

# **Line 101 and Line 132-A MAOP Validation Report**

**DRAFT**

January \_\_, 2011

**Draft subject to revision.**

## MAOP Validation Report

### Executive Summary

The MAOP Validation Study reviewed all available design and test records for Lines 101 and 132A in the San Francisco Peninsula. The review enabled PG&E to create a database covering all pressurized mainline components, including pipe, valves, fittings, taps, tees and other appurtenances. Additionally, this database was used to confirm pipeline stress levels at established MAOPs (Maximum Allowable Operating Pressures) and ensure compliance with Class Location requirements in the Federal Code.

Where there are unknowns we have based recommendations on industry practice and sound engineering judgment. Thus, for example, there are a number of pipeline fittings in L-101 and L-132A for which PG&E has not been able to identify full specification. Consistent with the procedures described in ASME B31.8S and PG&E's regular practice, this analysis assumed conservative values where design standards were not fully known. Based upon these conservative assumed values, and PG&E design and construction standards, these fittings are all operating within their design limits, pressure rating and Class Location restrictions.

# MAOP Validation Report

## 1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this report is to document the Maximum Allowable Operating Pressure (MAOP) Validation Project for the San Francisco Peninsula Pipeline. This draft report covers L-101 and L-132A.

## 2. SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

### L-101:

Line 101 runs from Milpitas Terminal to the San Francisco Gas Load Center. From Milpitas Terminal to San Francisco Airport Tap, the pipeline currently has an MAOP of 400 psig and from the San Francisco Airport Tap to Lomita Park Regulator Station it has an MAOP of 396 psig. The pressure is reduced at Lomita Park to 145 psig (the downstream MOP).

When evaluating L-101, we collected data for the portion of Line 101 that runs from Milpitas Terminal to Lomita Park Border Meter Station, which is 35.1 Miles (185,319 feet) in length. It consists of 20, 24, 30, 34, and 36-inch diameter pipe. Line 101 was originally installed as a 20 inch line in 1929 from Milpitas to San Francisco and operated at less than 275 psi. This is the oldest of the three main pipelines on the Peninsula. However, all portions of the original 1929 pipe have been replaced. The portion of the pipeline from Milpitas (MP 0.00) to Rengstorff Station (MP 9.78) was replaced with 34" and 36" pipe and upgraded to 400 MAOP in 1965. The remainder of the pipeline from Rengstorff Station (MP 9.78) to Lomita Park (MP 33.68) was updated to the current MAOP of 396 psig in 1989. This line generally lies close to the San Francisco Bay in flat ground. The pipeline runs along a right-of-way that roughly follows State Highways 237 and 101.

### L-132A:

Line 132A is a pipeline that cross ties Line 101 to Lines 109 and 132. It is 1.5 miles (7,739 ft) long. The MAOP of the pipeline is 400 psig. The pipeline was originally installed in the 1940s. It consists of 12, 16, and 24-inch diameter pipe and lies in flat ground generally along Rengstorff Avenue in Mountain View.

## 3. DEFINITIONS

Item	Definition
Maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP)	The maximum pressure at which a pipeline, pipeline segment, or component is qualified to operate in accordance with the requirements of 49 CFR Part 192 based on the design pressure of the weakest element in a pipeline segment. (Ref 8)

## MAOP Validation Report

Maximum operating pressure (MOP)	The maximum pressure a gas pipeline system may operate in accordance with the requirements of 49 CFR Part 192 definition of maximum allowable operating pressure for a <b>system</b> . (Ref 8)
OD	Outside Diameter
Specified minimum yield strength (SMYS)	The minimum yield strength in pounds per square inch (psi) prescribed by the specification under which pipe is purchased from the manufacturer or as specified in 49 CFR Part 192. (Ref 8)
Transmission line	A pipeline other than a gathering line, that: 1. Transports gas from a gathering line or storage facility to a distribution center, storage facility, or large volume customer that is not downstream from a distribution center; or 2. Operates at a hoop stress of 20 percent or more of SMYS; or 3. Transports gas within storage field as defined in 49 CFR Part 192.3, "Definitions." Note: A large volume customer may receive similar volumes of gas as a distribution center, and includes factories, power plants, and institutional users of gas. (Ref 8)
Uprate	The process for increasing the MOP or MAOP (uprating) for pipelines according to the requirements of 49 CFR Part 192, Subpart K, "Uprating." (Ref 8)
WT	Wall Thickness of the pipe or fitting.

### 4. DATA GATHERING

The installed pipe properties and post installation hydrostatic testing data were gathered and reviewed by following a modified process for creating a Pipeline Feature Lists (PFL). PG&E modified that process to address the unique nature of this project and expedited time line. The original process is detailed in "Procedure for Completing Pipeline Features List (PFL) for In-line Inspection Projects", (Ref 1) which was developed for use during the Pre-assessment phase of In-Line-Inspection projects in order to document all known features and define the scope for future pipe changes prior to pigging.

Specifically the following additional items were collected and incorporated into the PFL spreadsheets, along with the items specified in the PFL procedure, in order to allow for a calculation of operating stress for all mainline components.

- Sleeve – Wall thickness and grade
- Bend – Grade
- Tee – Grade
- Reducer – Wall thickness and grade

The pipeline data available in the GIS (Graphical Information System) system was downloaded into a spreadsheet format to form the basis or starting point for the PFL

## MAOP Validation Report

spreadsheets. It bears mention that the GIS system only contains information about the main line pipe segments themselves. In contrast, the PFL includes all elbows, reducers, tees, mainline valves, taps, valves, casings and any other individual components or “features” that make up the gas pipeline. Also, please note that in PG&E’s GIS system, setting a value to a negative amount designates that it is an “assumed” value. For example, an assumed value of 0.281 wall thickness for the pipe would be displayed in GIS as “-.281”. Assumed values are conservative values for pipe wall thickness, grade, yield strength or seam type that are based upon minimum pipe specifications purchased by PG&E in the year or era that any given pipe section was originally installed, but for which records do not exist or were not readily available when the GIS system was created in the late 1990s.

Original construction job files were gathered from the following locations:

- San Jose Division
- De Anza Division
- Peninsula Division
- Bayshore & Geneva Records Center
- Walnut Creek GT&D Records Center

These job files were manually reviewed for relevant information. The records for a single construction project were then consolidated, reviewed by an independent two-person team, and entered into the PFL (Pipeline Features List) spreadsheet. The completed spreadsheet was then printed out and manually reviewed again by another two-person team. The corrections identified were made to the PFL and then reviewed a 3<sup>rd</sup> time. In some areas, the data was reviewed more than three times. This information was used to generate a “discrepancy list” of changes or differences between the PFL data and the original GIS data. Information consolidated onto the discrepancy list was input back to the GIS system. It is important to note that if pipe characteristics could not be verified in the PFL review, they were marked as “unknown”, but if the value existed in GIS and the PFL indicated it was “unknown”, the GIS value was not changed. While the value could not currently be validated, PG&E assumed that the value that existed in GIS originated from a source document that is not currently available.

During the creation of the PFLs, the Strength Test Pressure Reports (STPR) were gathered for all available construction jobs and matched up to the PFL and GIS data. This information was accumulated in a spreadsheet and compared using the job numbers, STPR drawings, pipe size, pipe grade, pipe wall thickness, seam type and approximate footage. The majority of the Strength Test Pressure reports were completed as part of the initial construction process, but some test reports were for later testing and uprating projects. This STPR information will also be incorporated into GIS as part of the GIS Validation portion of this project.

## 5. DATA INTERPRETATION AND EVALUATION

The resultant data was evaluated to confirm the pipeline components were operating within the percent of yield strength as required by 49 CFR Part 192 based on their Class Location. Thus, after completion and verification of the PFL and STPR data,

## MAOP Validation Report

an additional evaluation was performed in order to assign Joint Factors to long seam types, and to calculate the percent stress at a given pressure level.

The STPR data from the most recent records review was added to the spreadsheets. The “STPR Status” column spreadsheet indicates the status of strength test documentation, based on reconciliation of available data with PFL and GIS pipe segments. The following three categories were identified, and each pipe segment was assigned to one of these three categories:

STPR Status	Definition
<b>Tested</b>	<p>“Tested” indicates either of the following scenarios:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Completed strength test documentation was found and verified that matches segment, footage, and pipe specification (O.D., wall thickness, grade, long seam).</li> <li>2) This category includes pipe installed prior to State or Federal Code implementation (pre-1961 pipe) that was not tested when originally installed, but was later tested on an uprate job, for which completed strength test documentation was located and verified.</li> </ol>
<b>Incomplete</b>	<p>“Incomplete” indicates any of the following scenarios:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Completed strength test documentation was found that matches other segments or pipe specifications for a given job number, but not for the given segment. (e.g. If a completed STPR is available for the 24” X -60 DSAW 0.312” wall pipe but not for the 24” X-52 DSAW 0.312” pipe on the same job, then the X-52 segments would be listed as “incomplete”.)</li> <li>2) GIS shows strength test data, but no completed strength test documentation was found. This is the case for some post-1961 jobs which likely were tested but no test records were found during this validation process.</li> <li>3) This category includes incomplete reports with design criteria but no actual test data.</li> </ol>
<b>Untested</b>	<p>No strength test documentation has been located and there is no evidence that any strength testing was conducted. This is generally the case for pre-1961 jobs, prior to State or Federal requirements for strength testing that were not tested later as part of an uprate.</p>

**Figure 1 - STPR Status Definitions**

The calculation of the pipeline and fitting stress level occasionally encountered “unknown” grades and wall thicknesses that required further review and evaluation. PG&E resolved all “unknown” pipe specifications either through additional records integration or through excavation/inspections. Joint factors as described in Gas Standard A-11 were utilized. For the purposes of fitting stress calculations the PG&E standards applicable to a given era were used. The results of this evaluation for each of the Peninsula Pipelines are described below.

### 5.1.1. Line 101

All pipeline and fittings in L-101 south of MP 32.17 [Redacted] were confirmed to be operating at less than 50% of SMYS. This conforms with any Class Location up to Class 3. There are no Class 4 sections on this pipeline between Milpitas and Lomita Park Station.

The detailed review of L-101 documentation indicated that approximately 2,448 feet of re-conditioned pipe was installed at two locations between MP 32.17 Millbrae

## MAOP Validation Report

Avenue and MP 33.6 Lomita Park Station. PG&E excavated and verified the pipe to be 20" outside diameter x 0.250" wall thickness. The pipe was manufactured by A.O. Smith at 33,000 psi- minimum yield strength or greater.

PG&E confirmed the yield strength of this pipe using the following sources of information: 1) PG&E letter dated December 12, 1962 entitled "History of Pipe Purchases," documenting the purchase of pipe for several pipelines installed in 1929/1930 as having a minimum yield strength of 33,000 psi; 2) The establishment of a 396 psig MAOP following the 1989 uprate: The only possible value for yield strength in the design equation from 49 CFR 92.105 for 20" pipe with .0.250" WT and a 0.80 JT factor in a Class 3 area (operating one class out) is 33,000; 3) PG&E Gas Standard A-11 which indicates that all pipe purchased by PG&E between 1927 and 1930 in 20" or larger diameter had a minimum yield of 33,000; 4) Industry experience based on sample yield tests of 1930 era A.O. Smith pipe provided by Kiefer and Associates as-well-as DNV consultants; and 5) Field measures of yield strength values at two dig sites on the re-conditioned pipe using Advanced Technology Corporation's Automated Ball Indentation technique, confirming a yield of not less than 46,000 psi.

The longitudinal seam of this pipe corresponds to a joint factor of 0.8. Utilizing the data above results in a maximum pipeline pressure of 330 psi at 50% specified minimum yield strength (SMYS) and 396 psig at 60% SMYS. This pipeline was strength tested for eight hours on October 10, 1989 at 650 psig and thus qualified under 49 CFR 192.611 to operate up to 396 psig. In this situation the pipeline is operating, "one class location out" based on the 1989 hydrostatic test as allowed under 49 CFR192.611.

PG&E performed five excavations at MP 2.45, MP 2.49, MP 2.54, MP 10.40 and MP 19.99 in order to validate the pipeline seam type. All of the pipeline segments were confirmed to be DSAW pipe using a combination of radiography, visual examination and ultrasonic examination. Additionally, at MP 10.40, the pipeline was taken out of service and camera inspected for approximately 400 feet to confirm that it was DSAW pipe.

Analysis of the fittings on the pipeline revealed 11 fittings (sleeves, bends or reducers) that were assigned unknown value to at least one of the fitting properties necessary for stress calculations. These 11 fittings were installed in 1963 and 1965. Available job documents do not contain enough information to verify the grade or wall thickness of the fitting. PG&E Gas Standards in place at the time of construction refer to B31.1 and API 5LX and state that the fittings should match the pressure rating of the pipe. Therefore, facilities built to the PG&E Standards would not be operating over 50% SMYS at 375 psig.

There are complete hydrostatic test records for approximately 34.47 miles (98.2%) of pipe in Line 101. Another 0.45 miles (1.3%) of pipe has "incomplete" hydrostatic test records, as test reports could not be definitively matched to the specific pipeline segments, (see definition of "incomplete" above), leaving approximately 0.18 miles (0.5 %) of the pipeline that was installed in 1957, prior to State or Federal Code mandating pressure testing. The minimum hydrostatic test pressure, for the segments with records, is 605 psig or 1.51 times the 400 psig MAOP. All of the pipe

## MAOP Validation Report

footage that has not been post construction hydrostatically tested is 34 inch DSAW from Job Number 137560 installed in 1957 and located near Mile Point 2.5.

### 5.1.2. Line 132A

PG&E confirmed that all pipeline segments and fittings in L-132A were operating at less than 50% of SMYS and thus were commensurate with any class location up to Class 3. There are no Class 4 locations on this pipeline. Additionally, although the 1944 and 1947 segments in this pipeline were not hydro-tested due to its era of construction, this pipe is seamless, based on the original purchase documentation, and thus not subject to the manufacturing threats associated with welded seams in other pipelines of this time.

Analysis of the fittings revealed nine fittings (sleeves and bends) that were assigned unknown values to at least one of the fitting properties required to calculate stress. Two of these fittings are sleeves installed in 1981. PG&E Gas Standards in effect at this time required the wall thickness be a minimum of 0.375. This results in a stress level of 34% of SMYS. The remaining elbows were installed with the original pipe in 1944. The PG&E Gas Standards from 1945 (one year after installation of this pipe) indicate that elbows would be 0.375 wall thickness. However available documentation from the job indicates these are probably bell -end segments that are mostly likely the wall thickness of the pipe and made from similar material. Using the wall thickness of the pipe, 0.281 (the more conservative value), the stress level in these elbows would be 46% of SMYS at 375 psig.

There are complete hydrostatic test records for 0.55 miles (37%) of pipe in Line 132A. Another 0.039 miles (3%) have "incomplete" strength test pressure reports and 0.88 miles (60%) have no hydrostatic test data. All of the un-tested pipe is seamless. All of the pipe footage that has not been post construction hydrostatically tested is 24 and 16 inch seamless pipe from job number 73429 installed in 1944 and job number 85737 installed in 1947.

## Appendix– Reference Sources

	Name of Document	Date / Revision	Description	Author / Approval
1	Procedure for Completing Pipeline Features List for In-line Inspection Projects	3 Dec 2009 Revision # 3	Document describes the process of downloading information from GIS and reviewing records to establish a list of features.	Redacted  Approved by Redacted 4 Dec 2009
2	Historical Gas Pipe Minimums	17 Feb 2000	Written by 2 long time PG&E engineers to document historical pipe minimums. Note Gas Standard A-11 addresses Joint Factors.	Redacted Redacted
3	Gas Standard A-11 Drawing Number 085053	9 Jan 1970 Last Revision 5 Feb 1976	Describes how to identify different types of gas pipe. Includes joint factors for longitudinal seams on the last page.	Full names not clear. Approved using initials only.
4	Welding Sleeves for Steel Gas Mains Drawing Number 081439 MS-1102	4 Jan 1945	Document lists specifications for welding sleeves. Including Minimum thickness for various sizes up to 26 inch diameter pipe. Minimum tensile strength 60,000 psi.	Full names not clear. Approved using initials only.
5	Gas Standard A-60 Gas Main Welding Sleeves Drawing Number 283226	26 Mar 1968 Last Revision 18 May 1971	Lists specifications for welding sleeves. Grade must be equal or greater than carrier pipe. Wall thickness not less than .375 and equal or greater than carrier pipe.	Redacted on original issue. Later revisions initialed.
6	Gas Standard A-60 Gas Main Welding Sleeves Drawing Number 283226	26 Mar 1968 Last Revision 18 May 1976	Lists specifications for welding sleeves. Grade must be equal or greater than carrier pipe. Wall thickness not less than .375 and equal or greater than carrier pipe. Recommended 1.2 times carrier wall thickness.	Redacted on original issue. Later revisions initialed.
7	Gas Standard A-60 Page 8 Drawing Number 088312	Last Revision 15 Jun 1990	Lists specifications for welding sleeves. Grade must be equal or greater than carrier pipe. Wall thickness calculated by formula, generally 1.42 times carrier wall thickness.	Full names not clear, Revisions initialed.

8	Utility Standard WP 4125S Establishment of MAOP for gas pipelines	March 2010	Describes the standards defining the establishment and maintenance of MAOP and MOP information for gas pipelines	Redacted
9	Line Pipe Manufacturing in North America	CRTD- Vol 43	ASME research report prepared by Kiefner and Associates for the Gas Pipeline Safety Research Committee	Redacted
10	Integrity Characteristics of Vintage Pipelines	2005	Describes how the technical information on vintage pipelines may be used to comply with ASME B31.8S, created under contract to the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America.	Battelle Memorial Institute
11	Gas Standard Drawing 081465	8-8-1945	Gives standard sizes, dimensions and properties for 45 degree long radius elbows	Signed and approve with initials.
12	Gas Standard Drawing 281992	10-8-1952	Gives standard sizes, dimensions and properties for 90 degree long radius elbows	Signed and approve with initials.
13	Gas Standard Drawing 283158 MS 1051	9-20-1962	Gives standard sizes, dimensions and properties for 90, 45 degree elbows. Tees and reducers	Signed and approve with initials.
14	Gas Standard MS 1050	6-1-1964	Gives standard sizes, dimensions and properties for tees	Signed and approve with initials.
15	PG&E Letter "History of Pipe Purchases"	12-12-1962	Describes the PG&E pipe purchases from 1920s through 1962 in order to identify unknown pipe.	Redacted Manager of Gas System Design Dept.