2, Silt 2	Clay1, Silt 1	
	M45 (Fiberglass)	SC1	SC2	SC3	SC4	SC5	SC5
	M55 (HDPE)	Crushed rock	GW,GP, SW,SP	GM,GC, SM,SC	CL,ML, ML-CL	СН, МН, СН-МН	
NOTES: 1. Unified Soil Classi 2. AASHTO Soil Classi 3. As described in A3 4. Manuals of water	NOTES: 1. Unified Soil Classification System, as described in ASTM D 2487 2. AASHTO Soil Classification System, as described in AASHTO M145. 3. As described in ASCE 15-98. 4. Manuals of water supply practices published by AWWA.						

	2013 MGEvable	Lateral S	of Ben	ng Pizess	ne (hst)	R.A.
Soil Type	M-9 ⁽¹⁾ Concrete	M-11 ⁽²⁾ Steel	M-23 ⁽³⁾ PVC	M-41 ⁽³⁾ DIP	M-45 ⁽³⁾ Fiberglass	M-55 ⁽⁴ HDPE
Muck, Peat	(1)	(2)	0	0	0	(4)
Soft Clay	(1)	(2)	500	1,000	1,000	(4)
Silt	(1)	(2)	-	1,500	1,500	(4)
Sandy Silt	(1)	(2)	-	3,000	3,000	(4)
Sand	(1)	(2)	1,000	4,000	4,000	(4)
Sand and Gravel	(1)	(2)	1,500	-	-	(4)
Sandy Clay	(1)	(2)	-	6,000	6,000	(4)
Sand and Gravel with Clay	(1)	(2)	2,000	-	-	(4)
Sand and Gravel Cemented with Clay	(1)	(2)	4,000	-	-	(4)
Hard Pan (clay)	(1)	(2)	5,000	9,000	9,000	(4)
0tes: 1. Based on knowledge of local soil conditions. Factor of Safety of 1.0. 2. To be determined from field tests by qualified geotechnical engineers. Factor of Safety of 1.0. 3. Factor of Safety of 1.5. 4. Thrust blocks do not resist pullout and are not a substitute for external mechanical restraint.						
ASCE PIPELINES 2013 Prepared	for Teaching & E	ducational Pur	poses Only; No	Other Use Perm	itted	8

ASCE O PIPELINES 2013stionable still President Strategy of Design					
Pipelines and Trench	struction &	Renewals	CRIPTION	al Perspective	
		Friction Angle Phi (degrees)	Cohesion c (psf)	Unit Weight (pcf)	Modulus Soil Reaction [!] (psi)
STD. SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS	USCS ⁽¹⁾		GW, GP,	, SW, SP	
	M9 (Concrete)	48	0	140	N/A
	M11 (Steel)	?	?	?	1600 – 2500 (Depends on Cover)
	M23 (PVC)	31 - 35	0	110	3000
AWWA DESIGN MANUALS	M41 (DIP)	36	0	100	500 (Reflects installation conditions)
	M45 (Fiberglass)	?	?	?	1415- 5000 ¹ (Depends on Cover)
	M55 (HDPE)	?	?	118-150	1600 – 2500 (Depends on Cover)
NOTES: ¹ . Constrained soil Modulus for M45;					
ASCE PIPEUNES 2013 Prepared for Teaching & Educational Purposes Only; No Other Use Permitted 9					





































	ELINE RESEARCH DS SYMPOSIUM	
	Buried	AMIL-I Asset Management Institute - International
• 2003	BAMI	COA-DWM
• 2004	BAMI-I	BOD
• 2006	BAMI-I	EPA Grant
• 2008	BAMI-I	Completes grant
• 2010	BAMI-I	Launches CTAM
• 2013	BAMI-I	Launches CTAM 200




















Pressure Pipelines INSPECTION TECHNOLOGIES

Acoustic correlation

- External and Internal
- Leaks
- Wall thickness
- Impact Echo -> Internal
- CCTV -> Internal
- Eddy Current -> Internal
 - Wire Break
 - Wall thickness
- Broadband electromagnetics
 - External
 - Pipe wall thickness

- Ultrasound
 - External and internal
 - Wall thickness
- Laser -> Internal and External
- Infrared Thermography
 - Leak Detection External
 - Thermal changes
- JD7 Wachwater
- Long range guided ultrasonics
- Pure Smart ball
- Pure/WRc Sahara

UNIVERSITY OF







Pressure Pipelines Technologies -> Rehab/Renovation	
 Nonstructural Improve water quality cement epoxy coating fast setting polymers 	 Structural CIPP, fold and form, close fit, loose fitting liners Carbon fiber Hose liners Spray in place? Grout in place (MainSaver)? Melt in place? Aqualiner Sliplining (grouted and non-grouted)
	UNIVERSITY OF































Appendix B

Breakout Sessions

Session 1 Breakout Report Pipeline Failures

Group Leader - Mr. John Black

Students

- 1. Andrew Makardetsh
- 2. Milad Haneen
- 3. Nick Spinden
- 4. Jacob Elias
- 5. Alex Rafiqui
- 6. Claudio Segovia
- 7. Jay Bui
- 8. Quadri Akamo
- 9. Espinosa S. McDonald
- 10. Pizarro
- 11. J. Ramirez

Kick-off Points

- Construction related failures.
- Broken strands on prestressed concrete pipes.

Terms of Failures

- Most are slow leaks.
- Few blow outs due to corrosion.

Causes

- Drilling rigs
- Uninformed contractors
- Poor inspection

PVC Not Used in US

- Has a property that degrades and burns below processing temperature.
- High cost for large PVC.
- Expected life of PVC 50 years (?)
- In service in Germany before war.

Pipe Failure due to Series of Interacting Situations

- Need data, training, observation of known environments which cause failure.

HDPE up to 36"

- Joints on Cast Iron pipes (Concerns)
- Barrel of Pipe is in good condition.
- Could be used substitute during war.
- Lead was used for productions

Where do Failures Start?

- Point of Stress Concentration
 - Defects
 - Oxidation layers
 - What causes that point of stress concentration?

What are Long-term Effects on Composite Pipe?

PVC is not manufactured to be very tough in the US

- Manufacturers do not identify what happen and try to prevent it.
- Manufacturing can introduce inclusions such as dirty resin, burnt carbon.

Cast Iron Made Thinner Over the Years

- Reduce variance in quality.
- Reduce likelihood with defect.
- Strength improvement but fight on corrosion not imposed.
- Contractors not treating pipes well during installation.

Session 2 Breakout Report Pipeline Inspection and Monitoring

Group Leader - Mr. Gerhard Muenchmeyer

Students

Xiangjie Kong Jim Geisbash Neil Gaukstad Charles Herchis Marin Roubal Gen Nielsen Kelly Wood Alex Rafqui

Inspection and Monitoring

- MR
 - Elbows and reducers are weak points. Good reason to monitor the weak points first.
- Sensors on Fittings

Currently being done on a gas line in Western Australia. Could be done on water pipelines. Linked in through cellular networks.

- Kong

Technology is available for pipe inspection. The challenge is getting the equipment in the pipe. Delivery vehicle, as well.

- Failure mode of different types of pipe to help choose appropriate technology
- Categorize infrastructure
- EPA and the trades need to come up with some standard terminology, reporting etc.

Session 3 Breakout Report Pipelines Materials, Corrosion and Biofilm

Group Leader - Mr. Frank Blaha

Students

- 1. Inigo Azofra
- 2. Leonardo Pena
- 3. Omar Pena
- 4. Eduardo Reyes
- 5. Divyashree Divyashree
- 6. Michelle C Sherman
- 7. Franklin Cheng
- 8. Carlos Saldana
- 9. Rodolfo Guerra
- 10. Edie Lopez Humberto
- 11. Johnson Alejandro
- 12. Pino Bravo
- Polyurethane and other new corrosion coatings add to long-term performance. Degradation of coatings is expensive to UV. How sensitive: Just put on thicker?
- Standard and Accepted Protocol for Accelerated Life-span testing of Corrosion Coatings Materials.
- Longevity: Assessment and design factors, case studies for new pipe materials and liner materials.
 - Basic performance
 - Thrust resistant
 - Deterioration resistant for GRP, CIPP, SIPP Liners
- CML life extension and composition modes for improved life extension/ biofilm control.
- Biofilm work impacts corrosion, pumping costs, control measures

Session 4 Breakout Report Pipeline Asset Management and Sustainability

Group Leader - Dr. Tom Iseley

Students

- 1. Laura Villa
- 2. Eric Rocha
- 3. Chetan Patel
- 4. David Trejo
- 5. Bryson Ewing
- 6. Charles Kist
- 7. Mahran Zatar
- 8. Reece Bierhalter

GAPS

- Cost to Implement Asset Management Program
 - Need backing from upper management.
 - At what point is it more cost effective to just replace?
 - See WRF study.
 - Rehab initiative is 47% to total system replacement.
- Risk Reduction and Reducing Negligence Claims
- How to Pay for Rehabilitation Costs?
- Cost for Asset Management
- Making a Decision what to rehabilitate
 - 3600 assets
 - 240 year life cycle
 - Replacement
 - 4% of replacement cost to conduct
- Occur to inform
- Negligence
- Driver Emergency
- Non Preventive Water
 - TX negative water audit annually
- Standards for Reliability
 - Cannot benchmark
 - Useful life
 - Estimate useful life
 - ISI- embodied energy
 - PCA- How to get finance
- How to Deal with Pipe at the End of Useful Life
- Extent of Sustainability such as 200 Years

DRIVER FOR UTILITY TO IMPLEMENT AM PLAN

- Reliability

- Funding (Tied to have plans)
- Core Values + Vision Needed
- Emergency Management
- Cost Savings, Building a Business Case
- Reducing Water Loss/ Conservation
- Reducing Response Time
- Budgeting Process
- Not a Standard for Rehabilitation
 - Can't benchmark
 - Can't develop best management properly
- No Standard for Useful Life
- How do you estimate Useful Life?
- Defining Terms
- Benchmarking
- Embodied Energy + CO_2
- Follow On to GASBY and Push towards Sustainability, Do we want?

Session 5 Breakout Report Trenchless Technologies

Group Leader - Dr. Mark Knight

Students

- 1. Ivette Aguilar
- 2. Jorge Almendares
- 3. Pooja Patel
- 4. Elena Soto

Major Knowledge-Gaps

- Pressure pipe for potable water: Lack of design standards (none)
- Pressure pipe for potable water: No AWWA accepted replacement
- We don't know how the systems really work: velocities, surge cycles
- Qualifications for design engineers (lack of professional training)
- Service-lateral reconnections: How do you address those connections?
- Rehabbing the main and not entering into private-property
- Technology improvements needed to fix service connection to the building
- Established contractors with enough work to create programs

Major Limitations / What's Holding Back Trenchless Technology

- Perception that it's more expensive; lacking critical mass of data
- Education lacking
- Engineering community holding it back, very conservative
- Operational repairs and fixes for mixed material systems

Major Limitations / What's Holding Back Condition Assessment

- Develop better technology for inspection and assessment
- Many owners do not recognize value of money saved by understanding their system
- Too many technologies that are oversold
- Technology is sometimes sold on a 1-off basis instead of an entire pipeline repair project













Appendix C

Biography of Speakers







Mr. Frank John Blaha Senior Account Manager Water Research Foundation Phone: 303-347-6244 Email: fblaha@waterrf.org

Thirty years of experience in the water and environmental field. Mr. Blaha primarily worked as a consulting engineer until he joined the Water Research Foundation 17 years ago. While at the Water Research Foundation his focus has primarily been on distribution systems and buried infrastructure concerns.

Mr. Michael D. Royer Physical Scientist U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Phone: 732-321-6633 Email: Royer.michael@epa.gov

Currently, Mr. Royer is project manager for EPA-WERF Cooperative Agreement on aging water infrastructure. Previously he was project manager for EPA task orders on condition assessment of water mains. He is contributor to EPA/ORD aging water infrastructure research program development.

Mr. Robert Smith Research Program Manager U.S. DOT/PHMSA Phone: 919-238-4759 Email: robert.w.smith@dot.gov

Robert graduated from the Pennsylvania State University in 1997 with a BS in Petroleum and Natural Gas Engineering. He coordinated and managed the offshore pipeline and human factors research program at the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (formerly U.S. Minerals Management Service) from 1997 to 2003. Since 2003, he is currently the R&D Manager and leads several strategic initiatives for the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.



Mr. James Hart Oil and Gas Program Manager NACE International Phone: 281-228-6226 Email: jim.hart@nace.org

As Oil and Gas Program Manager for NACE International he is the industry and staff liaison for all NACE, Oil & Gas related programs worldwide. Mr. Hart work with all NACE internal departments from Conferences, Education, and Membership, to Standards and Government Relations. He also works with all external stakeholder groups to develop and promote NACE programs and benefits. Prior to joining NACE International in July of 2011, he was Publisher of Pipeline and Gas Technology Magazine at Hart Energy and have over 25 years' related experience in publishing, product development and communications.



Dr. Kesi You Engineer Shanghai Municipal Engineering Design Institute Co., Ltd., Phone: 86+021+51299343 Email: <u>youkesi@smedi.com</u>

Currently, Dr. You is Engineer with Shanghai Municipal Engineering Design Institute Co., Ltd. He recently completed his Ph.D. in Transportation Engineering from Southeast University.



Mr. Jonathan Faughtenberry Senior Facility Engineer & Project Manager Oasis Petroleum, Inc Phone: 330-232-0219 Email: faughtenberry@yahoo.com

Mr. Faughtenberry has served 4 years as an Engineer and Project Manager at Freese and Nichols, Inc. He has also served 5 years at Chesapeake Energy as a Project Manager in the Barnett and Utica Shale Locations. Currently, he serves as a Senior Facility Engineer & Project Manager for Oasis Petroleum overseeing the design, installation, and operations of their Bakken Shale saltwater, freshwater, and gas gathering system.



Mr. David Marshall Engineering Services Director Tarrant Regional Water District Phone: 817-720-4250 Email: david.marshall@trwd.com

Mr. Marshall is a registered professional engineer in Texas and has 34 years of experience in water resources. He worked for the U.S. Forest Service for five years in research of biological control of insect pests. He worked with the U.S. Geological Survey for five years as a hydrologic technician and hydrologist starting when he began his master's degree. He spent five years with Alan Plummer and Associates, Inc., where he was involved in many different types of water and environmental projects. He has been with the District since 1988 (25 years), he has been involved in a wide range of water quality and engineering projects. He started as Western Division Water Quality Manager for the District. As Engineering Services Director, his current role, his responsibilities include management of the District's water resources, including flood control and raw water supply. He also oversees major maintenance and capital improvement projects. He is currently part of the integrated pipeline team, a joint effort of TRWD and Dallas to build a 149 mile, \$2.3 billion dollar transmission pipeline.







Mr. Xiangjie Kong Director of R&D Pure Technologies Ltd Phone: 905-624-2436 Email: <u>xiangjie.kong@puretechltd.com</u>

Mr. Kong has over 15 years' experience in developing innovative condition assessment solutions for the water industry. As the Director of R&D at Pure Technologies, he is responsible for departmental leadership and technical management of all R&D activities. He has led the development of some of the most advanced water pipeline inspection techniques and tools. Mr. Kong holds a B.Sc. (1996) in Physics from Peking University in china and a M.Sc. in Physics (1998) from Queen's University in Canada.

Mr. Martin Roubal Managing Director Rock Solid Group Pty Ltd Phone: +61 39335 6122 Email: mroubal@rocksolidgroup.com.au

Martin Roubal has been the managing director for the Rock Solid group of companies for the past 26 years and during this time has acquired extensive experience in various aspects of Non-Destructive Testing, geophysical surveying & geotechnical engineering.

Mr. Marc Bracken President/CEO Echologics Engineering Inc. Phone: 905-672-3246 Email: <u>MBracken@echologics.com</u>

Marc Bracken is the Vice President and General Manager of Echologics Engineering. Marc received Bachelor's and Master's Degree in mechanical engineering with a specialization in acoustics from the University of Toronto. He started Echologics in 2003, and since this time the company has become a significant contributor to the advancement of water pipe leak detection and condition assessment technology. Echologics was acquired in 2011 by Mueller Water Products.



John has a passion for pipes and has been known as a "Pipe Whisperer" for many years. He became "Chief Whispers to Pipes" in 2007 and while he seldom talks to pipes, they definitely communicate their story to him. John has had over 50 years of engineering experience, with over 40 years involvement with water supply and drainage system design, construction and operation. He was a member of the pipelines task group 7A for the University of Canterbury's Centre for Advanced Engineering project report, "Lifelines in Earthquakes - Wellington Case Study" 1991. He has a good understanding of most pipeline materials from clay (ceramic) pipes to wood-stave and cast iron pipes from the 1860's, through to the modern plastics pipe materials. This understanding has been honed through experience with condition assessment and pipe failure investigations. John regularly undertakes condition assessment of pipes of all materials (especially asbestos cement). He has developed a number of pipe condition assessment techniques including the use of computed tomography (CT) scanning for measuring the depth of deterioration of AC pipes. CT scanning can also be useful for detecting inclusions and flaws in PVC and PE pipe materials. He has been (and continues to be) a participating member of three joint Australia/New Zealand standards committees PL/6, (polyolefin pipes), PL/21, (PVC, ABS and Polyamide pipes) and PL/45 (test methods) since 1993. John has provided independent technical and practical advice regarding the selection of pipeline materials for earthquake recovery and new works to the local authorities that have been directly affected by the Canterbury earthquakes (Waimakariri and Selwyn District Councils and Christchurch City) as well as many other authorities around New Zealand.



Dr. Neil Grigg Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering Colorado State University Phone: 970-491-3369 Email: <u>neilg@engr.colostate.edu</u>

Dr. Grigg is a Professor in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Colorado State University, where he has also been Head of the Department of Civil Engineering and Director of the Colorado Water Resources Research Institute. He holds a Ph.D. (1969) from Colorado State (Hydraulic Engineering), an M.S. (1965) from Auburn University (Hydraulic/Structural Engineering), and a B.S. (1961) from the US Military Academy (Engineering). His recent experience has focused on urban water and utility management, with a special emphasis on data management and risk assessment. He teaches a graduate course in pipeline engineering and hydraulics at Colorado State. His Water Research Foundation projects include: integration of cost of failure into risk assessment, dual water systems, and secondary effects of corrosion control on distribution systems, integrity of water distribution systems, predicting main breaks, and surviving disasters in water utilities. He also worked with the WaterRF toward implementing the National Mains Failure Database. He was an expert advisor to WaterRF's Research Advisory Committee on water supply infrastructure. He is also currently a member of the Editorial Advisory Board for the Journal, AWWA. His published book titles include Water and Sewer Infrastructure Management (second edition) and Urban Water Infrastructure, as well as about a dozen other books on water and infrastructure engineering and management.

He has worked extensively in public works and utility engineering. He was co-founder and a principal of Sellards & Grigg Inc., Denver and participated in a number of municipal engineering projects involving water supply, stormwater, and public works. He has also been a state official and regulator in his role as Assistant Secretary for



Natural Resources and Director of Environmental Management (1979-80), State of North Carolina. He was responsible for managing the Clean Water Act programs in permitting, enforcement, and construction grants. He also had responsibility for river basin water quantity and quality, and groundwater management. He is a Life Member and Fellow of the American Society of Civil Engineers, a Life Member of the American Water Works Association and American Public Works Association (Board of Directors, 1992-95). He is a former president of the Fort Collins Water Board and former two-term member Fort Collins Transportation Board. He is a registered professional engineer in Colorado, Alabama, and North Carolina.

Mr. Ernest Lever R&D Director, Infrastructure Gas Technology Institute Phone: 847-544-3415 Email: Ernest.Lever@gastechnology.org

More than twenty years of experience in the plastics piping field. Specific expertise in molded fittings, electrofusion, butt-fusion, using the finite element method to model the behavior of plastic systems and the slow crack growth behavior of PE piping assemblies. Developed proprietary FEA tools for the modelling of transient non-linear heat transfer as applied to heat fusion of polymer assemblies.

Experienced in multi-physics, probabilistic and statistical simulations of physical systems. Currently involved in developing risk models that focus on threat interactions and their influence on probability of failure of infrastructure systems.







Dr. Graham Bell Principal Professional Associate and Senior Vice President HDR Engineering, Inc. Phone: 909-841-6729 Email: Graham.Bell@hdrinc.com

Dr. Bell received his Engineering degrees from the UCLA School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. He has more than 30 years of experience in designing, testing, assessing and forensic evaluation of damage on civil engineering and water works projects. He has been the co-principal investigator for nine AWWA/WaterRF Research Projects. He has more than 65 peer reviewed journal and conference publications and presentations. Dr. Bell is the past Chairman of AWWA Corrosion Committee; Member of AWWA Concrete Pressure Pipe Committee; Past Chair or Vice Chair of NACE International Committee on Corrosion Control for Ductile Iron Pipe and Cathodic Protection of PCCP and Cement Mortar Coated Pipe.

Dr. Sri Rajah Senior Structural Engineer HDR Engineering, Inc. Phone: 425-450-6269 Email: sri.rajah@hdrinc.com

Dr. Rajah has over 25 years of experience in civil engineering in research, teaching, and consulting in the areas of pipelines, geotechnical, structural, and hydraulic engineering. He has more than 40 peer reviewed journal and conference publication and presentations.





Dr. Tom Iseley, P.E. Professor & Director Construction Engineering Management Technology IUPUI-Purdue School of Engineering & Technology Phone: 317- 278 -4970 Email: dtiseley@iupui.edu

Dr. Tom Iseley has over 35 years of experience in the planning, design, and construction of underground infrastructure systems. From 1982, he served on the faculty of Mississippi State University, Purdue University, and Louisiana Tech University. During the past 25 years, he has maintained an international leadership position in trenchless technology. In 1989, Dr. Iseley established the Trenchless Technology Center (TTC) at Louisiana Tech University. He is a founding director of the North American Society for Trenchless Technology (NASTT). **Dr. Mark Knight**

Associate Professor Department Civil and Environmental Engineering Executive Director Center for Advancement of Trenchless Technologies (CATT) University of Waterloo Phone: 1 519 581-8835 Email: <u>maknight@uwaterloo.ca</u>

Dr. Knight worked as a Geotechnical Consultant for six year prior to going back to complete Master and Doctorate degrees in Civil Engineering. He joined University of Waterloo as a professor in 1997. He developed NASTT CIPP Good practice course along with number pipeline condition assessment, construction and renovation course using trenchless technology. He is also the founding member of the International Research Trenchless Technology Advisory Committee and Developer of industry leading pipeline software programs: BOREAID, PPI-BOREAID, PPI-PACE and CIPPCALC.



Dr. Ali Abolmaali Department Chair University of Texas at Arlington Phone: 817-272-3877 Email: <u>Abolmaali@uta.edu</u>

Dr. Abolmaali is a Professor in structural and applied mechanics at the University of Texas at Arlington. He is the Founding Director of UT-Arlington Center for Structural Engineering Research and the Professor-in-Charge of the Structural Simulation Laboratory at UTA. Professor Abolmaali has intensive research experience and ongoing research projects in computational structural engineering and full scale structural testing of civil, aerospace, and underground structural systems including research in fluid structure interaction problems. As a Principal Investigator, Dr. Abolmaali has secured over \$30M in research and development funds from states, federal and private agencies. These funding agencies include but not limited to the National Science Foundation, departments of transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and others to conduct basic and applied research in structural engineering and mechanics. Professor Abolmaali's ongoing research projects focus on developing coupled nonlinear finite element algorithms and full-scale experimental testing to simulate the nonlinear behavior of structural systems subjected to static and dynamic loadings up to collapse. Dr. Abolmaali is the author and coauthor of over 105 refereed technical journal papers and conference proceedings in structural engineering and finite element method. Dr. Abolmaali has given over 110 technical presentations nationally and internationally. Dr. Abolmaali has conducted several high profile failure investigation research projects for the National Transportation Safety Board examples of which are the Boston Tunnel collapse (Big Dig Tunnel), Minneapolis Bridge collapse, and Big Spring's Nebraska Bridge collapse.
Appendix D

Symposium Attendee List

Sharon Hamilton, P.E.

City of Austin - Water Utilities 625 E. 10th Street, Suite 400 Austin, TX 78701 Phone: 512-972-1170 Fax: 512-972-0228 Cell: 512-695-3263 Email: Sharon.hamilton@austintexas.gov

Randy D. Randolph, P.E.

Engineering Managere Central Arizona Project 23636 North Seventh Street Phoenix, AZ 85024 Phone: 623-869-2260 Fax: 623-869-2249 Cell: 602-717-8286 Email: rrandolph@cap-az.com

John A. Economides, P.E.

Economides Consulting 310 Via Andalusia Encinitas, CA 92024 Phone: 619-985-4066 Fax: 760-652-4849 Email: johnecono@aol.com

Alan C. Hutson, P.E.

Principal/Manager Freese and Nichols 10497 Town and Country Way, Ste. 600 Houston, TX 77024 Phone: 713-600-6847 Fax: 713-600-6801 Cell: 817-891-4695 Email: alan.hutson@freese.com

Anna Pridmore, Ph.D.

Vice President - Pipe Solutions Structural Technologies 1332 N. Miller Street Anaheim, CA 92806 Cell: 714-869-8824 Email: apridmore@structural.net

Raymond E. Asuquo

Regional Discipline Lead - Pipelines Shell Petroleum Development Company P.O. Box 263 Port Harcoust, Rivers Nigeria Phone: +234-8070339041 Email: <u>Raymond.asuquo@shell.com</u>

Jain Zhang

Research Manager Water Research Foundation 6666 W Quincy Ave Denver, CO 80235 Phone: 303-347-6114 Email: jzhang@waterrf.org

Veysel F. Sever

Senior Engineer Benton & Associates 1970 W. Lafayette Jacksonville, IL 62650 Phone: 217-245-4146 Fax: 217-245-4149 Email: <u>fserver@bentonassociates.com</u>

Ahmad Habibian

National Practice Leader Black & Veatch 18310 Montgomery Village Ave #500 Gaithersburg, MD 20879 Phone: 301-556-4382 Fax: 301-556-4452 Email: habibiana@by.com

Kelly W. Wood

Engineer VI Freese and Nichols, Inc. 4055 International Plaza Suite 200 Fort Worth, TX 76133 Phone: 817-735-7317 Fax: 817-735-7491 Email: kww@freese.com

Charles Herckis

Senior Project Manager TDW Services 201 S. Maple Ave Unit 308 Oak Park, IL Phone: 630-234-7412 Email: <u>charles.herckis@tdwilliamson.com</u>

Jim Geisbush

Engineer Central Arizona Project 23636 N. 7th St Phoenix, AZ 85024 Phone: 623-869-2696 Email: jgeisbush@cap-az.com

William Skerpan

VP – Chief Construction Services Beta Group Inc. 6 BlackstoneValley Place Lincoln, RI 02865 Phone: 401-333-2382 Fax: 401-333-9225 Email: <u>bskerpan@beta-inc.com</u>

Neil J. Gankstad

Civil Engineer Central Arizona Project 23636 N 7th St Phoenix, AZ 85024 Phone: 623-869-2258 Email: ngankstad@cap-az.com

John H. Bambei

Chief of Engineering Denver Water 1600 W. 12th Ave Denver, CO 80204 Phone: 303-628-6669 Fax: 303-628-6851 Email: john.bambei@denverwater.org

Elizabeth R. Blackwelder

Project Manager Freese and Nichols, Inc. 4055 International Plaza Fort Worth, TX 76109 Phone: 817-735-7339 Email: <u>erb@freese.com</u>

Camille G. Rubeiz

Director of Engineering PPI 2839 Maple Ln Fairfax, VA 22031 Phone: 469-499-1050 Email: <u>crubeiz@plasticpipe.org</u>

Andy Dettmer

Senior Project Manager Pure Technologies 6630 Roundrock Rd Dallas, TX 75248 Phone: 214-236-5728 Email: andy.dettmer@puretechltd.com

Michael E. Grilli CEO Beta Group 6 Blackstone Valley Place Lincoln, RI 02865 Phone: 401-333-2382 Email: mgrilli@beta-inc.com

Ricky W. Wu Design Engineer

Hanson 1003 N MacArthur Blvd Grand Prairie, TX 75050 Phone: 972-266-7505 Fax: 972-264-6236 Email: ricky.wu@hanson.com

Henry H. Bardakjain

Consultant 1331 N Maryland Ave Glendale, CA 91107 Phone: 818-502-0676 Email: hbardakjain@gmail.com

Hubert W. Barker, P.E.

Barker & Associates Inc. 820 State Road 48 Durant, OK 74701 Phone: 580-931-9045 Email: wbarker@barkerengineers.com

Jain Xu

Researcher University of Texas at Austin 3500 Greystone Drive Austin, TX 78731 Phone: 512-576-4160 Email: jainxu@utexas.edu

Kesi You, Ph. D.

Urban Traffic and Underground Space Design Institute No 98 Guoynan Road Shandhai, China 200432 Denver, CO 80204 Phone: 13951753757 Email: youkesi@smedi.com

Anthony Parente

Manager, Capital Works Region of Peel 10 Peel Centre Dr. 4th flr Suite B Brampton, ON Phone: 416-577-0597 Email: <u>anthony.parente@peelregion.ca</u>

Jim M. Williams

Engineering Manager Meers Group Inc. 14411 West Rd Houston, TX 77041 Phone: 832-851-7876 Email: jim.williams@mears.net

Ali Alavinasab

Design Engineer - Head of Structural Department – Pure Technologies 3322 State Route 22 West Suite 902 Bldg 9 Branchburg, NJ 08876 Phone: 908-809-3080 Fax: 908-526-9900 Email: ali.alavinasab@puretechltd.com

Sri Rajah

Senior Structural Engineer HDR Engineering, Inc. 500 108th Ave NE, Suite 1200 Bellevue, WA 98009 Phone: 425-450-6269 Email: <u>sri.rajah@hdrinc.com</u>

Soheil Eslaamizaad

Senior Specialist Enbridge 635 Dartmouth Point Edmonton, AB T6M2R8 Phone: 780-297-6438

Jason C. Gehrig

Engineer TRWD 808 E. Northside Dr. Fort Worth, TX 76102 Phone: 817-335-2491 Email: Jason.gehrig@trwd.com

Dorian French

Senior Vice President Brown and Gay Engineers 500 W 7th Street, Suite 1800 Fort Worth, TX 76102 Phone: 512-470-7240 Email: <u>dfrench@browngay.com</u>

Aharon Ran

Director of Engineering Mekorot Water Company G Lincoln St Tel Aviv, Israel 61201 Phone: +972 36230663 Fax: +972 36230889 Email: aran@mekorot.co.il

Jonathan C. Faughtenberry

Senior Engineer Oasis Petroleum 537 Darlington TR Fort Worth, TX 76131 Phone: 330-232-0219 Email: faughtenberry@yahoo.com

Andrew J. Whelton

Assistant Professor University of South Alabama 3142 Shelby Hall, Department of Civil Engineering Mobile, AL 36527 Phone: 540-230-6069 Email: <u>ajwhelton@southalabama.edu</u>

Mark Dollins

Managing Engineer Austin Water Utility 3907 South Industrial Blvd Austin, TX 78744 Phone: 512-972-1028 Email: mark.dollins@austintexas.gov

John R. Black

Technical Principal Pipeline Materials Opus International Consultants 20 Moorhouse Avenue Christchurch, NZ 8140 Phone: 0064274844886 Email: john.r.black@opus.co.nz

Marty S. Paris

Vice President Kimley-Horn and Associates 12750 Merit Drive, Suite 1000 Dallas, TX 75251 Phone: 972-776-1732 Email: marty.paris@kimley-horn.com

Michael D. Royer

Physical Scientist U.S. EPA 2890 Woodbridge Ave. (MS-104) Edison, NJ 08837 Phone: 732-321-6633 Email: royer.michael@epa.gov

Fox Steven

Vice President HDR 2022 Calle Cantora El Cajon, CA 92019 Phone: 619-520-8712 Email: sfox@hdrinc.com

Carl Sharkey

Regional Sales Manager Echologics 297 18th Ave San Francisco, CA 94121 Phone: 415-819-7270 Email: carlshark@yahoo.com

Students:

Oifeng Yu Student Catholic University of America 620 Michigan Ave NE Washington, DC 20064 Phone: 202-319-5629 Email: yuqfseu@gmail.com

Michelle Sherman

Program Manager Center for Underground Infrastructure Research & Education 1221 West Mitchell Street Arlington, TX 76010 Phone: 817-272-9177 Fax: 817-272-2630 Email: <u>msherman@uta.edu</u>

Divyashree

Graduate Research Assistant University of Texas at Arlington 1600 W. 12th Ave 1221 West Mitchell Street Arlington, TX 76010 Phone: 817-272-9177 Fax: 817-272-2630 Cell: 817-917-0174 Email: <u>divya.sm14@gmail.com</u>

Armando Espinosa

Student UTA 701 S. Nedderman Dr. Arlington, TX 76019 Email: <u>armando.espinosa@mavs.uta.edu</u>

Mahran M. Zatar

Student UTA 5201 Bryant Irvin Rd Apt# 3136 Fort Worth, TX 76132 Phone: 817-744-0501 Email: mahran.zatar@mays.uta.edu

David M. Trejo

Student UTA 701 Nedderman Dr Arlington, TX 76019 Email: <u>dtrejo@mavs.uta.edu</u>

Armando Espinosa

Manager, Capital Works Region of Peel 10 Peel Centre Dr. 4th flr Suite B Brampton, ON Phone: 416-577-0597 Email: <u>anthony.parente@peelregion.ca</u>

Pejman Rezakhani

PhD Student UTA Arlington, TX 76019 Phone: 682-217-4489 Email: pejman.rezakhani@mavs.uta.edu

Alimohammad Entezarmahdi

Student UTA 815 W. Abram Apt# 112 Arlington, TX 76013 Phone: 817-885-9082 alimohammad.entezarmahdi@mavs.uta.edu Appendix E

List of Acronyms

LIST OF ACRONYMS

WRF	Water Research Foundation
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
PHMSA	Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
TRWD	Tarrant Regional Water District
BEM	Broadband Electro- Magnetics
WaterRF	Water Research Foundation
AWWA	American Water Works Association
FAC	Focus Area Council
PAC	Project Advisory Committee
NAS	National Academy of Sciences
RTCR	Revised Total Coliform Rule
RICP	Research and Information Collection Partnership
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
PSW	Partnership for Safe Water
PCP	Pneumatic Capsule Pipeline
AGV	Automated Guided Vehicle
UCFT	Underground Container Freight Transport
UCM	Underground Container Mover
UCTS	Underground Container Transportation System
DOT	Department of Transportation
PHMSA	Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
ILI	Inline Inspection
NDT	Non-Destructive Testing
ROV	Remotely Operated Vehicles
PIG	Pipeline Inspection Gauges
HSK	Hand Scanning Kit
SCG	Slow Crack Growth
CI	Cast Iron
CT	Computed Tomography
PVC	Polyvinyl chloride
ABS	Acrylonitrile Butadiene Styrene
NASTT	North American Society for Trenchless Technology
CATT	Center for Advancement of Trenchless Technologies