

Managing System Integrity for Hazardous Liquid Pipelines

API RECOMMENDED PRACTICE 1160
THIRD EDITION, FEBRUARY 2019

REAFFIRMED, MARCH 2024



Special Notes

API publications necessarily address problems of a general nature. With respect to particular circumstances, local, state, and federal laws and regulations should be reviewed.

Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, committees, or other assignees make any warranty or representation, either express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained herein, or assume any liability or responsibility for any use, or the results of such use, of any information or process disclosed in this publication. Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, or other assignees represent that use of this publication would not infringe upon privately owned rights.

API publications may be used by anyone desiring to do so. Every effort has been made by the Institute to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data contained in them; however, the Institute makes no representation, warranty, or guarantee in connection with this publication and hereby expressly disclaims any liability or responsibility for loss or damage resulting from its use or for the violation of any authorities having jurisdiction with which this publication may conflict.

API publications are published to facilitate the broad availability of proven, sound engineering and operating practices. These publications are not intended to obviate the need for applying sound engineering judgment regarding when and where these publications should be utilized. The formulation and publication of API publications is not intended in any way to inhibit anyone from using any other practices.

Any manufacturer marking equipment or materials in conformance with the marking requirements of an API standard is solely responsible for complying with all the applicable requirements of that standard. API does not represent, warrant, or guarantee that such products do in fact conform to the applicable API standard.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Contact the Publisher, API Publishing Services, 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001.

Copyright © 2019 American Petroleum Institute

Foreword

Nothing contained in any API publication is to be construed as granting any right, by implication or otherwise, for the manufacture, sale, or use of any method, apparatus, or product covered by letters patent. Neither should anything contained in the publication be construed as insuring anyone against liability for infringement of letters patent.

The verbal forms used to express the provisions in this specification are as follows:

- the term “shall” denotes a minimum requirement in order to conform to the standard;
- the term “should” denotes a recommendation or that which is advised but not required in order to conform to the standard;
- the term “may” is used to express permission or a provision that is optional;
- the term “can” is used to express possibility or capability.

Informative elements—As used in a standard, “informative” denotes elements that identify the document, introduce its content, and explain its background, development, and its relationship with other documents or provide additional information intended to assist the understanding or use of the document.

Normative elements—As used in a standard, “normative” denotes elements that describe the scope of the document and that set out provisions that are required to implement the standard.

This document was produced under API standardization procedures that ensure appropriate notification and participation in the developmental process and is designated as an API standard. Questions concerning the interpretation of the content of this publication or comments and questions concerning the procedures under which this publication was developed should be directed in writing to the Director of Standards, American Petroleum Institute, 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001. Requests for permission to reproduce or translate all or any part of the material published herein should also be addressed to the director.

Generally, API standards are reviewed and revised, reaffirmed, or withdrawn at least every five years. A one-time extension of up to two years may be added to this review cycle. Status of the publication can be ascertained from the API Standards Department, telephone (202) 682-8000. A catalog of API publications and materials is published annually by API, 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001.

Suggested revisions are invited and should be submitted to the Standards Department, API, 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001, standards@api.org.

Contents

	Page
1	Scope 1
2	Normative References 1
3	Terms, Definitions, Acronyms, and Abbreviations 2
3.1	Terms and Definitions. 2
3.2	Acronyms and Abbreviations 8
4	Integrity Management Program. 10
4.1	Program Considerations 10
4.2	Elements of Integrity Management 12
5	Threat Assessment. 15
5.1	Threats 15
5.2	Threat Interaction 16
6	Identifying Critical Locations with Respect to the Consequences of a Release. 18
6.1	General. 18
6.2	Determining Whether a Release from a Pipeline Segment or a Facility Could Affect a Critical Location 18
6.3	Documentation and Updating 21
7	Data Integration. 21
7.1	General. 21
7.2	Effective Data Integration. 21
7.3	Types of Data to Integrate to Support Integrity Management 22
7.4	Data Maintenance (Management of Change). 24
7.5	Integration of Data to Validate MOP 24
8	Risk Assessment Implementation 24
8.1	General Considerations 24
8.2	Developing a Risk Assessment Approach. 25
8.3	Characteristics of Risk Assessment Approaches. 27
9	Integrity Assessment and Remediation 28
9.1	General. 28
9.2	In-line Inspection. 29
9.3	Hydrostatic Pressure Testing 40
9.4	Other Assessment Methods 43
9.5	Repair Methods 43
10	Reassessment Intervals 44
10.1	General. 44
10.2	Anomaly Growth Rates 44
10.3	Establishing the Reassessment Interval 46
11	Preventive and Mitigative Measures 47
11.1	General. 47
11.2	Prevention and Mitigation of Threats 50
11.3	Mitigating the Consequences of Unintended Releases 56
11.4	Reducing Pressure 58
12	Integrity Management of Facilities 58
12.1	General Considerations 58
12.2	Facility Threat Assessment 59
12.3	Gathering, Reviewing, and Integrating Data 60
12.4	Facility Risk Assessment. 60

Contents

	Page
12.5 Facility Integrity Assessment	61
12.6 Reassessment Intervals	65
12.7 Prevention and Mitigation Measures	68
13 Program Evaluation	71
13.1 General	71
13.2 Performance Measures	72
13.3 Performance Tracking and Trending	76
13.4 Self-Reviews	77
13.5 Performance Improvement	78
14 Management of Change	78
14.1 General	78
14.2 Management of Change—Newly Constructed Systems or New Acquisitions	80
14.3 Management-of-Change Operations	80
14.4 Management-of-Change Pipeline Status	80
Annex A (normative) Threats to Pipeline Integrity	81
Annex B (informative) In-line Inspection Technologies	95
Annex C (informative) Repair Strategies	100
Annex D (normative) Calculating Reassessment Intervals	105
Annex E (informative) Other Technologies	111
Annex F (informative) Leak Detection Methods	113
Annex G (informative) Facilities Piping and Equipment Threats	115
Annex H (informative) Example Visual/Surveillance Inspection Form for Facilities	121
Annex I (informative) Advisory Bulletins and National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) Pipeline Accident Report References	122
Bibliography	124
Figures	
1 PDCA Cycle Applied to an Integrity Management Program	12
2 Identifying Pipeline Segments or Facilities Located Within Critical Locations	20
3 Simplified Depiction of Risk	26
4 ILI Process Flow Diagram	33
5 Inspection Terminology	34
6 Example Timing for Scheduled Responses	48
A.1 Example of Seismic Threshold Response Application	93
B.1 An Example Tool Selection Process	98
D.1 Reassessment Intervals Based on a Specific Failure-pressure vs Flaw-size Model	105
D.2 Example of Seismic Threshold Response Application	107
D.3 Remaining Life of a Crack-like Flaw in a Material of Less-Than--Optimum Toughness	107
H.1 Example of Seismic Threshold Response Application	121
Tables	
1 Threat Categories	29
2 Integrity Assessment Methods	30
3 In-line Inspection Tools and Capabilities	32

Contents

Page

Tables (continued)

4	Corrosion Rates Related to Soil	45
5	Examples of Preventive Measures to Address Pipeline Integrity Threats	49
6	Examples of Mitigative Measures to Address Consequences	49
7	Leak Detection Methods	57
8	Direct Inspection Methods Applicable to Facilities	66
9	Examples of Preventive Measures to Address Facility Integrity Threats	69
10	Examples of Mitigative Measures to Address Consequences at Facilities	70
11	Examples of Integrity Performance Measurement by Threat	73
12	Performance Measures by Process Step	75
13	Examples of Management Change	79
A.1	Example Seismic Activity Response Criteria	92
D.1	Benchmark Cycles to Determine Cycle Aggressiveness	109
G.1	Organization of Topics Covered in Annex G	115

Introduction

The goal of any pipeline operator is to operate the pipeline so that there are no adverse effects on the public, employees, the environment, or customers. The goal is an error-free, spill-free, and incident-free operation of the pipeline.

An integrity management program provides a way to improve the safety of pipeline systems and to allocate operator resources effectively to:

- identify and analyze actual and potential precursor events that can result in pipeline incidents,
- examine the likelihood and potential severity of pipeline incidents,
- provide a comprehensive and integrated method for examining and comparing the spectrum of risks and risk reduction activities available,
- provide a structured, easily-communicated way for selecting and implementing risk reduction activities,
- establish and track system performance with the goal of improving that performance.

This recommended practice (RP) outlines a process that an operator of a pipeline system can use to assess risks and make decisions about risks in operating a hazardous liquid pipeline to achieve a number of goals, including reducing both the number and consequences of incidents. Section 4 describes the components of an integrity management program. This RP also supports the development of integrity management programs required under 49 CFR 195.452 of the U.S. federal pipeline safety regulations.

This RP is intended for use by individuals and teams charged with planning, implementing, and improving a pipeline integrity management program. A team may include engineers, operating personnel, and technicians or specialists with specific experience or expertise (such as corrosion, in-line inspection, and right-of-way patrolling). Users of this RP should be familiar with applicable pipeline safety regulations (e.g. 49 CFR 195). This RP is also designed to serve as a roadmap to relevant consensus standards, recommended practices, guidance documents, technical reports, advisory bulletins, and safety regulations that can help operators manage integrity for hazardous liquid pipelines.

Guiding Principles

The development of this RP was based on certain guiding principles. These principles are reflected in multiple sections and are provided to give the reader the opportunity to view pipeline integrity from a broader perspective.

Integrity should be built into pipeline systems from initial planning, design, and construction. Integrity management of a pipeline starts with the sound design and construction of the pipeline. Guidance for new construction is provided in several consensus standards, including ASME B31.4, as well as pipeline safety regulations. As these standards and guidelines are applied to the design of a pipeline, the designer should consider the area the pipeline traverses and the possible impacts that the pipeline may have on that area, and the people that reside in its vicinity. New construction is not a subject of this RP, but the design specifications and as-built condition of the pipeline provide important baseline information for an integrity management program.

Effective integrity management is built on qualified people using defined processes to operate maintained facilities. The integrity of the physical facility is only part of the complete system that allows an operator to reduce both the number of incidents and the adverse effects of errors and incidents. The total system also includes the people that operate the facility and the work processes that the employees use and follow. A comprehensive integrity management program should address people, processes, and facilities.

An integrity management program should be flexible. An integrity management program should be customized to

An integrity management program should be flexible. An integrity management program should be customized to support each operator's unique conditions. Furthermore, the program should be continually evaluated and modified to accommodate changes in the pipeline design and operation, changes in the environment in which the system operates, and new operating data and other integrity-related information.

Continuous evaluation is required to ensure the program takes appropriate advantage of improved technology and that the program remains integrated with the operator's business practices, and effectively supports the operator's integrity goals.

The integration of information is a key component for managing system integrity. A key element of the integrity management program is the integration of all relevant information in the decision-making process. Information that can impact an operator's understanding of the important risks to a pipeline system comes from a variety of sources. The operator is in the best position to gather and analyze this information. By integrating all of the relevant information, the operator can determine where the risks of an incident are applicable and are the greatest and make prudent decisions to reduce these risks.

Preparing for and conducting a risk assessment is a key element in managing pipeline system integrity. Risk assessment is an analytical process through which an operator determines the types of adverse events or conditions that might impact pipeline integrity, the likelihood that those events or conditions will lead to a loss of integrity, and the nature and severity of the consequences that might occur following a failure. This analytical process involves the integration and analysis of design, construction, operating, maintenance, testing, and other information about a pipeline system. Risk assessments can have varying scopes, varying levels of detail, and use different methods. The ultimate goal of assessing risks is to identify and prioritize the most significant risks so that an operator can make informed decisions about these issues.

Assessing risks to pipeline integrity is an iterative process. The operator continuously gathers new and refreshed information about the pipeline system through operating, maintenance, and testing experience. This information should be factored into the understanding of system risks. As the significance and relevance of this newer information to risk is understood, the operator may need to adjust its integrity plan accordingly. This may result in changes to inspection methods or frequency or additional modifications to the pipeline system in response to the data. As changes are made, different pipelines within a single operating company and different operators will be at different places with regard to the goal of incident-free operation. Each pipeline system and each company should implement specific goals and measures to monitor the improvements in integrity, and to assess the need for additional changes. The following applies to operators:

- Operators have multiple options available to address risks. Components of the facility or system can be changed; additional training can be provided to the people that operate the system; processes or procedures can be modified; or a combination of actions can be used to optimize risk reduction.
- Operators should address integrity issues raised from assessments and information analysis.
- Operators should evaluate anomalies and identify those that are potentially injurious to pipeline integrity.
- Operators should remediate or eliminate injurious defects.
- Operators should periodically assess the capabilities of new technologies and techniques that may provide improved understanding about the pipe's condition or provide new opportunities to reduce risk. Knowledge about what is available and effective will allow the operator to apply the most appropriate technologies or techniques to a specific risk to best address potential impacts.

Pipeline system integrity and integrity management programs should be evaluated on a continual basis. Operators are encouraged to perform internal reviews to ensure the effectiveness of the integrity management program in achieving the program's goals. Some operators may choose to use the services of third parties to assist with such evaluations.

Managing System Integrity for Hazardous Liquid Pipelines

1 Scope

This recommended practice (RP) is applicable to pipeline systems used to transport hazardous liquids as defined in U.S. Title 49 CFR Part 195.2. The use of this RP is not limited to pipelines regulated under 49 CFR 195 and the principles embodied in integrity management are applicable to all pipeline systems.

This RP is specifically designed to provide the operator with a description of industry-proven practices in pipeline integrity management.

The RP is largely targeted to onshore pipelines along the right-of-way, but the process and approach can be applied to pipeline facilities, including pipeline stations, terminals, and delivery facilities associated with pipeline systems. Certain sections of this RP provide guidance specific to pipeline stations, terminals, and delivery facilities.

2 Normative References

The following referenced documents are indispensable for the application of this document. For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendments) applies.

API Bulletin 5T1, *Imperfection and Defect Terminology*

API Standard 653, *Tank Inspection, Repair, Alteration, and Reconstruction*

API Recommended Practice 1110, *Pressure Testing of Steel Pipelines for the Transportation of Gas, Petroleum Gas, Hazardous Liquids, Highly Volatile Liquids or Carbon Dioxide*

API Standard 1163, *In-line Inspection Systems Qualification*

API Recommended Practice 1166, *Excavation Monitoring and Observation for Damage Prevention*

API Recommended Practice 1173, *Pipeline Safety Management Systems*

API Recommended Practice 1176, *Assessment and Management of Cracking in Pipelines*

ASME B31G, *Manual for Determining the Remaining Strength of Corroded Pipelines: A Supplement to ASME B31, Code for Pressure Piping*

ASME B31.4, *Liquid and Slurry Piping Transportation Systems*

ASME B31.8S, *Managing System Integrity of Gas Pipelines*

ASTM E1049-85, *Standard Practices for Cycle Counting in Fatigue Analysis*

NACE SP0169, *Control of External Corrosion on Underground or Submerged Metallic Piping Systems*

NACE SP0204, *Stress Corrosion Cracking (SCC) Direct Assessment Methodology*

NACE SP0502, *Pipeline External Corrosion Direct Assessment Methodology*