



Description This procedure addresses the techniques and procedures for analyzing the predicted failure pressures for pipe with corrosion metal loss and cracks or crack-like defects.

Regulatory Applicability Regulated Transmission Pipelines
 Regulated Gathering Pipelines (Type A)
 Regulated Gathering Pipelines (Type B)
 Regulated Distribution Pipelines

Frequency As Needed

Reference AGA, Pipeline Research Committee Project, PR-3-805, "A Modified Criterion for Evaluating the Remaining Strength of Corroded Pipe," (December 22, 1989), (PRCI PR-3-805(R-STRENG))
ASME/ANSI B31G-1991 (Reaffirmed 2004), "Manual for Determining the Remaining Strength of Corroded Pipelines,"

Forms / Record Retention

Related Specifications None

OQ Covered Task None

Procedure Steps

1. Applicability.

Whenever required by this part, operators of onshore steel transmission pipelines must analyze anomalies or defects to determine the predicted failure pressure at the location of the anomaly or defect, and the remaining life of the pipeline segment at the location of the anomaly or defect, in accordance with this section.

2. Corrosion metal loss.

When analyzing corrosion metal loss under this section, an operator must use a suitable remaining strength calculation method including, ASME/ANSI B31G (incorporated by reference, see §192.7); R-STRENG (incorporated by reference, see §192.7); or an alternative equivalent method of remaining strength calculation that will provide an equally conservative result.

3. Cracks and crack-like defects—

- a) When analyzing cracks and crack-like defects under this section, an operator must determine predicted failure pressure, failure stress pressure, and crack growth using a technically proven fracture mechanics model appropriate to the failure mode (ductile, brittle or both), material properties (pipe and weld properties), and boundary condition used (pressure test, ILI, or other).
- b) If the pipeline segment is susceptible to cyclic fatigue or other loading conditions that could lead to fatigue crack growth, fatigue analysis must be performed using an applicable fatigue crack growth law (for example, Paris Law) or other technically appropriate engineering methodology. For other degradation processes that can cause crack growth, appropriate engineering analysis must be used. The above methodologies must be validated by a subject matter expert to determine conservative predictions of flaw growth and remaining life at the maximum allowable operating pressure. The operator must calculate the remaining life of the pipeline by determining the amount of time required for the crack to grow to a size that would fail at maximum allowable operating pressure.
 - i. When calculating crack size that would fail at MAOP, and the material toughness is not documented in traceable, verifiable, and complete records, the same Charpy v-notch toughness value established in paragraph (e)(2) of this section must be used.
 - ii. Initial and final flaw size must be determined using a fracture mechanics model appropriate to the failure mode (ductile, brittle or both) and boundary condition used (pressure test, ILI, or other).
 - iii. An operator must re-evaluate the remaining life of the pipeline before 50% of the remaining life calculated by this analysis has expired. The operator must determine and document if further pressure tests or use of other assessment methods are required at that time. The operator must continue to re-evaluate the remaining life of the pipeline before 50% of the remaining life calculated in the most recent evaluation has expired.
- c) For cases in which the operator does not have in-line inspection crack anomaly data and is analyzing potential crack defects that could have survived a pressure test, the operator must calculate the largest potential crack defect sizes using the methods in paragraph (d)(1) of this section. If pipe material toughness is not

documented in traceable, verifiable, and complete records, the operator must use one of the following for Charpy v-notch toughness values based upon minimum operational temperature and equivalent to a full-size specimen value:

- i. Charpy v-notch toughness values from comparable pipe with known properties of the same vintage and from the same steel and pipe manufacturer;
 - ii. A conservative Charpy v-notch toughness value to determine the toughness based upon the material properties verification process specified in §192.607;
 - iii. A full size equivalent Charpy v-notch upper-shelf toughness level of 120 ft.-lbs.; or
 - iv. Other appropriate values that an operator demonstrates can provide conservative Charpy v-notch toughness values of the crack-related conditions of the pipeline segment. Operators using an assumed Charpy v-notch toughness value must notify PHMSA in accordance with §192.18.
4. When performing the analyses of predicted or assumed anomalies or defects in accordance with this section, an operator must use data as follows.
- a) An operator must explicitly analyze and account for uncertainties in reported assessment results (including tool tolerance, detection threshold, probability of detection, probability of identification, sizing accuracy, conservative anomaly interaction criteria, location accuracy, anomaly findings, and unity chart plots or equivalent for determining uncertainties and verifying tool performance) in identifying and characterizing the type and dimensions of anomalies or defects used in the analyses, unless the defect dimensions have been verified using *in situ* direct measurements.
 - b) The analyses performed in accordance with this section must utilize pipe and material properties that are documented in traceable, verifiable, and complete records. If documented data required for any analysis is not available, an operator must obtain the undocumented data through §192.607. Until documented material properties are available, the operator shall use conservative assumptions as follows:
 - i. An operator must use one of the following for material toughness:
 - Charpy v-notch toughness values from comparable pipe with known properties of the same vintage and from the same steel and pipe manufacturer;
 - A conservative Charpy v-notch toughness value to determine the toughness based upon the ongoing material properties verification process specified in §192.607;
 - If the pipeline segment does not have a history of reportable incidents caused by cracking or crack-like defects, maximum Charpy v-notch toughness values of 13.0 ft.-lbs. for body cracks and 4.0 ft.-lbs. for cold weld, lack of fusion, and selective seam weld corrosion defects;
 - If the pipeline segment has a history of reportable incidents caused by cracking or crack-like defects, maximum Charpy v-notch toughness values of 5.0 ft.-lbs. for body cracks and 1.0 ft.-lbs. for cold weld, lack of fusion, and selective seam weld corrosion; or

- Other appropriate values that an operator demonstrates can provide conservative Charpy v-notch toughness values of crack-related conditions of the pipeline segment. Operators using an assumed Charpy v-notch toughness value must notify PHMSA in advance in accordance with §192.18 and include in the notification the bases for demonstrating that the Charpy v-notch toughness values proposed are appropriate and conservative for use in analysis of crack-related conditions.
 - ii. An operator must assume one of the following for material strength:
 - Grade A pipe (30,000 psi), or
 - The specified minimum yield strength that is the basis for the current maximum allowable operating pressure.
 - iii. Until pipe wall thickness, diameter, or other data are determined and documented in accordance with §192.607, the operator must use values upon which the current MAOP is based.
5. Analyses conducted in accordance with this section must be reviewed and confirmed by a subject matter expert.
6. An operator must keep for the life of the pipeline records of the investigations, analyses, and other actions taken in accordance with the requirements of this section. Records must document justifications, deviations, and determinations made for the following, as applicable:
- a) The technical approach used for the analysis;
 - b) All data used and analyzed;
 - c) Pipe and weld properties;
 - d) Procedures used;
 - e) Evaluation methodology used;
 - f) Models used;
 - g) Direct in situ examination data;
 - h) In-line inspection tool run information evaluated, including any multiple in-line inspection tool runs;
 - i) Pressure test data and results;
 - j) In-the-ditch assessments;
 - k) All measurement tool, assessment, and evaluation accuracy specifications and tolerances used in technical and operational results;
 - l) All finite element analysis results;
 - m) The number of pressure cycles to failure, the equivalent number of annual pressure cycles, and the pressure cycle counting method;
 - n) The predicted fatigue life and predicted failure pressure from the required fatigue life models and fracture mechanics evaluation methods;
 - o) Safety factors used for fatigue life and/or predicted failure pressure calculations;
 - p) Reassessment time interval and safety factors;
 - q) The date of the review;
 - r) Confirmation of the results by qualified technical subject matter experts; and
 - s) Approval by responsible operator management personnel.