

Evaluation of Pressure Rating Methods Recommended by API RP 17TR8

Final Report with Peer Review Responses

Global Security Sciences Division



Report Authors

This Argonne report has multiple authors depending on section. Argonne employed a contractor, William Aiken (Aiken Engineering Company), to perform a major portion of the work described. Mr. William Aiken and his firm were charged with completing a detailed design of two typical high-pressure high-temperature subsea components and analytically verifying the designs applying principles of ASME BPVC Sections VIII Divisions 2 and 3 as set forth in the first edition of API 17TR8. Upon completion of a verified design Aiken Engineering had two components fabricated per industry practices using a common material, characterized the material, and pressure tested the components to failure. Dr. Dan Fraser and Roy A. Lindley contributed to conclusions and recommendations with Mr. Aiken's concurrence. The initial report was peer reviewed in accordance with BSEE practices. Responses to the peer review comments are provided in Appendix G of the report. The responses are a joint effort of Mr. Aiken, Roy A. Lindley, and Dr. Bruce Miglin (ADICA, LLD under subcontract to Argonne). Mr. Aiken is a professional engineer and attached his engineering stamp to the report.

About Argonne National Laboratory

Argonne is a U.S. Department of Energy laboratory managed by UChicago Argonne, LLC under contract DE-AC02-06CH11357. The Laboratory's main facility is outside Chicago, at 9700 South Cass Avenue, Argonne, Illinois 60439. For information about Argonne and its pioneering science and technology programs, see www.anl.gov.

DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY

Online Access: U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) reports produced after 1991 and a growing number of pre-1991 documents are available free via DOE's SciTech Connect (http://www.osti.gov/scDOCUMENT AVAILABILITYitech/)

Reports not in digital format may be purchased by the public from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS):

U.S. Department of Commerce National Technical Information Service 5301 Shawnee Rd Alexandria, VA 22312 www.ntis.gov Phone: (800) 553-NTIS (6847) or (703) 605-6000 Fax: (703) 605-6900 Email: orders@ntis.gov

Reports not in digital format are available to DOE and DOE contractors from the Office of Scientific and Technical Information (OSTI):

U.S. Department of Energy Office of Scientific and Technical Information P.O. Box 62 Oak Ridge, TN 37831-0062 www.osti.gov Phone: (865) 576-8401 Fax: (865) 576-5728 Email: reports@osti.gov

Disclaimer

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor UChicago Argonne, LLC, nor any of their employees or officers, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of document authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof, Argonne National Laboratory, or UChicago Argonne, LLC.

This report was prepared by Argonne National Laboratory (ANL) under contract to the Department of Energy (DOE) through an interagency agreement between the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE) and the DOE. The opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in the report are those of the authors and they do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of BSEE.

Evaluation of Pressure Rating Methods Recommended by API RP 17TR8

Final Report with Peer Review Responses

prepared by **Roy A. Lindley, P.E. Ret.** Strategic Alliance for Global Energy Solutions Center Global Security Sciences Division, Argonne National Laboratory

Willian B. Aiken, P.E. President, Aiken Engineering Company Under Contract to Argonne National Laboratory

Bruce P. Miglin, Ph.D. Metallurgist, Associate Professional of ADICA, LLC Under Contract to Argonne National Laboratory

Prepared for U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement

July 18, 2017

EVALUATION OF PRESSURE RATING METHODS RECOMMENDED BY API 17TR8

PREPARED FOR

ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY LEMONT, ILLINOIS

PREPARED BY

AIKEN ENGINEERING COMPANY HOUSTON, TEXAS

FINAL WITH PEER REVIEW RESPONSES- JULY 18, 2017

1

EVALUATION OF PRESSURE RATINGS METHODS RECOMMENDED BY API 17TR8

PREPARED FOR

ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY LEMONT, ILLINOIS



BY

William B. Aiken, P.E.

Aiken Engineering Company F-4556

> AIKEN ENGINEERING COMPANY 9720 Cypresswood Drive Suite 340 Houston, Texas 77070

FINAL WITH PEER REVIEW RESPONSES- JULY 18, 2017

Evaluation of Pressure Ratings Methods Recommended by API 17TR8

Table of Contents

Prefac	e	
1.0	Summary	7
2.0	Discussion of Verification Methods in TR8 and Other Codes	
3.0	Purpose of Study	
4.0	Procedure of Study	
5.0 5.1 5.2 5.3	Components Evaluated in Study Components Analyzed and Tested Components Analyzed but Not Tested Material Properties of Components	
6.0 6.1 6.2 6.3 6.4	Comparison of Collapse Pressures and Burst Pressures Collapse Pressures by Elastic-Plastic FEA Burst Pressure by Hydrotest Comparison of Collapse Pressure and Burst Pressure Validation of FEA Model	
7.0 7.1 7.2 7.3	Pressure Ratings of Test Bodies Pressure Ratings by Elastic-Plastic FEA Pressure Ratings by Linear Elastic FEA Pressure Ratings by Proof Test	17 18 19 20
8.0 8.1 8.2	Pressure Ratings of Other Components by FEA API 13 5/8 x 20k Flange API 16 3/4 x 10k Flange	
9.0 9.1 9.2	Comparison of Pressure Ratings for All Components Comparison of Pressure Ratings by Different Codes Comparison of Historical Pressure Ratings with TR8 Ratings	
10.0	Conclusions	
11.0	Figures	
APPE	 NDIX A - Design Calculations, Material Properties and Specifications A1 Design Calculations and Material Properties A2 Material Specification D2456-1 Revision 1 	A-1 A-2 A-10
APPE	NDIX B – Finite Element Analysis of Components	B-1

B1	FEA of Large Neck Test Body	B-2
B2	FEA of Small Neck Test Body	B-28
B3	FEA of API 13 5/8 x 20k Flange	B-46
B4	FEA of API 16 3/4 x 10k Flange	B-57
APPENDI	X C – Hydro and Burst Tests of Test Bodies	C-1
C1	Documents by Aiken Engineering	C-1
C2	Southwest Research Institute Test Report	C-2
APPEND	X D– Validation of FEA of Test Bodies	D- 1
APPEND	X E – Pressure Ratings by Proof Testing	E-1
APPEND	IX F – Miscellaneous Documents	F-1
F1	Material Documents from Forged Products	F-2
F2	Test data from Franklin Research	F-35
F3	F22 Test Data from Forged Products	F-42
APPEND	X G – Peer Review Comment Responses	G-1
G1	Introduction and Background	G-1
G2 Scope)	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argo	nne Project G-3
G3	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne	Project
Scope)		G-8
G4	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer Review Comments	G-18
G5	Comments Outside of Peer Review Charge	G-20
G6	Appendix A Cross Tabulation of Responses to Peer Review Report Text	as
Tabulated	in Section 4.2	G-2 1

List of Figures

Figure 5.1: Details of Large Neck Test Body	32
Figure 5.2: Details of Small Neck Test Body	33
Figure 5.3: Assembly of Large Neck Test Body	34
Figure 6.1: FEA Model of Large Neck Test Body	35
Figure 6.2: Assembled Test Body Ready for Testing	36
Figure 6.3: Test Body Inside a Containment Structure	36
Figure 6.4: Rupture Failure in Large Test Body	37
Figure 6.5: Rupture Failure in Small Test Body	37
Figure 8.1: FEA Model of 13 5/8 x 20 K Flange	38
Figure 9.1: Historical Pressure Ratings for Test Bodies	39

List of Tables

Table 2.1 - TR8 Verification Methods for HPHT	9
Table 6.1 - Comparison of Burst and Plastic Collapse Pressures	17
Table 7.1 - Comparison of Pressure Ratings by Proof Test and Elastic-Plastic FEA	20
Table 9.1 - Pressure Ratings for all Components by FEA	23
Table 9.2 - Ratio of Pressure Rating to Collapse Pressure by FEA	24
Table 9.3 - Comparison of Internal Pressure Ratings of Test Bodies (At 70 F and with As- Specified Material Properties)	26

Preface

The first edition of API Technical Report 17TR8, *High-Pressure High-Temperature (HPHT) Design Guidelines*, was released in February 2015. As stated in the introduction to the report, the report provided "design guidelines for high-pressure, high-temperature equipment specifically for subsea applications." The technical report was written by a large task group that included many highly qualified engineers and scientists in the subsea industry. The task group is to be commended for their efforts and the well-written, comprehensive document they produced.

API Technical Report TR8 advocates for engineering mechanics methods that have not been commonly used in the subsea industry or adopted by codes pertaining to subsea applications. Although the theories advanced by the report are not altogether new, some are new to the subsea industry. Many industry engineers and scientists would like to see validation of these new theories as they apply to subsea equipment. For this purpose, BSEE, in collaboration with Argonne National Laboratory, developed and funded a study to validate the pressure rating methods in API Technical Report TR8.

This report describes the methods and results of the study conducted. However, this study is only a first step in validating the methods set forth in API Technical Report TR8. Proper validation will require many similar studies concerning other types of subsea equipment, especially more complex equipment with multibody contact.

To simplify the reading of this report, several shorthand style abbreviations were adopted throughout. These are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Section VIII, Division 2 (2013 Edition) and Division 3 (2013 Edition) of the ASME Pressure Vessel Codes are referenced throughout this report. Throughout the report, these codes are simply referred to as Division 2 and Division 3. Another code referenced throughout this report is API Specification 6A, *Specification for Wellhead and Christmas Tree Equipment*, Twentieth Edition, October 2010. In this report, API Specification 6A is referred to as API 6A. Lastly, hereafter, API Technical Report 17TR8, *High-Pressure High-Temperature (HPHT) Design Guidelines* is referenced simply as TR8.

During this study, rupture pressures for components were determined using hydrotest and finite element analysis (FEA). Thus, in this paper, the term *burst pressure* is defined as "the rupture pressure determined by hydrotest." Similarly, the term *plastic collapse pressure*, or simply *collapse pressure*, is defined as "a rupture pressure determined by elastic-plastic FEA."

A study as comprehensive as this one requires guidance, assistance, and work by many people and organizations. These people and companies need to be acknowledged.

First and foremost, Argonne National Laboratory must be acknowledged for its huge part in this effort. Argonne personnel, specifically Dan Fraser and Roy Lindley, conceived this study, guided its execution, provided insight and direction, and, very importantly, obtained funding for the study.

Greg Bailey of Shell Oil Company and Bruce Miglin, a consultant who recently retired from Shell Oil Company, were on the advisory team along with Dan Fraser and Roy Lindley. Throughout the study, Greg provided guidance and insight based on his many years of experience in subsea and related industries. Many times during the study, Greg guided us toward a beneficial path. Bruce was the materials and fracture expert on the team. His greatest contribution to the team was designing, supervising, and evaluating the testing of ruptured material from the study.

The contributions of Forged Products Incorporated (FPI) were important to the success of the study. FPI forged, performed all QA/QC for, and machined the test components. FPI must be commended for meeting scheduled dates and providing high-quality, machined components that met all requirements. The FPI personnel whose efforts need to be recognized are Kevin Crowley, Joe Murphy, Lee White, and Rigoberto Cendejas.

Successful performance of hydrotests was an important part of this study. Southwest Research Institute (SwRI) in San Antonio, Texas, performed all aspects of the hydrotests. SwRI must be complimented for the professional, competent, and thorough way they performed the hydrotest program. The SwRI engineers who supervised the test program were Veronica McDonald and Chris Storey.

The material specifications for the test components were written by Manuel Maligas, a consulting metallurgist in Houston, Texas. Manuel has several decades of experience writing material specifications for subsea equipment. His contribution to the study was valuable.

Last, but certainly not least, Aiken Engineering personnel must be recognized for their contributions. Maurice Peltier was the project manager for the study. He ensured tasks were completed correctly, on time, and on budget. Ryan Moore's vast experience as a lead engineer in a subsea equipment manufacturer's test lab was valuable during designing and performing the hydrotests. Ryan monitored all testing at SwRI and offered many helpful suggestions to the test engineers during the test program.

1.0 Summary

API Technical Report 17TR8, *High-Pressure High-Temperature (HPHT) Design Guidelines* was released in February 2015, and as the title suggests, its purpose was to provide technical guidance for the design of subsea equipment operating at either high pressure (>15 ksi) or high temperature (>350 F). TR8 advocated for engineering methods that had not been commonly used in the subsea industry or adopted by codes pertaining to subsea applications.

Specifically, in Section 5.0, TR8 specifies the following analysis procedures for the verification of HPHT equipment:

- API 6A/6X/17D;
- ASME Division 2: 2013 Part 5 by Linear-Elastic FEA;
- ASME Division 2: 2013 Part 5 by Elastic-Plastic FEA; and
- ASME Division 3: 2013 Part KD by Elastic-Plastic FEA.

The linear-elastic methods set forth in API 6A and ASME Division 2 have been used for many years in the design of subsea equipment. However, the use of Division 2 and Division 3 elastic-plastic methods are new to the industry.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the elastic-plastic methods set forth in the ASME Codes to confirm that they provide adequate margins of safety for subsea equipment. This is especially important since TR8 allows equipment designed for pressures above 20 ksi to be verified only using Division 3 elastic-plastic methods.

The methodology of this study is summarized below:

- Two special test bodies for a 20 ksi operating pressure were designed and manufactured;
- The team performed both elastic-plastic and linear-elastic FEAs on both test bodies using ASME procedures;
- The team calculated pressure ratings based on the four methods allowed by TR8;
- Hydrotests were performed on the two test bodies to determine the actual rupture pressures;
- The team calculated the margin of safety for TR8 ratings based on actual burst pressures; and
- The margins of safety from all the rating methods in TR8 were compared.

The following are the important conclusions of this study. These conclusions are based on the results of the elastic-plastic FEA and the hydrotests performed as part of this study. The following conclusions apply to HPHT subsea equipment rated for a pressure of 20 ksi or lower. No consideration has been given to equipment rated for pressures greater than 20 ksi. However, there is no apparent reason that these conclusions could not apply to equipment rated for pressures higher than 20 ksi. The conclusions are as follows:

- 1. The Division 3 elastic-plastic method is not recommended for HPHT subsea equipment published with a 1.8 design-load factor.
- 2. A Division 3 analysis with a design load factor of 1.8 is acceptable only if the factor is applied to the rupture pressure determined by proof test to failure, and if provided justification demonstrates that additional requirements in Division 3 sufficiently reduce the risk of failure.
- 3. The Division 2 elastic-plastic method with a design load factor of 2.1 is a suitable method for calculating load ratings for HPHT subsea equipment.
- 4. For a Division 2 linear-elastic analysis, it is recommended that stress intensities and not von Mises stresses be compared with allowable stresses.
- 5. It is recommended that the subsea industry compare collapse pressures from FEA with burst pressures from hydrotests for a variety of subsea equipment.
- 6. The subsea industry should confirm that performing the fracture mechanics analysis required by Division 3 justifies reduction of the design load factor to 1.8.

2.0 Discussion of Verification Methods in TR8 and Other Codes

API 17TR8 is a new API technical report that provides design guidelines for subsea drilling and production equipment operating at high pressures or high temperatures (HPHT). TR8 defines

high pressure as greater than 15 ksi and *high temperature* as greater than 350 F. When operating temperature or pressure meets the HPHT criteria, TR8 requires design verification using one of four methods, and the specific method to be used depends on the operating pressure. The four methods for design verification are listed below:

- Linear-elastic analysis based on the methods in API 6A/6X/17D;
- Linear-elastic analysis based on the methods in ASME Section VIII Division 2;
- Elastic-plastic analysis based on the methods in ASME Section VIII Division 2; and
- Elastic-plastic analysis based on the methods in ASME Section VIII Division 3.

Table 2.1 identifies the acceptable verification methods in TR8. Note that if pressure exceeds 15 ksi or temperature exceeds 350 F, then equipment is considered HPHT. The information in the table is taken from Figure 1 in TR8. For some pressure ranges, TR8 allows the use of limit-load analysis. This method is similar to standard elastic-plastic analysis, but does not consider the effects of strain hardening. The limit-load method is seldom used because it is less accurate, because it requires the same analysis as standard elastic-plastic FEA, and because it is often difficult to achieve convergence. For these reasons, limit-load analysis is not considered in this study.

Pressure	Temperature	Failure Criterion	Acceptable Validation Methods
Pi≤15 ksi	T ≤ 350 °F	Yield Strength	Not HPHT - No TR8 Verification Required
Pi≤15 ksi	T > 350 °F	Yield Strength	API 6A with Stress Intensity
15 ksi > Pi <u><</u> 20 ksi	T > 350 °F	Yield Strength	Division 2 Linear-Elastic or
		Tensile Strength	Division 2 Elastic-Plastic or
		Tensile Strength	Division 3 Elastic-Plastic
Pi > 20 ksi	$T > 350 ^{\circ}F$	Tensile Strength	Division 3 Elastic-Plastic

Table 2.1 - TR8 Verification Methods for HPHT

Prior to 2007, linear-elastic analysis was the only method accepted by API or ASME for verifying pressure ratings. Since the late 1970s, the majority of pressure-containing equipment in subsea drilling and production has been verified using the linear-elastic method in Division 2. This method was required by API 6A, which, at the time, was the most widely used code in the subsea industry.

Based on long operating histories, designs verified by this methodology have unquestionably passed the test of time. Structural failures of equipment designed by this method are rare and are usually due to overloads, design errors, QA/QC mistakes, or leakage.

In 2007, Divisions 2 and 3 of the ASME Code added procedures for verification using elasticplastic FEA. Currently, API has not approved verification by elastic-plastic FEA. API still requires verification by the linear-elastic procedures set forth in the 2004 release of Division 2.

As Table 2.1 shows, for pressures between 15 ksi and 20 ksi, TR8 allows validation by elasticplastic FEA or by linear-elastic FEA. Furthermore, the elastic-plastic FEA can use either Division 2 or Division 3 procedures. However, for pressures greater than 20 ksi, TR8 allows only the use of elastic-plastic FEA according to the procedures in Division 3. Neither elastic-plastic analysis using Division 2 procedures nor linear-elastic analysis is acceptable if pressures exceed 20 ksi.

The maximum pressure ratings allowed by the three validation methods are different. The ratings from ASME Divisions 2 and 3 elastic-plastic analysis both use the same elastic-plastic FEA procedure to calculate plastic collapse pressure. Both Division 2 and Division 3 define maximum pressure rating as the collapse pressure from FEA divided by a design factor. However, the values of these design factors are much different for Divisions 2 and 3. Division 2 specifies a design factor of 2.4, and Division 3 specifies a design factor of 1.8. As such, the pressure rating using Division 2 procedures will be 25 percent lower than the pressure rating allowed by Division 3. Division 3 justifies its lower design factor by adding enhanced material requirements and fatigue calculations using fracture mechanics methods.

The linear-elastic method is very different from the two elastic-plastic methods, and the fundamental difference lies in the basis of pressure ratings. In linear-elastic FEA, pressure ratings are based on yield strength, whereas in elastic-plastic procedures, tensile strength is the basis of pressure ratings. Pressure ratings from linear-elastic FEA will be different from ratings using elastic-plastic procedures.

3.0 Purpose of Study

The petroleum industry has a long and successful history of setting pressure ratings using the procedures set forth in API 6A. These procedures are based on linear-elastic FEA methods described in Division 2 and allowable stresses based on yield strength. For pressures greater than 15 ksi, TR8 allows pressure ratings to be set using elastic-plastic methods from the ASME Codes. Furthermore, for pressures above 20 ksi, TR8 requires that pressure ratings be set using only Division 3 elastic-plastic methods. This is a significant procedural change for the industry, and the consequences of using the elastic-plastic methods specified in TR8 must be carefully evaluated before they are adopted by the subsea industry. Evaluation of the elastic-plastic methods in TR8 as related to HPHT subsea equipment is the purpose of this study.

4.0 Procedure of Study

The elements of this study were wide ranging and numerous. The study included engineering, design, manufacturing, material testing, hydrotesting, and 3-D finite element analyses. Rather than include an extensive description of the tasks performed during the study, an outline of the discreet steps that comprised the study is provided on the following page.

A review of the procedure outline shows that internal pressure was the only load that was considered in this study. Although internal pressure is arguably the most critical load that is applied to subsea equipment, it is not the only load that can produce or contribute to failure. Other loads such as external tension, shear and bending moments are significant and can either cause or contribute to failure. It is imperative and required by TR8 that all loads be included in a structural analysis of HPHT equipment.

5.0 Components Evaluated in Study

A total of four components were evaluated in this study. In the context of the study, *evaluation* means determining pressure rating based on analysis by FEA, hydrotest, or both.

Pressure ratings were determined by both hydrotest and FEA for two of the four components in this study. Pressure ratings for the other two components were determined by only FEA. The two components evaluated by both hydrotest and FEA are the primary focus of this study. The other two components were a later addition and were included to provide evaluations of additional shapes commonly used in the subsea industry.

Outline of Discrete Tasks Performed in Study

I. 1	DESIGN THE TEST BODIES
	A. Identify the design conditions
	B. Identify the bore size and shape for functionality
	C. Choose material
	D. Write material specification
	E. Perform conceptual design based on strength of materials calculations
	F. Perlorm detail design G. Produce detail drawings of test hodies
п	G. Troduce detail drawings of test bodies
п.	MANUFACTURE THE TEST BODIES
	A. Forge the test bodies
	C. Removed test coupons from rough machined bodies
	D. Perform all tests and OA/OC required by the material specification
	E. Perform final machining of test bodies
	F. Perform dimensional inspection to confirm conformance to drawing dimensions
III.	PERFORM FEA OF THE TWO TEST BODIES
	A. Calculate the collapse pressure using elastic-plastic FEA
	1. Case 1: using the minimum specified material properties
	2. Case 2: using the actual material properties
	B. Perform linear-elastic FEA at the rated pressures
IV.	Hydrotest the test bodies
	A. Choose bolt torque based on pressure end loads
	B. Design and fabricate the containment canister
	C. Design the test procedure
	D. Choose shall gage locations and mount shall gages E. Test the two bodies to the API required hydrotest pressure
	F Mount the test bodies inside the containment canisters
	G. Incrementally apply internal pressure until the test bodies burst.
	H. Produce a comprehensive test report
V.	DETERMINE PRESSURE RATING FOR THE TWO TEST BODIES BASED ON THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES:
	A. API 6A with linear-elastic FEA
	B. API 6A based on burst pressure
	C. API TR8 Division 2 procedures with elastic-plastic FEA
	D. API TR8 Division 3 procedures with elastic-plastic FEA
	E. API TR8 Division 3 based on burst pressure
VI.	COMPARE THE BURST PRESSURES FROM TEST AND ELASTIC-PLASTIC FEA; AND, THE PRESSURE RATINGS BY THE
	VARIOUS CODE PROCEDURES:
	A. Compare the burst pressures based on tests and elastic-plastic FEA
	D. Compare pressure ranges based on tests and rEA by the following includes.
	 Elastic-plastic FEA using Division 2 procedures (Approved by TR8)
	3. Elastic-plastic FEA using Division 3 procedures (Approved by TR8)

4. Burst pressure using the Division 3 factor5. Burst pressure using the API 6A factor
VII. DISCUSS THE FINDINGS OF THE STUDY
A. ResultsB. ConclusionsC. Opinions
VIII. DISCUSS SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY
IX. PRODUCE THE FINAL REPORT

In this section, the design, geometry, loads, and materials for each of the four components are described. The two primary components that were both tested and analyzed are discussed first, followed by discussions about the two components that were only analyzed.

5.1 Components Analyzed and Tested

The two components specifically designed for this study were the large neck test body and the small neck test body. Both components were designed, manufactured, hydrotested, and analyzed using FEA. The design philosophy for the two components is summarized in the following statements:

- The design pressure rating for both components was 20,000 psi. However, calculations for this study were actually performed at the design pressure of 26,000 psi. The purpose of the high design pressure was to provide a margin of 6,000 psi and allow the components to safely accommodate loads other than internal pressure. Note that this is common design practice for subsea components. Although a subsea component is rated for a specific design pressure, a designer will normally include some margin so external loads will not overstress the component;
- The geometry of each component was similar in size and shape to typical components used in subsea applications, such as valves and connectors. The neck diameter and wall thickness of each test body were determined by pressure requirements. The balance of each test body including the cross bore areas are the same since there needs to be sufficient material for the bolt holes of the attached blind flanges;
- The geometry of each component included cross-bores that produced very high local stresses; and
- The material was typical of common low-alloy steels used in subsea applications and met all the requirements of API 17TR8, the chemical composition requirements of API 6A PSL 3, and the requirements of NACE MR0175.

Although both components were designed for the same pressure rating, different rating criteria were used for each component. The large neck test body was designed to meet the rating criterion specified in the elastic-plastic method in Division 2. The small neck test body was designed to meet the rating criterion specified by the elastic-plastic method in Division 3.

Detailed drawings of the two bodies are shown in Figure 5.1 and Figure 5.2. The design calculations, material properties, and material specifications are included in Appendix A.

As Figures 5.1 and 5.2 show, the shapes and dimensions of the two test bodies are almost identical. There are only two differences between them. First, the large neck test body has a neck

OD of 5.680 inches, and the small neck body has a neck OD of 4.880 inches. Second, the transitions taper on the small neck body is slightly longer. All other dimensions and materials are identical for the two bodies.

The weak section in both bodies is located midway through the neck between the transition tapers. Internal pressure will rupture the neck at this location before failure occurs at any other location. The OD of the small neck body was designed based on the criterion in the 2013 Edition of Division 3, and the OD of the large neck body was designed using the more conservative criterion in the 2013 Edition of Division 2.

One end of each test body has a thick wall housing with width, length, and height dimensions of 17 3/4 inches. A long, cylindrical neck extends from one end of the housing. The end of the neck moving away from the housing is an integral API $3 1/16 \times 20$ k flange. The 3.060-inch bore through each test body extends for the entire length. The face of the housing opposite the flange includes drilled and tapped holes to mate with a $3 1/16 \times 20$ k API blind flange and a seal groove for a BX gasket.

A bore of 4.062 inches is machined through the two opposed faces of the housing. This bore is perpendicular to the 3.060-inch bore, and its centerline intersects the centerline of the 3.060-inch bore. Seal grooves and tapped holes are machined into the two faces with the 4.062-inch bores for the attachment of a 4 $1/16 \times 20k$ flange on each face. An enlarged cavity is machined in the center of the housing. The purpose of the enlarged cavity is to provide large, internal cross-bores that produce high-peak stresses where they intersect.

It is important to note that the length, width, and height dimensions of the large end were dictated by the ODs of the connecting flanges, not the functionality or stresses from external loads. Often in the design of subsea equipment, features other than functionality or stresses dictate the shapes and dimensions of components. Nonetheless, the majority of subsea equipment includes a cylinder or tubular section that contains high stresses, and this is often where failure will occur. Stresses in the majority of the material apart from the thin cylindrical section are often low.

During hydrotest, blind flanges were attached to the four external penetrations of the test bodies. Figure 5.3 shows the two test bodies with flanges and seals in place for hydrotest.

5.2 Components Analyzed but Not Tested

The following components were analyzed with FEA, but were not hydrotested:

- API 16 3/4 x 10k Weld Neck flange; and
- API 13 5/8 x 20k Weld Neck flange.

Both linear-elastic and elastic-plastic FEA were performed on these components. The geometry, materials, and loads for each component are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The 16 $3/4 \ge 10$ K flange and the 13 $5/8 \ge 20$ k flange are standard API flanges with shapes and dimensions specified in Tables B.53 and B.54 of API 6A. The two API flanges were chosen for evaluation because flanged connections are commonly used in subsea applications. One flange had thicker sections because it was rated for a 20,000 psi operating pressure, whereas the other,

with thinner sections, was rated for a 10,000 psi operating pressure. This provided an evaluation of components with thick and thin sections to see if section thickness affected the effectiveness of analysis methods.

Linear-elastic FEA was performed on both flanges at their rated internal pressure. The results of this analysis were used to calculate the maximum pressure ratings allowed by API 6A and Division 2 linear-elastic methods. Elastic-plastic FEA was performed with an internal pressure that was incrementally increased until plastic collapse occurred. Results of these solutions were used to calculate the minimum pressure ratings allowed by Division 2 and Division 3 elastic-plastic methods.

5.3 Material Properties of Components

The material for all four components was ASTM A182 F22 low-alloy steel with a minimum yield strength of 75,000 psi and a minimum tensile strength of 95,000 psi. The material specification is provided in Appendix A. All the required material properties are listed in the specification.

In addition, tensile tests and impact tests were performed on specimens taken from prolongations of the forging from which the test bodies were machined. Tests were performed at 70 F and 350 F. The material properties from these tests are the actual properties of the material. The actual yield strength is 92,200 psi and the actual tensile strength is 111,100. The results of material tests are included in Appendix F.

As a part of this study, elastic-plastic FEA was performed using the actual material properties and the as-specified properties. The true stress-strain data for the actual material was determined by the tensile tests. True stress-strain values for the as-specified material were calculated using the procedures in Appendix 3.D of ASME Division 2.

6.0 Comparison of Collapse Pressures and Burst Pressures

As stated in the preface, in this report, the term *collapse pressure* refers to the theoretical plastic collapse pressure based on FEA, and *burst pressure* refers to the failure pressure based on hydrotest to failure. Since TR8 procedures rate subsea equipment using the theoretical plastic collapse pressure, it is crucial that the theoretical collapse pressure closely agrees with the actual burst pressure.

An important part of this study was to determine and compare the collapse pressures and burst pressures of the two test bodies. To achieve this goal, elastic-plastic FEAs were performed to calculate the collapse pressures. Then hydrotests of the two test bodies were performed to measure the burst pressures.

This section describes the FEA and hydrotest procedures that were used to calculate the collapse and burst pressures. Lastly, the collapse pressures are compared with the burst pressures.

6.1 Collapse Pressures by Elastic-Plastic FEA

TR8 recommends that load ratings should be based on the plastic collapse FEA methods in Divisions 2 and 3. For calculation of prudent load ratings it is imperative that the theoretical collapse pressures from FEA be accurate or at least conservative. For this reason an important

part of this study was to compare collapse pressures using the Divisions 2 and 3 elastic-plastic methods with the actual burst pressures from tests.

For a valid comparison the material properties of the FEA models and the test bodies must be the same. For this reason, the actual material properties determined from tensile tests of prolongations from the actual test body forgings were used for this part of the study.

Figure 6.1 shows a volume plot of the FEA model for the large neck test body. The small neck model is identical in every respect except that the OD of the neck is slightly smaller and the transition tapers are slightly longer. As Figure 6.1 shows, the models are one-quarter symmetrical. The following is a list of the important features of the models:

- ANSYS Revision 16.2 FEA software was used for all solutions;
- All elements were type Solid 186 with full integration and pure displacement element formulation;
- A large displacement option was used to account for nonlinear geometrical changes;
- Elastic-plastic material properties were used as listed in Appendix F;
- Internal pressure was applied to the ODs of seal grooves;
- A bolt tension equal to the pressure end load was applied as negative pressure to bolt circles;
- The large neck model was comprised of 205,773 elements and 307,063 nodes;
- The small neck model was comprised of 251,526 elements and 404,186 nodes; and
- Multiple models were solved with finer meshes and more load steps, and the results were virtually identical (within 1 percent based on pressure at non-convergence of solution).

Appendix B includes numerous plots of the finite element model, mesh, and loads and boundary conditions for both test bodies. In addition, Appendix B contains important results for the elastic-plastic analysis and for the linear-elastic analysis. This section of the report is about the plastic-collapse pressures of the test bodies. Therefore, this section only discusses the elastic-plastic analysis. Linear-elastic analysis will be discussed later in this report. Also, Appendix B includes results for both test bodies, as well as for the other components that were evaluated. Appendix B1 concerns the large neck test body, and Appendix B2 concerns the small neck test body.

For elastic-plastic FEA, Divisions 2 and 3 require that a model with elastic-plastic material properties be solved with incrementally larger loads until the solution fails to converge. If the FEA is properly performed, non-convergence of the solution means that plastic collapse has occurred. The internal pressure at the last converged solution is defined as the plastic collapse pressure by ASME procedures.

Appendix B1 includes calculations for the collapse pressures of the large neck test body with the actual material properties and the as-specified material properties. Likewise, Appendix B2 includes the collapse pressures for the small neck test body. The collapse pressures are summarized below:

- 72,850 psi...Collapse pressure of large neck test body with actual material;
- 62,750 psi...Collapse pressure of large neck test body with as-specified material;
- 55,375 psi...Collapse pressure of small neck test body with actual material; and

• 47,850 psi...Collapse pressure of small neck test body with as-specified material.

6.2 Burst Pressure by Hydrotest

As stated in Section 5.1, prototypes of the large neck and small neck test bodies were manufactured in accordance with the detail drawings shown in Figures 5.1 and 5.2. The two test bodies were then prepared for hydrotesting. Figure 6.2 shows the assembled large neck test body ready to be tested. A figure of the assembled small neck is not included because it is almost identical to the assembled large neck body.

Two types of hydrotests were performed on each body. First, the test bodies were hydrotested inside a hyperbaric chamber with various combinations of internal and external pressure. For these tests, strain gages were mounted at critical locations on the test bodies, and strain readings were recorded throughout the test program. Second, the test bodies were mounted inside a blast containment structure as shown in Figure 6.3. Then, internal pressure was incrementally applied until the test bodies ruptured and relieved pressure. A comprehensive description of all test procedures, equipment, and results is included in Appendix C at the end of the report. This section of the report will only discuss the rupture hydrotest.

Figure 6.4 is a photograph of the large neck test body after rupture, and Figure 6.5 is a photograph of the small neck test body after rupture. The photographs show, as expected, that both ruptures occurred in the thin neck sections. The internal pressures when rupture occurred were:

- 67,959 psi...Burst pressure of large neck test body; and
- 51,469 psi...Burst pressure of small neck test body.

6.3 Comparison of Collapse Pressure and Burst Pressure

As discussed in Section 2.0 of this report, TR8 bases pressure ratings of equipment on the plastic collapse pressure calculated using elastic-plastic FEA. The pressure rating is the collapse pressure divided by the design factor specified in the code. For Division 2, the design factor is 2.4, and for Division 3, the design factor is 1.8. Obviously, the accuracy of the collapse pressure calculated by FEA is extremely critical. If calculated collapse pressure is greater than actual burst pressure, then pressure rating will not have the necessary margin of safety.

An important part of this study was designing, manufacturing, and hydrotesting components similar to typical subsea components used in subsea service. Collapse pressures were calculated using elastic-plastic FEA as required by TR8. The actual burst pressures of the components were determined by hydrotests to failure.

The collapse pressures calculated with elastic-plastic FEA were discussed in Section 6.1. The actual burst pressures determined by hydrotests were discussed in Section 6.2. Table 6.1 compares the burst pressures from the tests with the collapse pressures from FEA.

The most significant result of the comparison is that actual burst pressure was more than 6.7 percent lower than the FEA-determined collapse pressure based on actual material properties. This means that pressure ratings calculated by analysis were greater than pressure ratings calculated by burst tests. This is the reverse of what engineers normally try to achieve in the

design process. Analysis methods are normally designed to calculate failure pressures less than actual failure pressures. This ensures conservative load ratings. It is important that failure pressures from analysis are less than actual failure pressures from a test.

Another observation from Table 6.1 is that burst pressures from tests are more than 7 percent higher than collapse pressures determined from FEA using specified material properties. Although the strengths of actual components will usually be greater than the minimum specified strengths, this is not always true. The design engineer must assume that material strengths are the minimum properties in the specification. For this reason, elastic-plastic FEA for TR8 validation should always use minimum tensile strengths. This result indicates that, if actual material properties are equal to minimum specified properties, then the margin of safety based on elastic-plastic may be less than expected.

Method of Determining the Failure Pressure		Failure Pressure (psi)	
	Small Neck	Large Neck	
Plastic Collapse Pressure from FEA with Specified Material Properties	47,850	62,750	
Plastic Collapse Pressure from FEA with Actual Material Properties	55,375	72,850	
Burst Pressure from Hydrotest of Actual Components	51,469	67,959	
Burst Pressure Compared to Plastic Collapse of Actual Material	-7.05%	-6.71%	
Burst Pressure Compared to Plastic Collapse of Specified Material	7.56%	8.30%	

Table 6.1 - Comparison of Burst and Plastic Collapse Pr	essures
---	---------

6.4 Validation of FEA Model

In Section 6.3, collapse pressures from FEA were compared with burst pressures from hydrotests. For conclusions from this comparison to be correct, it is imperative that the FEA is accurate. The most reliable method of validating the accuracy of FEA is comparing FEA results with test results. For the purpose of validating FEA of test bodies, strain gages were attached to the two test bodies, and strain data was recorded throughout the hydrotest program. Then strains measured during the hydrotests were compared to strains calculated by the FEA.

The important features and results of this comparison are presented in Appendix D. The comparison confirms that critical values of calculated strains from FEA are within 4 percent of measured strains from hydrotests.

7.0 Pressure Ratings of Test Bodies

In this section, the pressure ratings using the following five code procedures are calculated and compared:

- Pressure Ratings by Division 2 Elastic-Plastic FEA;
- Pressure Ratings by Division 3 Elastic-Plastic FEA;
- Pressure Ratings by API 6A Linear-Elastic FEA;
- Pressure Ratings by Division 2 Linear-Elastic FEA; and
- Pressure Ratings by Proof Test.

The first four procedures are those that are allowed in TR8. These are the four procedures listed in Section 2.0. The fifth procedure is pressure rating by proof test. This procedure is allowed in API 6A and Division 3 but not in TR8. Since pressure ratings based on the proof test are not allowed in TR8, they are included in this study for comparison purposes only. A normal expectation would be that pressure ratings by an actual proof test would be higher than pressure ratings by theoretical methods.

Codes require that load ratings be determined using the minimum material strengths provided in the material specification. For this reason, all calculations for load ratings were done using the minimum specified material strengths.

Pressure ratings by Division 2 and Division 3 elastic-plastic FEA are based on the theoretical collapse pressures reported in Section 6.0. Pressure ratings by API and Division 2 linear-elastic FEA are based on linear-elastic FEA described in this section and in Appendix B. Pressure ratings by proof testing are described in this section and in Appendix E.

7.1 Pressure Ratings by Elastic-Plastic FEA

By the rules in Division 2 and Division 3, the allowable pressure rating based on elastic-plastic FEA is the theoretical plastic collapse pressure divided by the design load factor provided in the code. The design load factors are different for the two Codes:

- <u>For Division 2:</u> Design Load Factor = 2.4
- For Division 3: Design Load Factor = 1.8

Calculations for the collapse pressures of the large neck and small neck test bodies were completely described in Section 6.1. The collapse pressures from Section 6.1 are repeated below:

- 72,850 psi.... Collapse pressure of large neck test body with actual material;
- 62,750 psi.... Collapse pressure of large neck test body with as-specified material;
- 55,375 psi.... Collapse pressure of small neck test body with actual material; and
- 47,850 psi.... Collapse pressure of small neck test body with as-specified material.

For pressure rating calculations, the minimum material properties given in the material specification must be used. Dividing the collapse pressures for as-specified materials by the design load factor produced the following pressure ratings:

- <u>Pressure Ratings of Large Neck Test Body:</u>
 - o 34,861 psi...Pressure rating by Division 3 elastic-plastic; and
 - o 26,146 psi...Pressure rating by Division 2 elastic-plastic.
- <u>Pressure Ratings of Small Neck Test Body:</u>
 - o 26,583 psi...Pressure rating by Division 3 elastic-plastic; and
 - o 19,938 psi...Pressure rating by Division 2 elastic-plastic.

Comparing the pressure ratings shows that ratings by Division 3 are significantly higher than ratings by Division 2 (33 percent higher). Division 3 justifies its 33 percent higher pressure

ratings by requiring enhanced material properties and fracture mechanics analyses that are not required by Division 2. However, the following important question must be answered: Does the requirement of fracture mechanics analysis and enhanced material properties justify a 33-percent increase in pressure rating for subsea equipment?

7.2 Pressure Ratings by Linear Elastic FEA

Pressure rating based on linear-elastic FEA is allowable under API 6A and under ASME Division 2, but not under ASME Division 3. API 6A adopts the analysis procedures in ASME Division 2. However, ever since the 2007 edition, API 6A and Division 2 have differed in a significant way: API 6A compares stress intensity with allowable stress, whereas Division 2 compares von Mises stress with allowable stress. In this report, pressure ratings for the large neck test body and the small neck test body were calculated based on stress intensity and von Mises stress.

Linear-elastic FEA was performed on the large neck and small neck test bodies using the same FEA models that were used for the elastic-plastic FEA. The only difference was that linearelastic material properties were used for linear-elastic solutions. The two linear-elastic FEA models were solved for an internal pressure of 10,000 psi; however, since loads and stresses are linear in a linear-elastic FEA, the value of internal pressure is not important. The results at any pressure can easily be found using linear ratios of loads and stresses.

For both test bodies, stresses were linearized at the critical neck sections using post-processing options in the ANSYS FEA Program. Critical linearized stresses at the internal pressure of 10,000 psi are reported in Appendix B1 for the large neck test body and in Appendix B2 for the small neck test body.

As reported in Appendix B1 and Appendix B2, all critical linearized stresses at 10,000 psi are lower than the allowable stresses. Since FEA stresses are linear with pressure when linear-elastic materials are used, the internal pressure that produces the allowable stress can be easily calculated using linear analysis. These calculations are detailed in Appendix B1 and Appendix B2. Based on the calculations in these appendices, the rated pressures for the two bodies using the specified material properties were:

- <u>Pressure Ratings for Large Neck Test Body Based on Linear-Elastic FEA:</u>
 - o 29,551 psi...Pressure rating based on API 6A (stress intensity); and
 - o 34,091 psi...Pressure rating based on ASME Division 2 (von Mises stress).
- Pressure Ratings for Small Neck Test Body Based on Linear Elastic FEA:
 - 23,825 psiPressure rating based on API 6A (stress intensity); and
 - o 27,483 psiPressure rating based on ASME Division 2 (von Mises stress).

API 6A and ASME Division 2 include maximum allowable stresses for the hydrotest load condition. When external forces and moments are zero or low, pressure ratings may be limited by the hydrotest case and not the normal operating case. This is especially true for ratings by API 6A. The pressure ratings listed above do not consider the hydrotest load condition. This means that for some applications, the pressure ratings may be lower than shown above.

7.3 Pressure Ratings by Proof Test

Many codes concerning pressure ratings describe methods for determining pressure ratings based on hydrostatic proof tests to failure. Generally, the procedure in one of these tests is to build a prototype of the component or assembly and then apply an incrementally increasing hydrostatic pressure until burst occurs. The allowable pressure rating, then, is the hydrostatic pressure at which burst occurs multiplied by a load reduction factor specified in the code.

Of the codes considered in this study, API 6A and ASME Division 3 provided procedures for pressure rating components based on proof test results. Division 2 and TR8 do not provide these procedures. However, TR8 does state that validation programs may include a proof test to failure. Since the burst tests performed on the two test bodies can be considered proof tests, pressure ratings can be calculated based on the proof test procedures described in these two codes.

Both codes provide an equation for calculating pressure rating based on burst pressure, a load reduction factor, and the ratio of minimum yield strength to actual yield strength of the component tested. These pressure rating calculations are included in Appendix E of the report. The pressure ratings for the two test bodies are summarized in Table 7.1.

Test Body	Maximum Pressure Rating (psi)				
	API 6A	Division 3	Division 3	Division 2	
	Proof Test	Proof Test	Elastic-Plastic	Elastic-Plastic	
Small Neck Body	20,934	24,173	26,584	19,938	
Large Neck Body	27,641	31,918	34,861	26,146	

Table 7.1 - Comparison of Pressure Ratings by Proof Test and Elastic-Plastic FEA

Comparing the ratings by proof test with the ratings by Division 3 FEA reveals an interesting result. Pressure ratings determined by Division 3 elastic-plastic FEA are greater than those determined by proof test. The natural expectation for this phenomenon is that a pressure rating based on proof test would be greater than one based on a theoretical analysis. Comparing pressure ratings by Division 2 to ratings by proof test shows that ratings determined by proof test are higher than theoretical ratings determined by Division 2 elastic-plastic FEA.

8.0 Pressure Ratings of Other Components by FEA

The original scope of this study was to calculate pressure ratings for the large neck and small neck test bodies. During the process of the study, the decision was made to also include two standard API flanges loaded with internal pressure.

Pressure ratings were calculated for the two flanges using both linear-elastic FEA and elasticplastic FEA. Using the results of the linear-elastic FEA, pressure ratings were calculated using the procedures in API 6A and Division 2. Likewise, using the results of elastic-plastic FEA, pressure ratings were calculated using the design load factors in Division 2 and Division 3. Thus, four pressure ratings were calculated for each component. In this section of the report, the FEA procedures and pressure rating calculations for the two API flanges are summarized. More extensive details of the FEA and the pressure rating calculations are included in the following Appendices:

- Appendix B3 API 13 5/8 x 20k Flange; and
- Appendix B4 API 16 3/4 x 10k Flange.

8.1 API 13 5/8 x 20k Flange

Geometry and FEA Model

The geometry and dimensions of the API 13 5/8 x 20k flange are given in Table B-54 in API 6A. Figure 8.1 shows the axisymmetric model and mesh for the elastic-plastic analysis. This same model was used for the linear-elastic analysis, but the elastic-plastic material properties were changed to reflect linear-elastic properties, and the internal pressure was changed to the rated pressure of 20 ksi. Internal pressure was applied to the OD of the seal groove. Pressure end load was provided by compressive pressure on the bolt area and was reacted by fixed axial displacements of all nodes on the pipe end of the model. The loads applied to the model were all pressure-induced loads.

Elastic-Plastic FEA

The elastic-plastic analysis for the flanges was performed just like the elastic-plastic analysis for the two test bodies. Since details of elastic-plastic procedures are described in Section 6.1, they are not repeated in this section. Also, the method of calculating pressure ratings from collapse pressures was described in Section 7.1 and will not be repeated in this section.

As shown in Figure 8.1, the elastic-plastic model was solved for a single load step with 300 equal iterations. The internal pressure after the 300th iteration was 75,000 psi. The 240th iteration was the last iteration that converged. Hence, the collapse pressure was:

collapse pressure = (240/300) x 75,000 psi = 60,000 psi

The pressure ratings based on elastic-plastic FEA were:

- Pressure Ratings for API 13 5/8 x 20k Flange by Elastic-Plastic FEA (Specified Material):
 - o 25,000 psiPressure rating by Division 2; and
 - 33,333 psiPressure rating by Division 3.

Linear-Elastic FEA

The linear-elastic FEA for the flanges was performed exactly like the linear-elastic FEA for the two test bodies. Since the methods of linear-elastic analysis were described in Section 7.2, they will not be repeated in this section of the report.

From the linearized stress table in Appendix B3, the important linearized stresses in the critical section are:

• Linearized membrane stress intensity = 37,040 psi;

- Linearized membrane plus bending stress intensity = 58,830 psi;
- Linearized membrane von Mises stress = 32,210 psi; and
- Linearized membrane plus bending von Mises stress = 51,550 psi.

The allowable membrane stress was 50,000 psi, and the allowable membrane plus bending stress was 75,000 psi. Since stress is linear with pressure, the pressure ratings for the flange were easily calculated using linear ratios of stress and pressure. Pressure rating calculations are included in Appendix B3.

- <u>Pressure Ratings for 13 5/8 x 20k Flange by Linear-Elastic FEA (Specified Material):</u>
 - o 25,497 psi...Pressure rating by API 6A (stress intensity); and
 - o 29,098 psi...Pressure rating by ASME Division 2 (von Mises stress).

8.2 API 16 3/4 x 10k Flange

The elastic-plastic and linear-elastic FEA models, meshes, loads, boundary conditions, and important results for the 16 3/4 flange are included in Appendix B4. All aspects of the elastic-plastic and linear-elastic analyses were identical to those performed on the API 13 5/8 x 20k flange, except the flange geometry was different and the pressure for the elastic-plastic FEA was 10,000 psi. Since the procedures for these tests have been described in previous sections of the report, they will not be repeated in this section. Only the important results are listed below. The interested reader can review methods and calculations in Appendix B4.

Elastic-Plastic FEA

The collapse pressure of the API 16 3/4 x 10k flange based on elastic-plastic FEA was:

- Collapse pressure = 34,750 psi; and
- Pressure Ratings for API 16 3/4 x 10k Flange by Elastic-Plastic FEA:
 - o 14,479 psi...Pressure rating by Division 2; and
 - o 19,306 psi...Pressure rating by Division 3.

Linear-Elastic FEA

The pressure ratings for the API 16 3/4 x 10k flange based on linear-elastic analysis were:

- Pressure rating for membrane stress intensity = 14,310 psi;
- Pressure rating for membrane plus bending stress intensity = 16,991 psi;
- Pressure rating for membrane von Mises stress = 16,453 psi; and
- Pressure rating for membrane plus bending von Mises stress = 18,587 psi.

The allowable membrane stress was 50,000 psi, and the allowable membrane plus bending stress was 75,000 psi. Since stress is linear with pressure, pressure ratings for the flange based on linear-elastic FEA were:

- <u>Pressure Ratings for 16 3/4 x 10k Flange by Linear-Elastic FEA:</u>
 - o 14,310 psi...Pressure rating by API 6A; and
 - o 16,453 psi...Pressure rating by ASME Division 2.

9.0 Comparison of Pressure Ratings for All Components

Sections 7.0 and 8.0 presented pressure ratings for all of the components considered in this study. The presentations in the previous sections were organized by individual component. In Section 9.0, pressure ratings for all components and all codes will be summarized in a single table. This type of presentation allows for a better comparison of pressure ratings from a global viewpoint so that general trends can be evaluated.

9.1 Comparison of Pressure Ratings by Different Codes

Table 9.1 lists all collapse pressures and pressure ratings calculated in this study using the specified material properties. Each row corresponds to an individual component. The first column lists the component, the second column lists the plastic collapse pressure, and the next four columns list pressure ratings by code method. Note that Division 2 linear-elastic ratings are based on von Mises stress, which is the current method specified in the code. As discussed earlier in the report, prior to 2007, Division 2 based pressure ratings on stress intensity, which was more conservative than von Mises stress. When Division 2 linear-elastic ratings were based on stress intensity, pressure ratings were the same as ratings by API 6A.

Table 9.2 presents the same information as Table 9.1, but in a different format. Instead of pressure ratings, the table shows collapse pressure divided by pressure rating which is the design load factor. Obviously, lower design load factors indicate a lower factor-of-safety for the pressure rating.

A study of the data in Table 9.2 shows several important characteristics of pressure ratings calculated by different codes. It's important to observe that Division 2 elastic-plastic analysis had the most conservative pressure ratings for the two test bodies. However, pressure ratings determined by API 6A were about equal to those determined by Division 2 elastic-plastic for the two flanges.

(Dased on the Speened Material Toperties)							
Descripton of Component	Plastic	Pressure Ratings (psi)					
	Collapse	By Linear-Elastic FEA		By Elastic-Plastic FEA			
	(psi)	API 6A	Division 2	Division 2	Division 3		
Large Neck Test Body	62,750	29,551	34,091	26,146	34,861		
Small Neck Test Body	47,850	23,825	27,483	19,938	26,583		
API 13-5/8 x 20k Flange	60,000	25,497	29,098	25,000	33,333		
API 16-3/4 x 10k Flange	34,750	14,310	16,453	14,479	19,306		

 Table 9.1 - Pressure Ratings for all Components by FEA

 (Based on the Specified Material Properties)

23

(based on the specified Watchar Topentes)							
Desripton of Component	Plastic	Factor of Safety from Burst					
	Collapse	By Linear-Elastic FEA		By Elastic-Plastic FEA			
	(psi)	API 6A	Division 2	Division 2	Division 3		
Large Neck Test Body	62,750	2.12	1.84	2.40	1.80		
Small Neck Test Body	47,850	2.01	1.74	2.40	1.80		
API 13-5/8 x 20k Flange	60,000	2.35	2.06	2.40	1.80		
API 16-3/4 x 10k Flange	34,750	2.43	2.11	2.40	1.80		

Table 9.2 - Ratio of Pressure Rating to Collapse Pressure by FEA

(Based on the Specified Material Properties)

For all test components but the small neck test body, the least conservative pressure ratings were determined by Division 3 elastic-plastic analysis. Pressure ratings based on Division 2 linear-elastic analysis were nearly equal to the ratings based on Division 3 elastic-plastic analysis for the two test bodies, but not for the two flanges. The ratings for the two flanges were considerably less when based on Division 2 linear-elastic analysis rather than on Division 3 elastic-plastic analysis.

In all cases, the ratings determined by API 6A were lower than Division 2 linear-elastic ratings and Division 3 elastic-plastic ratings.

Now, consider the impact of these results on the pressure rating methods in API TR8 that were presented in Table 2.1:

- For pressures of 15 ksi or below, TR8 specifies the use of API 6A. API 6A is the most conservative of all the ratings methods in TR8, except for Division 2 elastic-plastic ratings with a design load factor of 2.4;
- For pressures greater than 20 ksi, TR8 requires that pressure ratings be based on Division 3 elastic-plastic analysis, which is generally the least conservative rating method; and
- For pressures above 15 ksi, but less than 20 ksi, TR8 specifies that pressure ratings be based on either Division 2 or Division 3 elastic-plastic or Division 2 linear-elastic analysis. Currently, the standard practice for most major subsea equipment manufacturers is to perform only elastic-plastic FEA. This means that, for pressures above 15 ksi and below 20 ksi, pressure ratings are probably done using Division 2 or Division 3 elastic-plastic analysis. Division 2 elastic-plastic analysis produces pressure ratings less than or equal to those based on API 6A. Division 3 produces pressure ratings higher than those based on API 6A.

A careful study of the three observations above reveals the following conclusion based on TR8 requirements:

API TR8 criteria allow equipment rated for pressures above 15 ksi to have a lower margin of safety than equipment rated for pressures below 15 ksi.

TR8 justifies the lower margin of safety by the addition of additional material and analysis requirements, most of which seek to match the requirements in Division 3. Some of the more important requirements in TR8 are listed below:

- Product Specification Level 5 (PSL5) was added. PSL5 includes fracture toughness requirements, higher Charpy toughness values, and improved QA/QC;
- Linear-elastic FEA must be performed in accordance with Division 2, and elastic-plastic FEA must be performed in accordance with Division 2 and Division 3 codes; and
- Rigorous fatigue analysis must be performed in accordance with Division 2 or Division 3, and/or rigorous fracture mechanics analysis must be performed in accordance with Division 3.

Consider the additional material requirements in TR8. Materials that have been used in subsea equipment for many years already meet the additional requirements in TR8. Appendix F3 presents material test results for forgings manufactured by Forged Products Inc. for subsea equipment, such as BOP bodies, wellhead bodies, and connector bodies. A review of the data shows the material has exceptional properties, especially Charpy impact values. Most of the average Charpy values exceed 100 ft-lb. Based on the properties in this table, the additional material requirements in TR8 will not improve the structural reliability of subsea equipment. Hence, the improved material requirements in TR8 should not be used to justify lower margins of safety.

For pressures greater than 15 ksi, TR8 encourages the use of the Division 3 elastic-plastic FEA pressure rating method. This study demonstrates that this method is less conservative than other rating methods and is much less conservative than API 6A, which has proven to be reliable through decades of successful operating experience. TR8 has not provided any justification that the elastic-plastic FEA method in itself can justify the lower margin of safety for complex subsea equipment.

The subsea industry already performs rigorous fatigue analysis of subsea equipment. Usually, fatigue assessment is done based on DNV RP C203, which is more comprehensive and perhaps more rigorous than ASME requirements. Furthermore, DNV RP C203was developed specifically for offshore equipment, whereas ASME fatigue and fracture methods were written for pressure vessels. Therefore, the enhanced fatigue requirements in TR8 should not justify lower margins of safety.

Furthermore, fracture mechanics' crack growth calculations have limited usefulness in the analysis of how cracks propagate in subsea equipment. This is because fracture mechanics analysis requires an explicit, time-based load history. This history is not possible for subsea equipment because loads on subsea equipment are random and must be statistically defined. Loads on subsea equipment cannot be explicitly defined in the correct sequence, as required by Division 3.

Neither TR8 nor Division 3 offers any analytical calculations or experimental data proving that additional material requirements and more rigorous analysis requirements justify lower margins of safety. If the lower margins of safety in Division 3 are allowed, then engineering calculations and tests should be performed to confirm that additional requirements adequately lower risks of failure, so that lower margins of safety are safe from failure.

For example, this study revealed that failure pressures calculated from burst tests were 7 percent lower than failure pressures calculated from rigorous analysis. Although a 7 percent error is not huge, it is non-conservative. Moreover, the error may be greater for other, more complex components, like BOP connectors. Before the lower margins of safety in Division 3 are adopted, failure pressures by hydrotest and rigorous FEA should be compared for more complex subsea equipment.

9.2 Comparison of Historical Pressure Ratings with TR8 Ratings

Table 9.3 compares the pressure ratings of the two test bodies using the allowed methods in API TR8. The table compares ratings based on the linear-elastic methods in both TR8 and Division 2, and the elastic-plastic methods in both Division 2 and Division 3. The bottom row shows the historical time frame in which the method was commonly used by the subsea industry.

Table 9.3 - Comparison of Internal Pressure Ratings of Test Bodies (At 70 F and
with As-Specified Material Properties)

Test	Linear-Elastic FEA			Elastic-Plastic FEA	
Body	API 6A Using	ASME	ASME	ASME	ASME
	Stress	Division 2	Division 2	Division 3	Division 2
	Intensity	Using Stress	Using von	Using Plastic	Using Plastic
		Intensity	Mises Stress	Collapse	Collapse
Small Neck	23,825	23,825	27,483	26,584	19,938
Large Neck	29,551	29,551	34,091	34,861	26,146
	From 1970 to	From 1970 to	From 2007 to	From 2015 to	From 2015 to
	Present	2007	Present	Present	Present

Figure 9.1 shows plots of the pressure rating data in Table 9.3. Figure 9.1A represents data for the large neck body, and Figure 9.1B represents data for the small neck body. The purpose of Figure 9.1 is to compare pressure ratings determined by TR8 methods on a historical basis since 1970. Each line in the plots shows the historical rating by one of the following methods:

- API 6A by Linear-Elastic FEA (from approximately 1970 to present);
- ASME Division 2 by Linear-Elastic FEA (from approximately 1970 to 2007);
- ASME Division 2 by Linear-Elastic FEA (from 2007 to present);
- ASME Division 2 by Elastic-Plastic FEA (from 2015 to present); and
- ASME Division 3 by Elastic-Plastic FEA (from 2015 to present).

Note that pressure ratings determined by elastic-plastic FEA were not allowed prior to 2015 before TR8 was published. Even so, elastic-plastic pressure ratings have been extended in the plots back to 1970 so the ratings can be easily compared to historical ratings.

Note that the pressure rating curves in Figure 9.1 and the data in Table 9.3 are for the two test bodies. The figure and data point out some interesting features for the test bodies:

- The most conservative pressure ratings were determined by ASME Division 2 elasticplastic FEA. Pressure ratings determined by this method were less than those allowed by API 6A since 1970. This means equipment rated by the Division 2 elastic-plastic method has lower pressure ratings than historical pressure ratings that have proven to be reliable. This also means equipment that has been pressure rated using Division 2 elastic-plastic analysis has a higher margin of safety than historical equipment.
- Pressure ratings by ASME Division 3 are significantly greater than those allowed by API 6A since 1970. This means equipment rated by this method has higher pressure ratings than equipment proven satisfactory based on decades of operational history. In other words, equipment pressure rated by Division 3 has lower margins of safety than historical equipment.
- Equivalent design factors for historical pressure ratings can be calculated from the data in Table 9.3. For the large neck test body, dividing the plastic collapse pressure of 62,750 psi by the API 6A pressure rating of 29,551 psi produces an equivalent design factor of 2.12. Likewise, for the small neck test body, the plastic collapse pressure is 47,850 psi, and the API 6A pressure rating is 23,825 psi, which produces a design factor of 2.01.
- When ASME Division 2 linear-elastic analysis changed from being based on stress intensity to being based on von Mises stress, pressure ratings substantially increased. In fact, pressure ratings based on Division 2 linear-elastic analysis provide the greatest ratings compared to the other methods used for the large neck test body. This means that pressure ratings based on Division 2 linear-elastic analysis after 2015 are considerably higher than historical pressure ratings, and the margins of safety are much less.

10.0 Conclusions

The following are the important conclusions of this study. These conclusions are based on results of the elastic-plastic FEA and hydro-tests that were performed as part of this study. The conclusions apply to HPHT subsea equipment rated for 20 ksi or less. No consideration has been given to equipment rated for pressures greater than 20 ksi. However, there is no apparent reason that these conclusions would not apply to equipment rated for pressures higher than 20 ksi.

<u>These conclusions were marginally revised after the consideration of peer-review</u> <u>comments. The majority of the revisions are in the discussion section after each</u> <u>conclusion. These revisions were made to clarify a few misunderstandings that were</u> <u>evident from the peer-review comments. The content of the conclusions themselves has not</u> <u>substantially changed.</u>

<u>The Division 3 elastic-plastic method is not recommended for HPHT subsea equipment as</u> published with a 1.8 design load factor until supplementary validation is performed.

ASME, Division 3, allows a 1.8 load factor for calculating load ratings based on elastic-plastic FEA. This is lower than the 2.4 load factor allowed by ASME, Division 2. The Argonne study shows that the equivalent load factor for existing subsea equipment is about 2.1 for simple shapes. Decades of successful operating experience show that the equivalent load factor of 2.1 has produced safe, reliable subsea equipment.

Pressure-vessel experts working with ASME have determined that a 1.8 load factor is suitable for pressure vessels designed and manufactured in accordance with the rules in Division 3. The Argonne study did not consider pressure vessels and does not question the use of a 1.8 load factor for Division 3 pressure vessels.

Nonetheless, just because a 1.8 load factor is suitable for pressure vessels does not mean it is suitable for HPHT subsea equipment. Many important characteristics of HPHT subsea equipment are significantly different from pressure vessels, as acknowledged in the following quote from Section 4.2.1.4 in TR8:

"....Oilfield equipment are of complex geometry, far from a simple cylindrical pressure vessel or piping union design. They are typically subjected to a variety of extreme external loading conditions and they are not explicitly addressed in ASME BPVC....."

Another important consideration is that TR8 does not require that all the rules and requirements in Division 3 be used. TR8 adopts only a small part of Division 3.

A 1.8 load factor may produce HPHT equipment that is reliable and safe for subsea operation. However, TR8 does not provide any references validating that a 1.8 load factor is suitable for HPHT subsea equipment. Until scientific studies or tests are offered that validate the suitability of a 1.8 load factor for HPHT subsea equipment, it is recommended that a larger load factor be used for HPHT subsea equipment.

<u>The Division 3 elastic-plastic method with a design load factor of 2.1 is recommended to calculate load ratings for HPHT subsea equipment.</u>

This recommendation is based on the results of the Argonne study and the validation data currently available in the public domain. If scientific studies or tests exist in the public domain that validate a 1.8 load factor, then it is recommended that the TR8 committee publish a paper presenting this work so that it can be peer-reviewed. If the TR8 committee cannot do this, then the committee should commission appropriate scientific studies or tests validating that a 1.8 load factor is adequate for HPHT subsea equipment.

A Division 3 analysis with a design load factor of 1.8 is acceptable if the factor is applied to results of a load test, and validation is provided that demonstrates the additional requirements in TR8 and Division 3 sufficiently reduce the risk of failure.

Paragraph KD-1254 in Division 3 provides a procedure for rating equipment based on a proof test. This confirms that a proof test to failure is acceptable by Division 3 as a means to pressure-rate equipment.

The design load factor in Division 2 is 2.4, which is 33% greater than the design load factor of 1.8 in Division 3. ASME and TR8 state that this reduction in the margin of safety is validated by additional requirements, such as fracture mechanics in Division 3. HPHT subsea equipment in general has more complex shapes, more multibody contacts of components, and different materials as compared to pressure vessels. Before a load rating for HPHT subsea equipment is determined by dividing the test loads by a design load factor of 1.8, the user should confirm that the reduction in margin of safety has been validated.

For a Division 2 linear-elastic analysis, it is recommended that stress intensities are compared with allowable stresses and not von Mises stresses until supplementary validation is performed.

The Division 2 linear-elastic method is an acceptable method in TR8 to rate HPHT subsea equipment for pressures of 20 ksi or less. Division 2 allows that von Mises stresses be compared with allowable stresses, whereas API historically has compared stress intensities with allowable stresses.

The Argonne study revealed that the use of von Mises stresses allows higher pressure ratings for subsea equipment. Since subsea equipment has historically been rated using linear-elastic analysis with stress intensity, the design margins based on von Mises stresses will be lower than the design margins of historically successful equipment. The safety of reduced design margins based on the use of von Mises stresses should be investigated before the subsea industry makes this change. Until this issue is investigated, it is recommended that the HPHT subsea industry continue using stress intensities.

Note that this is not a question about the accuracy of von Mises stress, but about the safety of reduced margins of safety. Scientific studies and tests have confirmed that von Mises stress is a more accurate predictor of yield than stress intensity. Stress intensity is always greater than or equal to von Mises stress.

It is recommended that the subsea industry compare collapse pressures from FEA with burst pressures from hydro-tests for a variety of subsea equipment.

For numerous subsea components, the subsea industry should compare the collapse pressures from elastic-plastic FEA with the actual burst pressures from hydro-tests. This is necessary to validate the accuracy of collapse pressures by FEA. The reason for this recommendation is that the Argonne study showed that collapse pressures from FEA were higher than burst pressures for the two test bodies that were evaluated in this study.

This is an especially concerning outcome for subsea equipment because the two test bodies in this study were simple shapes. Many subsea components have much more complex geometries, and many have geometries with multibody contacts. It is possible that more complex shapes with multibody contacts will be even less conservative than the simple shapes evaluated in this study.

The subsea industry should confirm that performing the fracture mechanics analysis required by Division 3 justifies reduction of the design load factor to 1.8.

Reduction of the design margin based on performance of fracture mechanics may not be suitable for HPHT subsea equipment. The following are two important reasons this is true:

 Division 3 justifies the reduction of the design load factor based on the requirement of fracture mechanics analysis. The purpose of a fracture mechanics analysis is to ensure that defects do not propagate to the critical crack size and cause a rapid, brittle failure. This may not be a critical failure mode for subsea equipment. TR8 requires that all pressurecontaining components meet the material requirements in API 6A and NACE MR0175. Material that meets the requirements of these two codes will be ductile, have high impact strengths, and have high fracture toughness. Materials with these properties are not susceptible to brittle failures. Operating history confirms that subsea equipment made of materials that meet these requirements are not susceptible to brittle fractures. A reduced design margin should not be justified by requiring an analysis to prevent brittle failure if brittle fracture has historically not been a problem and is not expected to be a problem in the future.

2. To perform a fracture mechanics analysis, Division 3 requires a load histogram with loads in the same sequence that they will be applied in service. This is usually easy for the pressure vessels for which Division 3 was written. However, developing a load histogram with loads in the proper sequence may not be practical or perhaps even possible for HPHT subsea equipment. The reason is that the highly cyclic loads on subsea equipment capable of causing fatigue cracks are randomly applied by the environment. This means that load histograms for subsea equipment must be statistically defined in load bins with a percent occurrence time for each load bin. The sequence of application is random and unpredictable. It may be possible to convert a statistically based load histogram into a conservative sequence. However, this has not been demonstrated in a published and peer-reviewed format. This should be done before subsea equipment design margins are reduced based on fracture mechanics analysis.

11.0 Figures

Below is a list of the figures that are referenced in the text of this report. They are provided in the following pages.

Figure 5.1	Details of Large Neck Test Body	Page 32
Figure 5.2	Details of Small Neck Test Body	Page 33
Figure 5.3	Assembly of Large Neck Test Body	Page 34
Figure 6.1	FEA Model of Large Neck Test Body	Page 35
Figure 6.2	Assembled Test Body Ready for Testing	Page 36
Figure 6.3	Test Body inside a Containment Structure	Page 36
Figure 6.4	Rupture Failure in Large Test Body	Page 37
Figure 6.5	Rupture Failure in Small Test Body	Page 37
Figure 8.1	FEA Model of 13 5/8 x 20 K Flange	Page 38
Figure 9.1	Historical Pressure Ratings for Test Bodies	Page 39
Figure 6.1 Figure 6.2 Figure 6.3 Figure 6.4 Figure 6.5 Figure 8.1 Figure 9.1	FEA Model of Large Neck Test Body Assembled Test Body Ready for Testing Test Body inside a Containment Structure Rupture Failure in Large Test Body Rupture Failure in Small Test Body FEA Model of 13 5/8 x 20 K Flange Historical Pressure Ratings for Test Bodies	Page 35 Page 36 Page 36 Page 37 Page 37 Page 38 Page 39










Figure 6.2 Assembled Test Body Ready for Testing





Figure 6.4 Rupture Failure in Large Test Body

Figure 6.5 Rupture Failure in Small Test Body









APPENDIX A

DESIGN CALCULATIONS AND MATERIAL SPECIFICATION

This appendix includes the strength-of-materials calculations that were the basis for design of the two test bodies. The design calculations used the material strengths and other material properties for the F22 material that are specified in Material Specification D2456-1 Revision 1 which is included in Appendix A.

Appendix A1	Design Calculations and Material Strengths	A-2
Appendix A2	Material Specification	A-10

Appendix A1 Design Calculations for HPHT Test Bodies

Design Overview

The primary subject of this study was to design, manufacture, analyze with FEA and hydrotest two test bodies that were specifically created for this study. The first test body was designed to meet API 6A design criteria based on strength-of-materials calculations. The second test body was designed with smaller sections so that critical stresses were 25% higher. This reason for the 25% higher stresses in the second test body is that the design factor in Division 3 elastic-plastic critieria is 25% lower than the design factor in Division 2. The following are additional design requirements for the two bodies:

- 1. The configurations were to be typical of subsea components such as gate valves.
- 2. The material was to be typical material that is commonly used in subsea applications.
- 3. The maximum operting pressure was 20,000 psi at 70 F.
- 4. The design pressure of bodies should be 26,000 psi to provide margin for the application of external loads.
- 5. The designs were to be based on strength-of-material calcuations and verified if necessary by simple FEA.
- 6. One test body should be designed to meet the design criteria in API 6A which requires that the primary membrane stress intensity do not exceed 2/3 of the yield strength.

Figures 5.1 and 5.2 in the main body of this report are drawings of the two HPHT test bodies. The two bodies are identical in every respect except for the outside diameter (OD) of the neck. The small neck body has been designed to have a 25% greater stress in the critical section.

The flanges in the test bodies are standard API flanges rated at 20,000 psi. The dimensions of the enlarged body are dictated by the flange and bolting dimensions. Section stresses and displacements in the enlarged portions of the bodies will not be high. However, peak stresses at the intersecting bores will be high.

The critical locations in the two bodies will be in the thin necks of the cylindrical sections. Failure will obviously be by burst in the thin necks.

The following are design calculations for the critical section in the neck. Note that during the design process, numerous neck ODs were considered. The calculations presented are only the calculations for the final designs for the test bodies.

Design Conditions



Material Data

The material specification for the test bodies is Aiken Specification D2456-1 Revision 1. The specification is included at the end of this appendix.

From the material specification, the material strengths are as follows:

S _u := 95000	$\frac{1 \text{bf}}{\text{in}^2}$	Ultimate tensile strength at 70 Deg F
S _y := 75000	$\frac{1\mathrm{bf}}{\mathrm{in}^2}$	Yield strength at 70 Deg F
S _{ut} := 1078	$00 \cdot \frac{\text{lbf}}{\text{in}^2}$	True ultimate tensile strength at 70 Deg F
E := 306000	$1000 \cdot \frac{1\text{bf}}{\text{in}^2}$	Modulus of Elasticity at 70 Deg F
Nu := 0.3		Poissons Ratio at all temperatures

Design of Large Neck OD Based on Strength of Materials Calculations

The tubular section that extends from the 17-3/4 inch cubic body is referred to as the neck portion of the test body. The nominal inside diameter is 3 1/16 inches. The OD will be designed based on the allowable stress criteria. Note that critical stresses were calculated for several neck ODs; however, in this report calculations only for the actual OD that was built and tested will be included.

Geometry of Neck

 $OD := 5.680 \cdot in -0.00 + 0.030 \dots Outside diameter of throat$ $ID := 3.063 \cdot in -0.00 + 0.030 \dots Inside diameter of throat$ $P := P_i = 20000 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2} \dots Design internal pressure$

Primary Stresses

Stress Intensity

Von Mises Stress

Membrane

Membrane plus bending

$$\begin{split} &\operatorname{Seq}_{\mathbf{b}} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot \left[\left(\operatorname{S1}_{\mathbf{b}} - \operatorname{S2}_{\mathbf{b}} \right)^2 + \left(\operatorname{S2}_{\mathbf{b}} - \operatorname{S3}_{\mathbf{b}} \right)^2 + \left(\operatorname{S3}_{\mathbf{b}} - \operatorname{S1}_{\mathbf{b}} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\operatorname{Seq}_{\mathbf{b}} = 48845 \cdot \frac{1 \operatorname{bf}}{\operatorname{in}^2} \quad \dots \dots \text{Membrane} + \operatorname{Bending} \text{ Von Mises Stress} \end{split}$$

Allowable Stresses

$$S_{am} := \frac{2}{3} \cdot S_y$$

 $S_{am} = 50000 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$ Allowable primary membrane stress for bodies

$$S_{ab} := S_y$$

 $S_{ab} = 75000 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$ Allowable primary bending stress for bodies

Maximum Allowable Working Pressures (MAWP)

1	$MAWP_m := \frac{S_{am}}{SI_m} \cdot P$	
1	$MAWP_m = 29933 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$	
1	$MAWP_b := \frac{S_{ab}}{SI_b} \cdot P$	
1	$MAWP_b = 26595 \cdot \frac{1bf}{in^2}$	
1	$MAWP_m := \frac{S_{am}}{Seq_m} \cdot P$	
1	$MAWP_{m} = 34517 \cdot \frac{1bf}{in^{2}}$	MAWP for body based on membrane von Mises stress from strength of materials equations
1	$MAWP_b := \frac{S_{ab}}{Seq_b} \cdot P$	
1	$MAWP_b = 30709 \cdot \frac{1bf}{in^2}$	

Note that API 6A requires that MAWPs are based on stress intensity. The MAWPs based on von Mises stresses are included for reference only. They are included because ASME Codes changed from stress intensity to von Mises stress in 2010.

Design of Neck OD Based on Finite Element Analysis

Simple FEA of the large neck design was performed prior to manufacturing the parts. This FEA is not presented in the report because much more rigorous FEA that was performed as a part of the TR8 evaluation process is included in the report.

Design of Small Neck OD Test Body Based on Strength-of-Materials Calculations

The calculations are repeated for the small neck OD test body

-

Geometry of Neck

OD := 4.880·in	Outside diameter of throat
ID := 3.063·in	Inside diameter of throat
$\mathbf{P} := \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{i}} = 20000 \cdot \frac{\mathbf{lbf}}{\mathbf{in}^2}$	Design internal pressure

Primary Stresses

$S1_m := \frac{P \cdot ID}{(OD - ID)}$	
$S1_m = 33715 \cdot \frac{1bf}{in^2}$	Membrane hoop stress
$S2_{\mathbf{m}} := \frac{\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{D}^2}{\left(\mathbf{OD}^2 - \mathbf{D}^2\right)}$	
$S2_m = 13001 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$	Membrane axial stress
$S3_m := \frac{-P}{2}$	
$S3_{m} = -10000 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$	Membrane radial stress
Membrane plus bending	
$S1_b := P \cdot \frac{(OD^2 + ID^2)}{(OD^2 - ID^2)}$	
$S1_b = 46002 \cdot \frac{1bf}{in^2}$	Hoop stress at bore

$S2_{b} := \frac{P \cdot ID^{2}}{\left(OD^{2} - ID^{2}\right)}$	
$S2_b = 13001 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$	Axial stress at bore
S3 _b := −P	
$S3_{b} = -20000 \cdot \frac{1bf}{in^{2}}$	Radial stress at bore

Stress Intensity

$$\begin{split} &\mathrm{SI}_{\mathbf{m}} \coloneqq \mathrm{S1}_{\mathbf{m}} - \mathrm{S3}_{\mathbf{m}} \\ &\mathrm{SI}_{\mathbf{m}} = 43715 \cdot \frac{\mathrm{lbf}}{\mathrm{in}^2} & \dots \\ &\mathrm{Bending} \\ &\mathrm{SI}_{\mathbf{b}} \coloneqq \mathrm{S1}_{\mathbf{b}} - \mathrm{S3}_{\mathbf{b}} \\ &\mathrm{SI}_{\mathbf{b}} \coloneqq \mathrm{66002} \cdot \frac{\mathrm{lbf}}{\mathrm{in}^2} & \dots \\ &\mathrm{Membrane} + \mathrm{Bending} \ \mathrm{Stress \, Intensity} \end{split}$$

Von Mises Stress

Membrane

Membrane plus bending

$$Seq_{b} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot \left[\left(S1_{b} - S2_{b} \right)^{2} + \left(S2_{b} - S3_{b} \right)^{2} + \left(S3_{b} - S1_{b} \right)^{2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$



Allowable Stresses



Maximum Allowable Working Pressures (MAWP)

$MAWP_{m} := \frac{S_{am}}{SI_{m}} \cdot P$	
$MAWP_{m} = 22875 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^{2}}$	
$MAWP_b := \frac{S_{ab}}{SI_b} \cdot P$	
$MAWP_b = 22726 \cdot \frac{1bf}{in^2}$	
$MAWP_m := \frac{S_{am}}{Seq_m} \cdot P$	
$MAWP_{m} = 26402 \cdot \frac{1bf}{in^{2}}$	
$MAWP_b := \frac{S_{ab}}{Seq_b} \cdot P$	
$MAWP_b = 26242 \cdot \frac{1bf}{in^2}$	

The critical membrane stress intensity in the large neck body is 29,933 psi; and, the critical membrane stress intensity in the small neck body is 22,875 psi. The difference between the two stress intensities is 24% which is near the desired difference of 25%.

Appendix A2 Material Specification for Test Body Used in Evaluation of API 17TR8 Methods

Document D2456-1 Revision 1 Released November 2, 2015

By Aiken Engineering Company

1.0 SCOPE

This specification establishes the material requirements for parts forged from an ASTM A182 F22 low alloy steel with chemical composition to meet the requirements of API 6A, PSL 3. The material is intended for finished parts with a 20 ksi working pressure, 75 ksi strength class, temperature classification X (0-350F), and material class DD for sour service as described in NACE MR0175/ISO 15156. For all standards referenced in this specification, the revision in effect on the date of this specification shall be used.

2.0 CHEMICAL COMPOSITION

The chemical composition of the material shall conform as follows

Element	Weight Percent	Element	Weight Percent
Carbon (C)	0.10 – 0.15	Copper (Cu)	0.30 max
Manganese (Mn)	0.40 - 0.60	Nickel (Ni)	0.50 max
Phosphorus (P)	0.025 max	Aluminum (Al)	0.015 – 0.055
Sulfur (S)	0.025 max		
Chromium (Cr)	2.00 - 2.50		
Molybdenum (Mo)	0.87 – 1.13		
Silicon (Si)	0.50 max		

Calcium treatment is permitted for sulphide shape control

Chemical composition of the material shall be determined in accordance with ASTM A751.

Elements other than those used for grain refinement/de-oxidation not specified shall not be intentionally added. The total amount of residual elements shall not exceed 1.00%. All elements shall be reported.

3.0 STEEL MAKING REQUIREMENTS

The steel shall be fully killed (de-oxidized) and produced by fine grain practice with one of the following methods:

 Electric Arc Furnace (EAF), followed by Vacuum Degassing, Ladle Refining, or Argon Oxygen Decarburization

4.0 HOT WORKING REQUIREMENTS

The forging hot working shall be performed to meet the following requirements:

- The minimum forging reduction ratio shall be a minimum of 4.0 to 1
- Forging shall be rough-machined prior to heat treatment as needed to ensure mechanical properties.
- The overall reduction ratio shall be sufficient to ensure a fully wrought structure throughout the entire part.

5.0 HEAT TREATMENT

- All the items shall be heat treated. Forgings shall be heat treated by normalizing (optional), austenitizing, liquid quenching, and tempering.
- Forgings with bores or blind holes shall be oriented to allow for an optimal quench and to minimize the entrapment of steam.
- One full quench and temper is permitted by the supplier. Any additional reheat treatments shall be reviewed and approved by Aiken Engineering.
- All heat treatment equipment and procedure used shall be done in accordance with API 6A and API RP 6HT.
- Only automatic controlling and recording instruments shall be used
- Heat treatment controlling and recording instrumentation shall be calibrate according to API 6A for the full scale range.
- Instrumentation used to calibrate the production shall possess accuracy in accordance with API 6A
- Material shall be loaded into the heat treatment furnace such that the presence of one part does not adversely affect the heat treatment response of any other part in the same heat treatment load.
- Parts shall be loaded for quenching in a single layer only. Parts shall be separated for quenching so that there is sufficient space between each part to provide adequate quench media coverage during the quenching operation.
- Temperature for austenitizing and tempering shall be monitored using load thermocouples attached to one or more production parts in each load based upon the heaviest cross-section for any part in the load.

6.0 NORMALIZING

Normalizing is optional. If performed it shall be in range of 1725 – 1775F. The hold time shall be a minimum of 30 minutes per inch of heaviest cross section thickness with one hour minimum time at temperature followed by air cooling.

7.0 AUSTENITIZING

Austenitizing shall be performed at 1675 – 1725F. The hold time at austenitizing temperature shall be a minimum of 30 minutes per inch of heaviest cross section thickness with one hour minimum. The hold time shall start when the contact thermocouple reaches within 15F of the set point temperature range. The maximum hold time at the austenitizing temperature shall be 40 minutes per inch of maximum cross section thickness.

8.0 QUENCHING

Water quench shall be performed. Quenching equipment shall be located in such a manner, and handling facilities shall function with sufficient speed, to prevent the temperature of the forging from dropping below the upper critical temperature (Ar3) for the alloy prior to immersion in the quench bath. Quenching facilities shall have sufficient agitation and be of sufficient volume such that the temperature of the water quench media used shall not exceed 100F maximum at the beginning of the quench nor exceed 120F any time during and at the completion of the quench. Forgings shall be cooled to below 400F prior to removal from the quench medium. The equipment shall be capable of transporting forgings from the heat treatment furnace to the quench bath within a maximum of 90 seconds.

9.0 TEMPERING

Tempering is required and shall be performed at minimum 1225F. The hold time shall be a minimum of 60 minutes per inch of maximum cross section thickness with one hour minimum. The hold time shall start when the contact thermocouple reaches within 15F of the set point. Contact thermocouple will be placed on location of maximum section thickness.

10.0 MATERIAL QUALIFICATION

Mechanical properties (tensile, impact and hardness properties) shall be determined by testing material taken from a Qualification Test Coupons (QTC). As a minimum, there shall be one QTC per heat and per heat treat lot. The QTC shall accompany the forged product through all heat treat cycle

The QTC shall be obtained from the following:

 A prolongation shall be taken from the flanged end of the forging. The prolongation shall be removed from the forging after final base metal heat treatment.

11.0 MECHANICAL PROPERTIES

Mechanical testing shall be carried out in accordance with ASTM A370.

Testing shall be performed on prolongation taken from the flanged end. Longitudinal test specimens (parallel to the primary grain flow direction) shall be taken so that the tensile specimen gauge length as taken from the prolongation is at least 1/4T and no less than 25 mm from any heat treated surface where T is the thickness. A drawing illustrating where the material is taken from the forging will be supplied.

Two additional tensile re-tests from the same forging, without any additional heat treatment are allowed in the event that the first tensile test fails to meet minimum requirements. The results of each test shall meet the specified requirements for material acceptance.

Results for mechanical testing shall be as follows:

•	Ultimate tensile strength, min	95,000 psi (6565 MPa)
•	Yield strength (0.2% offset) min	75,000 psi (515 MPa)
•	Reduction area, min	35%
•	Elongation in 2", min	18%
•	Brinell Hardness	197 – 237 HB after finish machining

12.0 Charpy V-Notch Impact Testing

The material shall undergo Charpy V-Notch impact testing at 0F (-18C). Testing shall be performed in the longitudinal direction (parallel to the primary grain flow direction).

Full sized test specimens (10 x 10 mm) shall be used. Impact values shall be as follows:

- Minimum average for three specimens: 40 ft-lbs
- Minimum for single value: 30 ft-lbs

13.0 HARDNESS TESTING

Brinell hardness shall be performed on the prolongation after the final heat treatment cycle.

Brinell hardness shall be performed in accordance with ASTM E10.

Measured hardness shall be in the range of 197 – 237 Brinell.

14.0 NONDESTRUCTIVE EXAMINATON

NDE shall be carried out after final heat treatment and in accordance with established procedures. NDT operators shall be certified in accordance with ASNT SNT-TC-1A or equivalent.

All NDE procedures shall be approved by qualified ASNT SNT-TC-1A Level III or equivalent.

15.0 VISUAL EXAMINATION

Forgings surfaces shall be 100% visually examined and shall be free from visible laps, cold shuts, cracks, porosity, slag, scale, and other surface imperfections. Any defects shall be removed by grinding or machining. Acceptance criterial for visual examination of forgings shall be in accordance with ASTM A961

16.0 VOLUMETRIC ULTRASONIC TESTING (UT)

Following quality heat treatment and prior to machining operations, the entire forging shall be volumetrically inspected according to ASTM A388. Acceptance criterial shall be as per API 6A, PSL 3.

17.0 MAGNETIC TESTING (MT)

Following finish machining all accessible wetted surfaces shall be magnetic particle inspected. A drawing will be created denoting the areas subjected to surface inspection.

Magnetic particle inspection shall be performed in accordance with procedures specified in ASTM E709. Magnetic particle inspection shall use the wet fluorescent method. The acceptance criterial shall be per API 6A PSL 3.

18.0 WELDING

Repair by welding of forgings at any point in the manufacturing process is not permissible. Surface defect may be removed by machining or grinding, provided that the amount of material remove does not encroach on the minimum required section thickness of the forging.

19.0 CUSTOMER WITNESS INSPECTION

Aiken Engineering or a representative of Aiken Engineering shall be permitted to witness any phase of the manufacturing process that is performed in accordance with this specification. A prior request shall be submitted to the supplier to witness specific operations.

A plan will be provided in advance of manufacture to allow Aiken Engineering to denote hold, witness, monitor, and review points for the process.

20.0 CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

A test report shall be created by the supplier listing the following requirements:

- Aiken Engineering Purchase Order Number
- Aiken Engineering material specification number (including revision number)
- Aiken Engineering drawing/part number (including revision number)
- · Original MTR from forging supplier
- Heat number from steel mill
- Chemical analysis (ladle and check analysis)
- Melting practice
- Hot work reduction ratio
- Heat treatment information (set points, cycle times, quench media, quench media temperature before and after quench as applicable)
- Heat treatment lot number
- Tensile test results, Charpy V-Notch impact test results
- Hardness test results from test coupons
- · NDE results (visual, magnetic and ultrasonic)
- · Statement of compliance to this specification.

21.0 MARKING & TRACEABILITY

Finished product shall be marked to ensure full traceability to melt and heat treatment lot. The remnants of the material qualification prolongation will be marked and stored as well as a precaution against the need for further testing. Aiken will inform the supplier when the remnants may be scrapped. Identification shall consist of the following.

- Manufacturer's symbol or name
- · Heat number or manufacturer's heat identification and heat treatment lot
- Drawing or part number as indicated in the order
- · Serial number traceable to the inspections.

APPENDIX B

FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS OF COMPONENTS

As a part of this study, six pressure containing components were analyzed using FEA. The purpose of the FEA was to calculate pressure ratings based on the methods and requirements of the following Codes:

API 6A ASME Division 2 Linear-elastic ASME Division 2 Elastic-plastic ASME Division 3 Elastic-plastic.

Performance of this task required that linear-elastic FEA solutions and elastic-plastic solutions be done for all six components. The important features of the finite element models, element meshes, boundary conditions, loads, material properties, solution cases and important results are described in Appendix B. The majority of the information and data about the FEAs are described in computer plots with annotations added to provide explanations and additional information.

Appendix B is divided into 4 sub-appendices, one for each component that was analyzed. The first page of each sub-appendices provides a brief description of the important features of the FEA for the component. The first page also lists the main contents of the appendix and the starting page number.

Appendix B1	FEA of Large Neck Test Body	B-2
Appendix B2	FEA of Small Neck Text Body	B-28
Appendix B3	FEA of API 13-5/8 x 20k Flange	B-46
Appendix B4	FEA of API 16-3/4 x 10k Flange	B-57

Appendix B1 FEA of Large Neck Test Body

Some important features of the FEA model of the large neck test body were described in Section 6.0 of the main body of this report; they will not be further discussed in this Appendix. Plots of the large neck test body model, features, mesh, loads and boundary conditions are presented in the following figures:

FEA Plots of the Large Neck Test Body

Figure B1.1:	Outside Surfaces of Large Neck Model
Figure B1.2:	Inside Surfaces of Large Neck Model
Figure B1.3:	FEA Mesh of Outside Surfaces
Figure B1.4:	FEA Mesh of Inside Surfaces
Figure B1.5:	FEA Mesh of Main Body
Figure B1.6:	FEA Mesh of Internal Cavity
Figure B1.7:	FEA Mesh of 3-1/16 x 20k Flange
Figure B1.8:	FEA Mesh of 3-1/16 x 20k Flange Bore

The large neck FEA model was solved with the following three material properties:

Linear-elastic properties for the as-specified material Elastic-plastic properties for the actual material Elastic-plastic properties for the as-specified material

The results of the solution with linear elastic properties were used to calculate pressure ratings based on the linear-elastic procedures in API 6A and ASME Division 2. The results of the solutions with elastic-plastic properties were used to calculate pressure ratings based on the elastic-plastic rules in ASME Division 2 and Division 3.

The following are discussions of the FEA solutions of the large neck model that were performed, the important results and the pressure ratings based on Code rules.

Linear-Elastic FEA

The large neck FEA model was solved with linear-elastic material properties at the design internal pressure of 10,000 psi. The pressure ratings using stresses from linear-elastic FEA were based on the minimum material strengths of the as-specified material. The linear-elastic analysis methods in API 6A and Division 2 are the same. However, API 6A and Division 2 differ in that API 6A compares stress intensity with the allowable stresses whereas Division 2 compares von Mises stress with the allowable stresses. In this report, pressure ratings are calculated based on both stress intensity and on von Mises stress.

The following figures of the linear-elastic FEA model and results are included in Appendix B1:

<u>Model and Results of Linear-elastic FEA of Large Neck Test Body</u> Figure B1.9: Features of Large Neck Model for Linear Elastic FEA Figure B1.10: von Mises Stresses in Large Neck Body with 10 ksi Internal Pressure Figure B1.11: Total Displacements in Large Neck Body with 10 ksi Internal Pressure Figure B1.12: Linearized Stresses in Large Neck Body with 10 ksi Internal Pressure Figure B1.13: Pressure Rating Calculations.

The most important figures are the linearized stress table in Figure B1.12 and the pressure rating calculations in Figure B1.13. The stress table shows the linearized stresses through the critical section. The critical section was found by linearizing section stresses through several paths in the model and choosing the most highly stressed section to perform pressure rating calculations. The location of the critical path is shown in Figure B1.10.

From the linearized stress table in Figure B1.12, the important linearized stresses in the critical section at an internal pressure of 10 ksi are

Linearize membrane stress intensity = 14,740 psi Linearized membrane plus bending stress intensity = 25,380 psi Linearized membrane von Mises stress = 12,780 psi

Linearized membrane plus bending von Mises stress = 22,000 psi

The allowable membrane stress is 2/3 of yield strength and the allowable membrane plus bending stress is the yield strength. Since the minimum yield strength is 75,000 psi, the allowable stresses are

Allowable membrane stress = $(2/3) \times 75,000 \text{ psi} = 50,000 \text{ psi}$

Allowable membrane + bending stress = 75,000 psi

For an elastic analysis, stress is linear with pressure. Hence, the pressure ratings for the large neck body based on linear-elastic analysis are calculated using linear interpolation as shown below (see Figure 1.13):

Rating for membrane stress intensity = $(50,000/14,740) \times 10,000 = 33,921$ psi Rating for membrane + bending stress intensity = $(75,000/25,380) \times 10,000 = 29,551$ psi Rating for membrane von Mises stress = $(50,000/12,780) \times 10,000 = 39,124$ psi Rating for membrane + bending von Mises stress = $(75,000/22,000) \times 10,000 = 34,091$ psi

The pressure ratings based on membrane stress are different than those based on membrane plus bending stress. The actual pressure rating is the lessor of the two ratings. Hence, the allowable pressure ratings are

Pressure rating based on stress intensity (API 6A) = 29,551 psi Pressure rating based on von Mises stress (ASME Division 2) = 34,091 psi

Elastic-Plastic FEA

The FEA model was also solved with elastic-plastic material properties. One elastic-plastic solution used the actual material properties which were determined by tensile tests of a prolongation from the forging. A second elastic-plastic solution used the minimum material properties listed in the material specification. The true-stress strain curve for the as-specified material was calculated based on the methods in Part 5 of ASME Division 2.

Each elastic-plastic solution was solved by incrementally increasing the internal pressures until the solution failed to converge. As required by ASME procedures the internal pressure of the

last converged solution was designated as the plastic collapse pressure of the large neck test body.

The following result plots from the elastic-plastic solutions are included at the end of Appendix B1:

Results with Actual Material Properties

Figure B1.14: Pressures on Large Neck FEA Model after Completion of 2 Load Steps

Figure B1.15: Boundary Conditions on Large Neck FEA Model

Figure B1.16: Von Mises Stresses in Large Neck Body Just Before Burst

Figure B1.17: Von Mises Stresses in Large Neck Body Just Before Burst (Modified Scale)

Figure B1.18: Total Strain in Large Neck Body Just Before Burst

Figure B1.19: Displacements in Large Neck Body Just Before Burst

Results with As-Specified Material Properties

Figure B1.20: Pressures on Large Neck FEA Model after Completion of 3 Load Steps

Figure B1.21: Boundary Conditions on Large Neck FEA Model

Figure B1.22: Von Mises Stresses in Large Neck Body just Before Burst

Figure B1.23: Total Strain in Large Neck Body just Before Burst

Figure B1.24: Displacements in Large Neck Body just Before Burst.

Plastic Collapse Pressures and ASME Pressure Ratings

As previously stated by ASME rules the plastic collapse pressure is the pressure at the last converged solution of the FEA model. The following paragraphs describe the procedure for calculation of the plastic collapse pressure using the elastic-plastic FEA model. Collapse pressure calculations are performed for the large neck test body with actual material properties and with specified material properties.

A solution consists of starting with a zero internal pressure and slowly ramping the pressure up in small increments until the solution does not converge. The pressure at the end of the solution and the pressure increment are specified at the onset of the solution. If the solution converges when the maximum pressure is reached a second load step must be performed. The second load step is a continuation of the first load step but with an increased value for the final pressure and possibly a different pressure increment. If the solution still converges at the end of second load step then a third load step must be performed. This process must be continued until nonconvergence is achieved.

The ANSYS program lists the time and/or the iteration number at the last converged solution. The internal pressure at the last converged is easily calculated using simple linear interpolation based on either time or iteration number. The following are calculations for the collapse pressures and pressure ratings.

Large Neck Test Body with Actual Material Properties

Plastic Collapse Iteration History

Load Step 1: 70,000 psi internal pressure after 70 equal iterations (time = 1.0) Load Step 2: 75,000 psi internal pressure after 20 additional iterations (time = 2.0) Time = 1.57 at last converged solution

Plastic Collapse Pressure

Plastic collapse pressure = $(1.57 - 1.0) \times (75,000 - 70,000) + 70,000$ psi Plastic collapse pressure = 72,850 psi for large neck body

ASME Pressure Ratings

Division 2 Pressure Rating = 72,850 psi / 2.4 = 30,354 psiDivision 3 Pressure Rating = 72,850 psi / 1.8 = 40,472 psi

Large Neck Body with Specified Material Properties

Plastic Collapse Iteration

Load Step 1: 55,000 psi internal pressure after 50 equal iteration (t = 1.0)

Load Step 2: 60,000 psi internal pressure after 10 additional iterations (t = 2.0)

Load Step 3: 65,000 psi internal pressure after 20 additional iterations (t = 3.0) Time =2.55 at last converged solution

Plastic Collapse Pressure

Plastic collapse pressure = $(2.55 - 2.0) \times (65,000 - 60,000) + 60,000$ psi Plastic collapse pressure = 62,750 psi for large neck body

ASME Pressure Ratings

Division 2 Pressure Rating = 62,750 psi / 2.4 = 26,146 psiDivision 3 Pressure Rating = 62,750 psi / 1.8 = 34,861 psi

A third elastic-plastic solution was performed by restarting the original solution with the actual properties at the last pressure that converged. The internal pressure just before plastic-collapse was incrementally reduced to a very low pressure (less than 1 psi). This solution simulated the effect of removing internal pressure. The results after pressure has been removed are the residual stresses and strains produced by material yielding just before plastic collapse has occurred. These plots will provide important data for future testing of the material.

The following result plots from the solution after pressure is removed are included at the end of Appendix B1:

Results with Actual Material Properties after Pressure is Removed

Figure B1.25: Residual Displacements on Bore Surfaces

Figure B1.26: Residual Displacements on External Surfaces

Figure B1.27: Residual von Mises Stresses on Bore Surfaces

Figure B1.28: Residual von Mises Stresses on External Surfaces

Figure B1.29: Residual Displacements on Bore Surfaces of Main Body

Figure B1.30: Residual Displacements on External Surfaces of Main Body

Figure B1.31: Residual von Mises Stresses on Bore Surfaces of Main Body

Figure B1.32: Residual von Mises Stresses on External Surfaces of Main Body

Figure B1.33: Residual Maximum Principal Stresses on Bore Surfaces of Main Body

Figure B1.34: Residual Minimum Principal Stresses on Bore Surfaces of Main Body

Figure B1.35: Residual Total Principal Strain (1st) on Bore Surfaces of Main Body

Figure B1.36: Residual Total Principal Strain (2nd) on Bore Surfaces of Main Body
Figure B1.37: Residual Total Principal Strain (3rd) on Bore Surfaces of Main Body
Figure B1.38: Residual Total Principal Strain (EQV) on Bore Surfaces of Main Body













Linearized Stresses in Large Neck with Actual Material at 10 ksi Pressure PRINT LINEARIZED STRESS THROUGH A SECTION DEFINED BY PATH= PATHA DSYS= 0

RADIUS OF CURVATURE = 2.0680

***** POST1 LINEARIZED STRESS LISTING ***** INSIDE NODE = 316 OUTSIDE NODE = 96

LOAD STEP 1 SUBSTEP= 10 TIME= 0.14286 LOAD CASE= 0

** AXISYMMETRIC OPTION ** RHO = 2.0680 The following X,Y,Z stresses are in Section Coordinates.

		** MEMBRANE	**			
	SX	SY	SZ	SXY	SYZ	SXZ
-	3510.	4463.	0.1122E+05	-223.8	-1.256	-44.01
	S1	S2	S 3	SINT	SEQV	
0	.1122E+05	4469.	-3516.	0.1474E+05	0.1278E+05	
		** BENDING	** I=INSIDE	C=CENTER O=0	UTSIDE	
	SX	SY	SZ	SXY	SYZ	SXZ
	-5765.	-15.97	4879.	0.000	0.000	0.000
C	-1124.	-1.450	465.8	0.000	0.000	0.000
0	3517.	13.07	-3948.	0.000	0.000	0.000
	S1	S2	S3	SINT	SEQV	
	4879.	-15.97	-5765.	0.1064E+05	9228.	
C	465.8	-1.450	-1124.	1590.	1415.	
0	3517.	13.07	-3948.	7465.	6469.	
		** MEMBRANE	PLUS BENDING	** I=INSID	E C=CENTER	0=0UTSI DE
	SX	SY	SZ	SXY	SYZ	SXZ
	-9274.	4447.	0.1610E+05	-223.8	-1.256	-44.01
C	-4634.	4461.	0.1169E+05	-223.8	-1.256	-44.01
0	7.360	4476.	7275.	-223.8	-1.256	-44.01
	S1	S2	S 3	SINT	SEQV	
	0.1610E+05	4451.	-9278.	0.2538E+05	0.2200E+0	5
С	0.1169E+05	4467.	-4639.	0.1633E+05	0.1417E+0	5
0	7276.	4487.	-4.083	7280.	6362.	
		** PEAK **	I=INSIDE C=C	ENTER 0=OUTS	DE	
	SX	SY	SZ	SXY	SYZ	SXZ
	0.000	-10.58	1318.	-179.9	-10.78	-378.2
C	1790.	1.752	-644.0	4.594	1.235	43.29
0	0.4974E-13	-1.575	933.2	92.45	1.244	43.58
	S1	S2	S 3	SINT	SEQV	
	1420.	126.0	-238.3	1658.	1509.	
С	1790.	1.742	-644.8	2435.	2185.	
0	935.2	90.47	-94.11	1029.	950.6	
		** TOTAL **	I=INSIDE C=	CENTER 0=OUT	SIDE	
	SX	SY	SZ	SXY	SYZ	SXZ
	-9274.	4436.	0.1742E+05	-403.7	-12.04	-422.3
C	-2844.	4463.	0.1104E+05	-219.2	-0.2033E-0	1 -0.7232
0	7.360	4474.	8209.	-131.3	-0.1196E-0	1 -0.4293
	S1	S2	S 3	SINT	SEQV	TEMP
	0.1743E+05	4448.	-9293.	0.2672E+05	0.2314E+0	5 0.000
C	0.1104E+05	4470.	-2850.	0.1390E+05	0.1204E+0	5
0	8209.	4478.	3.503	8205.	7116.	0.000

Figure B1.12 Linearized Stresses in Large Neck Body with 10,000 psi Internal Pressure
Pressure Ratings for Large Neck Body with Spec Material by Linear Elastic FEA

Note: Stresses were calculated with an ANSYS 3D FEA Model.

$S_y = 75000 \frac{lbf}{m^2}$ Material yield strength
$S_{ma} := \frac{2}{3} \cdot S_y = 50000 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$ Allowable primary membrane stress intensity
$S_{ba} = 1.5 \cdot S_{ma} = 75000 \cdot \frac{10f}{m^2}$ Allowable primary plus bending stress intensity
D _i := 3.06 inInside diameter of pipe
D _o := 5.68-inOutside diameter of pipe
From FEA
$P_i = 10000 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$ Internal pressure
$S_{nii} = 14740 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$
$S_{bi} = 25380 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$ Membrane plus bending stress intensity at Pi
$S_{me} := 12780 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$ Membrane von Mises stress at Pi
S _{be} = 22000 <u>Ibf</u>
$P_{rmi} := \frac{S_{ma}}{S_{mi}} \cdot P_i = 33921 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$ Rating based on membrane SI
$P_{rbi} := \frac{S_{ba}}{S_{bi}} P_i = 29551 \cdot \frac{Ibf}{in^2}$ Rating based on membrane + bending SI
$P_{me} := \frac{S_{ma}}{S_{me}} \cdot P_{i} = 39124 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^{2}}$ Rating based on membrane SE
$P_{rbe} := \frac{S_{ba}}{S_{be}} P_i = 34091 \frac{10f}{m^2}$ Rating based on membrane + bending SE

Figure B1.13 Pressure Rating Calculations





















Residual Displacements on External Surfaces of Main Body after Internal Pressure is Relieved









Appendix B2 FEA of Small Neck Test Body

Appendix B1 describes FEA of the large neck test body and Appendix B2 describes FEA of the small neck test body. Other than results, the contents of Appendix B1 and Appendix B2 are virtually the same. To make Appendix B2 easier to read, the common text and information in Appendix B1 is repeated in Appendix B2. Hence, there is considerable redundancy in Appendix B2.

Some of the important features of the FEA model of the small neck test body were described in the main body of this report; they will not be further discussed in this Appendix. Plots of the small neck test body model, features, mesh, loads and boundary conditions are presented in the following figures:

Results with Actual Material Properties

Figure B2.1: Outside Surfaces of Small Neck Model

Figure B2.2: Inside Surfaces of Small Neck Model

Figure B2.3: FEA Mesh of Outside Surfaces

Figure B2.4: FEA Mesh of Inside Surfaces

Figure B2.5: FEA Mesh of Main Body

Figure B2.6: FEA Mesh of Internal Cavity

Figure B2.7: FEA Mesh of 3-1/16 x 20k Flange

Figure B2.8: FEA Mesh of 3-1/16 x 20k Flange Bore

The FEA model was solved with the following three material properties:

Linear-elastic properties for the as-specified material Elastic-plastic properties for the actual material Elastic-plastic properties for the as-specified material

The results of the solution with linear elastic properties were used to calculate pressure ratings based on the linear-elastic procedures in API 6A and ASME Division 2. The results of the solutions with elastic-plastic properties were used to calculate pressure ratings based on the elastic-plastic rules in ASME Division 2 and Division 3.

The following are discussions of the FEA solutions of the small neck model that were performed, the important results and the pressure ratings based on Code rules.

Linear-Elastic FEA

The small neck FEA model was solved with linear-elastic material properties at the design internal pressure of 10,000 psi. The pressure ratings using stresses from linear-elastic FEA were based on the minimum material strengths of the as-specified material. The linear-elastic analysis methods in API 6A and Division 2 are the same. However, API 6A and Division 2 differ in that API 6A compares stress intensity with the allowable stress whereas Division 2 compares von Mises stress with the allowable stress. In this report, pressure ratings are calculated based on both stress intensity and on von Mises stress.

The following figures of the linear-elastic FEA model and results are included in Appendix B2:

Model and Results of Linear-elastic FEA of Small Neck Test Body

Figure B2.9: Features of Small Neck Model for Linear Elastic FEA

Figure B2.10: von Mises Stresses in Small Neck Body with 10 ksi Internal Pressure

Figure B2.11: Total Displacements in Small Neck Body with 10 ksi Internal Pressure

Figure B2.12: Linearized Stresses in Small Neck Body with 10 ksi Internal Pressure

Figure B2.13: Pressure Rating Calculations.

The most important figure is the linearized stress table in Figure B2.12 and the pressure rating calculations in Figure B2.13. The stress table shows the linearized stresses through the critical section. The critical section was found by linearizing section stresses through several paths in the model and choosing the most highly stressed section for pressure rating calculations. The location of the critical path is shown in Figure B2.10.

From the linearized stress table in Figure B2.12, the important linearized stresses in the critical section at an internal pressure of 10 ksi are

Linearize membrane stress intensity = 20,360 psi

Linearized membrane plus bending stress intensity = 31,480 psi

Linearized membrane von Mises stress = 17,650 psi

Linearized membrane plus bending von Mises stress = 27,920 psi

The allowable membrane stress is 2/3 of yield strength and the allowable membrane plus bending stress is the yield strength. Since the minimum yield strength is 75,000 psi, the allowable stresses are

Allowable membrane stress = $(2/3) \times 75,000$ psi = 50,000 psi Allowable membrane + bending stress = 75,000 psi

For an elastic analysis, stress is linear with pressure. Hence, the allowable pressure ratings for the small neck body based on linear-elastic analysis are calculated using linear interpolation as shown below:

Rating for membrane stress intensity = $(50,000/20,360) \times 10,000 = 24,558$ psi Rating for membrane + bending stress intensity = $(75,000/31,480) \times 10,000 = 23,825$ psi Rating for membrane von Mises stress = $(50,000/17,650) \times 10,000 = 28,329$ psi Rating for membrane + bending von Mises stress = $(75,000/27,290) \times 10,000 = 27,483$ psi

The pressure ratings based on membrane stress are different than those based on membrane plus bending stress. The actual pressure rating is the lessor of the two ratings. Hence, the allowable pressure ratings are

Pressure rating based on stress intensity = 23,825 psi Pressure rating based on von Mises stress = 27,483 psi

Elastic-Plastic FEA

The FEA model was also solved with elastic-plastic material properties. One elastic-plastic solution used the actual material properties which were determined by tensile tests of a

prolongation from the forging. A second elastic-plastic solution used the minimum material properties listed in the material specification. The true-stress strain curve for the as-specified material was calculated based on the methods in Part 5 of ASME Division 2.

Each elastic-plastic solution was solved by incrementally increasing the internal pressures until the solution failed to converge. As required by ASME procedures the internal pressure of the last converged solution was designated as the plastic collapse pressure of the small neck test body.

The following result plots from the elastic-plastic solutions are included at the end of Appendix B1:

Results with Actual Material Properties

Figure B2.14: Pressures on Small Neck FEA Model after Completion of 2 Load Steps

Figure B2.15: Boundary Conditions on Small Neck FEA Model

- Figure B2.16: Von Mises Stresses in Small Neck Body Just Before Burst
- Figure B2.17: Von Mises Stresses in Small Neck Body Just Before Burst (Modified Scale)

Figure B2.18: Total Strain in Small Neck Body Just Before Burst

Figure B2.19: Displacements in Small Neck Body Just Before Burst

Results with Specified Material Properties

Figure B2.20: Pressures on Small Neck FEA Model after Completion of 3 Load Steps

Figure B2.21: Boundary Conditions on Small Neck FEA Model

Figure B2.22: Von Mises Stresses in Small Neck Body just Before Burst

Figure B2.23: Total Strain in Small Neck Body just Before Burst

Figure B2.24: Displacements in Small Neck Body just Before Burst.

Plastic Collapse Pressures and ASME Pressure Ratings

As previously stated by ASME rules the plastic collapse pressure is the pressure at the last converged solution of the FEA model. The following paragraphs describe the procedure for calculation of the plastic collapse pressure using the elastic-plastic FEA model. Collapse pressure calculations are performed for the small neck test body with actual material properties and with specified material properties.

A solution consists of starting with a zero internal pressure and slowly ramping the pressure up in small increments until the solution does not converge. The pressure at the end of the solution and the pressure increment are specified at the onset of the solution. If the solution converges when the maximum pressure is reached a second load step must be performed. The second load step is a continuation of the first load step but with an increased value for the final pressure and possibly a different pressure increment. If the solution still converges at the end of second load step then a third load step must be performed. This process must be continued until nonconvergence is achieved.

The ANSYS program lists the time and/or the iteration number at the last converged solution. The internal pressure at the last converged is easily calculated using simple linear interpolation based on either time or iteration number. The following are calculations for the collapse pressures and pressure ratings.

Small Neck Body with Actual Material Properties

Plastic Collapse Iteration History Load Step 1: 50,000 psi internal pressure after 50 equal iterations (time = 1.0) Load Step 2: 55,000 psi internal pressure after 10 additional iterations (time = 2.0) Load Step 3: 60,000 psi internal pressure after 20 additional iterations (time = 3.0) Time = 2.10 at last converged solution Plastic Collapse Pressure Plastic collapse pressure = $(2.07 - 2.0) \times (60,000 - 55,000) + 55,000 \text{ psi}$ Plastic collapse pressure = 55,375 psi for small neck body **ASME** Pressure Ratings Division 2 Pressure Rating = 55,375 psi / 2.4 = 23,073 psiDivision 3 Pressure Rating = 55,375 psi / 1.8 = 30,764 psiSmall Neck Body with Specified Material Properties Plastic Collapse Iteration Load Step 1: 45,000 psi internal pressure after 45 equal iteration (t = 1.0) Load Step 2: 50,000 psi internal pressure after 20 additional iterations (t = 2.0) Time =1.57 at last converged solution Plastic Collapse Pressure Plastic collapse pressure = $(1.57 - 1.0) \times (50,000 - 45,000) + 45,000 \text{ psi}$ Plastic collapse pressure = 47,850 psi for small neck body **ASME** Pressure Ratings Division 2 Pressure Rating = 47,850 psi / 2. 4 = 19,937 psiDivision 3 Pressure Rating = 47,850 psi / 1.8 = 26,583 psi













Linearized Stresses in Small Neck with Spec Material at 10 ksi Pressure PRINT LINEARIZED STRESS THROUGH A SECTION DEFINED BY PATH= PATHA DSYS= 0

RADIUS OF CURVATURE = 1.9030

***** POST1 LINEARIZED STRESS LISTING ***** INSIDE NODE = 12623 OUTSIDE NODE = 12861

LOAD STEP 1 SUBSTEP= 10 TIME= 0.22222 LOAD CASE= 0

** AXISYMMETRIC OPTION ** RHO = 1.9030 The following X,Y,Z stresses are in Section Coordinates.

		** MEMBRANE	* *			
	SX	SY	SZ	SXY	SYZ	SXZ
-	-3848.	7050.	0.1648E+05	528.4	0.4653E-01 -	-0.9084
	S1	S2	S 3	SINT	SEQV	
0).1648E+05	7075.	-3874.	0.2036E+05	0.1765E+05	
		** RENDING *	* I-INSIDE	C-CENTER 0-0	IITSIDE	
	SX	SV	\$7	SXV	SV7	SX7
	-6081	0.2452	5047	0.000	0.000	0.000
ċ	-1108.	0.1738E-01	372.6	0.000	0.000	0.000
ŏ	3865.	-0.2104	-4302	0.000	0.000	0.000
•	S1	S2	\$3	SINT	SEOV	
1	5047.	0.2452	-6081.	0.1113E+05	9651.	
Ċ	372.6	0.1738E-01	-1108.	1480.	1334.	
Ŏ	3865.	-0.2104	-4302.	8167.	7076.	
				** I_INCID	E C-CENTED (-OUTSIDE
	cv		PLUJ DENDINU C7	evv evv	E GEGENIER U	CV7
	JA _0020	31 7050	JL 0 21525±05	579 1	JIL 0 44525-01	3AL 1 _0 0001
-	-7727.	7050.	0.2153E+05 0 1494E+05	520.4 529 /	0.4053E-01	1 -0.7004
ň	-4750.	7050.	0.1000E+05	520.4	0.40532-01	-0.7004
v	10.03 C1	7047. \$2	0.1210ETUJ 62	526.4 SINT	SEUN	-0.7004
	0 2152E+05	7066	_00/5	0 21/18F±05	0 2720F±05	
ċ	0.2155L+05	7000.	-//1070	0.3140E+03	0.2727L+0	
ŏ	0.1218F+05	7089	-77.66	0.1220F+05	0.1062F+05	5
Ŭ	0.12102100			01 12202 100	0110011100	
	•	** PEAK **	I=INSIDE C=C	ENTER 0=0UTS	IDE	
	SX	SY	SZ	SXY	SYZ	SXZ
	0.000	-6.447	1414.	333.4	0.3186E-01	-0.5947
С	1639.	1.790	-524.3	-11.54	-0.9110E-03	0.1530E-01
0	-0.6217E-12	-1.565	823.7	-171.5	-0.1671E-01	0.3179
	S1	S2	S3	SINT	SEQV	
	1414.	330.1	-336.6	1750.	1530.	
C	1639.	1.708	-524.3	2164.	1954.	
0	823.7	170.7	-172.2	995.9	876.3	
		** TOTAL **	I=INSIDE C=	CENTER O=OUT	SIDE	
	SX	SY	SZ	SXY	SYZ	SXZ
1	-9929.	7043.	0.2294E+05	861.8	0.7839E-01	-1.503
Ċ	-3317.	7051.	0.1633E+05	516.9	0.4562E-01	-0.8931
Ó	16.83	7048.	0.1300E+05	357.0	0.2982E-01	-0.5906
-	S1	S2	S3	SINT	SEQV	TEMP
	0.2294E+05	7087.	-9973.	0.3292E+05	0.2851E+05	5 0.000
С	0.1633E+05	7077.	-3343.	0.1967E+05	0.1705E+05	5
0	0.1300E+05	7066.	-1.249	0.1301E+05	0.1128E+05	5 0.000

Figure B2.12 Linearized Stresses in Small Neck Body with 10,000 psi Internal pressure

Pressure Ratings for Small Neck Body with Specified Material by Linear Elastic FEA

Note: Stresses were calculated with an ANSYS 3D FEA Model.

 $S_{ma} := \frac{2}{3} \cdot S_y = 50000 \cdot \frac{lbf}{2}$ Allowable primary membrane stress intensity $S_{ba} = 1.5 S_{ma} = 75000 \cdot \frac{lbf}{2}$ Allowable primary plus bending stress intensity Do = 4.88 in Outside diameter of pipe From FEA. $P_i > 10000 \cdot \frac{lbf}{m^2}$ Internal pressure $P_{\text{rmi}} := \frac{S_{\text{ma}}}{S_{\text{mi}}} \cdot P_{1} = 24558 \cdot \frac{\text{lbf}}{12}$ Rating based on membrane SI $P_{rbi} := \frac{S_{ba}}{S_{bi}} P_i = 23825 \cdot \frac{lbf}{c^2}$ Rating based on membrane + bending SI $P_{\text{rme}} := \frac{S_{\text{ma}}}{S_{\text{ma}}} P_{\text{i}} = 28329 \frac{10 \text{ f}}{...2}$ Rating based on membrane SE $P_{rbe} = \frac{S_{ba}}{S_{ba}} \cdot P_{i} = 27483 \cdot \frac{1bf}{m^{2}}$ Rating based on membrane + bending SE

> Figure B2.13 Pressure Rating Calculations













Appendix B3 FEA of API 13-5/8 x 20k Flange

The geometry and dimensions of the FEA model of the API 13-5/8 x 20k flange were taken from Table B.41 in API 6A. The geometry of the FEA model is shown in Figure B3.1. As the figure shows, neither the bolts nor the seal ring were included in the model because they are not critical components for this study and their presence will not affect the accuracy of the critical stress or the collapse pressure calculations. Numerous FEA of API flanges reported in literature have demonstrated that bolts and seal rings can be neglected without significantly affecting the critical results required for pressure rating of API flanges.

The model was axisymmetric and comprised of 17,135 elements and 52,344 nodes. All elements were quadrilateral, ANSYS Plane 183 elements. Figure B3.2 shows an enlarged view of the FEA mesh in the critical regions.

The model was solved with linear-elastic material properties and with elastic-plastic material properties. Results of the linear elastic solution were used to calculate pressure ratings based on API 6A and Division 2 linear-elastic procedures.

Linear-Elastic FEA

The model was solved with linear-elastic material properties at rated internal pressure of 20,000 psi. The following Figures at the end of this appendix describe the important features of the FEA model, loads and boundary conditions; and, the important results of the solution with linear-elastic material properties:

Figure B3.1..... Features of 13-5/8 x 20k API Flange Model for Linear-Elastic FEA Figure B3.2..... Mesh Details for 13-5/8 x 20k Model for Linear Elastic FEA Figure B3.3..... Pressures on 13-5/8 x 20k Flange Model with Linear-Elastic Material Figure B3.4..... Radial Displacements of Flange with 20 ksi Internal Pressure Figure B3.5..... Axial Displacements of Flange with 20 ksi Internal Pressure Figure B3.6..... von Mises Stresses in Flange with 20 ksi Internal Pressure Figure B3.7..... Linearized Stresses in 13-5/8 x 20k Flange with 20 ksi Internal Pressure Figure B3.8..... Pressure Rating Calculations

Figure B3.3 shows the pressure load and boundary conditions for the linear-elastic solution. As shown in the figure, internal pressure was applied to the OD of the seal groove. The pressure end load was applied as a pressure on the simulated area of the bolts. The center line of the simulated bolt area was the bolt centerline. The width of the simulated bolt area was the bolt diameter. This method is commonly used to simulate bolt loads on axisymmetric models of flanges. The nodes on the bottom (pipe end) of the model were fixed in the axial direction.

Figure B3.6 is a plot of the von Mises stresses in the flange with the location of the critical path shown. The critical path was found by linearizing stresses across numerous sections and finding the section where primary and primary membrane plus bending stresses are largest. Figure B3.7 shows the linearized stresses across the critical path. The stresses underlined in red are the ones that must be compared with the allowable stresses.

Notice that the membrane stress intensity and the membrane von Mises stresses are both underlined. This is because API 6A requires that stress intensities be compared with the allowable stresses whereas Division 2 requires that the von Mises stresses be compared with the allowable stresses.

The linear-elastic stresses in Figure B3.7 were used to calculate the pressure rating based on the API 6A which requires the use of the ASME Division 2 linear-elastic analysis method. Calculations for pressure ratings based on the linearized stresses are Figure B3.8: They are listed below:

Pressure ratings for the 13-5/8 x 20k API Flange by linear-elastic FEA 25,497 psi Pressure rating by API 6A 29,098 psi Pressure rating by ASME Division 2

Elastic-Plastic FEA

The FEA model was also solved with elastic-plastic material properties. The elastic-plastic solution used the material properties of the low alloy steel with a 75,000 psi yield strength. The following figures at the end of this appendix show the important features of the elastic-plastic model, solutions and important results:

Figure B3.9..... Features of 13-5/8 x 20k API Flange Model for Elastic-Plastic FEA Figure B3.10.... Mesh Details for 13-5/8 x 20k Model for Elastic-Plastic FEA Figure B3.11.... Pressures on 13-5/8 x 20k Flange Model after 300 Iterations Figure B3.12.... Radial Displacements in Flange at Burst Pressure of 60 ksi Figure B3.13.... Axial Displacements in Flange at Burst Pressure of 60 ksi Figure B3.14.... von Mises Stresses in Flange at Burst Pressure of 60 ksi Figure B3.15.... Total Strain in Flange at Burst Pressure of 60 ksi

The elastic-plastic solution was solved by incrementally increasing the internal pressures until the solution failed to converge. Figure B3.11 shows the model with an internal pressure of 75,000 psi after 300 equal iterations. The model failed to converge before all 300 iterations were completed. The last converged solution was at iteration 240. Hence, the pressure at the last converged solution was 60,000 psi.

The following pressure ratings where calculated by dividing the collapse pressure by the design factors:

Pressure ratings for 13-5/8 x 20k API Flange by Elastic-plastic FEA 25,000 psi Pressure rating by Division 2 elastic-plastic 33,333 psi Pressure rating by Division 3 elastic-plastic






PathG

PRINT LINEARIZED STRESS THROUGH A SECTION DEFINED BY PATH= PATHG DSYS= 0 **RADIUS OF CURVATURE =** 9.6030 ***** POST1 LINEARIZED STRESS LISTING ***** INSIDE NODE = 1885 OUTSIDE NODE = 803 LOAD STEP 1 SUBSTEP= 1 TIME= 1.0000 LOAD CASE= 0 **** AXISYMMETRIC OPTION **** RHO = 9.6030 THE FOLLOWING X, Y, Z STRESSES ARE IN SECTION COORDINATES. ** MEMBRANE ** SX SY SZ SXY SYZ SXZ -6304. 8785. 0.3044E+05 2132. 0.000 0.000 **S1** SEQV **S2 S**3 SINT 0.3044E+05 0.3704E+05 9081. -6600. 0.3221E+05 ** BENDING ** I=INSIDE C=CENTER O=OUTSIDE SX SY SZ SXY SXZ SYZ 6195. 6305. -9924. 0.000 0.000 0.000 -3745. 0.000 0.000 0.000 С -671.4 -871.3-0.1368E+05 0.000 0 -7648. 8181. 0.000 0.000 SEQV **S1 S2 S**3 SINT -9924. 6305. 6195 0.1623E+05 0.1617E+05 С -671.4 -871.3 -3745. 3073. 2979. 0 8181. -7648. -0.1368E+05 0.2187E+05 0.1956E+05 I=INSIDE C=CENTER O=OUTSIDE ** MEMBRANE PLUS BENDING ** SX SY SZ SXY SYZ SXZ -109.3 0.1509E+05 0.2052E+05 2132. 0.000 0.000 -0.1005E+05 8114. 0.2957E+05 0.000 С 2132. 0.000 -0.1999E+05 0.3862E+05 1137. 0.000 0.000 0 2132. **S1 S2 S**3 SINT SEQV 0.2052E+05 0.1538E+05 0.2092E+05 -402.7 0.1889E+05 C 0.2957E+05 -0.1030E+05 0.3987E+05 0.3455E+05 8361. 0 0.3862E+05 1350. -0.2020E+05 0.5883E+05 0.5155E+05 ** PEAK ** I=INSIDE C=CENTER O=OUTSIDE SX SY SXY SYZ SXZ SZ -0.9379E-12 2950. 0.000 2088. -2298. 0.000 С 5270. -559.2 -1470. 571.3 0.000 0.000 0 0.000 0.000 0.000 1103. 3587. -2405. **S1 S2 S**3 SINT SEQV 3569. 2950. -1480. 5049. 4770. C 5325. -614.7 -1470. 6795. 6411. 0 3019. -1917. 3587. 5503. 5243. ** TOTAL ** I=INSIDE C=CENTER O=OUTSIDE SX SY SZ SXY SYZ SXZ 0.000 -109.3 0.2347E+05 0.1718E+05 0.000 -166.2 0.000 С -4780. 7554. 0.2810E+05 2704. 0.000 0 -0.1999E+05 2240. 0.4221E+05 -273.2 0.000 0.000 **S2** TEMP **S1** S3 SINT SEQV 0.2347E+05 0.1718E+05 -110.9 0.2358E+05 0.2115E+05 0.000 0.2810E+05 8121. С -5346. 0.3345E+05 0.2915E+05 0 0.4221E+05 2243. -0.1999E+05 0.6220E+05 0.5459E+05 0.000

Figure B3.7

Linearized Stresses in 13-5/8 x 20k Flange with 20,000 psi Internal Pressure

Pressure Ratings of Flange with Elastic Material

Note: Stresses were calculated with an ANSYS 2D FEA Model.

5 _y = 75000 <u>bf</u> m ²	
$S_{ma} := \frac{2}{3} \cdot S_y = 50000 \cdot \frac{lbf}{m^2}$	Allowable primary membrane stress intensity
$S_{ba} = 1.5 \cdot S_{ma} = 75000 \cdot \frac{bf}{m^2}$	Allowable primary plus bending stress intensity
D ₁ = 18.75-in	Inside diameter of pipe
D _o := 21.854·in	Outside diameter of pipe
From FEA	
$P_i := 20000 \cdot \frac{1bf}{in^2} \dots$	
S _{mi} := 37040 - <u>lbf</u> in ²	
$S_{bi} := 58830 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$	
S _{me} := 32210. <u>Ibf</u>	
$S_{be} = 51550 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$	Membrane + bending von Mises stress at Pi
$P_{mui} = \frac{S_{ma}}{S_{mi}} \cdot P_i = 26998 \frac{10f}{in^2}$	Rating based on membrane SI
Sba bi	Pressure rating based on API 6A
$P_{rbi} = \frac{P_i}{S_{bi}} P_i = \frac{25497}{in^2}$	
$P_{\text{rme}} := \frac{S_{\text{rma}}}{S_{\text{rma}}} \cdot P_{i} = 31046 \frac{\text{lbf}}{2}$	Rating based on membrane SE
	Pressure rating based on ASME Division 2 elastic-plastic
$P_{rbe} = \frac{s_{ba}}{s_{be}} P_i = \frac{29098}{in^2} \frac{lbf}{in^2}$	Rating based on membrane + bending SE

Figure B3.8 Pressure Rating Calculations









Appendix B4 FEA of API 16-3/4 x 10k Flange

The geometry and dimensions of the FEA model of the API 16-3/4 x 10k flange were taken from Table B.40 in API 6A. The geometry of the FEA model is shown in Figure B4.1. As the figure shows, neither the bolts nor the seal ring were included in the model because they are not critical components for this study and their presence will not affect the accuracy of the critical stress or the collapse pressure calculations. Numerous FEA of API flanges reported in literature have demonstrated that bolts and seal rings can be neglected without significantly affecting the critical results required for pressure rating of API flanges.

The model was axisymmetric and comprised 13,102 elements and 40,071 nodes. All elements were quadrilateral, ANSYS Plane 183 elements. Figure B4.2 shows an enlarged view of the FEA mesh in the critical regions.

The model was solved with linear-elastic material properties and with elastic-plastic material properties. Results of the linear elastic solution were used to calculate pressure ratings based on API 6A and Division 2 linear-elastic procedures.

Linear-Elastic FEA

The model was solved with linear-elastic material properties at rated internal pressure of 10,000 psi. The following Figures at the end of this appendix describe the important features of the FEA model, loads and boundary conditions; and, the important results of the solution with linear-elastic material properties:

Figure B4.1..... Features of 16-3/4 x 10k API Flange Model for Linear-Elastic FEA Figure B4.2..... Mesh Details for16-3/4 x 10k Model for Linear Elastic FEA Figure B4.3..... Pressures on 16-3/4 x 10k Flange Model with Linear-Elastic Material Figure B4.4..... Radial Displacements of Flange with 10 ksi Internal Pressure Figure B4.5..... Axial Displacements of Flange with 10 ksi Internal Pressure Figure B4.6..... von Mises Stresses in Flange with 10 ksi Internal Pressure Figure B4.7..... Linearized Stresses in 16-3/4 x 10k Flange with 10 ksi Internal Pressure Figure B4.8..... Pressure Rating Calculations

Figure B4.3 shows the pressure load and boundary conditions for the linear-elastic solution. As shown in the figure, internal pressure was applied to the OD of the seal groove. The pressure end load was applied as a pressure on the simulated area of the bolts. The center line of the simulated bolt area was the bolt centerline. The width of the simulated bolt area was the bolt diameter. This method is commonly used to simulate bolt loads on axisymmetric models of flanges. The nodes on the bottom (pipe end) of the model were fixed in the axial direction.

Figure B4.6 is a plot of the von Mises stresses in the flange with the location of the critical path shown. The critical path was found by linearizing stresses across numerous sections and finding the section where primary and primary membrane plus bending stresses are largest. Figure B4.7 shows the linearized stresses across the critical path. The stresses underlined in red are the ones that must be compared with the allowable stresses.

Notice that the membrane stress intensity and the membrane von Mises stresses are both underlined. This is because API 6A requires that stress intensities be compared with the allowable stresses whereas Division 2 requires that the von Mises stresses be compared with the allowable stresses.

The linear-elastic stresses in Figure B4.7 were used to calculate the pressure rating based on the API 6A which requires the use of the ASME Division 2 linear-elastic analysis method. Calculations for pressure ratings based on the linearized stresses are Figure B3.8: They are listed below:

Pressure ratings for 16-3/4 x 10k API Flange by linear-elastic FEA 14,310 psi Pressure rating by API 6A 16,453 psi Pressure rating by ASME Division 2

Elastic-Plastic FEA

The FEA model was also solved with elastic-plastic material properties. The elastic-plastic solution used the material properties of the low alloy steel with a 75,000 psi yield strength. The following figures at the end of this appendix show the important features of the elastic-plastic model, solutions and important results:

Figure B4.9..... Features of 16-3/4 x 10k API Flange Model for Elastic-Plastic FEA Figure B4.10.... Mesh Details for 16-3/4 x 10k Model for Elastic-Plastic FEA Figure B4.11.... Pressures on 16-3/4 x 10k Flange Model after 160 Iterations Figure B4.12.... Axial Displacements in Flange at Burst Pressure of 34.75 ksi Figure B4.13.... Radial Displacements in Flange at Burst Pressure of 34.75 ksi Figure B4.14.... von Mises Stresses in Flange at Burst Pressure of 34.75 ksi Figure B4.15.... Total Strain in Flange at Burst Pressure of 34.75 ksi

The elastic-plastic solution was solved by incrementally increasing the internal pressures until the solution failed to converge. Figure B4.11 shows the model with an internal pressure of 40,000 psi after 160 equal iterations. The model failed to converge before all 160 iterations were completed. The last converged solution was at iteration 139. Hence, the pressure at the last converged solution was 34,750 psi.

The following pressure ratings where calculated by dividing the collapse pressure by the design factors:

Pressure ratings for 16-3/4 x 10k API Flange by elastic-plastic FEA 14,479 psi Pressure rating by Division 2 elastic-plastic 19,306 psi Pressure rating by Division 3 elastic-plastic







RADIUS OF CURVATURE = 10.120

***** POST1 LINEARIZED STRESS LISTING ***** INSIDE NODE = 302 OUTSIDE NODE = 969

LOAD STEP 1 SUBSTEP= 1 TIME= 1.0000 LOAD CASE= 0

** AXISYMMETRIC OPTION ** RHO = 10.120 THE FOLLOWING X,Y,Z STRESSES ARE IN SECTION COORDINATES.

	** MEMBRANE	* *			
SX	SY	SZ	SXY	SYZ	SXZ
-3625.	0.1007E+05	0.3082E+05	2668.	0.000	0.000
S1	S2	S3	SINT	SEQV	
0.3082E+05	0.1057E+05	-4126.	0.3494E+05	0.3039E+05	

		** BENDING **	* I=INSIDE	C=CENTER O=	OUTSIDE	
	SX	SY	SZ	SXY	SYZ	SXZ
Ι	3621.	0.1125E+05	-2766.	0.000	0.000	0.000
С	-1376.	-680.0	-149.1	0.000	0.000	0.000
0	-6374.	-0.1261E+05	2468.	0.000	0.000	0.000
	S1	S2	S3	SINT	SEQV	
Ι	0.1125E+05	3621.	-2766.	0.1402E+0	5 0.1216E+05	
С	-149.1	-680.0	-1376.	1227.	1066.	
0	2468.	-6374.	-0.1261E+05	0.1508E+0	5 0.1313E+05	

		** MEMBRANE	PLUS BENDING	** I=INSIDE	C=CENTER	O=OUTSIDE
	SX	SY	SZ	SXY	SYZ	SXZ
Ι	-3.891	0.2132E+05	0.2805E+05	2668.	0.000	0.000
С	-5001.	9388.	0.3067E+05	2668.	0.000	0.000
0	-9999.	-2545.	0.3329E+05	2668.	0.000	0.000
	S1	S2	S3	SINT	SEQV	
Ι	0.2805E+05	0.2165E+05	-332.7	0.2838E+05	0.2579E+0)5
С	0.3067E+05	9867.	-5480.	0.3615E+05	0.3142E+0)5
0	0.3329E+05	5 -1688.	-0.1086E+05	0.4414E+05	0.4035E+0)5

** PEAK ** I=INSIDE C=CENTER O=OUTSIDE

	SX	SY	SZ	SXY	SYZ	SXZ
Ι	0.4619E-13	-261.1	433.0	-2805.	0.000	0.000
С	2180.	-390.0	-370.6	1079.	0.000	0.000
0	0.000	421.0	827.4	-2716.	0.000	0.000
	S1	S2	S3	SINT	SEQV	
Ι	2677.	433.0	-2938.	5615.	4895.	
С	2573.	-370.6	-783.2	3357.	3171.	
0	2935.	827.4	-2514.	5449.	4759.	

		** TOTAL **	I=INSIDE C=C	ENTER O=OUTS	IDE	
	SX	SY	SZ	SXY	SYZ	SXZ
Ι	-3.891	0.2106E+05	0.2848E+05	-136.3	0.000	0.000
С	-2821.	8998.	0.3030E+05	3748.	0.000	0.000
0	-9999.	-2124.	0.3411E+05	-48.14	0.000	0.000
	S1	S2	S3	SINT	SEQV	TEMP
Ι	0.2848E+05	5 0.2106E+05	-4.773	0.2849E+05	0.2560E+05	0.000
С	0.3030E+05	5 0.1009E+05	-3909.	0.3421E+05	0.2979E+05	
0	0.3411E+05	5 -2123.	-9999.	0.4411E+05	0.4075E+05	0.000

Figure B4.7

Linearized Stresses in 16-3/4 x 10 k Flange with 10,000 psi Internal Pressure B-62

Pressure Ratings of 16-3/4 x 10k API Flange

Note: Stresses were calculated with an ANSYS 2D FEA Model.

$S_y := 75000 \frac{lbf}{in^2}$.	
$S_{ma} := \frac{2}{3} \cdot S_y = 50000$	0. lbf in ² Allowable primary membrane stress intensity
$S_{ba} := 1.5 \cdot S_{ma} = 750$	000. lbf m ² Allowable primary plus bending stress intensity
D _i := 16.75 in	
D _o := 23.75 in	Outside diameter of pipe
From FEA	
$P_i := 10000 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2} \dots$	Internal pressure
$S_{mi} := 34940 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$	
$S_{bi} := 44140 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$	
$S_{me} := 30390 \cdot \frac{lbf}{in^2}$	Membrane von Mises stress at Pi
$S_{be} := 40350 \cdot \frac{lbf}{2}$	
s III	Pressure rating by API 6A
$P_{\text{rmi}} := \frac{\sigma_{\text{ma}}}{S_{\text{mi}}} \cdot P_i = 14$	310. Ibr in ² Rating based on membrane SI
$P_{rbi} := \frac{S_{ba}}{S_{bi}} \cdot P_i = 169$	91. $\frac{\text{lbf}}{\text{in}^2}$
Sma	Pressure rating by ASME Division 2 linear-elastic
$P_{\text{rme}} := \frac{\text{ma}}{\text{S}_{\text{me}}} \cdot P_{i} = 16$	i453Rating based on membrane SE
$P_{rbe} := \frac{S_{ba}}{S_{be}} \cdot P_i = 185$	$\frac{10}{100}$

Figure B4.8 Pressure Rating Calculations B-63









APPENDIX C Hydro and Burst Tests of Bodies

C1 Documents by Aiken Engineering

As stated in Section 5.1 prototypes of the large neck and small neck test bodies were manufactured and prepared for hydrotesting. Hydrotests were performed by Southwest Research Institute in San Antonio Texas.

Table C1 summarizes the hydrotest plan that was proposed by Aiken Engineering. SwRI for all practical intent followed this plan. As shown in the table, two types of hydrotests were performed on each body. In the first set of tests the test bodies were hydrotested inside a hyperbaric chamber with various combinations of internal and external pressure as listed in Table C1. For these tests strain gages were mounted at critical locations on the test bodies and strain readings were recorded throughout the test program. Figures III-1, III-2, and III-3 show the locations of strain gages on the test Bodies.

In the second set of tests, the test bodies were mounted inside blast containment structures. Then internal pressure was slowly applied until the test bodies ruptured and relieved pressure. An identical but separate containment structure was provided for each test body.

Figure IV-8 on page C-89 is a photograph of the large neck body after rupture and Figure IV-7 is a photograph of the small neck body after rupture. As the photographs show, as expected both ruptures occurred in the thin neck sections. The maximum internal pressures before rupture occurred were

Burst pressure of large neck body = 67,959 psi

Burst pressure of small neck body = 51,469 psi

Step	Description	Р	ressures (p	osi)	Notes
		Internal	External	Increment	
0	Zero Strain Gages	0	0	0	Mount, run lead wires and assemble w/o bolt torque; zero gages
1	Bolt Preload	0	0	0	Torque bolts to 80% of yield using stud tensioners
2	Hydrotest + Preload	30,000	0	5,000	Record strain gage readings after each pressure step
3	Bolt Preload	0	0	-30,000	Slowly return internal pressure to zero and record strain gage readings
4	MAWP at Surface + Preload	20,000	0	5,000	Record strain gage readings after each pressure step
5	Bolt Preload	0	0	-30,000	Slowly return internal pressure to zero and record strain gage readings
6	MAWP at 5,000 Ft + Preload	22,222	2,222	5,000	Set internal and external pressures to 2,222 psi and record gage readings
7	Bolt Preload	0	0	-22,222	Slowly return internal pressure to zero and record strain gage readings
8	MAWP at 10,000 Ft + Preload	24,444	4,444	5,000	Set internal and external pressures to 4,444 psi and record gage readings
9	Bolt Preload	0	0	-24,400	Slowly return internal pressure to zero and record strain gage readings
10	Failure Pressure + Preload	~72,000	0	5,000	Record strain gage readings after each pressure step

Table C1 - Proposed Test Plan for 1st Test Body

C2 Test Report by Southwest Research Institute

Following completion of the hydrotest program, Southwest Research Institute produced a comprehensive report that described the test equipment, procedures and important results. The SwRI report is included in this appendix with the strain gage data for hydrotest of the two test bodies. The stain gage data for the burst test and operating pressure tests have been removed because the data is not related to this report and the data includes more than 150 pages of plots.

VALVE BODY HYDROSTATIC AND BURST TESTING

FINAL REPORT

SwRI Project 18.21910 Aiken Engineering Purchase Order 2456-0127-2016

prepared by

VERONICA MCDONALD

prepared for

Aiken Engineering Company 9720 Cypresswood Drive, Suite 340 Houston, Texas 77070

May 12, 2016

VALVE BODY HYDROSTATIC AND BURST TESTING

FINAL REPORT

SwRI Project 18.21910 Aiken Engineering Purchase Order 2456-0127-2016

prepared by

VERONICA MCDONALD

prepared for

Aiken Engineering Company 9720 Cypresswood Drive, Suite 340 Houston, Texas 77070

May 12, 2016



APPROVED:

Chris Storey, Group Leader Ocean Simulation Laboratory

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1.0	INTI	RODUCTION	1
2.0	TES	Г SETUP	1
	2.1	STRAIN GAGING	1
	2.2	TEST FACILITY	1
	2.3	Test Medium	1
	2.4	HIGH-PRESSURE CONNECTIONS / SUPPLY	1
	2.5	INSTRUMENTATION	2
	2.6	GENERAL TEST SCHEMATIC	3
3.0	HYD	ROSTATIC TESTING OF SMALL VALVE BODY	4
	3.1	30,000 psig Hydrostatic Test	4
	3.2	TEST AT MAWP	4
	3.3	TEST AT MAWP AT APPROXIMATELY 5,000 FT SIMULATED DEPTH	5
	3.4	TEST AT MAWP AT APPROXIMATELY 10,000 FT SIMULATED DEPTH	5
4.0	BUR	ST TEST OF SMALL VALVE BODY	5
	4.1	Burst Test	5
5.0	HYD	ROSTATIC TEST OF LARGE VALVE BODY	5
	5.1	Hydrostatic Tests	5
6.0	BUR	ST TEST OF LARGE VALVE BODY	5
	6.1	Burst Test	5
7.0	STR	AIN GAGE RESULTS	5

APPENDIX I – TEST DATA

APPENDIX II – Equipment Calibration Sheets APPENDIX III – Strain Gage Locations APPENDIX IV- Photographs

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Southwest Research Institute[®] (SwRI[®]) was contracted by Aiken Engineering to perform testing on two valve bodies in accordance with Aiken Engineering's Request for Quotation. The report contains the recorded data of the various test parameters measured during the tests, and presents the test results.

The valve body testing was conducted at Southwest Research Institute in San Antonio, Texas from April 15 through April 26, 2016.

2.0 <u>TEST SETUP</u>

2.1 Strain Gaging

Prior to pressure testing, a total of 10 biaxial strain gages were installed on the sample at locations agreed upon by SwRI and Aiken. Micro-Measurements MMF003153, 350 Ω , ±5% gages were used, giving the ability to measure 50,000 microstrain in tension or compression. Figures of the strain gage locations are included in Appendix III. Each gage was installed such that one element (strain channel) was placed in the axial direction and one in the hoop, or circumferential, direction. Two uniaxial strain gages were installed on samples of F22 material to be compared to other strain results. All gage locations required light surface preparations to create a suitable surface to bond to the gage (light scrubbing with Scotch-Brite pad and use of degreaser/solvent). Each gage was adhered to the surface of the test article using Vishay M-Bond 600 adhesive. SwRI technicians applied the adhesive then used heated vacuum pads to apply the necessary hold down pressure and cure temperature. Each location was cured for 1.1 hours at 275°F then temperature was allowed to return to ambient while the vacuum pads were left on for an additional 20-30 minutes.

Following confirmation of adhesive cure, the Teflon coated wiring was soldered in place, and each gage was tested for functionality. Dow Corning 748 sealant was applied over the strain gage locations and wiring to protect against water ingress.

2.2 Test Facility

The hydrostatic portions of testing were conducted in SwRI's 50-inch, 6,000 psi pressure vessel. The burst test was conducted at a remote test site on SwRI's campus. All tests were conducted at ambient temperature.

2.3 Test Medium

The pressurization medium for the valve body for all internal and external testing was San Antonio city water.

2.4 High-Pressure Connections / Supply

For testing in the 50 inch chamber, high pressure $(\frac{1}{4}^{n})$ stainless steel tubing was connected to the top and bottom flanges of the valve under test. The valve body was pressurized through the bottom flange connection. The valve body was depressurized through the top flange connection. For the burst test, ultra high pressure $(\frac{1}{4}^{n})$ stainless steel tubing was connected to the bottom flanges of the valve body under test. All other ports on the valve body flanges were plugged. The valve body was pressurized through the bottom flange connection. For both tests, the bore pressure was generated with a Haskel pump mounted on a SwRI pressure control panel used for this type of testing. To ensure that the rate of pressure reduction was not too rapid, a metering valve $(1/4^{n})$ ultra high pressure) was added to the pressure control panel downstream of the relay-controlled dump valve.

2.5 Instrumentation

The valve internal and external (where applicable) pressures were monitored by a digital pressure controller/display. A thermocouple was placed in the interior of the pressure vessel to monitor the ambient temperature during testing in the vessel. These instruments were connected to a computer data acquisition (DAQ) system. The computer data acquisition system recorded:

- A: Internal and External Pressure
- B: Thermocouple Temperature Reading (when applicable)
- C: Strain

Data was scanned and logged with National Instruments LabView software at preset intervals and electronically saved to the computer during each test sequence. Prior to testing, all pressure measuring instrumentation was calibrated on an SI Barnett or an Ashcroft deadweight calibrator which has calibrations traceable to the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). The instruments used are listed in Tables 1 and 2 below. The calibration sheets for these instruments are included in Appendix II.

Table 1 -	- Instrumentation	Used for	Sections 3.0 and 5.0)
-----------	-------------------	----------	----------------------	---

Test Item Monitored	Make/Model	Serial Number
Sample Pressure	Honeywell / TJE	1467253
Chamber Pressure	Sensotec/A5/B489-02	559498
Thermocouple Calibrator	Fluke	1131008

I upic a Institution office for beenons 4.0 and 0.0
--

Test Item Monitored	Make/Model	Serial Number
Sample Pressure	Sensotec/HP/8810-02	889788

2.6 General Test Schematic

A general schematic for the test setup in the hyperbaric chamber is shown below in Figure 1. A general schematic for the test setup for the burst test is shown in Figure 2 below.



Figure 1: Simplified Hyperbaric Chamber Test Connection Schematic, Orange = Thermocouple Lines, Blue= Strain Gage Lines, Black = Piping or High-Pressure Tubing, Red = Instrumentation Lines.



Figure 2: Simplified Burst Test Connection Schematic, Blue= Strain Gage Lines, Black = Piping or High-Pressure Tubing, Red = Instrumentation Lines.

3.0 HYDROSTATIC TESTING OF SMALL VALVE BODY

3.1 30,000 psig Hydrostatic Test

After the valve body was set up inside the 50-inch vessel, the body was pressurized in 5,000 psig increments. At each increment, pressure was maintained for two (2) minutes. When 30,000 psig was reached, pressure was maintained for two (2) minutes. Pressure was then vented slowly. No leaks in the valve body were observed during this test. The results of this test are shown in Appendix I.

3.2 Test at MAWP

Following the hydrostatic test, the valve body was tested at 20,000 psig with no external pressure. Pressure was applied in 5,000 psig increments. At each increment, pressure was maintained for two (2) minutes. When 20,000 psig was reached, pressure was maintained for two (2) minutes. Pressure was then vented. No leaks in the valve body were observed during this test. The results of this test are shown in Appendix I.

3.3 Test at MAWP at approximately 5,000 ft Simulated Depth

For this test, the hyperbaric chamber was sealed and filled with water. The chamber was pressurized to 2,222 psig. Pressure was maintained for two (2) minutes. The valve body was then pressurized in 5,000 psig increments. At each increment, pressure was maintained for two (2) minutes. When 22,222 psig was reached, 20,000 psig of differential pressure, pressure was maintained for two (2) minutes. The valve body pressure was then released to 2,222 psig. With both valve body and chamber pressures at 2,222 psig, valve body and chamber pressures were bled to ambient. No leaks in the valve body were observed during this test. The results of this test are shown in Appendix I.

3.4 Test at MAWP at approximately 10,000 ft Simulated Depth

Following the previous test, the chamber was pressurized to 4,444 psig. Pressure was maintained for two (2) minutes. The body was then pressurized in 5,000 psig increments. At each increment, pressure was maintained for two (2) minutes. When 24,444 psig was reached, 20,000 psig of differential pressure, pressure was maintained for two (2) minutes. The valve body pressure was then released to 4,444 psig. With both valve body and chamber pressures at 4,444 psig, body and chamber pressures were bled to ambient. No leaks in the valve body were observed during this test. The results of this test are shown in Appendix I.

4.0 BURST TEST OF SMALL VALVE BODY

4.1 Burst Test

For the burst test, the valve body was secured in an Aiken-provided containment and moved to a remote SwRI test site. Ultra high pressure ($\frac{1}{4}$ ") tubing was connected to the valve, as described in Section 2.4. The valve was pressurized continuously until failure. During this test, pressurization was paused periodically to guarantee that appropriate air pressure was being supplied to the high pressure pump. The maximum pressure reached during the test was 51,469 psig. As the material yielded, pressure decreased. The pressure at failure was 42,414 psig. The results of this test are shown in Appendix I.

5.0 HYDROSTATIC TEST OF LARGE VALVE BODY

5.1 Hydrostatic Tests

All tests outlined in Sections 3.1 through 3.4 were repeated for the large valve body. No leaks in the valve body were observed during testing. The results of these tests are shown in Appendix I.

6.0 BURST TEST OF LARGE VALVE BODY

6.1 Burst Test

For the burst test, the valve body was secured in an Aiken-provided containment and moved to a remote SwRI test site. Ultra high pressure $(\frac{1}{4})$ tubing was connected to the valve, as described in Section 2.4. The valve was pressurized continuously until failure. The maximum pressure reached during testing was 67,959 psig. As the material yielded, pressure decreased. The pressure at failure was 60,058 psig. The results of this test are shown in Appendix I.

7.0 STRAIN GAGE RESULTS

On the small valve body, two strain channels experienced signal loss during testing. The internal calibration block experienced signal loss during the 30,000 psig hydrostatic test. The gage at location 2B

in the hoop direction was lost during the test at MAWP and a simulated depth of 5,000 ft. On the large valve body, the internal calibration block experienced signal loss during the test at MAWP and a simulated depth of 10,000 ft. All internal strain gages and calibration blocks were disconnected before the burst test. Plots showing the strain data for each element are included in Appendix I.

APPENDIX I TEST DATA

SMALL VALVE BODY PRESSURE DATA










LARGE VALVE BODY PRESSURE DATA









C-23



STRAIN DATA- SMALL VALVE BODY

30,000 PSIG HYDROSTATIC TEST











































STRAIN DATA-LARGE VALVE BODY

30,000 PSIG HYDROSTATIC TEST












































APPENDIX II

EQUIPMENT CALIBRATION SHEETS



Calibration Certificate



Cost Center:	18 MECHANICAL & MATERIALS ENGINEERING	Certificate Number: 41643
Asset Number:	020122	Calibrated: 11/5/2015
Description:	PRESSURE TRANSDUCER	Calibration Due: 5/5/2016
Manufacturer:	SENSOTEC	Data Type: FOUND / LEFT
Model Number:	A5/B489-02	Temp./RH: 68 °F / 41 %
Serial Number:	559498	Work Order # 403135480
Calibration Procedure:	PRESSURE GAUGES	

This certificate documents traceability to the International System of Units (SI) through the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) or other national metrology institute. The laboratory quality system is compliant to ISO/IEC 17025 2005, ANSI/NCSL Z540-1-1994 and relevant requirements of ISO 9001-2008. This certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of Southwest Research Institute Calibration Laboratory and shall not be used to claim product endorsement by SwRI® or any agency of the U.S. Government.

Results of this calibration relate only to the instrument described above at the time of calibration and does not imply any long term stability. Date due for recalibration is determined by the customer and does not imply the instrument will remain within limits, as any number of factors may cause an out of tolerance condition before this date.

Data type shall be interpreted as follows: Found-left - data recorded and no adjustment or repair was performed. As-left - data recorded after adjustment or repair was performed. As-found data are reviewed and the customer notified when the as-found results are other than pass and/or greater than 70 percent of the test limit. Pass? or Fail? indicate the measured value, plus or minus the expanded uncertainty, overlap the test limit and it is not possible to state Pass or Fail with a 95% confidence level. No statement of compliance with manufacturer or other specification is made or implied by this certificate. The customer has sole responsibility for determination of in/out-of-tolerance or compliance/noncompliance for the intended use of the instrument.

Measurement uncertainties are calculated in accordance with the methods described in the ISO "Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement" (GUM) as an expanded uncertainty with a coverage factor of k = 2 to approximately a 95% level of confidence. See Remarks or attached Measurement Report with the same Work Order number for data.

Remarks: Calibrated with display S/N 14831.

Standards Used To Calibrate Equipment							
Asset	Manufacturer	Model	Description	Cal. Due Date			
017617	FLUKE	PC-7300-2	PISTON CYLINDER, OIL 2MPA/KG	1/16/2016			
017619	FLUKE	MS-7000	MASS SET	2/11/2016			
020448	FLUKE	MB-7002-0.8	MASS CARRYING BELL	1/27/2016			
020449	FLUKE	PG-7302	PLATFORM, OIL 72 KPSI	1/23/2016			

Approved By

Institute Calibration Laboratory, Bldg. 64, San Antonio, TX 78227, ext. 5215

Calibrated By: RLC Metrology Technician

Work Order:	403135480	Mfr:	Sensotec	Technician:	RLC		
Asset No.:	020122	Model:	A5/B489-02	Type Data:	Found-left		
Serial No.:	559498	Туре:	Pressure Transducer	Cal Date:	5-Nov-15		
Remarks: Calibrated wit	Remarks: Calibrated with display S/N 14831. Shunt values: Position 1 = 4865, Position 4 = 1671.						

Function/Range	Test Point	TI Reading	Difference	± Limit	± Uncertainty	Result	% Limit
Voltage output for	psi	psi	psi	psi	psi		
pressure applied	0	0	0	50	2.5	Pass	0%
	2000	2008	-8			Pass	16%
	4000	4014	-14			Pass	28%
	6000	6015	-15			Pass	30%
	8000	8013	-13			Pass	26%
	10000	10009	-9			Pass	18%
	8000	8016	-16			Pass	32%
	6000	6018	-18			Pass	36%
	4000	4017	-17			Pass	34%
	2000	2010	-10			Pass	20%
	0	0	0			Pass	0%
		END (OF REPORT				



Calibration Certificate



Cost Center:	18 MECHANICAL & MATERIALS ENGINEERING	Certificate Number: 41919
Asset Number:	020121	Calibrated: 11/11/2015
Description:	PRESSURE TRANSDUCER	Calibration Due: 5/11/2016
Manufacturer:	SENSOTEC	Data Type: FOUND / LEFT
Model Number:	HP/8810-02	Temp./RH: 68 °F / 40 %
Serial Number:	889788	Work Order # 403135553
Calibration Procedure:	PRESSURE GAUGES	

This certificate documents traceability to the International System of Units (SI) through the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) or other national metrology institute. The laboratory quality system is compliant to ISO/IEC 17025 2005, ANSI/NCSL Z540-1-1994 and relevant requirements of ISO 9001-2008. This certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of Southwest Research Institute Calibration Laboratory and shall not be used to claim product endorsement by SwRI® or any agency of the U.S. Government.

Results of this calibration relate only to the instrument described above at the time of calibration and does not imply any long term stability. Date due for recalibration is determined by the customer and does not imply the instrument will remain within limits, as any number of factors may cause an out of tolerance condition before this date.

Data type shall be interpreted as follows: Found-left - data recorded and no adjustment or repair was performed. As-left - data recorded after adjustment or repair was performed. As-found data are reviewed and the customer notified when the as-found results are other than pass and/or greater than 70 percent of the test limit. Pass? or Fail? indicate the measured value, plus or minus the expanded uncertainty, overlap the test limit and it is not possible to state Pass or Fail with a 95% confidence level. No statement of compliance with manufacturer or other specification is made or implied by this certificate. The customer has sole responsibility for determination of in/out-of-tolerance or compliance/noncompliance for the intended use of the instrument.

Measurement uncertainties are calculated in accordance with the methods described in the ISO "Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement" (GUM) as an expanded uncertainty with a coverage factor of k = 2 to approximately a 95% level of confidence. See Remarks or attached Measurement Report with the same Work Order number for data.

Remarks: Calibrated to 72500 psig with display S/N 1303324.

Standards Used To Calibrate Equipment

Asset 017616	Manufacturer FLUKE	Model PC-7300-5	Description PISTON CYLINDER, OIL 5MPA/KG	Cal. Due Date 11/7/2016
017619	FLUKE	MS-7000	MASS SET	2/11/2016
020448	FLUKE	MB-7002-0.8	MASS CARRYING BELL	1/27/2016
020449	FLUKE	PG-7302	PLATFORM, OIL 72 KPSI	1/23/2016

Approved By

Institute Calibration Laboratory, Bldg. 64, San Antonio, TX 78227, ext. 5215

Calibrated By: RLC Metrology Technician

Work Order:	403135553	Mfr:	Honeywell		Technician:	RLC	
Asset No.:	020121	Model:	HP/8810-02		Type Data:	Found-I	eft
Serial No.:	889788	Type:	Pressure Transo	ducer	Cal Date:	11-Nov-	-15
Remarks: Calibrated with display S/N 1303324, from 0 to 72500 psig per customer request.							
Eunction/Pange	Test Point	TI Peading	Difference	+ Limit	+ Uncertainty	Posult	% Limit
Tunction/Range	rest Foint		Dillerence	<u> </u>		Result	70 LIITIIL
Displayed pressure	psi	psi	psi	psi	psi		
	0	0	0	500	37	Pass	0%
	14500	14499	-1			Pass	0%

28998

43496

57915

72507

57918

43485

29000

14494

-18

-2

-4

-85

7

-82

-15

0

-6

-18

END OF REPORT

29000

43500

58000

72500

58000

43500

29000

14500

0

Pass

Pass

Pass

Pass

Pass

Pass

Pass

Pass

Pass

0%

1%

17%

1%

16%

3%

0%

1%

4%



Calibration Certificate



Cost Center:	18 MECHANICAL & MATERIALS ENGINEERING	Certificate Number: 47924
Asset Number:	016644	Calibrated: 3/4/2016
Description:	THERMOCOUPLE CALIBRATOR	Calibration Due: 3/4/2017
Manufacturer:	FLUKE	Data Type: FOUND / LEFT
Model Number:	714	Temp./RH: 73.6ºF / 43 %
Serial Number:	1131008	Work Order # 403137749
Calibration Procedure:	FLUKE 71X SERIES	

This certificate documents traceability to the International System of Units (SI) through the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) or other national metrology institute. The laboratory quality system is compliant to ISO/IEC 17025 2005, ANSI/NCSL Z540-1-1994 and relevant requirements of ISO 9001-2008. This certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of Southwest Research Institute Calibration Laboratory and shall not be used to claim product endorsement by SwRI® or any agency of the U.S. Government.

Results of this calibration relate only to the instrument described above at the time of calibration and does not imply any long term stability. Date due for recalibration is determined by the customer and does not imply the instrument will remain within limits, as any number of factors may cause an out of tolerance condition before this date.

Data type shall be interpreted as follows: Found-left - data recorded and no adjustment or repair was performed. As-left - data recorded after adjustment or repair was performed. As-found data are reviewed and the customer notified when the as-found results are other than pass and/or greater than 70 percent of the test limit. Pass? or Fail? indicate the measured value, plus or minus the expanded uncertainty, overlap the test limit and it is not possible to state Pass or Fail with a 95% confidence level. No statement of compliance with manufacturer or other specification is made or implied by this certificate. The customer has sole responsibility for determination of in/out-of-tolerance or compliance/noncompliance for the intended use of the instrument.

Measurement uncertainties are calculated in accordance with the methods described in the ISO "Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement" (GUM) as an expanded uncertainty with a coverage factor of k = 2 to approximately a 95% level of confidence. See Remarks or attached Measurement Report with the same Work Order number for data.

Remarks:

Standards Used To Calibrate Equipment

Asset	Manufacturer	Model	Description	Cal. Due Date 2/26/2017
004164	FLUKE	5500A/SC300	CALIBRATOR MULTI - PRODUCT	
012066	AGILENT-HP	3458A OPT 002	MULTIMETER	7/23/2016

Approved By

Institute Calibration Laboratory, Bldg. 64, San Antonio, TX 78227, ext. 5215

Calibrated By: CER Metrology Technician

Work Order:	403137749	Mfr.	Fluke		Technician:	CER	
Asset No.	016644	Model	714		Type Data:	Found-	left
Serial No.	1131008	Туре	Thermocouple (Calibrator	Cal Date:	4-Mar-	16
Remarks:							
Function/Range	Test Point	TI Reading	Difference	± Limit	± Uncertainty	Result	% Limit
Type J Read	°C	°C	°C	°C	°C		
	-200.0	-200.3	-0.3	0.6	0.44	Pass	50%
	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	0.4	0.18	Pass	25%
	800.0	800.0	0.0	0.4	0.29	Pass	0%
	1200.0	1200.1	0.1	0.5	0.29	Pass	20%
	°F	°F	°F	°F	°F		
	-320.0	-320.5	-0.5	1.4	0.7	Pass	36%
	32.0	31.8	-0.2	0.9	0.3	Pass	22%
	2000.0	2000.0	0.0	0.9	0.5	Pass	0%
Type K Read	°C	°C	°C	°C	°C		
	-190.0	-190.2	-0.2	0.9	0.49	Pass	22%
	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	0.6	0.21	Pass	17%
	1300.0	1300.0	0.0	0.6	0.47	Pass	0%
	°F	°F	°F	°F	°F		
	-300.0	-300.3	-0.3	1.6	0.71	Pass	19%
	32.0	31.8	-0.2	1.0	0.36	Pass	20%
	2300.0	2300.0	0.0	1.0	0.84	Pass	0%
mV Read	mVolts	mVolts	mVolts	mVolts	mVolts		
	-10.000	-10.000	0.000	0.012	0.015	Pass	0%
	30.000	30.002	0.002	0.025	0.015	Pass	8%
	75.000	75.006	0.006	0.021	0.015	Pass	29%
mV Source	mVolts	mVolts	mVolts	mVolts	mVolts		
	-10.000	-9.992	0.008	0.012	0.001	Pass	66%
	30.000	30.003	0.003	0.025	0.001	Pass	14%
	75.000	74.998	-0.002	0.021	0.001	Pass	12%
Type J Source	°C	°C	°C	°C	°C		
	-200.00	-199.64	0.36	0.60	0.33	Pass	60%
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.17	Pass	0%
	800.00	800.15	0.15	0.40	0.27	Pass	37%
	1200.00	1200.08	0.08	0.50	0.27	Pass	16%
		END	OF REPORT				



Calibration Certificate



Cost Center:	18 MECHANICAL ENGINEERING	Certificate Number: 49570
Asset Number:	021857	Calibrated: 3/31/2016
Description:	PRESSURE TRANSDUCER	Calibration Due: 9/30/2016
Manufacturer:	HONEYWELL	Data Type: AS LEFT
Model Number:	TJE	Temp./RH: 68 °F / 39 %
Serial Number:	1467253	Work Order # 403138268
Calibration Procedure:	PRESSURE GAUGES	

This certificate documents traceability to the International System of Units (SI) through the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) or other national metrology institute. The laboratory quality system is compliant to ISO/IEC 17025 2005, ANSI/NCSL Z540-1-1994 and relevant requirements of ISO 9001-2008. This certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of Southwest Research Institute Calibration Laboratory and shall not be used to claim product endorsement by SwRI® or any agency of the U.S. Government.

Results of this calibration relate only to the instrument described above at the time of calibration and does not imply any long term stability. Date due for recalibration is determined by the customer and does not imply the instrument will remain within limits, as any number of factors may cause an out of tolerance condition before this date.

Data type shall be interpreted as follows: Found-left - data recorded and no adjustment or repair was performed. As-left - data recorded after adjustment or repair was performed. As-found data are reviewed and the customer notified when the as-found results are other than pass and/or greater than 70 percent of the test limit. Pass? or Fail? indicate the measured value, plus or minus the expanded uncertainty, overlap the test limit and it is not possible to state Pass or Fail with a 95% confidence level. No statement of compliance with manufacturer or other specification is made or implied by this certificate. The customer has sole responsibility for determination of in/out-of-tolerance or compliance/noncompliance for the intended use of the instrument.

Measurement uncertainties are calculated in accordance with the methods described in the ISO "Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement" (GUM) as an expanded uncertainty with a coverage factor of k = 2 to approximately a 95% level of confidence. See Remarks or attached Measurement Report with the same Work Order number for data.

Remarks: Calibrared with display S/N 1423727.

Standards Used To Calibrate Equipment							
Asset	Manufacturer	Model	Description	Cal. Due Date			
017616	FLUKE	PC-7300-5	PISTON CYLINDER, OIL 5MPA/KG	11/7/2016			
017619	FLUKE	MS-7000	MASS SET	4/9/2018			
020448	FLUKE	MB-7002-0.8	MASS CARRYING BELL	1/26/2017			
020449	FLUKE	PG-7302	PLATFORM, OIL 72 KPSI	1/25/2017			

Authorized Signatory

Institute Calibration Laboratory, Bldg. 64, San Antonio, TX 78227, ext. 5215

Calibrated By: PWC Metrology Technician

Work Order: Asset No.: Serial No.: Remarks: Calibrated wit	403138268Mfr:Honeywell021857Model:TJE1467253Type:Pressure Transducerrated with display S/N 1423727.France Content of the second		ducer	Technician: Type Data: Cal Date:	PWC As-found 29-Mar-16						
Function/Range	Test Point	TI Reading	Difference	± Limit	± Uncertainty	Result	% Limit				
Displayed pressure	psi	psi	psi	psi	psi						
	0	-12	-12	30	3.3	Pass	40%				
	6000	5999	-1			Pass	3%				
	12000	12010	10			Pass	33%				
	18000	18017	17			Pass	57%				
	24000	24020	20			Pass	67%				
	30000	30020	20			Pass	67%				
	24000	24027	27			Pass	90%				
	18000	18027	27			Pass	90%				
	12000	12021	21			Pass	70%				
	6000	6010	10			Pass	33%				
	0	-8	-8			Pass	27%				
END OF REPORT											

Work Order: Asset No.: Serial No.:	403138268 021857 1467253	Mfr: Model: Type:	Honeywell TJE Pressure Trans	ducer	Technician: Type Data: Cal Date:	PWC As-left 31-Mar-	-16				
Remarks: Calibrated w	ith display sn 142	3727. Adjusted.									
Function/Range	Test Point	TI Reading	Difference	± Limit	± Uncertainty	Result	% Limit				
Displayed pressure	psi	psi	psi	psi	psi						
	0	1	1	30	3.3	Pass	3%				
	6000	6003	3			Pass	10%				
	12000	12004	4			Pass	13%				
	18000	18005	5			Pass	17%				
	24000	24009	9			Pass	30%				
	30000	30002	2			Pass	7%				
	24000	24015	15			Pass	50%				
	18000	18011	11			Pass	37%				
	12000	12012	12			Pass	40%				
	6000	6010	10			Pass	33%				
	0	1	1			Pass	3%				
END OF REPORT											

APPENDIX III

STRAIN GAGE LOCATIONS



Figure III-1. Internal strain gage locations, as shown in the Aiken Engineering Requiest for Quote.



Figure III-2. External strain gage locations, as shown in the Aiken Engineering Requiest for Quote.



Figure III-3. External strain gage locations, as shown in the Aiken Engineering Requiest for Quote.

PHOTOGRAPHS

APPENDIX IV



Figure IV-1. Small Valve Body



Figure IV-2. Small Valve Body.



Figure IV-3. Small Valve Body.



Figure IV-4. Large Valve Body.



Figure IV-5. Large Valve Body.



Figure IV-6. Large Valve Body.



Figa.rt IV-7. Small Vain Body SecL:Afttr Burst Test.



Figure IV-8. Large Valve Body Neck After Burst Test.

APPENDIX D Validation of FEA Results

In Section 6.3 of the main body of this report, collapse pressures from FEAs were compared with burst pressures from hydrotests. For conclusions from this comparison to be correct, it is imperative that FEAs are accurate. The most reliable method of validating the accuracy of a FEA is comparing FEA results with test results. For the purpose of validating FEAs of the test bodies, strain gages were attached to the two test bodies, and strain data were recorded throughout the hydrotest program. Then strains that were measured during hydrotests were compared to strains calculated by the FEAs.

The SwRI test report is included in Appendix C2. Pages C-83 and C-84 show the locations of strain gages on the two test bodies. Ten biaxial strain rosettes were attached to each test body. Five rosettes (1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, and 5A) were placed at critical locations, and the other five (1B, 2B, 3B, 4B, and 5B) were placed at a symmetrical location on the other side of the test body. All of the biaxial rosettes were attached with one gage oriented in the axial direction and another gage oriented in the hoop direction.

Two pairs of rosettes were placed in the small bores inside each test body. These rosettes were designated as 1A, 1B, 2A, and 2B. A review of the strain plots in the SwRI report shows that data from the bore rosettes were not linear and were unstable. This was probably caused by the rosettes' proximity to the seal rings, which could have slipped and moved during hydrotesting. For this reason, the bore gage results were not considered in this study. The study only considered rosettes 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 5A, and 5B.

Figure D1 shows the locations of rosettes 3, 4, and 5. Figure D1 also lists the node numbers of finite element models for the two test bodies. Two node numbers are listed at each location. One is for the large neck test body, and the other is for the small neck test body.

The strain data compared with FEA strains was gathered during the initial hydrotest of each body. Plots of the strains during this test are provided in the following pages of the SwRI report:

Pages C-50 through C-71 for the large neck test body

Pages C-27 through C-47 for the small neck test body

Table D1 compares strains from FEAs with strains from hydrotesting. Table D1.1 compares strains in the large neck test body, and Table D1.2 compares strains in the small neck test body. The last columns in Tables D1.1 and D1.2 show the percentage difference between strains from FEAs and strains from hydrotesting. The comparison is very favorable for gages 3A, 3B, 4A, and 4B, but not for gages 5A and 5B. A review of Figure 6.5 shows that gages 5A and 5B were located very near a flange connection. The flange connection could have caused the poor strain comparison at gages 5A and 5B. Flange preload strains at gage 5 are included in the hydrotest strains, but are not included in the FEA strains. The reason preload strains are not included in the FEA is that Division 2 and 3 procedures do not include preload for a global plastic collapse analysis.
Gages 4A and 4B are at the critical locations in the test bodies because they are located at the rupture locations. Since the comparison of strains from FEAs and tests are within 4 percent at the critical locations, the FEA results at the critical locations are validated by test results.





Node 16906 = Gages 4A and 4B LOAD STEP= 1 SUBSTEP= 20 Node 16984 = Gages 5A and 5B LOAD CASE= 0.28571 TIME= 0 Node 44932 = Gages 3A and 3B SHELL NODAL RESULTS ARE AT TOP/BOTTOM FOR MATERIAL THE FOLLOWING X, Y, Z VALUES ARE IN GLOBAL COORDINATES EPELY NODE EPELX EPELZ EPELXY EPELYZ EPELXZ 16906 -0.24343E-03 0.12843E-03 0.43853E-03-0.23519E-08 0.14906E-08-0.48920E-06 16906 -0.24343E-03 0.12843E-03 0.43853E-03-0.23519E-08 0.14906E-08-0.48920E-06 16984 -0.19593E-03 0.12962E-03 0.35732E-03 0.18773E-03 0.44902E-06-0.13813E-06 16984 -0.19593E-03 0.12962E-03 0.35732E-03 0.18773E-03 0.44902E-06-0.13813E-06 44932 0.22772E-03 0.37107E-03-0.25586E-03 0.44086E-07-0.49384E-06 0.28980E-06 44932 0.22930E-03 0.37260E-03-0.25599E-03 0.11664E-07-0.44833E-06 0.13878E-05 MINIMUM VALUES 16906 44932 NODE 16906 16906 44932 16906 VALUE -0.24343E-03 0.12843E-03-0.25599E-03-0.23519E-08-0.49384E-06-0.48920E-06 MAXIMUM VALUES 16984 NODE 44932 44932 16906 16984 44932 VALUE 0.22930E-03 0.37260E-03 0.43853E-03 0.18773E-03 0.44902E-06 0.13878E-05 Table D1.1 Strains from FEA Solution of Large Neck Test Body at 20 ksi

LOAD STEP= 1 SUBSTEP= 20 Node 352 = Gages 4A and 4B TIME= 0.40000 LOAD CASE= 0 Node 460 = Gages 5A and 5B SHELL NODAL RESULTS ARE AT TOP/BOTTOM FOR MATERIAL 1 Node 115410 = Gages 3A and 3B THE FOLLOWING X, Y, Z VALUES ARE IN GLOBAL COORDINATES NODE EPELX EPELY EPELZ EPELXY EPELYZ EPELXZ 352 -0.39629E-03 0.20229E-03 0.70602E-03-0.74779E-07 0.13251E-07-0.33283E-04 352 -0.39629E-03 0.20229E-03 0.70602E-03-0.74779E-07 0.13251E-07-0.33283E-04 460 -0.18790E-03 0.12180E-03 0.35129E-03 0.17449E-03 0.53067E-05 0.23558E-05 460 -0.18790E-03 0.12180E-03 0.35129E-03 0.17449E-03 0.53067E-05 0.23558E-05 115410 0.22958E-03 0.37501E-03-0.25909E-03 0.48124E-06 0.24337E-06 0.19062E-07 115410 0.22961E-03 0.37571E-03-0.25929E-03 0.38814E-07 0.18215E-06-0.16376E-06 MINIMUM VALUES NODE 352 460 115410 352 352 352 VALUE -0.39629E-03 0.12180E-03-0.25929E-03-0.74779E-07 0.13251E-07-0.33283E-04 MAXIMUM VALUES NODE 115410 115410 352 460 460 460 0.22961E-03 0.37571E-03 0.70602E-03 0.17449E-03 0.53067E-05 0.23558E-05 VALUE Table D1.2 Strains from FEA Solution of Small Neck Test Body at 20 ksi

		0	ť			
Strain	Strain	SwRI	Microstrain	FEA	Microstrain	Error between
Gage	Gage	Report	from	Node	from	Strain Gage
ID	Direction	Page	Strain Gage	Number	FEA	and FEA
3A	Ноор	C-58	240	44932	228	5.0%
3A	Axial	C-59	370	44932	371	-0.3%
3B	Ноор	C-60	225	44932	228	-1.3%
3B	Axial	C-61	375	44932	371	1.1%
4A	Ноор	C-62	455	16906	439	3.5%
4A	Axial	C-63	125	16906	128	-2.4%
4B	Ноор	C-64	450	16906	439	2.4%
4B	Axial	C-65	125	16906	128	-2.4%
5A	Ноор	C-66	290	16984	357	-23.1%
5A	Axial	C-67	90	16984	130	-44.4%
5B	Ноор	C-68	280	16984	357	-27.5%
5B	Axial	C-69	85	16984	130	-52.9%

Table D1Comparison of Strains from Strain Gages andFEA Table D1.1Large Neck Test Body

Note: Plot on SwRI report for gages 5A and 5B indicate a problem with the

rossettes 7	Fable D1.	2 Small 1	Small Neck Test Body						
Strain	Strain	SwRI	Microstrain	FEA]				

Strain	Strain	SwRI	Microstrain	FEA	Microstrain	Error between
Gage	Gage	Report	from	Node	from	Strain Gage
ID	Direction	Page	Strain Gage	Number	FEA	and FEA
3A	Ноор	C-35	225	115410	230	-2.2%
3A	Axial	C-36	360	115410	375	-4.2%
3B	Ноор	C-37	225	115410	230	-2.2%
3B	Axial	C-38	360	115410	375	-4.2%
4A	Ноор	C-39	730	352	706	3.3%
4A	Axial	C-40	195	352	202	-3.6%
4B	Ноор	C-41	730	352	706	3.3%
4B	Axial	C-42	195	352	202	-3.6%
5A	Ноор	C-43	285	460	351	-23.2%
5A	Axial	C-44	85	460	122	-43.5%
5B	Ноор	C-45	300	460	351	-17.0%
5B	Axial	C-46	90	460	122	-35.6%

Note: Plot on SwRI report for gages 5A and 5B indicate a problem with the rossettes

APPENDIX E

PRESSURE RATINGS BY PROOF TESTING

Many pressure codes designate methods for determining pressure ratings based on a hydrostatic proof test. Generally, the procedure is to build a prototype of the component or the assembly and apply an incrementally larger hydrostatic pressure until burst occurs. The allowable pressure rating is the hydrostatic test pressure at burst multiplied by a load reduction factor that is specified by the code.

The following is a discussion of the requirements in the pressure codes considered in this study that allow use of the proof test to establish pressure rating. This is followed by calculations for allowable pressure ratings by proof test methods for the two test bodies in this study.

Pressure Ratings of Test Bodies by Proof Test Rules in API 6A

Section 4.3.3.5.1, titled "Design Qualification by Proof Test," describes the procedure in API 6A for establishing pressure rating by proof test. If the actual yield strength from tensile testing is known, then the equation for pressure rating is

$$P = 0.5 W (Sy/Sr)$$

where,

P = pressure rating W = the maximum hydrostatic pressure when the test was stopped Sy = specified minimum yield strengthSr = actual average

The specified and actual yield strengths of the test bodies are

Sy = 75,000 psi Sr = 92,200 psi

The burst pressures of the two test bodies were

Pbs = 51,469 psi.....burst pressure of small neck test body

Pbl = 67,959 psi.....burst pressure of large neck test body

Hence, according to API 6A rules, the maximum allowable pressure ratings by proof test are

Prs = (0.5) (51,469) (75,000/92,200) $Prs = 20,934 \text{ psi....allowable pressure rating of small neck test body by API 6A$ Prs = (0.5) (67,959) (75,000/92,200) $Prs = 27,641 \text{ psi....allowable pressure rating of large neck test body by API 6A$

Pressure Ratings of Test Bodies by Rules in ASME Section VIII Division 3

Article KD-1254, titled "Determination of Maximum Design Pressure at Room Temperature," also describes procedures for establishing pressure rating by proof test. When actual yield strengths have been determined by tensile tests, the basic equation for pressure rating is

P = (1/1.732) CP (Sy/Sr)

where,

CP = collapse pressure or the maximum hydrostatic pressure when the test was stopped

Hence, the maximum allowable pressure ratings for the test bodies based on proof test are

Prs = (1/1.732) (51,469) (75,000/92,200) $Prs = 24,173 \text{ psi}\dots\text{maximum allowable pressure rating of small neck test body}$ Prs = (1/1.732) (67,959) (75,000/92,200) $Prs = 31,918 \text{ psi}\dots\text{maximum allowable pressure rating of large neck test body}$

Pressure Rating by Proof Test Rules in ASME Section VIII Division 2

Division 2 does not include a procedure for establishing maximum allowable pressure ratings by proof test.

APPENDIX F

MISCELLANEOUS DOCUMENTS

Appendix F1	Material Documents from Forged Products (33 pages)	F-2
Appendix F2	Test Data from Franklin Research (7 pages)	F-35
Appendix F3	F22 Test Data from Forged Products	F-42

Forged Products, Inc. 6505 N. HOUSTON-ROSSLYN ROAD HOUSTON, TEXAS 77091 Phone 713-462-3416 Fax 713-460-9404



CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Customer Name: Purchase Or		Purchase Order No.	Part No.	Qty	Date			
AIKEN EN	GINEERING CO.	2456-11-10-2015 LN 1	2456-200 Rev 0	2	2/17/2016			
Descriptio	on		Serial Number(s) Drawing Number (s)					
TEST BOI	DY, API 17 EVAL 3	3-1/16 – 20K (F22)	AH450-2E1 AH450-2E2	PN2456-200 Rev 3				
Heat No.	Lot #	FPI W/O	Applicable Specifi	cations				
AH450	543959	87473	D2456-1 Rev 01					

I hereby certified that the goods described above are in compliance with the stated drawings, specification and engineering documents required by the purchase order.

Additionally, each part received a visual and dimensional inspection and were (was) found in acceptable condition.

Respectfully,

02/17/2016

Rigoberto Cendejas Forged Products Inc (832) 590-7921 rcendejas@fpitx.com

Forged Products, Inc.



CERTIFIED TEST REPORT

	Forgeu P	Touu	LLS,	Inc	•	-		~	F	15.5	P	1		-		CLIN			201	1.	-		_
	HOUSTON, TEXA	S 77091 · (7	13) 462	-3416		F	ORC	ED I	PRO	DUC	TS, I	NC.		-	-	87	473	-		-	DATE	SHIPPED	
						_		0.00								07	475		-		-	-	
	0	CUSTOMER					CUSTO	DMER'S ORDER NO. LN			DRAW	ING NO			REV		PAF	TNO		REV			
	AIKEN	ENGINEER	RING				2456-	6-11-10-2015 1			PN24	56-20	0	_	3		245	6-200	·	0			
0.10	PART(S) DESCRIPTIC)N	11.2.5	11.1	1.1	SPEC	IFICATIO	N NO.		REV		GR	ADE			× X 2	С	ERTIFIC	ATION T	ON TYPE		
Т	EST BODY, API 1	7 EVAL 3-1	1/16 -:	20K (F	22)		C	2456	-1	_	1		A18	2 F22			EN 10	0204,	/ ISO :	10474	1	TYP	E 3.1
					-		_	CHEN	/ICAL	CON	POSI	TION		_	1.			-		· · · ·			
	HEAT #	MILL SOL	JRCE	QTY		с	Mn	P	S	Si	Ni	Cr	Mo	V	AI	Cu	Cb	π	Sn	N			CE
	AH450	EQS	;		LADLE	.15	.58	.010	.006	.24	.45	2.42	1.11	.018	.020	.15	.006	.003	.008	.0071	-		1.00
SN	AH450-2E1;	AH450-2E	2	2	PA	.015	.58	.014	.008	.26	.42	2.42	1.07			.160		-	-	1	_	1	-
			-				-				-	-		_		-		_	-	-	-		-
			HEA	TTRE	ATMEN	IT /TE	ADEDA	THES		POPTO	DINE	DENLI	EIT TIN	AFICD	FRORT								-
-		NO	MALIZE	TINE		CTEMIT	7E	TUNES	ANE NO	NCH	DINF	AREINFIL	TEA.	ADED	EPORT	ED IN F	NOURS/	1	UDW	-	1	-	
	SN	NOP	(WALIZE	1	AU	STENT	26	1.200	qui	inch	1	-	(Ely	IPER	1			7272-1	HOW	_	# ATCH	FURNA	
		TEMP ("F)	TIME	COOL	TEMP	? ("F)	TIME	coo	LANT	START	FINISH	TEM	P ("F)	TIME	COOL	PART	QTC	PART	9	TC	60		
AH45	0-2E1; AH450-2E2	1750	6.00	AIR	17	00	6.00	WA	TER	71	73	12	30	10.00	WATER	2	PROL	REP.	N/A	N/A	543959	43959 AMS 2750	
			-			_												H	-				
-			-	-	-			1.	-		-					-	-	N.			-		
-			-						_			-	_	-						-		-	
		122200	100	10.00	1.1.1	12711	1			111	1	1.11		1111		1		1111		1	-		
		PHYS	CAL P	ROPE	RTIES (/	All mec	hanica	l prope	rties o	btained	l in the	Longitu	udinal	directio	on unle	ss othe	rwise s	pecifie	d)				
Э	YIELD STRENGTH	DDL A	la de la	EL	ONG	RED. O	FAREA	10.00	TEST SP	ECIMEN		-		TEMP	ABSO	RBED E	VERGY	LATERAL EXPANSION SHEAR		-			
#	(PSI)	TENSILE STR (PSI)	RENGTH	(%)	(%)		SIZE	(IN)	HARC (HE	INESS	TYPE C	накру	(°F)	111	(FT-LBS			(MILS)			(%)	
543959	92,200	111,1	00	24	.00	74	.30	0.5	01	236	237	LC	VN	0	147	153	156	81	85	86	100	100	100
				1				1			10.11	1.1.1			1.11		11.11		1		1		
						-		1				-	1										
								11.			1.1	100		1	1		1.171						
-						_		ADI	DITIO	NAL 1	ESTIN	IG											
	TEST TYPE	S	PECIFICA	TION		REV						120	1000	TE	ST RESU	LTS							
0	F Examination	A	STM A	388			NO R	EJECT	ABLE	NDICA	TIONS	PER	API 64	A PSL :	3								
IVI	PExamination	Ą	STME	709		-	NOR	EJECT	ABLE	NDICA	TIONS	PER	API 64	A PSL3	-	ICTO	ICTER						_
-			_	_		-	NOW	ELD RI	EPAIR	OSU	RES	JONA	AINY OI	FIRE	PROD	UCIS	ISTED		-		-		
		00000	-						LIVE	.050	NL.J		-					-					
	X Steel Mill Ce	ertificate(s)			[х	Final I	Hardne	ess Re	port(s)			х	Certif	icate d	of Com	pliand	e				
	X Heat Treat C	ert & Char	t(s)		[х	Dimer	nsional	Repo	rt(s)				х	Visual	Inspe	ction	Repor	t(s)				
	X UT Report(s)				х	MP Re	eport(s	5)					1.1	Other	:	1.1			_			
			_					1111										_		_		-	-
_							NOW	ELD R	EPAIR	PERFO	DRME		NY OI	FTHE	PROD	UCTS I	ISTED). TNOW O			ICE OF F	ORGED	-
	A	DDITION	AL CEP	RTIFIC	ATIONS	5	÷				PRODUC	TS, INC.	AND THA	T THE IT	EMSON	THIS REP	ORT WER	EMANU	FACTURE	D IN THE	UNITED	STATES	
X	NACE MR0175	PART			, r	Prolor	ngatio	n							1	OF AM	The second	~	-				
X	FORGE RATIO:	6.42	::1	X-SEC	ΓĹ	0.00	:1			-	1		> ~	14	-	11	0	/			7	1	
X	GRAIN SIZE:	ASTM 5 OR F	INER	1.1							-		pl	M	0		2	CE		2/	18/	201	6
				_											QU.	ALITY A	SURAN	CE		1			-

ELLWOOD QUALITY STEELS COMPANY

A PENNSYLVANIA BUSINESS TRUST. 700 MORAVIA STREET, NEW CASTLE, PA 16101

Rd.

CERTIFIED TEST REPORT

Date: 7/17/13

Page 1

Report of Tests of:	(2), 40" x 53" x 112" - Grade F22 MX Ingot(s)	
---------------------	---	--

6505 North Houston Rosslyn

For Company: Forged Products Inc

Customer's Order: 11340-#9,#10 Date of Order: 7/5/13

Houston, TX 77091

Our Shop Order: 100914

Specification: CS-F22 MX REV.02

0		
RV	AAPPROVED	
DAT	on	
- AAAAA	12/8/15	
	87422	

Heat #	C	Mn	P	S	Si	Ni	Cr	Mo	۷	Cu	AI	Hppm	Ti	Sn
AH450	.15	.58	.010	.006	.24	.45	2.42 .	1.11 -	.018 .	.15	.020	1.3	.003	.008
	В	Nb	Ca	N	and a surface of the local data									
	.0003	.006	.0025	.0071							-		-	

CHEMICAL ANALYSIS

The material was melted using the electric furnace-ladle refined-vacuum degassed process and was subsequently bottom poured.

The material has been melted using a fine grain melt practice capable of meeting ASTM 5 or finer.

The material was calcium treated.

CE = 1.00

J factor = 148

The material was produced in accordance with the EQS Quality Manual dtd. 8/3/09, Rev. 1 which meets the intent of the latest revisions to ISO 9001:2008, ISO 10012-1, MIL-I-45208, NCA-3800, and 10-CFR-50 App. B for quality assurance, inspection and calibration systems.

I cortify that the reported results and statements of the certificate represent the actual attributes of the material furnished and are in full compliance with all purchase order/specification requirements. The recording of false, ficilitious or fraudulent statements or entries on this document may be punishable as a felony under Federal Statutes. During the manufacturing process, tests, and inspections, the material did not come in direct contact with morcury or any of its compounds nor with any morcury containing dovice employing a single boundary of containment. No welding or weld repair was performed on this material. The material was produced free of radioactive elements.

Chris ME Vars Chuis McVey Matallurgian

F-4





3939 Blaffer Houston, Tx 77026 Ph. 713-672-6616 Fax (713) 672-9509

Cust No: 002202 Cust Name: FORGED PRODUCTS Quantity: 2

Cust PO#: 87473

Cert Date: 01/08/2016

Matl: F22

Description: ROUGH MACHINED JOB 87473 HN AH450 18 1/4"SQ X 14 1/2"OD X 1@ 42 3/4"LG 1@ 49 3/4"LG

Process: (3RD PARTY WITNESS) NORMALIZE, WATER QUENCH & TEMPER TO 217-237 HBW PER HT DATA SHEET 100% INSPECTION 3 PLACES, 120 DEG APART 4 PLACES ON OTHER END PER DWG T/C REQD

Controlled by Furnace Instrument:

THERMOCOUPLE IN LOAD T/C# E6453

TEMP	TIME	COOLING METHOD
1750 F	6.0 HOURS	AIR COOLED
1700 F	6.0 HOURS	WATER 71-73F
1230 F	10.0 HOURS	WATER COOLED
	TEMP 1750 F 1700 F 1230 F	TEMP TIME 1750 F 6.0 HOURS 1700 F 6.0 HOURS 1230 F 10.0 HOURS

2 PIECES CHECKED 7 PLACES EACH 223-235 HBW	

Furnaces and instruments are calibrated to AMS 2750E. Reported heat treat times and temperatures are taken from the furnace chart recorder. Mechanical testing conforms to the requirements of ASTM A370 and only applies to the sample tested or inspected. Frequency of all testing is dictated by specification and/or customer purchase order. All work is performed and accepted, unless otherwise agreed to in writing, in accordance with the Lone Star Heat Treating Corporation Master Services Agreement Terms and Conditions which may be found at www.lsht.com and our quality manual QM-01 Rev. 13. While at Lone Star Heat Treating this material did not come in contact with mercury nor was it subject to any weld repairs.

one Star Heat Treating Corp. Danny Bierman



Page 1 of 1

F-5

PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

Prod. Mgr.



3939 Blaffer Houston, Tx 77026 Ph. 713-672-6616 Fax (713) 672-9509

Cust PO#: 87473

Cust No: 002202 Cust Name: FORGED PRODUCTS Quantity: 2 Ma Description: ROUGH MACHINED JOB 87473 HN AH450 18 1/4"SQ X 14 1/2"OD X 1@ 42 3/4"LG 1@ 49 3/4"LG

Matl: F22

Weight: 5200





3939 Blaffer Houston, Tx 77026 Ph. 713-672-6616 Fax (713) 672-9509

Cust PO#: 87473

Cust No: 002202 Cust Name: FORGED PRODUCTS Quantity: 2 Ma Description: ROUGH MACHINED JOB 87473 HN AH450 18 1/4"SQ X 14 1/2"OD X 1@ 42 3/4"LG 1@ 49 3/4"LG

Matl: F22

Weight: 5200





Cust No: 002202

Certificate of Heat Treatment Work Order No: 543959 3939 Blaffer Houston, Tx 77026 Ph. 713-672-6616 Fax (713) 672-9509

Cust PO#: 87473

Cust Name: FORGED PRODUCTS

Quantity: 2

Matl: F22

Weight: 5200

Description: ROUGH MACHINED JOB 87473 HN AH450 18 1/4"SQ X 14 1/2"OD X 1@ 42 3/4"LG 1@ 49 3/4"LG





3939 Blaffer Houston, Tx 77026 Ph. 713-672-6616 Fax (713) 672-9509

Cust PO#: 87473

Cust No: 002202 Cust Name: FORGED PRODUCTS Quantity: 2 Description: ROUGH MACHINED JOB 87473 HN AH450 18 1/4"SQ X 14 1/2"OD X 1@ 42 3/4"LG 1@ 49 3/4"LG

Matl: F22

Weight: 5200



PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

Lone Star Heat Treating Corp. Customer Receipt

QAF-015

F-10

Date:	01/05/2016				VVo #:	543959
Cust #:	002202	Customer: FORGE	D PRODUCTS		Phone #:	(713) 462-3416
Cust PO#:	87473	Due Date:			Contact:	HEATHER RAMIREZ
Sticker #:	669	Location: db	Material: F22	Qty: 2		Weight: 5200

Desc: ROUGH MACHINED JOB 87473 HN AH450 18 1/4"SQ X 14 1/2"OD X 1@ 42 3/4"LG 1@ 49 3/4"LG

Process: (3RD PARTY WITNESS) NORMALIZE, WATER QUENCH & TEMPER TO 217-237 HBW PER HT DATA SHEET 100% INSPECTION 3 PLACES, 120 DEG APART 4 PLACES ON OTHER END PER DWG T/C REQD

Ship To: FORGED PRODUCTS 6506 N. HOUSTON ROSSLYN ROAD HOUSTON, TX 77091

ALL WORK IS ACCEPTED SUBJECT TO OUR "STATEMENT OF LIMITED LIABILITY" a copy of which is available upon request.

SIMPLY STATED: all work is accepted subject to the following conditions:

ALL WORK IS PERFORMED AND ACCEPTED, UNLESS OTHERWISE AGREED TO IN WRITING, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LONE STAR HEAT TREATING CORPORATION MASTER SERVICES AGREEMENT TERMS AND CONDITIONS WHICH MAY BE FOUND AT THE FOLLOWING LOCATION: WWW.LSHT.COM. THE MASTER SERVICES AGREEMENT TERMS AND CONDITIONS ARE EXPRESSLY INCORPORATED HEREIN BY REFERENCE AS IS SET FORTH HERE IN FULL AND ARE COMPLETELY BINDING UPON THE PARTIES.

Accredited ISO 9001 / 17025 P.O. Box 802404 ٠ Houston, TX 77280-2404 ٠ Telephone (713) 460-3655 • Fax (713) 460-3695 Report Date: 01/13/16 Report No: 740351.00 Rev.: A Cust Acct: FOR091 To: **Forged Products** Attn: Accounts Payable 6505 N. Houston-Rosslyn Road Houston, TX 77091 Ordered By: PO#: 87473 Material: AISI F22 18.25"OD x 6"Long Test Piece ID/Heat: AH450 Delivery Ticket:9180 Line/Rel:1,247 Job Info: DWG#2456-200-TST-SAW **Tensile Test Results** Elong. R. of A. Hardness Ult. Load Size Area Yield No./Location Tensile (in^2) (lbs.) (in.) (psi) (%) (%) (psi) .501 92,200 111,100 24.0 74.3 236 HBW

Unless otherwise stated, yield stress is 0.2% offset, gauge length is 2 in. for 1/2 in. bars or 1 in. for 1/4 in. bars.

			Charpy Test Results		
No.	Temp	Location	Foot-Pounds	% Shear	Mils Lat Exp
	0°F	LCVN	147-153-156	100-100-100	81-85-86

Witnessed by: Lee White, Forged Products, 1/13/16 Witnessed by: Maurice Peltier, Aiken Engineering, 1/13/16

Document Reviewed By:

1



Our reports are for the exclusive use of our customer and our name may be used only with prior written approval. Our reports apply only to the sample tested or inspected and do not necessarily represent the quality of other apparently similar or identical materials. All test specimens and testing conforms to ASTM A-370 requirements unless otherwise stated. This test report shall not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of Accu-Test Labs LLP.

Page No: 1

This report contains 1 page(s)

237 HBW

77202 1-12-15 MCP

F-11

PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2



Accredited ISO 9001 / 17025

P.O. Box 802404 Houston, TX 77280-2404 Telephone (713) 460-3655 Fax (713) 460-3695

Report Date: 01/14/16 Report No: 740351.01 Rev.: A Cust Acct: FOR091

To: Forged Products Attn: Accounts Payable 6505 N. Houston-Rosslyn Road Houston, TX 77091

Ordered By: PO#: 87473 Material: AISI F22 18.25"OD x 6"Long Test Piece ID/Heat: AH450 Delivery Ticket:9180 Line/Rel:1,247 Job Info: DWG#2456-200-TST-SAW

Chemical Analysis Results

C: 0.15 Mn: 0.58 P: 0.014 S: 0.008 Si: 0.26 Cr: 2.42 Mo: 1.07 Ni: 0.42 Cu: 0.16

Chemical analysis results are reported in percent by weight.

Document Reviewed By:



Our reports are for the exclusive use of our customer and our name may be used only with prior written approval. Our reports apply only to the sample tested or inspected and do not necessarily represent the quality of other apparently similar or identical materials. All test specimens and testing conforms to ASTM A-370 requirements unless otherwise stated. This test report shall not be reproduced, except in full, without the written approval of Accu-Test Labs LLP.

Page No: 1

This report contains 1 page(s)

F-12

PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

FORGED PRODUCTS, INC.

6505 N. HOUSTON-ROSSLYN ROAD

HOUSTON, TEXAS 77091 | P: (713) 462-3416



() Preliminary Examination (info Only)

(X) Final Examination

	R NUMBER:	2456-11	-10-2015			FPI W/O NUMBER:	87473
MATERIAL GRADE:		A182 F22	2	_		PER DRAWING/SIZE:	PN2456-200
DESCRIPTION: TEST BOD	Y, API 17 EV	AL 3-1/16 -	20K (F22)			PART NUMBER:	2456-200
MATERIAL HEAT NUMBER:		AH450		QTY:	2	SERIAL NUMBER:	AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2
MATERIAL HEAT NUMBER:	6			QTY:	_	SERIAL NUMBER:	0
MATERIAL HEAT NUMBER:	-			QTY:		SERIAL NUMBER:	0
SPECIFICATION:	ASTM A38	88					
ACCEPTANCE:	API 6A PS	L 3					
EQUIPMEN	IT: OLYMPUS	5 XT		SERIA	LNUMBER: 7	0161012	CALIBRATION DATE: 8/17/2016
LONGIT	IUDINAL TRANS	DUCER:	SIZE: 1"		MHZ: 2	.25 / 5	SERIAL NUMBER: 830357 / 894415
SHEA	RWAVE TRANS	DUCER:	SIZE: A	/A	MHZ:		SERIAL NUMBER:
LONGITUDIN		ZATION	1/8	1/4" FR	H AT 80% F	SH	DB-36/44
Lowartobly	ALC STANDARDI		10	,			
SHEARWAVE	STANDARDIZA	TION:	M	T			DB:
COUPLANT:		(X) WAT	ER/CELLULOSE	GUM	() OIL	() OTHER:
PART CONDI	TION:	(X) CLEA	N HINED 250 RM	is.	{) DIRTY	() RUST CONTAMINATED
SURACE PIN		(X) VOLL	JMETRIC EXAN		ERFORMED PI	X) BLAST CLEANED	() OTHER:
DACC (U	or pr	(X) VOLL () 100% (X) TESTI (X) CALIE Form	UMETRIC EXAN S VOLUMETRIC ING PERFORMI BRATION STAN	INATION PA EXAMINAT ED 100% AS DARD(S): 4	ERFORMED PI ION PERFORM FAR AS PRACE TO D C. 4	R V BLAST CLEANED ER WORK ORDER REQUIREME MED THICAL DUE TO GEOMETRY MAC, 42. QC, 4	() OTHER: INTS 304, 2, 5, 011, 14
DACC W	as pr PE: COAXIAL	(X) VOLL () 100% (X) TESTI (X) CALIE Porm	JMETRIC EXAN 5 VOLUMETRIC ING PERFORM BRATION STAN 1ed -	IINATION P EXAMINAT ED 100% AS DARD(S): 4	ERFORMED PI ION PERFORM FAR AS PRACE TO DEC. 4	R VORK ORDER REQUIREME MED TICAL DUE TO GEOMETRY MQC, 42.QC, 44	() OTHER: INTS 30C, 2, 5, 011, 14
DACC W	DE: COAXIAL	(X) VOLL () 100% (X) TESTI (X) CALIE Form	UMETRIC EXAN 5 VOLUMETRIC ING PERFORM BRATION STAN 7 e d -	IINATION P EXAMINAT ED 100% AS DARD(S): 4	ERFORMED PI ION PERFORM FAR AS PRAC IO & C. 4	X) BLAST CLEANED ER WORK ORDER REQUIREME MED THCAL DUE TO GEOMETRY MQC, 42.0C, 4	() OTHER: 30, 2, 3, 5, 011, 14
DACC W	on pro-	(X) VOLL () 100% (X) TESTI (X) CALIE	JMETRIC EXAN 5 VOLUMETRIC ING PERFORMI BRATION STAN 7 C.C.	IINATION P EXAMINAT ED 100% AS DARD(S): 4	ERFORMED PI ION PERFORM FAR AS PRAC IOQC, 4	x) BLAST CLEANED ER WORK ORDER REQUIREME MED THICAL DUE TO GEOMETRY MAC, 42. QC, 4	() DIHER: 304, 2, 5, 011, 14
TRANSDUCER CABLE LEN	ውድ ውድ PE: COAXIAL NGTH: 6 FT,	(X) VOLL () 100% (X) TESTI (X) CALIE Porm	JMETRIC EXAN S VOLUMETRIC ING PERFORM BRATION STAN 1ed.	IINATION P EXAMINAT ED 100% AS DARD(S): 4	ERFORMED PI ION PERFORM FAR AS PRAC DOC. 4	x) BLAST CLEANED ER WORK ORDER REQUIREME MED TTICAL DUE TO GEOMETRY MQC, 42.QC, 44	() OTHER: INTS 30C, 2, 5, 011, 14
IRANSDUCER CABLE LEN	M pr PE: COAXIAL	(X) VOLL () 100% (X) TESTI (X) CALIE Porm	JMETRIC EXAN 5 VOLUMETRIC ING PERFORM BRATION STAN 7 e d -	IINATION P EXAMINAT ED 100% AS DARD(S): 4	ERFORMED PI ION PERFORM FAR AS PRAC 10 Q.C. 4	x) BLAST CLEANED ER WORK ORDER REQUIREME MED TICAL DUE TO GEOMETRY MQC, 42.0C, 4	() OTHER:
DACC W FRANSDUCER CABLE TYP FRANSDUCER CABLE LEN	DE: COAXIAL	(X) VOLL () 100% (X) TESTI (X) CALLE Pomm	JMETRIC EXAN 5 VOLUMETRIC ING PERFORM BRATION STAN	IINATION P EXAMINAT ED 100% AS DARD(S): 4	ERFORMED PI ION PERFORM FAR AS PRAC IOQC, 4	x) BLAST CLEANED ER WORK ORDER REQUIREME MED TTICAL DUE TO GEOMETRY MQC, 42.QC, 4	() DIHER: 304, 2, 5, 011, 14
DACC (UL TRANSDUCER CABLE LEN TRANSDUCER CABLE LEN	22 PM PE: COAXIAL IGTH: 6 FT, TONS FOUND	(X) VOLL () 100% (X) TESTI (X) CALIE Pomm	JMETRIC EXAN	IINATION P EXAMINAT ED 100% AS DARD(S): 4	ERFORMED PI ION PERFORM FAR AS PRAC DODC, 4	x) BLAST CLEANED ER WORK ORDER REQUIREME MED THICAL DUE TO GEOMETRY MQC, 42.00 C, 4	() DIHER: 30, 2, 3, 5, 011, 14
DACC W TRANSDUCER CABLE TYP TRANSDUCER CABLE LEN NO REJECTABLE INDICAT WITNESS BY: M.C.	OL PM PE: COAXIAL NGTH: 6 FT, TIONS FOUND	(X) VOLL () 100% (X) TESTI (X) CALLE Porm	SIKEN	IINATION P EXAMINAT ED 100% AS DARD(S): 4	ERFORMED PI ION PERFORM FAR AS PRAC 1001-5-4	ER WORK ORDER REQUIREME AED TICAL DUE TO GEOMETRY HQC, 42.00, 41 HQC, 42.0	() DIHERE
DACC (U) FRANSDUCER CABLE TYP FRANSDUCER CABLE LEN NO REJECTABLE INDICAT WITNESS BY: $M.C.$	DE: COAXIAL IGTH: 6 FT, TONS FOUND FELL	(X) VOLL () 100% (X) TESTI (X) CALLE Pomm 	JMETRIC EXAN	IINATION PI EXAMINAT ED 100% AS DARD(S):4	ERFORMED PH ION PERFORM FAR AS PRAC DOD C. 4	ER WORK ORDER REQUIREME MED TICAL DUE TO GEOMETRY HQC, 42.QC, 4 HQC, 42.QC, 4 HQC, 4 H	() DIHERE
DACC W TRANSDUCER CABLE TYP TRANSDUCER CABLE LEN NO REJECTABLE INDICAT WITNESS BY: M.C., TESULTS: <u>2</u>	COAXIAL NGTH: 6 FT, TIONS FOUND PCS. ACCEPT/	(X) VOLL () 100% (X) TESTI (X) CALIE POMP D ABLE	SIKEN	IINATION P EXAMINAT ED 100% AS DARD(S): 4	ERFORMED PI ION PERFORM FAR AS PRAC TOQC, 4	ER WORK ORDER REQUIREME AED TICAL DUE TO GEOMETRY HQC, 42.00, 41 HQC, 42.00, 41 TO GEOMETRY HQC, 42.00, 41 TO GEOMETRY TO GEOME	() DIHER: INTS 30C, 2, 5, 01), 14 PCS. REJECTABLE

F-13 PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

CERTIF	ICATE
0	F
QUALIFI	CATION
wit	h
Forged Pro	ducts, Inc.
This certi	fies that
Carlos	Deras
has successfully passed all testing re stablished guidelines of SNT-TC-1A	equirements in compliance with the for the following special processes
Ultrasonic Tes	ting – Level II
And is therefore qualifie Forged Products, Inc.	ed in accordance with procedure FP-1000.
July 18, 2014 Qualification Date	July 18, 2019 Expiration Date Reviewed and Approved by: Rigoberto Cendejas FPLVP of Quality - 7/8/2014
Stanker Lowelland ADAIT ADAD D	

F-14 PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

 40 17.75±.0 41 8.88±.0 17.75±.0 12 17.75±.0 13 8.88±.0 11.312± 15 8× Ø 1.240 +.01 	 40 17.75±.0 41 17.75±.0 12 17.75±.0 18.88±.0 18.88±.0 11.312± 	17.75±.0 17.75±.0 17.75±.0 17.75±.0 18.88±.0 18.88±.0	* 17.75±.0 * 8.88±.03 * 17.75±.0	17.75±.0	* 17.75±.0		, 17.75±.0	8 22.5°	7 Ø 14.062±	₅ V Ø 1.81 ;	₅ 1-3/4-8UN -2B T	4 8X Ø 1.615 +.01	3 Ø11.312±.0	2 8X Ø 1.50 ⁺ 7 THRU	1 22.5°		DWG DIMENSIONS	PO # 27285 ITEM 1 QTY: 1	PART# NA			
3 3 5 √2.63	.015 (58c		3 9580	3 9580	13 9380)3	+-	.015	(90°	2.188 1	5 0 ▼ 3.0 932c	015 788	000	226	EMP	SERIA	CUSTO CUST.		BRE		
011.313 1.251 × 2.425 1	086,880	8,880	1000	いたわ	8.880	204.41	17.762	- 22.5°	Ø14.062	V 2018 181 × 90° V	134-8x2.180	Ø 6× 1.42€×3.∞2↓	3 \$ 11.312	(2X) Ø 1.501 Thru-	3 22.50	# ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	L# AH450-2E1 H斑 AH450	MER: FORGED PRODUCTS, INC. # 87473	DWG #: PN2456-200 REV 3	AUX MACHINE WORKS, LF	•	
														•	+	EMP #	SERIAL #			P DIMENSI		
					HE E	INSPECTO	>						12			ACTUAL DI		DESCRIPTION: T	JL	ONAL VERIFI		
		÷			en De	1915. 1915	o 镌									MENSIONS		EST BODY, API	DB # 53200	CATION LO		
												4.3				EMP#	SERIAL #	17 EVALUATI		G		
							4					*				ACTUAL DIMENSIONS		ion, 3 1/16 - 20K	DATE:			

F-15 PO #2456-11-10-2015-LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

PART	# NA		DWG #: PN2456-200 REV 3		JOB # 53200		DATE:
PO#	27285 ITEM 1	CUSTOME	R: FORGED PRODUCTS, INC.		DESCRIPTION: TEST BODY, API	17 EVALUAT	10N, 3 1/16 - 20K
QTY:	1	CUST. #8	7473				
	DWG DIMENSIONS	SERIAL #	AH450-2E1 HT# A.H450	SERIAL #		SERIAL #	
		EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP#	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS
17	∨ Ø 1.438 X 90°	9380	00+ 05+10		*		
18	22.5°	t	22.5°				
19	(Ø14.06)	6494	(\$14.06)				
20	(33.19)	_	(33.19)	Ŧ			
21	42.06		42.26				
22	8.88±.03	1020	8.880	×			
23	Ø 14.062±.015	0859	(4, de 3				
24	22.5°		22.5°				
25	8X $Ø$ 1.615 $\frac{+.015}{010}$ \mp 3.0		\$ 1000 × 3,001				
26	1-3/4-8UN -2B ∓ 2.188		1 2612×8-741		-ECTOR \$	5	
. 27	∨ Ø 1.81 X 90°	4	col × 18.10		INSTER 11 2019		
28	Ø 14.06±.06	tak?	490·hip		f a		4,
29	Ø 6.75±.06	_	db. 755	-			
30	Ø 4.685 ^{+.004}		ton the generation	-		-	
S ⁴	Ø3.06+.03		540.50				
32	.25±.03	1	,250	-			
33	R.12±.03	6492	R.120	4			

F-16 PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

PART# NA		DWG #: PN2456-200 REV 3		JOB # 53200	-)ATE:
PO # 27285 ITEM 1	CUSTOME	R: FORGED PRODUCTS, INC.		DESCRIPTION: TEST BODY, API	17 EVALUATI	ON, 3 1/16 - 20K
DWG DIMENSIONS		AHARA-DEA HT#AH450	SEDIVI #			
	EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS
34 2X .12 X 45	Teh9 0	120 X45° 25				
3.38+.12		3.442	-			
3.53±.03		3.530				
37 (15°)		150			•	
¢7.562 ^{+.0C}	ÖÖ	\$ 7. Soz				
39 (24.31)		24.305	6			
40 (13.63) 13.56		13.630		MICPECTOR #5		
41 33.19±.03		33.19	-	FEB 11 2016		
¢7.56 ^{+.12}		010/*620				
43 (15°)	1	150	-			
4 3.53±.03	stor,	3.530	4			
45 30°±2°	1020	30°	-			
4° 5.00±.03	_	5.00	-			
R.50±.03		2X 2x R.50				
50 +00 1		>>>				

F-17 PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Let #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

PART# NA	DW	IG #: PN2456-200 REV 3		JOB # 53200	DATE:
PO # 27285 ITEM 1	CUSTOMER: F	ORGED PRODUCTS, INC.		DESCRIPTION: TEST BODY, API 17 EVALU	ATION, 3 1/16 - 20K
QTY: 1	CUST. # 87473				
DWG DIMENSIONS	SERIAL # AH	450-2E1 HT # AH450	SERIAL #	SERIAL	-
	EMP#	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP#	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS EMP #	ACTUAL DIME
4ª Ø8.00±.03	CTCI	\$ 8.005			
50°±2°	-	30°	-		
Ø 4.062+.030		& Y.076	-		
\$2 \$5.930 ^{+.004} 2X 2X	1020 24	25950			
8.38±.03	E492 2	.380			
54 R.38±.03	-	2.380	_,		
₅ Ø 5.68 ^{+.03}		5 703			
56 R.38±.03		. 380		R	
■ R.38±.03		1,30,0		INSPECTOR 11	
₅a .06±.02	e ht	0600 / .060		FEB 2 2 barr	
50 45°	1	esh/ est			
en -606 ⁺ -004	•	607/.607			
ศ R.030 2X	5	050 1/ 30, 10 20			
82 2X 32		24 22 22 25	,. - 10 -		а ,
2x 23.00°±.25°	1101 1	202/920 78	<		

F-18 PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

PART	NA		DWG #: PN2456-200 REV 3		DESCRIPTION	OB # 53200	ADI 1
0#2	7285 ITEM 1	CUSTOME	R: FORGED PRODUCTS, INC.		DE	SCRIPTION: T	SCRIPTION: TEST BODY, API 1
TTY:	1	CUST. # 87	473				
	DWG DIMENSIONS	SERIAL #	AH450-2E1 HT# AH450	SERIAL #			
		EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP #		ACTUAL D	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS
64	.30 ^{+.02} 00	6492	-206/.309	r —			
65	.06±.02	01a	•06			÷	
66	45°		dSo	1			
67	32		321				
8	23.00°±.25°		2 S.co				
3	R.03±.02	_	0.02				
70	.6980004		,700				
71	T 32		×25				
72	23.00°±.25°		13.00°		1		
73	.33+.02	0201 I	, 340				
	IN	SPECTO)R #5				
	INSPECTOR :	FEB II 2		DATE:			

F-19 PO #2456=11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev-0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

	BREAU	X MACHINE WORKS, LI	UIMENSI	UNAL VERIFICATION LA	JG	
PART# NA		DWG #: PN2456-500 REV 1		JOB # 53286		DATE
PO # 27285 ITEM 2	CUSTOME	R: FORGED PRODUCTS, INC.		DESCRIPTION: TEST BODY WIT	TH REDUCED	NECK, API 17 EVALUATION
QTY: 1	CUST. # 8	473 HT # AH450			4	
DWG DIMENSIONS	SERIAL #	AH450-2E2	SERIAL #		SERIAL #	
	EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS
1 22.5°	1.6497	22.50				
8X Ø1.50 ^{+.03} 2 THRU	_	8X Ø 1.5/5	-			
₃ Ø11.312±.015		Ø11.312				
4 8X ϕ 1.615 $\frac{+.015}{010} \pm 3.0$	9380	1.42842,995	ł			
5 1-3/4-8UN -2B ▼ 2.188	1	134-8 × 2,196	-			
6 🗸 Ø 1.81 X 90°		1.81 x90"				
7 Ø14.062±.015		14.063	-			,
8 22.5°	+	22.5		-		
9 17.75±.03		1797				
10 17.75±.03	9380	1274			ia)	
11 8.88±.03	1	198'8	_	MEDECTOR #5		
12 17.75±.03		014.41		Pro 1 5 2016		
13 8.88±.03	-	& bt8'9				
¢11.312±.015		11.312				
15 8X Ø 1.240 +.015 010 ∓ 2.63		1.25 42.425				
16 1-3/8-8UN -28 ∓ 1.75	+	54'1× 8-9/1	-			
17 V Ø 1.438 X 90°	6	1.439 × 90°				

F-20 PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

PART	# NA		DWG #: PN2456-500 REV 1		JOB # 53286		DATE:
PO#	27285 ITEM 2	CUSTOME	R: FORGED PRODUCTS, INC.		DESCRIPTION: TEST BODY WITH	REDUCED	NECK, API 17 EVALUATIO
QTY:	1	CUST. # 8	1473 4T#AH450				
	DWG DIMENSIONS	SERIAL #	AH450-2E2	SERIAL #		SERIAL #	
		EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP#	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIO
18	22.5°	9380	22.5				
19	(Ø14.06)		(\$ H, 6)	-			
20	(33,19)		(33.19)				
24	42.06	4	42.06				
22	8.88±.03	2290	8.881	_			
23	Ø 14.062±.015	-	290.71				
24	0.5 <u>⊅</u> <u>1.615</u> + <u>015</u> x ⊗		1.428 x 2.995				
25	1-3/4-8UN -2B ∓ 2.188		13/4-8-12.19				1
26	∕ Ø 1.81 X 90°		1.81 ×96°	_	ii.		
27	22.5°	4	2250				
28	Ø14.06±.06	6492	dry ocs		INSPECTOR #5		
29	Ø 6.750±.060		054-250	[FEB 1 5 ZUIS		
30	Ø 4.685 ^{+.004} 2X		44.687 44.689 4 4				
31	Ø3.06 ^{+.03}		\$3.06% / 3.080			• •	
32	.25±.03	×	.250	-		7	
33	R.12±.03		12. 120			-	
34	3.3800	4	2 開山へ	X			

· · · ·

F-21 PO-#2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200-Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN-AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

PART# NA		DWG #: PN2456-500 REV 1		JOB # 53286		DATE:
PO # 27285 ITEM 2	CUSTOME	R: FORGED PRODUCTS, INC.		DESCRIPTION: TEST BODY WIT	H REDUCED I	VECK, API 17 EVALUATION
	CUST.#8	HT# AH450				
DWG DIMENSIONS	SERIAL #	AH450-2E2	SERIAL #		SERIAL #	
	EMP#	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP#	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS
35 5.03±.03	6492	5.030				
36 Ø7.562 ^{+.000} 120		17.502	1.5			
37 (24,31)		012.10				
38 (15°)		12°	10			
39 (10,64)	-	16.560				
40 33.19±.03		33.195				
41 (15°)		150				
42 5.03±.03		5.030				
43 Ø7.56 ^{+.12}	4	029.20	<			
44 30°±2°	0201	30°			-	
45 5.00±.03		5.00	>			
R.50±.03 2X		2× R.50				
47 Ø8.00±.03		6 8.00			th	
48 5.00±.03		5,00		INST STOR	<i>G</i> 1)	
49 30°±2°		30 °		FEB 2 8 co		
50 Ø 4.062+.030		44.090	-			
Ø 5.930+.004 51 2X	1020	\$ 5.932				
52 2X .12 X 45°	6492	120X45° 24				

F-22 PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN-2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

PART	井 NA		DWG #: PN2456-500 REV 1		JOB # 53286		DATE:
PO#2	27285 ITEM 2	CUSTOM	ER: FORGED PRODUCTS, INC.		DESCRIPTION: TEST BODY WIT	H REDUCED	NECK, API 17 EVALUATION
QTY:	<u>.</u>	CUST.#8	1473 HT # AH450				
	DWG DIMENSIONS	SERIAL #	AH450-2E2	SERIAL #		SERIAL #	
		EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS
53	R.38±.03	6492	2380				
54	R.38±.03	4	2380				
55	Ø4.88 ^{+.03}		MU-896				
56	R.38±.03		290				
57	· R.38±.03		P. 200				
58	.06±.02		Pundesive / 060				
59	45°		csh / osh				
60	.606000		804. / 408				
61	R.030 2X		R-030 24 / R-030				
62	24 32		324 28 / 325		INSPECTOR #5		
63	2x 23.00°±.25°		23 28/12 28		FEB 1 6 2019		
64	.30+.02	- /-	-306 1 -310	ð	4		
65	.06±.02	1020	90. 900				
66	45°	-	hεs	_			
67	32/	_	32.1	_			
89	23.00°±.25°		23.00'	1			
69	R.03±.02	Inth	0-800				

F-23 PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN-2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

PART# N	A		DWG #: PN2456-500 REV 1		DESCI	JOB # 53286 RIPTION: TEST BODY WITH	JOB # 53286 [] RIPTION: TEST BODY WITH REDUCED N
PO # 2728	5 ITEM 2	CUSTOME	R: FORGED PRODUCTS, INC.				
QTY: 1		CUST. # 87	473				
			HT#AH450				
	DWG DIMENSIONS	SERIAL #	AH450-2E2	SERIAL #		1	SERIAL #
		EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS	EMP #	ACTUAL DIMENSIONS		EMP#
70	-698004	ctal	.700				
71	1 as		32~				
72 2	23.00°±.25°		corst)			
73	.33 ^{+.02} 00	1020	chs.			1 1	
	NSPECTOR :		<i>د</i> ر	DATE			

F-24 PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN-AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

FORGED PRODUCTS, INC.

6505 N. HOUSTON-ROSSLYN ROAD HOUSTON, TEXAS 77091 | P: (713) 462-3416



MAGNETIC PARTICLE EXAMINATION REPORT # 87473 -MT

CUSTOMER PL	JRCHASE ORDER M	NUMBER: 2456-11-10-2015		FPI W/O NUMBER:	87473		
MATERIAL GRADE:		A182 F22		PER DRAWING/SIZE:	PN2455-200		
DESCRIPTION:	TEST BODY,	API 17 EVAL 3-1/16 -20K (F22)	1.2	PART NUMBER:	2456-200		
ATERIAL HEAT NUMBER:		AH450	AH450 <u>QTY:</u> 2		AH450-2E1		
MATERIAL HEA	AT NUMBER:		QTY:	SERIAL NUMBER:	AH450-2E2		
MATERIAL HEA	T NUMBER:		QTY:	SERIAL NUMBER:	0		
SPECIFICATION	4:	ASTM E709					
ACCEPTANCE:		API 6A PSL3					
	PART CONDITIC	DN: (ズ) CLEAN (ズ) DRY	() DIRTY) WET	() RUST CONTAMINATED		
	SURFACE FINISH	H: (火) MACHINED 250 R	MS () BLAST CLEANED	() OTHER:		
	FOLUDARNT.	mana to	6 Manalza	90			
	EQUITIVIENT:	111 yrie - Lec	-1	2 1-01-10	CALIBRATION DATE: 1-5-16		
	TECHNIQUE:	FWDC-WETF	lureseen, Co	ntinuar Met.	hod		
		() ҮОКЕ	SPACING:	<u> </u>	LIFTING FORCE:		
		() DIRECT					
		(X) CENTRAL CONDUC	CTOR: DIAMETER:		AMPS: 2300		
			TURNS	4	AMPS: 911/40		
<u>Phem</u> 8007 Black l Nagne 10 Ind	etall ou A Batch light In Lic Flu dication	akiti 165062915 nTensity 36 X Intensity - ns abserved De	oo mw/cm pie.gaqe -MAG=	- Castal 0-3 EAU	STrips 155 (or less)		
ESULTS: PERATOR:	_2P 	CS. ACCEPTABLE 2 Derad CARLOS DERAS	DATE:	S. RECORDABLE 2/16/2016	PCS. REJECTABLE		

PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

CERTIFICATE

OF

QUALIFICATION

with

Forged Products, Inc.

This certifies that

Carlos Deras

has successfully passed all testing requirements in compliance with the established guidelines of SNT-TC-1A for the following special processes:

Magnetic Particle Testing – Level II

And is therefore qualified in accordance with Forged Products, Inc. procedure FP-1000.

January 12, 2015 Qualification Date

January 12, 2020 Expiration Date

Reviewed and Approved by: Rigoberto Cendejas FPI VP of Qualtiy - 01/27/2015

Stephen Lewellen

ASNT ACCP Professional Level III

Certificate Number 51312

F-26

PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

Forged Products, Inc. 6505 N. HOUSTON-ROSSLYN ROAD HOUSTON, TEXAS 77091 Phone 713-462-3416 Fax 713-460-9404



NAME	E: <u>Carlos Deras</u>	
NEAR VISION	ACUITY: JAEGER NUM	BER <u>1</u> AT 12 INCHES
	UNCORRECTED	CORRECTED
RIGHT EYE LEFT EYE:		
COLOR CONTRAS	T DIFFERENTIATION: IS	SHIHARA COLOR PLATES
	NONE	ION (GLASES OR CONTACTS)
REMARKS:		
		, Aa
EXAMINER: Stephen	ewellen A	Am
TITLE: <u>NOTLevel</u>	#51312	
DATE: 10/27/2015		

F-27 PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2

Forged Products, Inc.					Hardness Test Report			
6505 N. H HOUSTON, TEX	OUSTON-ROSSLYN F (AS 77091 P: (713)	462-3416 FC		DUCTS, INC		MP	/QP 2456-200	
OB INFORMATIO	ON						101	
Date:	2/16/2016			P	urchase Order No.	2456-11-10-20	015	
Customer Name:	AIKEN ENG	NEERING		<u>P</u>	art No.	2456-200		
Job No/Report No:	i	87473	Otv:	2 D	wg No.	PN2456-200		
Description:	TEST BODY,	API 17 EVAL 3-1/2	L6 -20K (F22)	T	est Location:		See Belo	ow
Material Specificat	tion: D2456-1				aterial Grade:	A182 F22		
ST METHOD								
BRINELL - (H 3000 Kgf - 1	IBW) Omm Tungsten (Carbide Ball	AIR BRINE 3000 Kgf	ELL - (HBW) - 10mm Tungste	n Carbide Ball	OTHER		
EST EQUIPMENT	Г						Sec. Sec.	
PORTABLE T	ESTER	PORTABL	E W/CHAIN ADAP	TER	STATIONARY		OTHE	R
SERIAL NUMBER	R CAL	DATE	SERIAL	NUMBER	CAL DATE	SERIA	LNUMBER	CAL DATE
7 11283	4 12/18	11.5						
COPE	10/10							
SERIAL NUMBER	R CAL DA	TE SER	AL NUMBER	CAL DATE	SERIAL	NUMBER	CAL DATE	MAGNIFICATION
KING SCAN	13/18/15		01516					Star Marson
007	10110		1,					20X
987			4					
ST REQUIREME	NIS		T			1		
TES	T SPECIFICATION	12456-200	N	O. OF TEST PER	PART	REQUI	RED HARDNESS	S RANGE (HBW)
PONESS TEST P	-1 N/1; DWG# Pr	12430-200		5			197 - 1	237
If the ar	nhient temner	ature is helow	50°E or above 9	5°E perform a	verification tes		TESTED VE	
SEDIAL #	HEAT/LOG #	TEMAD ("E)			C		E E	
AU450 251	AU450	100	-224	022	017	220	201	r
AH450-2E1	AH450	62	001	200	011	ddo	001	
AH450-2E2	AH450		031	232	ddi	224	222	
			TESTIC	CATIONS (OP	TIONAL			
			TEST EC	CALIONS (OF	IIONAL)		VERIEICA	TION
						CALIBRA	TION BLOCKS	RESULTS
						225	LIPPER	ちまわ
10000	s al maint	Sec. Marine		الديل فالمك		014	LOWER	A111
SEE M	ARKED I	JP DWG	6 # PN24	156-500) REV 1	214	LOWER	214
<u>SEE M</u>	ARKED I	JP DWG	5 # PN24	<u>456-50(</u>	<u>) REV 1</u>	214	LOWER	214
				4				
ADDRESS TESTING		100000000000000000000000000000000000000		PERIFICIPION D				
ARDNESS TESTING	PERFORMED IN	ACCORDANCE W	TO THE REQUES	D HARDNESS DA	VEALS THAT THE I	RESULTS OBTAINI	D	
CONFORM		(UNFORM)	TO THE REQUIRE	U HARDNESS RA	NGE			
ECHNICIAN:		7. 2.		W	TNESS BY:			
ATE:		2/17/1	6	DA	ГЕ:			A
		* ***	R				Enc	losure 1 - WI 7.5.1.9a Rev

F-28 PO #2456-11-10-2015 LN 1, PN 2456-200 Rev 0, Heat #AH450, Lot #543659, SN AH450-2E1 & AH450-2E2





(DRILL OPERATION) PRE-HEAT TREAT MACHINE REF WT# (LBS) 2443
Thermal Treatment Receiving Inspection Report

Supplier:							
FPI W/O No:		87473	Heat No:	AH450-2E1	Qty:	y suitantiinii	(prel)
Order Qty:	2		Heat No:	AH450-2E2	Qty:	القروروروس ر	
Qty. Rec:			Heat No:		Qty:		
Specification:		D2456-1	Process Verification:	Accept		Reject	
Required Hardr	iess:	/	By:		Date:		

Special Instructions:

		INSP	ECHON	RESUL	IS						
Serial Number	WO / HT Number	Material Condition	Sup Haro	plier Iness	FPI Ha Verifi	rdness cation	FPI Inspect Hardness	Item Status			
		condition	Res	sults	Veim		Than arress	Accept	Reject		
AH 450-2E	6		223	229			228				
			235	9.23							
			ダンラ	223							
			329								
AH450-262	i	/	229	22-3							
			223	223							
			223	223							
			229								

Inspected By:

Date: / ~ / 0 - / 6

DELIVERY PERFORMANCE DATA

Due Date:

Received Date:

	PI DUCTS, INC.	6506 N. Houston-Rosslyn Rd. Houston, Texas 77091 Phone: (713) 462-3417	SUBCONT	RACT HEAT TREA	T DATA SHEET
Ven	ndor:	LONE START HEAT TREATING	<u>co.</u>	Date Shipped:	
PC <u>Work Order</u>	No: <u>No:</u>	87473	the state of the s	Promised Return Date:	
Material Gr	ade:	F22 (CS-F22MX R/4)		Lood T. C. De	annino di
item Serial N	o(s): <u>AH450-</u>	-2E1 & -2E2		2nd Benty Witness P	<u>unea</u>
Part Descri	ption/Condition	on: ROUGH MACHINED	7473-PHIM-ISI	1 day notification for	Ouench
in in the second	ใสวรี น ีสามส์สมัคลได้	LOAD PARTS PER FLM-87473	Rev 0 - INDUCE FLOW	THRU I.D. DURING THE QUENC	CHOPERATION
Parts:	antity 2	<u>Heat No: AH450</u> Heat No: 0	Qty Parts: Oty Parts:	2 Qty Test Mat'l:	0 Extension: 1
Test Material:	1	Heat No: 0	Qty Parts:	0 Qty Test Mat'l:	0 Extension: 0
Part De Rough X Rough	<i>talls</i> Forging Machined	Material Weight: 2717 2443 Max. Section Size: 9.63	LBS each LBS each	Test Materia <u>Prolongati</u> RER DWC 874	I Description
		in a The use of The states		PER DWG 874	EPI Varification Check
	Min	1750	t & Acceptance	Criteria	Accept Reject By
Normalize:	Max:	1775 °F 5.5 HRS Min.	Comments: AIR C	OOL TO BELOW 300°F	
Austenitize:	Min: Max:	1700 1725 °F 5.5 HRS Min.	Comments: FOLL	OWED BY WATER QUENCH	
*Quench:	<u>Coolant:</u>	Start (°F): 75 End (°F): 120	COOL Comments: HORI	TO BELOW 400°F USING ZONTAL FLOW	
Temper:	Min: Max:	1225 °F 10 HRS Min.	Comments: WATE	R COOL TO AMBIENT	
Other:	CYCLE DURA TEMPERATU	TIONS ARE BESED ON FURNACE RE FOR ONE HOUR MININIMUN	T.C. THE CONTACT 1	F.C. IS REQUIRED TO REACH S	ET
**Brinell:	<u>Min:</u> Max:	217 HBW <u>No. of Checks:</u>	3 Comments		
VENE *Unless specified Water: The Oll: Temper **All hardness te Ec Temp Hardness Ex	OOR MUST R (otherwise, the following tatures shall be within sting must be condi- quipment Qua- perature Cont Re-Heat A Hardness Te cam Preparatio	EQUEST APPROVAL FROM FPI owing statements apply. a water shall not be greater than 100°F at the b in the range recommended by the quenchant <i>i</i> ucted using Brinell type equipment only. alification: X API 6A Anx M trolled by: Furnace T.C. Only ullowance: One (1) esting per: X ASTM E10 on Depth: X 1/8" (Min) to 3/1	PRIOR TO ANY RE- eginning of the quench & shall nanufacturer. X Fu X Fu X Ot Ot 5" (Max)	HEAT TREAMENT, INCLUDI not exceed 120'F upon the completion of I-H-6875 rnace & Contact T.C. her: CONTACT FPI her: 4" (Min) to 5/16" (Max)	NG RE-TEMPERING. the quench. Contact T.C Other: Other: Other:
Certification X FPI Purc X FPI Worl X FPI Deliv X Material X Quantity The Shear Pir	h must be supp hase Order No k Order No. very Ticket No I Description (<u>)</u> n method or	plied with shipment unless other o. X Heat No. X Material Grade b. X Thermal Processing X Quench Media X Media Temperatures Hardness Test & The hardness measurements perf	wise specified. Docu X Hardness F X Furnace Ch X Statement X Authorized (Start/Completion) <i>imocouple Location(s</i>	ment package must include: lesults larts of Compliance Signature) Per Sketch Below	athod are NOT ACCEPTED
		a a a places 120° Apart d places		CONTACT THER THE SURFACE O THE PART. THE HOLD TIME FURNACE THER FOR THE AUSTE TEMPER CYCLE THE SONTACT T THE ST TEMPER TOLERANCES FO TO THE END OF	athod are NOT ACCEPTED. MOCOUPLE TO BE PLACED ON IF THE HEAVIEST SECTION OF SWILL START WHEN THE MOCOUPLE IS WITHIN 25'F NITIZE CYCLE & 15'F FOR THE OF THE FURNACE SET POINT. HERMOCOUPLE MUST REACH RATURES WITHIN THE SAME IR AT LEAST <u>ONE HOUR</u> PRIOR THE HEAT TREAT CYCLE.
Prepared By:	R. CEN Rev 01 - Revised	DEJAS Date: <u>11/30/</u> I cycle duration & TC requirements -	/2015 Reviewed	Ву:	Date: Form No. WI 7.5.1.8 Rev. 07

Thermal Treatment Receiving Inspection Report

Supplier:							
FPI W/O No:		87473	Heat No:	AH450-2E1	Qty:	y suitantiinii	(prel)
Order Qty:	2		Heat No:	AH450-2E2	Qty:	القروروروس ر	
Qty. Rec:			Heat No:		Qty:		
Specification:		D2456-1	Process Verification:	Accept		Reject	
Required Hardr	iess:	/	By:		Date:		

Special Instructions:

		INSP	ECHON	RESUL	IS						
Serial Number	WO / HT Number	Material Condition	Sup Haro	plier Iness	FPI Ha Verifi	rdness cation	FPI Inspect Hardness	Item Status			
		condition	Res	sults	Veim		Than arress	Accept	Reject		
AH450-2E	6		223	229			228				
			235	9.23							
			9,23	223							
			329								
AH450-262	i	/	229	22-3							
			223	223							
			223	223							
			229								

Inspected By:

Date: / ~ / 0 - / 6

DELIVERY PERFORMANCE DATA

Due Date:

Received Date:

	PI DUCTS, INC.	6506 N. Houston-Rosslyn Rd. Houston, Texas 77091 Phone: (713) 462-3417	SUBCONT	RACT HEAT TREA	T DATA SHEET
Ven	ndor:	LONE START HEAT TREATING	<u>co.</u>	Date Shipped:	
PC <u>Work Order</u>	No: <u>No:</u>	87473	the state of the s	Promised Return Date:	
Material Gr	ade:	F22 (CS-F22MX R/4)		Lood T. C. Do	annino di
item Serial N	o(s): <u>AH450-</u>	-2E1 & -2E2		2nd Benty Witness P	<u>unea</u>
Part Descri	ption/Condition	on: ROUGH MACHINED	7473-PHIM-ISI	1 day notification for	Ouench
in in the second	ใสวรี น ีสามส์สมัคลได้	LOAD PARTS PER FLM-87473	Rev 0 - INDUCE FLOW	THRU I.D. DURING THE QUENC	CHOPERATION
Parts:	antity 2	<u>Heat No: AH450</u> Heat No: 0	Qty Parts: Oty Parts:	2 Qty Test Mat'l:	0 Extension: 1
Test Material:	1	Heat No: 0	Qty Parts:	0 Qty Test Mat'l:	0 Extension: 0
Part De Rough X Rough	<i>talls</i> Forging Machined	Material Weight: 2717 2443 Max. Section Size: 9.63	LBS each LBS each	Test Materia <u>Prolongati</u> RER DWC 874	I Description
		in a The une of The states		PER DWG 874	EPI Varification Check
	Min	1750	t & Acceptance	Criteria	Accept Reject By
Normalize:	Max:	1775 °F 5.5 HRS Min.	Comments: AIR C	OOL TO BELOW 300°F	
Austenitize:	Min: Max:	1700 1725 °F 5.5 HRS Min.	Comments: FOLL	OWED BY WATER QUENCH	
*Quench:	<u>Coolant:</u>	Start (°F): 75 End (°F): 120	COOL Comments: HORI	TO BELOW 400°F USING ZONTAL FLOW	
Temper:	Min: Max:	1225 °F 10 HRS Min.	Comments: WATE	R COOL TO AMBIENT	
Other:	CYCLE DURA TEMPERATU	TIONS ARE BESED ON FURNACE RE FOR ONE HOUR MININIMUN	T.C. THE CONTACT 1	F.C. IS REQUIRED TO REACH S	ET
**Brinell:	<u>Min:</u> Max:	217 HBW <u>No. of Checks:</u>	3 Comments		
VENE *Unless specified Water: The Oll: Temper **All hardness te Ec Temp Hardness Ex	OOR MUST R (otherwise, the following tatures shall be within sting must be condu- quipment Qua perature Contor Re-Heat A Hardness Te cam Preparation	EQUEST APPROVAL FROM FPI owing statements apply. a water shall not be greater than 100°F at the b in the range recommended by the quenchant <i>i</i> ucted using Brinell type equipment only. alification: X API 6A Anx M trolled by: Furnace T.C. Only ullowance: One (1) esting per: X ASTM E10 on Depth: X 1/8" (Min) to 3/1	PRIOR TO ANY RE- eginning of the quench & shall nanufacturer. X Fu X Fu X Ot 0 t 5" (Max)	HEAT TREAMENT, INCLUDI not exceed 120'F upon the completion of I-H-6875 rnace & Contact T.C. her: CONTACT FPI her: 4" (Min) to 5/16" (Max)	NG RE-TEMPERING. the quench. Contact T.C Other: Other: Other:
Certification X FPI Purc X FPI Worl X FPI Deliv X Material X Quantity The Shear Pir	h must be supp hase Order No k Order No. very Ticket No I Description (<u>)</u> n method or	plied with shipment unless other o. X Heat No. X Material Grade b. X Thermal Processing X Quench Media X Media Temperatures Hardness Test & The hardness measurements perf	wise specified. Docu X Hardness F X Furnace Ch X Statement X Authorized (Start/Completion) <i>imocouple Location(s</i>	ment package must include: lesults larts of Compliance Signature) Per Sketch Below	athod are NOT ACCEPTED
		a a a places 120° Apart d places		CONTACT THER THE SURFACE O THE PART. THE HOLD TIME FURNACE THER FOR THE AUSTE TEMPER CYCLE THE SONTACT T THE ST TEMPER TOLERANCES FO TO THE END OF	athod are NOT ACCEPTED. MOCOUPLE TO BE PLACED ON IF THE HEAVIEST SECTION OF SWILL START WHEN THE MOCOUPLE IS WITHIN 25'F NITIZE CYCLE & 15'F FOR THE OF THE FURNACE SET POINT. HERMOCOUPLE MUST REACH RATURES WITHIN THE SAME IR AT LEAST <u>ONE HOUR</u> PRIOR THE HEAT TREAT CYCLE.
Prepared By:	R. CEN Rev 01 - Revised	DEJAS Date: <u>11/30/</u> I cycle duration & TC requirements -	/2015 Reviewed	Ву:	Date: Form No. WI 7.5.1.8 Rev. 07

FRANKLIN RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

CERTIFICATE OF TESTS

Aiken Engineering Company 9720 Cypresswood Drive, Suite 340 Houston, Texas 77070 Attention: Maurice Peltier Purchase Order Number: 2456-0222-2016 Part Number: 2456-PRO AH450-2E1 QTC: 12" x 2.25" x 6" F22 11354 Jones Road West Suite E Houston, Texas 77065 Phone: (281) 894-2245 Fax: (281) 894-2216 Date: February 27, 2016 Laboratory Test Number: 28750

TEST DATA

True Stress/True Strain Information Electronically Transmitted

ROOM TEMPERATURE TENSILE:

Orientation: Longitudinal

Location: 1/4 T

ID	UTS,psi	YS, .2%psi	%EL	%RA	Dia. In.	G/Len.
1	108,700	91,600	25.1	73.4	0.502	2.000

ELEVATED TEMPERATURE TENSILE @ 350°F:

Orientation: Longitudinal

Location: 1/4 T

ID	UTS,psi	YS, .2%psi	%EL	%RA	Dia. In.	G/Len.
1	97,700	81,200	22.4	74.4	0.502	2.000

Manager / Laboratory Operations ISO 9001:2008 Certificate Number 800467

Any falsification, concealment, or alteration of any material fact, or any false, fraudulent, or fictitious statement or representation in connection with work performed at FRA is prohibited by company policy and could be punishable under Federal Law.

Franklin Research Associates FRA Lab No.28750 Aiken 70°F







F-38



Franklin Research Associates FRA Lab No.28750 Aiken 350°F



F-40



	NORM	IALIZE		AUTI	ENITIZE CYCLE TEMPER Test Material MECHANICAL PROPERTIES			IMPACT TEST																				
мат	CYC Temn	LE	Temn	Hrs	C(Type	OOLANT Start	- Fin	CYC	CLE Hrs	TST-SIZE	YS		Flø	RA	HBW			ос тем	P C-1	C-2	C-3	AVG	LE1	LE2	LE3	S1	S2	S 3
F22	1750	3	1725	2.25	water	66	74	1250	4	Prolongation	88,700	106,000	21.6	67.3 2	23 22	3	T	T4 -75	51	56	44	50	32	40	27	60	60	60
F22	1750	2.25	1725	2.75	water	85	91	1225	4	Prolongation	86,600	104,800	21.2	68.6 2	35 23	5 1	L	T4 -75	69	63	56	63	37	37	32	40	40	30
F22	1750 1750	2	1725	2.5 3	water	90 96	96 109	1225 1225	4.5 5.25	Prolongation	90,500 85.600	108,500	20.6	72.8 2	35 23 29 22	5 I 9 I	L '	T4 -75 T4 -75	110	76 73	113 98	100 93	60 62	38 72	58 55	100 85	80 70	100 80
F22	1750	2.25	1725	2.25	water	98	109	1225	4.25	Prolongation	94,270	102,000	20.3	69.0 2	35 23	5 1	L '	T4 -75	61	97	58 76	55 78	35	42 54	39	80	85	80 85
F22	1750	2	1725	2	water	73	78	1225	4.25	Prolongation	87,479	104,634	21.5	76.1 2	29 22	9	L	T4 -75	117	100	133	117	73	60	69	100	80	100
F22	1750	2	1725	3.75	water	62	66	1225	4	Prolongation	87,699	104,202	21.7	75.1 2	29 22	9	L	T4 -75	64	44	50	53	39	25	32	30	10	20
F22	1750	2	1725	2	water	66 85	76 00	1225	4.25	Prolongation	90,569	106,430	21.8	73.9 2	29 22	9 I	L '	T4 -75	37	72	71	60 05	21	41	42 51	20	60 100	60 100
F22 F22	1750	2 2.25	1725	2	water	85 81	90 87	1225	4	Prolongation	91,319	108,338	22.2	73.4 2	35 23 35 23	5	L '	14 -4 T4 -75	137	99 94	80 66	95 99	59 67	62 48	31	100	90	60
F22	1750	3	1725	2.25	water	50	63	1250	4	Prolongation	87,100	104,100	22.7	73.7 2	17 21	.7 I	L	T4 -75	110	79	118	102	67	50	71	55	50	70
F22	1750	3	1725	2.25	water	50	63	1250	4	Prolongation	87,400	104,900	21.4	71.5 2	17 21	7 -	Т	T4 -75	81	95	102	93	46	56	61	70	75	70
F22	1750	3	1725	2.25	water	50 70	63 77	1250	4	Prolongation	87,100	104,100	22.7	73.7 2	17 21 21 22	7 1	L '	T4 -75	110	79	118	102	67 70	50	71 68	55 95	50 70	70 80
F22 F22	1750	9.25	1725	7.25 9.75	water	70 65	77 69	1230	12.5	4X8X12 Prolongation	86,279	105,546	22.2	72.9 2	21 22 23 22	3	L '	T4 -751 T4 -501	- 102 - 119	88 111	113	97 114	70 80	57 71	08 76	85 100	70 80	80 100
F22	1750	9.25	1700	9.75	water	65	69	1235	12.5	Prolongation	89,491	106,962	23.3	75.0 2	25 22	5 1	L	T4 -50	= 133	139	118	130	79	84	70	100	100	80
F22	1750	7.25	1700	7.5	water	46	61	1235	11.5	Prolongation	81,719	100,506	24.6	73.2 2	10 21	0	L	T4 -50I	120	113	145	126	74	74	87	80	80	100
F22	1750	7.25	1700	7.5	water	46 70	61 00	1235	11.5	Prolongation	81,739	99,970	24.1	69.4 2	12 21	2	L '	T4 -501	= 68	95 110	67 146	77 129	53 70	71 76	49 80	80 100	85 100	45 100
F22 F22	1750	7.25 6	1700	7.5	water	79 81	90 93	1220	10.5	4x4x8 Prolongation	83,301	101,743	24.9	70.4 2	19 21 34 23	9 I 4 I	L '	14 -0F T4 -50I	: 82	72	146 93	128 82	78 58	76 52	89 66	50	100 45	100 65
F22	1750	9.25	1700	9.5	water	67	90	1230	12.5	Prolongation	81,248	99,978	22.7	66.6 2	15 21	5 1	L	T4 -50	= 101	50	108	86	71	36	71	60	45	70
F22	1750	7	1725	7	water	78	78	1220	10.5	Prolongation	90,160	107,628	23.5	72.7 2	30 23	0	L	T4 OF	133	136	143	137	76	84	88	100	100	100
F22	1750	5	1700	4.5	water	76	81	1220	6.75	4X4X8	88,514	105,929	24.1	73.9 2	28 22	8 I	L	T4 -50	= 84	86	123	98 100	60	58	76 05	70	70	100
F22 F22	1750	5 4	1700	4.5 4.5	water	76 81	81 86	1220	6.75 6.5	4X4X8 4X4X8	81,933	98,072 102,368	24.3 24.3	78.9 2	15 ZI 24 22	5 I 4 I	L '	T4 -501 T4 -501	- 190 - 105	203	205 122	113	88 74	96 77	95 79	100 85	100 85	100
F22	1750	4	1725	4.5	water	80	91	1230	6.5	4X4X8	90,850	106,953	23.3	71.4 2	29 22	9 1	L	T4 -50	= 126	122	113	120	85	81	75	100	100	100
F22	1750	6	1725	6.5	water	69	75	1230	10.5	Prolongation	84,223	103,826	22.7	69.3 2	19 21	9	L	T4 -50I	47	67	83	66	33	48	56	40	60	85
F22	1750	6.25	1725	6.25	water	74 72	75	1220	10.25	4X4X8	88,201	105,449	24.4	76.0 2	26 22	6 1	L	T4 -50	145	151	145	147	87	94 77	86	100	100	100
F22 F22	1750 1750	7	1725	/ 7	water	72 72	74 74	1240 1240	12.25	4X4X8 4X4X8	85,685	103,876	25.4 25.5	76.0 Z	28 22 22 22	8 2	L I	14 -501 T4 -501	- 126 - 151	116 142	137 152	126 148	82 86	77 84	86 87	100	100	100
F22	1750	3	1725	, 5	water	74	76	1220	8	4X4X8	85,170	103,171	24.0	72.8 2	18 21	8 1	L	T4 -50	54	104	95	84	43	70	64	60	100	90
F22	1750	3	1725	5	water	74	76	1220	8	4X4X8	85,661	101,720	23.4	67.6 2	16 21	6	L	T4 -50I	83	68	62	71	58	50	45	55	50	50
F22	1750	3	1725	5	water	74	76	1220	8	4X4X8	90,467	107,824	22.5	71.1 2	31 23	1	L	T4 -50	114	120	92	109	71	77	63	100	100	70
F22 F22	1750 1750	3 4	1725	5 5.5	water water	74 69	76 70	1220 1250	8	4X4X8 4X4X8	87,316 92,211	103,417	24.6 18.6	75.0 2 48.1 2	26 22 32 23	6 2	L I	14 -501 T4 -501	- 152 - 36	106 33	169 39	142 36	88 28	75 24	94 28	100 40	80 40	100 50
F22	1750	4	1700	5.5	water	70	91	1220	9.25	4X4X8	82,476	100,699	21.1	62.3 2	18 21	8 1	L	T4 -50	= 36	44	51	44	26	34	37	40	50	55
F22	1750	4	1700	5.5	water	70	91	1220	9.25	4X4X8	85,427	103,255	24.0	72.1 2	23 22	3	L	T4 -50I	87	48	93	76	59	37	60	70	45	70
F22	1750	4	1700	5.5	water	70	91	1220	9.25	4X4X8	83,431	102,536	25.1	76.4 2	22 22	2	L	T4 -501	¹⁴⁸	131	132	137	89 86	84	82	100	100	100
F22 F22	1750	5.75	1700	5.5	water water	70 70	91 91	1220	9.25 9.25	Prolongation	90,938	109,668	23.0 23.0	71.6 2	36 23 36 23	6	L I	14 -0F T4 -0F	130	134 134	140 140	135 135	86 86	87 87	89 89	100	100	100
F22	1750	5	1700	5.5	water	72	85	1220	10.5	4X4X8	88,858	106,799	23.8	73.4 2	28 22	8	L	T4 -50	= 159	145	152	152	91	91	86	100	100	100
F22	1750	5.25	1700	5.5	water	72	85	1220	10.5	4X4X8	85,326	103,071	23.9	72.4 2	19 21	9	L	T4 -50I	105	114	112	110	72	77	72	100	100	100
F22	1750	4	1700	5.5	water	70 70	91 01	1220	9.25	4X4X8	85,500	103,113	23.3	73.0 2	24 22	4 1	L	T4 -50		142	120	130	87	86	79	100	100	85
F22 F22	1750	4	1700	5.5	water	70 64	69 69	1220	9.25 7	4X4X8	92,147	109,984	23.3	76.6 Z	37 23	7	L '	T4 -501 T4 -501	- 175	118	140	102	94 62	97 72	88 70	80	100	100
F22	1750	5.75	1700	4.75	water	67	80	1220	9.75	Prolongation	88,200	105,600	22.8	73.0 2	29 23	0	L	T4 OF	159	169	176	168	86	93	NB	100	100	NB
F22	1750	8.5	1700	4.5	water	73	83	1220	7	4X4X8	95,500	110,700	23.6	69.5 2	36 23	7	L	T4 -50I	132	135	128	132	71	77	69	100	100	100
F22	1750 1750	8.5 6.25	1700	4.5 7 5	water	73 72	83 70	1220	7 12	4X4X8 Prolongation	91,500	107,200	21.0	61.4 2	26 23 27 22	1		T4 -501	82 82	77 50	93 87	84 54	54 20	45 28	60 53	75 25	70 50	85 80
F22	1750	6.25	1700	7.5	water	72	79	1220	12	Prolongation	94,100 94,100	111,400	21.3	65.6 2	37 23	, 7 ⁻	T	T4 -50	= 25	50	87	54 54	20	28	53	25	50	80
F22	1750	9	1700	6.5	water	77	86	1220	10	4X4X8	87,000	104,700	24.0	70.5 2	22 22	4	L	T4 -50I	136	123	142	134	74	69	84	100	100	100
F22	1750	4	1700	5.5	water	70	91 22	1220	9.25	4X4X8	85,427	103,255	24.0	72.1 2	23 22	3 1	L '	T4 -50	87	48	93	76	59	37	60	70	45	70
F22 F22	1725	5.5 6	1675	5.5 6.5	water water	72 61	80 63	1220	10.5	Prolongation	90,200	108,600	22.3 25.2	70.9 2	29 22 32 23	9 I 5 I	L I	14 -501 T4 -501	· 95 · 131	98 136	98 138	97 135	60 79	63 81	63 82	65 100	65 100	65 100
F22	1750	4	1700	5	water	63	75	1220	7	4X4X8	88,899	107,004	22.9	69.5 2	22 22	2	L	T4 -50	= 117	113	112	114	77	80	78	100	100	100
F22	1750	7	1700	6.5	water	57	63	1220	14.75	Prolongation	85,900	104,800	16.8	36.9 2	23 21	9 -	Т	T4 -50I	⁼ 17	24	60	34	17	19	41	34	40	65
F22	1750	3 4 E	1700	5	water	66 62	78 75	1220	8.5 7	4X4X8	90,800 05.460	108,100	24.4	70.3 2	26 23 27 22	0	L '	T4 -50	136	146 144	126	136 146	75 02	81 01	71 01	100	100	100
F22	1750	4.5 6.5	1700	5	water	75	85	1220	, 10	4X4X8	86,300	102,800	24.0	75.0 2	18 21	8 1	Ľ	T4 -50	¹⁴⁹	133	134	136	86	73	74	100	100	100
F22	1750	5	1700	5	water	66	78	1220	8.5	Prolongation	95,100	96,800	24.0	75.0 2	35 23	5 1	L	T4 -50I	126	116	122	121	76	70	74	100	100	100
F22	1750	5	1725	5.75	water	81	82	1220	10.5	Prolongation	87,600	105,600	20.4	60.8 2	26 23	4 -	Т	T4 -50	31	83	59	58	21	55	41	35	75	65
F22	1750 1750	3.75	1700	4.5 4.5	water	78 65	81 70	1240 1230	6.5 6.5	Prolongation	93,270	111,408	23.0	75.7 2	36 23 37 23	6 I 1 I	L '	14 -501 T4 -501	- 143 = 120	132	136	137 127	88 71	75 74	80 78	100	100	100
F22	1750	3.25	1700	4.5	water	63	70	1230	5	Prolongation	87,374	106,868	24.5	74.5 2	32 23	2	L i	T4 -50	= 125	139	152	139	71	79	85	100	100	100
F22	1750	4	1700	5	water	70	77	1230	10	4X4X8	89,299	107,316	23.6	70.8 2	28 22	8	L	T4 -50I	119	118	126	121	77	80	82	100	100	100
F22	1750	4	1700	5	water	70	77	1230	10	4X4X8	95,337	112,578	24.3	74.2 2	36 23	6 1	L	T4 -50	123	116	126	122	76	73	81	100	100	100
F22	1750 1750	3	1700	4	water	72 67	78 71	1230 1230	9.25 11 5	Prolongation	91,179	109,267	24.1	74.3 2	32 23 37 73	1	L '	T4 -501 T4 OF	- 134 127	133 130	133 121	133 129	77 81	78 88	78 82	100	100	100 90
F22	1750	5.25	1700	5	water	67	75	1230	8	Prolongation	95,000	112,900	23.0	72.5 2	35 23	4	Ľ	T4 -50	= 153	164	170	162	76	81	85	100	100	100
F22	1750	4	1700	5	water	67	75	1230	8	Prolongation	90,457	107,723	21.8	66.0 2	28 22	8	L	T4 -50I	48	47	35	43	32	32	25	40	35	20
F22	1750	7.25	1700	5.5	water	69	75	1220	10.5	4X4X8	94,776	112,873	23.4	75.8 2	37 23	7	L '	T4 -50	137	142	142	140	85	86	89	100	100	100
F22 F22	1750	6.5 7.25	1700	6.5 6.5	water water	70 70	75 75	1230	10.5	4X4X8 4X4X8	84,400 89,536	102,229	24.7 23.5	72.6 2	14 21 31 23	4 I 1 I	L I	14 -501 T4 -501	· 122	124	114 147	120	87 80	87 86	83 92	100	100	100
F22	1750	6	1700	9.5	water	74	79	1225	10.5	4X4X8	92,214	110,790	23.9	69.7 2	35 23	7	L	T4 -50	= 130	120	115	122	85	81	77	100	100	100
F22	1750	6.25	1700	6.5	water	79	84	1230	10.75	4X4X8	87,427	108,655	24.1	73.8 2	35 23	5 1	L	T4 -50I	127	121	103	117	81	67	65	100	100	100
F22	1750	7.25	1700	6.5	water	70	75	1230	10.5	4X4X8	89,536	107,887	23.5	72.6 2	31 23	1	L	T4 -50	135	135	147	139	80	86	92	100	100	100
⊦22 F22	1750 1750	5 6.25	1700 1700	5.5 6	water water	72 73	85 80	1220 1220	10.5 11	4X4X8 4X4X8	84,6U1 91 234	102,572 109 280	24./ 22 7	50.8 2	15 21 36 22	ס ו ה	L ·	14 -50I T4 -50I	- 148 - 126	148 127	154 117	150 123	90 78	90 76	97 76	100 100	100 100	100 100
F22	1750	5.25	1700	5	water	67	75	1230	8	Prolongation	95,000	112,900	23.0	72.5 2	35 23	4 1	L	T4 -50	- 153	164	170	162	76	81	85	100	100	100
F22	1750	6	1700	6	water	73	80	1220	11	4X4X8	88,183	106,980	23.6	71.6 2	29 22	9	L	T4 -50I	110	125	130	122	70	79	84	100	100	100
F22	1750	4 25	1700	6	water	73	80 80	1220	11	Prolongation	92,100	109,600	21.6	68.8 2	36 23	2	L '	T4 OF	145	143	132	140 21	87	84 10	78	100	100 15	100
г22 F22	1750 1750	∠.⊃ 7	1725 1725	2.25 7	water water	70 71	80 80	1225	4 10.5	470712 4X8X12	80.122	98.855	20.9 24.0	05.2 2 71.7 2	52 23 11 21	1	L ·	14 -751 T4 -751	41 = 79	∠4 56	∠7 83	51 73	∠ŏ 59	18 40	20 65	20 60	30 30	12 60
F22	1750	7	1725	7	water	73	82	1250	10.25	4X8X12	82,859	101,243	24.3	74.6 2	22 22	2	L	T4 -75	= 38	50	36	41	28	38	29	20	25	20

F22	1750	7.25	1725	7.25	water	68	79	1250	10	4X8X12	84,497	102,194	23.1	68.8 218	218	L	T4	-75F	80	74	85	80	59	58	63	55	55	60
F22	1750	8	1725	7	water	72	81	1250	10	4X8X12	82,333	100,558	23.6	71.4 214	214	L	T4	-75F	40	47	47	45	56	40	38	35	35	40
F22	1750	7	1725	7	water	63	71	1250	10	4X8X12	85,766	103,862	24.1	73.4 222	222	L	T4	-75F	103	102	84	96	74	71	63	85	80	65
F22	1750	7	1725	8.5	water	67	74	1250	11	4X8X12	86,129	103,915	22.2	70.6 218	218	L	T4	-75F	35	42	47	41	29	30	34	20	25	25
F22	1750	5.25	1700	5.5	water	70	91	1220	9.25	Prolongation	89,655	106,387	23.8	75.0 228	228	L	T4	-50F	172	154	157	161	100	82	87	100	100	100
F22	1750	5.25	1700	5.5	water	72	85	1220	10.5	Prolongation	92,800	111,900	22.7	72.7 232	231	L	T4	-50F	159	123	128	137		68	69		80	80
F22	1750	5	1700	5.5	water	73	79	1220	9	Prolongation	85,311	102,240	24.1	76.2 218	218	L	T4	-50F	157	164	140	154	89	96	81	100	80	80
F22	1750	7.75	1700	7.75	water	67	71	1230	11.5	Prolongation	89,545	108,072	24.6	75.5 225	225	L	T4	-50F	134	127	124	128	86	82	75	100	100	100
F22	1750	5	1700	5.5	water	71	75	1230	9	Prolongation	87,134	106,247	23.0	74.2 225	225	L	T4	-50F	128	138	133	133	76	79	80	100	100	100
F22	1750	7.75	1700	7.75	water	67	71	1230	11.5	Prolongation	89,545	108,072	24.6	75.5 225	225	L	T4	-50F	134	127	124	128	86	82	75	100	100	100
F22	1750	7.75	1700	7.75	water	67	71	1230	11.5	Prolongation	89,545	108,072	24.6	75.5 225	225	L	T4	-50F	134	127	124	128	86	82	75	100	100	100

Appendix G - Evaluation of Pressure Rating Methods Recommended by API RP 17TR8 Peer Review Comment Responses

Prepared by ARGONNE SAGES HPHT PROJECT TEAM

June 27, 2017

Disclaimer

This report was prepared by Argonne National Laboratory (ANL) under contract to the Department of Energy (DOE) through an inter-agency agreement between the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE) and the DOE. The opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in the report are those of the authors and they do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of BSEE.

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor UChicago Argonne, LLC, nor any of their employees or officers, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of document authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof, Argonne National Laboratory, or UChicago Argonne, LLC

Table of Contents

Introduction and Background	1
Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	3
Opinions and Expanding Scope of Current Argonne Study	3
Literature Review	3
ASME BPVC Is Guidance	4
Non-Pressure-Related Failure Modes	5
ASME BPVC Validation	5
Performance of Burst Test Is Expensive and Dangerous	6
Statistical Relevance	6
Standards Released Subsequent to BSEE Project Start	6
Collapse Pressure and Strain Limit	7
Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project)	8
Materials	8
Forging Reduction at Burst Region	8
Heat-Treat Quenching and Grain Structure at Burst Region	8
Material Properties from Prolongation	8
Post Burst Testing Material Examination	9
Examination for Preexisting Defects	. 10
Post-Failure Metallurgical Examination	. 10
Design and Geometry of Test Bodies	. 10
Shapes of Test Bodies	. 10
Flanges, Bolts, and Seals	. 10
FEA	. 11
Independent FEA	. 11
Mesh Sensitivity	. 11
UY Displacement Constraint	. 11
Model Dimensions	. 12
Elastic-Plastic Material Properties	. 12
Von Mises Flow Rule	. 12
Load-Displacement Curves	. 12
FEA Solutions to Plastic Collapse	. 13
Inaccurately Modeled Components	. 13

Burst Tests14	4
Purpose of Strain Gages14	4
Only Two Burst Tests Performed14	4
Pressure Ratings by Hydro-test1	5
Proof Testing Contradiction1	5
Miscellaneous1	5
Least Conservative Pressure Rating1	5
Histogram Load Sequence1	5
Elastic-Plastic FEA as an Allowable Method by API16	6
Comparison of Subsea Equipment and Pressure Vessels	6
Linear-Elastic as a "Gold Standard" 16	6
Numerical Analysis Compared to Test Results	7
Plastic Collapse and Ultimate Tensile Strength1	7
No FMECA1	7
"Design Margin" Term	7
Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	8
Comments Outside of Peer Review Charge	C
Appendix A- Cross Tabulation of Responses to Peer-Review Report Text as Tabulated in Section 4.2	1

Argonne Project Team Response to Peer-Review Comments

Introduction and Background

This document is a response to peer-review comments of the Argonne report that addressed a trial application of API 17TR8 (first edition), a design guideline for high-pressure, high-temperature subsea equipment. The Argonne project and peer review¹ was funded by the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE) at Argonne National Laboratory (Argonne). This project began in mid-2015 with the objective of applying relatively recent API guidelines and conducting instrumented physical tests to failure in a controlled environment.

The API document, 17TR8, incorporated the latest oil and gas industry thinking, including the use of ASME Section VIII, Division 3, methodology for high-pressure, high-temperature subsea equipment design. Specifically, this methodology includes elastic-plastic finite element analyses (FEA) for rated working pressures in excess of 15,000 psi. The technical report combines this analysis approach with other API guidance, but such combined guidance has not been validated fully in the public domain. To this end, Argonne conducted and reported the physical design, build, and test to failure of one typical component as one step toward validation.

Argonne contracted with Aiken Engineering to design, analyze, fabricate, and test a 3.25-inch bore component made according to regular practices used in the oil and gas industry. To be representative of typical subsea components and hardware, the tested hardware (of which two were made) had a flanged tubular section that transitioned to a cross-bored square cross section of the type that might occur in a valve. These components were ASTM A182 F-22, as are commonly used in the industry for such applications (although unclad). The final components were pressure-tested to failure, which occurred as expected in the tubular sections. The pressure testing was compared to pretest FEA predictions based on an analyst's interpretation of the API 17TR8 guidance and was presented in a technical report to BSEE. The subsequent peer review of this Argonne deliverable was conducted, directed, and overseen solely by BSEE staff.

Technical reports delivered to BSEE are subject to peer review in accordance with established agency policy. For the Argonne 17TR8 report, BSEE contracted with an organization to administer this process. The process began with the solicitation of technical reviewer candidates and concluded with a final peer-review report that compiled reviewer comments. That peer-review report contains a wide range of comments that are addressed in this present document.

Many reviewers' comments are specific to reported details and the scope of the Argonne project. Concurrently, several comments are peripheral to the actual scope of work undertaken for the BSEE-funded project. The latter include points about API 17TR8 and other standards, the intent of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (BPVC), and general topics associated with designing and building subsea components. Because many of these points are part of the motivation for the BSEE project and provide specific suggestions for future discussion and

¹ Summary Report for the External Peer Review of *Evaluation of Pressure-Rating Methods Recommended by API RP 17TR8,* Prepared by ExDyna under BSEE Contract Number: BPA E14PA00008, Task Order Number: E17PB00021,(Task Order 9), May 12, 1917.

projects, they have been included as part of Argonne's responses. The second section of this report addresses subjects in the peer review that are relevant to the project scope. The subcategories are the materials, design, and geometry of test bodies; FEA; burst tests; and miscellaneous subjects. The next response category is restated conclusions based on peer-review comments. This document concludes with noted responses beyond the review charges.

Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)

Opinions and Expanding Scope of Current Argonne Study

Among peer reviewers' comments, there are numerous opinions about the methodology of the Argonne study and the contents of the report. In some instances, there are contradictions among the reviewers. Generally, these contradicting opinions are pertinent to some parts of API 17TR8 and the incorporation of certain ASME Section VIII paragraphs. Several comments could enhance the Argonne study, provide beneficial information, and reduce uncertainties; however, an extension of the Argonne study is not a consideration at this time. Nevertheless, there is merit to recognizing these suggestions and opinions, as they have considerable relevance to defining and debating future validation and confirmation efforts. The Argonne team concurs with most of the subjects in this group.

Literature Review

The Argonne team concurs that a comprehensive, narrated technical review of validation literature with a detailed bibliography should be part of any technical report such as API 17TR8. The Argonne team understands that a complete package of such information was not available for public consumption despite previous requests for such information. As a package, such information could be useful to understand and communicate the basis and data of the study. Such a review could have explained the following:

- adopting the ASME 1.8 factor for subsea equipment when prior API guidelines and industry practice had been closer to 2.1.
- depending on fracture mechanics and crack-growth technology as a basis to offset the added conservatism associated with a 2.1 factor.
- improving clarity and intent about design factors being mean failure values rather than minimums below two standard deviations.
- removing technical doubts and uncertainties that exist because subsea situations differ from pressure-vessel designs.

Finally, such an information package (beyond the informative citations provided by a reviewer in the peer-review comments) could also aid analysts unaffiliated with the proceedings leading to API 17TR8 in applying guidance more consistent with intent.

Since only portions of the ASME BPVC are guidelines in 17TR8, the Argonne team does not agree that, because the BPVC Section VIII has been validated over many decades, 17TR8 is validated too. Validation is not necessarily transferable when a standard is modified by any other standard, at least not until a thorough analysis of the literature (and/or in conjunction with appropriate testing) has occurred for the entirety of the new situation. The API recognizes and accommodates this partial adoption of ASME BPVC in API 17TR8 Section 4.2.1.4, which reads as follows:

"Traditionally, the standard practice is to rely on the ASME BPVC to provide design guidance when the equipment's functional requirements go beyond the defined boundaries of the API specifications/standards. However, the problem then arises as to "how much of the ASME

BPVC does one follow"; 1) exact to the "letter" 2) use portions of the code that are applicable to the particular design or 3) following a parallel path using the ASME BPVC methods, but develop another set of design margins applicable to oilfield applications. Oilfield equipment are of complex geometry, far from simple cylindrical pressure vessel or piping union design. They are typically subjected to a variety of extreme external loading conditions and they are not explicitly addressed in ASME BPVC. This leads the equipment designer to rely on sound engineering practices and judgment, accompanied by unique validation prototype testing programs."

It is very likely that a thorough literature review, as suggested by the peer-reviewer comments, could not only further clarify the boundaries of the BPVC Section VIII applicability, but also lead to greater design consistency and assurances. Section 4.2.1.4 also helps explain why differences of opinion exist between BSEE project analysis and the methods a peer reviewer may have preferred. Sound engineering practice and judgment to one person may not be the same to another.

A fundamental premise of the Argonne study (as noted on page 6 of the project report) was to apply API 17TR8, First Edition², principles—including related guidance contained in specific normative references—as they existed in fully approved form at the onset of the BSEE-sponsored project. These principles specifically include:

- API 6A³/6X⁴/17D⁵;
- ASME Division 2: 2013 Part 5 by Linear-Elastic FEA;
- ASME Division 2: 2013 Part 5 by Elastic-Plastic FEA; and
- ASME Division 3: 2013 Part KD by Elastic-Plastic FEA.

The Argonne report did discuss the evolution of particular standards and the relative impacts of differences on pressure-based design ratings. These comparisons were not intended to be a validation literature review, but rather a simple industry history providing a basis for comparisons with trial application of the 17TR8 guidance (through collapse pressure determination using FEA modeling). Ideally, a thorough literature review would not only quantify proposed design margins, but fully justify any departure from historical success. This appears to not have been done for the First Edition of 17TR8 and has not been made available to interested users.

ASME BPVC Is Guidance

The Argonne team agrees with identified limitations and cautions regarding the use of ASME BPVC methods in API 17TR8 for design verification and assessment. The ASME BPVC is not a design handbook. While there is a degree of specificity in API 17TR8, there is also considerable latitude on design verification of high-pressure, high-temperature (HPHT) subsea equipment applications. The normal expectation is that not all designers will follow exactly the same practices. The obvious goal is to assure that, when following verification guidelines, the resulting

² High-Pressure, High-Temperature Design Guidelines, API Technical Report 17TR8, First Edition, February 2015.

³ API 6A, Specification for Wellhead and Christmas Tree Equipment, Twentieth Edition, October, 2010.

 ⁴ API Standard 6X, Design Calculation for Pressure-Containing Equipment, First Edition, March 2014.
⁵ API Specification 17D, Design and Operation of Subsea Production Systems-Subsea Wellhead and Tree Equipment, Second Edition 2011.

components are not prone to failure in service. This not only protects the environment, but also helps assure safe operations, including life safety.

Non-Pressure-Related Failure Modes

Obviously, a subsea component or even a portion of a component can have many failure modes other than pressure alone. However, pressure often (but not always) drives at least part of the design and remains a prominent factor in the manufacturing acceptance process. As a research-oriented project rather than a project intended to produce a production component, the scope of the BSEE-sponsored project never intended to explore other failure modes or to apply both forces and moments in an elevated temperature environment. To assure project objectives would be accomplished, informally, the Argonne team did look at non-pressure-related failure modes and agrees that exploring other failure modes and testing in other conditions would contribute significantly to the validation process. Failure modes and loading combinations other than pressure should be a consideration for future validation projects.

ASME BPVC Validation

The ASME BPVC has existed for decades and has been validated when all of a particular section and division are applied (Section VIII, Division 2 or Division 3 in this context). The Argonne team agrees that the BPVC is useful for analytical verification of subsea components. However, as discussed above, API 17TR8 does not adopt the entirety of either division for a variety of reasons, including complex geometry. Again, the ASME code is <u>not</u> a handbook of design, and thus the designer and analyst have an obligation to apply "*sound engineering practices and judgment*" to the situation at hand.

Aside from geometry differences (between pressure vessels and subsea equipment), the Argonne team believes other important differences also impact how much one can rely on BPVC methods for a particular subsea situation. These differences include the following:

- Subsea components do not have pressure-relief valves to limit maximum pressure loading. This difference could compromise the containment boundary in the subsea situation.
- Most pressure vessels are subject to in-service inspection. Many subsea components are not adequately accessible or retrievable for such inspections.
- There is not necessarily close parity between the forms of materials used for component manufacture. For example, subsea equipment bodies are forgings, while large pressure vessels tend to be combinations of rolled plates welded together. Fasteners in both applications are based on bar stock.
- Usually, temporal pressure vessel load and operating conditions are relatively easy to quantify compared to the subsea environment, where conditions for a particular well can vary greatly and unexpectedly from forecasts.

The materials for test articles of the BSEE-sponsored project were a rich chemistry F-22 forging that substantially exceeded the project's material specification (specified minimum yield of 75 ksi with actual yield in excess of 90 ksi). This material is substantially different from the listed ASME BPVC material and may not fall within the technical limitations of ASME methods for alternate materials.

Performance of Burst Test Is Expensive and Dangerous

The peer review includes several statements that burst tests of subsea equipment are impractical and unsafe. One example of this statement is given in comments on page 83 of the peer review. The Argonne study is evidence that this is not a correct statement. Two test bodies were tested to failure in a safe and practical manner, and the results were valuable. There is no doubt that burst tests must be properly planned, and adequate projectile containment structures must be provided. All major subsea equipment manufacturers have test bunkers designed to contain projectiles that might occur from bursts. Damage to the test bunker, if used, can be prevented by enclosing the test component in a simple and inexpensive fabricated containment that absorbs most or all of the released energy. The Argonne burst tests were conducted in an open, controlled-access area with containment and observing personnel isolated in a shielded area some distance from the test.

Statistical Relevance

The Argonne team wholly agrees; results from one or two tests are not statistically significant if one is seeking to quantify values that effectively establish and quantify safety margins. At the same time, one or a few full-scale tests provide far more confidence than no test results. Scaled tests can contribute, but there are nearly always scaling questions that are difficult to quantify beyond a reasonable doubt. The Argonne team believes the least uncertainty of any test outcome occurs when test articles have close similarity to a production version. This includes test materials being full scale, manufactured with identical processes and materials as the production item, and tested in representative conditions to the extent practical.

The Argonne team recognizes that full-scale testing to a statistically valid level can be very costly and time consuming. However, since there is considerable validation value derived from any number of full-scale tests (of an article prepared in accordance with commonly accepted industry practices and conventions), such testing is useful and advisable to validate a new or revised standard. This is particularly relevant when that standard relies upon excerpts from other standards or departs significantly from historical norms. The Argonne team's understanding is that there was no physical, testing-based validation information in the public domain for a subsea component prepared according to the guidelines of the First Edition of API 17TR8.

Standards Released Subsequent to BSEE Project Start

As explained above, the project finite element analyses and component fabrication were based on standards specifically called out in API 17TR8, First Edition. The particular guideline is somewhat unique in that normative references are to a particular version, yet many API

standards endorse the "latest version" of anything listed without a date or version. In addition to normative references, API 17TR8 provides a bibliography of some references without dates, versions, or guidance on use. One such example the Argonne team found is API Specification 20B (Specification for Open Die Forgings for the Petroleum and Natural Gas Industries). This standard is listed, but is not cited specifically in the main text of the technical report (First Edition of 20E is dated August, 2012, and the latest is the second edition dated February, 2017). For such a situation, are this specification and others a requirement, guidance, or merely optional information? If the specification's content is important, then this specification and any others

should be incorporated into the 17TR8 text where applicable. Potentially, this can become part of the next revision of API 17TR8.

Forged Products (the forging supplier for the BSEE project) regularly provides large and small forgings to the oil and gas industry and has the infrastructure and quality system associated with both versions of 20E. Additional, nonproprietary details of Forged Products heat treatment and forging work are provided as requested and are consistent with what would normally be publicly released.

Another concern of the reviewers pertained to the version of the AMSE BPVC, since 17TR8 references the 2013 edition. This revision was considered in the study, even though the 2015 edition was current at the time the study was performed. Again, a driving consideration was to apply API 17TR8 as it was written.

The original release of API 17TR8 is also the current release. A revision is in progress, and prelease information indicates that there will be additional requirements for materials and other aspects of HPHT equipment. The additional requirements in the revised TR8 were not considered in the Argonne study, and no responses are provided regarding new requirements.

Collapse Pressure and Strain Limit

Evaluation of strain limit (API 17 TR8, Fig. 1- Div. 3: KD-232) is beyond the scope of the Argonne project and would not have altered the comparisons reported. The Argonne team agrees this would be done as part of a full analysis of a production component designed in accordance with API 17TR8. Such a full analysis would similarly consider different failure modes, ratcheting, hydro-test, and fracture mechanics. The Argonne team's work focused on comparing global plastic-collapse predictions with physical testing as a step to validate 17TR8.

Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project)

Materials

Forging Reduction at Burst Region

For the valve bodies, Forged Products first forged the raw material (Heat AH450) to bloom, then reduced to a shaft that had a 16" diameter, was 51.60" long in the center, and had two identical square blocks at both ends (19.20" square by 27.20" long). Both the throat area and the single prolongation are from the middle section of the forging (shaft) that had experienced tremendous cross-section reduction (calculated to be around 12:1). For forgings, this amount of reduction will result in fine-grain structures before rough machining and heat-treating. The mechanical test results for the prolongation verified the strength of the materials in this area.

Heat-Treat Quenching and Grain Structure at Burst Region

The throat section is around 20" long, and the failure location during the burst testing was somewhere between 5" to 25" away from the prolongation piece. The heat-treat shop (Lone Star Heat-Treating Corp.) quenched the parts with the prolongation section facing the water jet, such that water flow was facilitated through the inside diameter. This area (flange/prolongation) received the most agitation and therefore experienced the most hardening. It takes less than 60 seconds for quenching thus the entire forging should be a bainitic microstructure. If some soft phases like pearlite were going to form (which is unlikely) due to the fast quench, it would be in the middle of the thick sections (end block) rather than the pipe section. Both the prolongation and thick sections should have high strengths and fully transformed bainite. For completeness, the quality assurance (QA)-verified heat treatment performed is summarized in the table below:

Process	Temperature (°F)	Time (hrs) at Temp	Cooling Method
Normalized	1750	6.0	Air cooled
Hardened	1700	6.0	Water 71–73°F
Tempered	1230	10.0	Water cooled

Material Properties from Prolongation

Material property verification tests were performed in accordance with ASTM A370. These tests were performed on test specimens taken from the prolongation. Longitudinal test specimens (parallel to the primary grain-flow direction) were obtained such that the tensile specimen gauge sections were at least ¼ T (where T is the thickness) and no less than 25 mm from the heat-treated surface. Charpy V-notch impact test specimens were also tested in the longitudinal direction. The specified material properties were as follows:

Material Property	Required Value by API 6A PSL	
Yield strength (0.2% offset)	3 75,000 psi min	
Ultimate tensile strength	95,000 psi min	
Reduction of Area	35% min	
Elongation in 2"	18% min	
Brinell hardness	197–237 after finish machining 40	
Charpy V-notch* @ 0°F	ft-lbs (min ave of 3 specimens) 30	
Charpy V-notch* @ 0°F	ft-lbs (min single value)	

* Full-sized specimens (10 x 10 mm)

Mechanical properties are expected to be the same or slightly lower in thicker sections and the same or slightly higher in thinner sections. Forged Products simulated the heat-treat and quench operations and compared them to Jominy end-quench tests. The hardenability results and tensile strength projections were consistent across the entire cross sections of the test pieces. Based on Forged Products' considerable experience with similar F22 heats, the tensile properties in the thinner section, where the intentional burst failure occurred, would be expected to be similar or slightly higher than those obtained from testing of the prolongation.

Post Burst Testing Material Examination

Posttest material investigations included optical metallography, a scanning electron microscopy examination. The objectives of this work were to:

1) investigate the microstructures of the material following the burst failure; and

2) determine if the burst failures originated at preexisting defects.

Samples were taken from three locations of the throat portions of both valve bodies. These locations were: at the burst, 180 degrees from the burst in the circumferential direction, and lastly at the flanged end farthest away from the burst. These tests were conducted at a third-party laboratory in Houston, TX, (Exova) that has considerable experience with oil and gas materials. Summaries of these investigations are noted here:

Metallographic samples were prepared for three orthogonal planes for the three sampling locations. This investigation showed that the grain-size average results varied between ASTM grain size 6 and 7. Microstructures were determined by Exova to be tempered martensite but there is uncertainty about this determination.⁶ (Note: The forge shop had determined the structure was Bainite and there was no physical explanation likely to have caused any such structure change.) The "At Burst" locations showed elongated grain structures, as would be expected from plastically deformed material.

⁶ The differences between Bainite and Martensite are subtle. An experienced third-party metallurgist could not positively determine the structure based on the available information but believes the post-test structure was most likely Bainite. Additional investigation might be more conclusive.

Examination for Preexisting Defects

Electron microscope examination of the fracture surfaces found no evidence of preexisting machining or material defects. Dimple rupture was noted at 400X and 1500X magnification examinations of the fracture faces.

Post-Failure Metallurgical Examination

The peer review includes queries about whether metallurgical examinations of the material at the rupture locations should have been performed. For example, on page 76 of the peer review, a reviewer makes the following statement:

".....a metallurgical evaluation of the failed components should be conducted."

Although the data obtained from these examinations would be useful, post-failure examinations were beyond the scope of the study, which encompassed only determining whether there were preexisting flaws.

Design and Geometry of Test Bodies

Shapes of Test Bodies

The peer review includes comments about the shapes of the test bodies from the standpoint that the flanges and thick body sections served no purpose other than to resist pressure. For example, on page 79 of the peer review, one reviewer states the following:

"The thick body section with intersecting bores did not contribute any useful information regarding the proof test, in that the design was adjusted to assure the failure would occur in the neck region."

This is a true statement. The test bodies were designed so that plastic collapse would occur in the neck section and not in the thick section with cross bores or in the flanges. The thick section with cross-bores was included to represent test body materials that had experienced a wide range of elastic and plastic strains. Moreover, the values of strains throughout the test bodies were known from results of the FEA solutions. This provides metallurgists with material that has been exposed to known values of elastic and plastic strains. Material with this strain history could be useful in future studies.

Flanges, Bolts, and Seals

The peer review included several criticisms of the flanges, bolts, and seals. More than one reviewer criticized these components because they did not meet the ASME codes or API standards. For example, on page 60, a reviewer makes the following statement:

"The flanges used in this situation are standard size 20 ksi flanges based on Table B.43 of API 6A for 20 ksi rated working pressures. The analysis does show that the flanges meet the requirements of global collapse at these pressures. However, it is likely that the sizes and numbers of bolts used might not meet the requirements of ASME Section VIII-2."

Criticisms of the flanges, bolts, and seals because they did not meet ASME codes or for any other reason are unwarranted. Flange evaluation was not an objective or concern of this study.

The only purpose of the flanges was to provide a safe, non-failing means of connecting blinds to the four openings of the test bodies. There was no requirement that the Argonne study flanges meet the ASME codes or any other code for that matter.

Flanges have been extensively evaluated in countless studies since the 1930s. The flanges were included in the designs to provide removable blind closures for the internal bores. They were designed not to rupture or leak before burst of the cylindrical neck sections in the test bodies. In fact, the bolts would not meet either API or ASME standards, and they would absolutely not meet all NACE MR0175 requirements. The bolts successfully performed the functions for which they were designed.

FEA

Independent FEA

Page 81 in the peer review summarizes comments by one reviewer about an independent FEA that was performed for the large neck body. The collapse pressure from the independent FEA was 72,251 psi, as compared to a collapse pressure of 72,850 psi from the Argonne FEA. The difference between the two collapse pressures was only 0.82%, which is insignificant.

The results of the independent FEA validate the accuracy of the Argonne FEA for the large neck body. Since the input (other than dimensions) and methodologies of the FEA for the small neck body were identical to those of the large neck body, it is reasonable to assume that validation of the small neck body FEA would occur if an independent FEA were performed.

The preceding two paragraphs, in essence, validate the accuracy of the methodology, assumptions, and input of the Argonne FEAs. Queries about these elements of the Argonne FEAs should have little to no impact on analytical results. Even so, responses to the peer-review queries about the FEAs are provided in the following paragraphs.

<u>Mesh Sensitivity</u>

A query on page 78 of the peer review stated that no documentation of the mesh sensitivity studies were included in the report. This is a correct statement. However, it is not common practice in stress reports to document anything but the results of the mesh sensitivity study. Section 6.1 in the Argonne report states that the FEA solutions of two different mesh densities for both test bodies produce collapse pressures within 1% of each other. The adequacy of the mesh densities are also validated by the results of the independent FEA of the large test body.

UY Displacement Constraint

Page 67 of the peer review states that the Argonne report does not describe the UY displacement constraints in the FEA models. The FEA models have no cut planes normal to the y-axis, and all loads in the Y direction are in static equilibrium. This means that a UY constraint is not necessary other than to prevent drift in the Y direction due to computer round-off errors. To prevent drift, a single node in each model was constrained in the Y direction. The location of the node was not important. A listing of reaction forces from solutions of the FEAs showed that reaction forces in the Y direction were virtually zero. This result is confirmed by stress and displacement plots in Appendix B1 for the large neck body and Appendix B2 for the small neck

body. If improper Y direction constraints were applied, hot spots would have appeared in the plots.

Model Dimensions

The original intent of the study was to use the as-built dimensions of the two test bodies. The first solutions of the two FEA models occurred before the test bodies were manufactured. This step was to validate the designs of the test bodies and to confirm that plastic collapse would occur in the neck sections. Obviously, as-built dimensions were not available before the test bodies were manufactured, so nominal dimensions were used for these models. After the two test bodies were manufactured, the as-built dimensions became available. These are listed in Appendix F of the Argonne report. The actual outside and inside diameter dimensions in the critical sections where failure occurred were within 0.50% of the nominal dimensions. Rebuilding and solving the FEA models with as-built dimensions would produce virtually identical collapse pressures. For this reason, all FEA solutions were performed with the nominal dimensions.

Elastic-Plastic Material Properties

There were several queries in the peer review regarding the elastic-plastic material properties used in the FEA solutions. The models used the true stress/true strain values that were obtained from a tensile test by Franklin Research Associates in Houston. The tensile test specimen was taken at a $\frac{1}{4}$ T location from the 12 x 2.25 x 6 qualification test coupon (QTC) provided by Forged Products. A plot of the true stress/true strain data is provided on page F-36 of the Argonne report. Additional information about the tensile test is provided on page F-35 of the report.

Von Mises Flow Rule

The peer review included several queries about the elastic-plastic material model used in the FEA solutions. As required in Divisions 2 and 3, "the von Mises yield function and associated flow rule" were utilized in the FEA models.⁷

Load-Displacement Curves

Page 80 of the peer review states that load-displacement curves from the FEA solutions were not provided in the Argonne report and that they would provide insight into the development of plastic hinges. Load-displacement curves were not included in the report because they would not serve any useful purpose during performance of the FEA or evaluation of the results. Load-displacement curves provide the FEA analyst with an indication of when plastic collapse is about to occur. This information would not be useful for this particular situation.

⁷ For clarification with regard to API 6a and API 6X: API 6A uses stress intensity for ratings based on the ASME methods. The allowable stress intensity is 2/3 the yield strength at the rated internal pressure. As an alternate 6A allows the use of von Mises stress at the bore and at the hydrostatic test pressure of 1.5 x the internal pressure. The allowable von Mises stress at the bore is the yield strength. The FEA analyst's experience is that usually the von Mises stress method will produce lower pressure ratings for 20 ksi equipment. API 6X allows the use of either stress intensity or von Mises stress based on the ASME methods with a 2/3 Sy allowable stress.

FEA Solutions to Plastic Collapse

Page 64 includes the following criticism by a reviewer about the iterative solution methods used in the Argonne study:

"The report indicates that it is a requirement, when using elastic-plastic evaluation, to determine the maximum pressure rating for a component and then apply the design margin to it. This is an incorrect statement."

This statement by the reviewer is not correct based on Paragraph 5.2.4.1 of ASME, Division 2 that states the following:

"Protection against plastic collapse is evaluated by determining the plastic collapse load of the component using an elastic-plastic stress analysis. The allowable load on the component is established by applying a design factor to the calculated plastic collapse load."

Clearly, ASME states that the elastic-plastic solution should be performed until elastic-plastic collapse occurs.

Even so, both the method used in the Argonne study per ASME and the method suggested by one reviewer are acceptable and will provide correct results. However, the method used in Argonne study was precisely as specified in Paragraph 5.2.4.1 of ASME, Division 2.

Inaccurately Modeled Components

The peer review included several criticisms that the blind, bolts, nuts, and seals were not included in the FEA models. Reviewers' concern was that disregarding these components may have affected the accuracy of the results. For example, on page 57 of the peer review, one reviewer states the following:

"The FEA models did not include all components of the assembly which was subjected to burst, such as the flange bolting, ring gasket, and blind flanges. These may not influence the results, but not including them raises the question of accuracy in the modeling."

As previously stated, the only important results of the Argonne study were the plastic collapse pressures of the two test bodies. Both test bodies collapsed in the neck section at locations far enough away from the flanges that inaccurate modeling of the flanges did not affect the burst pressures. The method of modeling the flange components provided statically equivalent loads at the flanged ends of the test bodies. Saint Venant's principle teaches that results far enough removed from statically equivalent features produce results that are the same as if accurate features were modeled. Figure B1.17 for the large neck test body and Figure B2.17 for the small neck test body unquestionably demonstrate that failure locations are far enough removed from the flanges. The stresses and strains in the neck sections, where burst occurred, were constant along the lengths near the locations of burst. They would not be constant along the lengths of the neck sections if end effects existed.

Burst Tests

Purpose of Strain Gages

The peer review includes numerous statements and queries about the strain gage results and how they could have or should have been used. Although remarks about strain gages by the peer reviewers are useful, no replies to these remarks are included in this response to the peer review. The reason is that the strain gage data was not a vital or necessary element for the conclusions or results of the Argonne study. Strain gages were applied to the test bodies simply to generate data that might be useful to BSEE or others. For example, BSEE might use the strain gage data from the differential pressure tests to study the effects of differential pressure.

One use of the strain gage data was to provide a visual indication about strain behavior as internal pressure increased during the burst tests. Although this provided a warning as to when burst was going to occur, it was certainly not essential to know during the burst test.

The strain gage data was also used to validate the accuracy of the FEA models at lower pressures when strains in the cylindrical neck section were linear with pressure. This validation is described in Section 6.4 of the Argonne report. As shown in Appendix D of the report, calculated strains were within 4% of measured values. Model validation using the strain gage data was not done because it was required, but because the data was available. Stresses and strains in the cylindrical neck section could be accurately validated using simple strength-of-materials calculations.

Several strain gages separated from the test vessels during hydro-testing, and even more were lost as pressure increased to failure. Strain gages characteristically fail at high strains. There are other strain-measurement methods, but there are also practical limitations to using these when performing a test to failure inside a safety containment shield.

Only Two Burst Tests Performed

The peer review includes numerous comments, queries, and questions about the accuracy of the conclusions since they are based on only two burst tests. For example, on page 58 of the peer review, one reviewer makes the following statement:

"The two component evaluations conducted are insufficient in number to demonstrate that the analytically predicted collapse pressure vs the proof test provide a statistical distribution range of data."

It is obviously true that two data points are not a large enough sampling to perform statistical analysis. However, API 17TR8 does not include references to test data that would justify their methodology and acceptance criteria. As stated previously, the two test results from the Argonne study may not be statistically significant, but they clearly show that elastic-plastic FEA may not be conservative in all cases and for all equipment. The results of the Argonne study surely indicate that more tests to failure should be performed and compared with elastic-plastic FEA results. This is especially the case for more complex equipment with multibody contacts and moving components, which are common in HPHT subsea equipment.

Pressure Ratings by Hydro-test

On page 65 in the peer review, a reviewer correctly states that pressure rating by hydro-test using Division 3 rules should not be based on pressure, but the pressure when strain at the OD is 2%. Review of the FEA results from the neck section of the two test bodies at burst pressure shows that strains on the OD were greater than 2%. The net effect is that the Division 3 pressure ratings based on burst will be less than those stated in the Argonne report and by API criteria. This reinforces the statements on page 28 of the Argonne report that pressure ratings based on Division 3 hydro-test procedures produce ratings less than those from elastic-plastic FEA with a 1.8 load factor.

Proof Testing Contradiction

A comparison of burst pressure is useful to physically quantify the accuracy of analytical methods independent of whether API, ASME, or any other guidance prohibits or requires a test to failure for design validation. The Argonne team is not suggesting that components must be validated this way. However, since there is apparently a conflict between ASME guidelines and API (as identified by the peer reviewers), this matter should be reconciled by the appropriate technical committees.

Miscellaneous

Least Conservative Pressure Rating

On page 75 of the peer review, a reviewer makes the following statement about the Argonne report:

"One statement in Section 9.1 on page 24 states that 'the least conservative pressure ratings were determined by ASME: VIII-3 elastic-plastic analysis.' This is not correct. Table 9.2 shows that the least conservative margin calculated is 1.74 based on linear-elastic analysis by ASME Section VIII..."

The reviewer improperly quoted the sentence from the Argonne report. The following is the actual sentence from the report:

"For all test components but the small neck test body, the least conservative pressure ratings were determined by Division 3 elastic-plastic analysis."

The criticism of the Argonne report by the reviewer is not deserved.

Histogram Load Sequence

One reviewer makes the following statement on page 85 of the peer review:

"It's possible to review the load histogram and evaluate a worst-case loading sequence for fatigue analysis. There can also be multiple load sequences run to verify a worst case."

Fatigue load histograms of environmentally induced loads on HPHT subsea equipment must be statistically defined because of the random nature of these loads. Fatigue load histograms can consist of several hundred load bins with various combinations of tension, bending moment, and

shear. Fatigue textbooks and even ASME, Division 3, state that the sequence of load application has a significant effect on fracture mechanics calculations.

Developing a sequence of loads that will produce conservative predictions of crack growth by fracture mechanics will not be so simple and may be impractical. Furthermore, validation that a load sequence produces conservative fracture mechanics calculations will not be a simple task. The sequence of environmental loads on subsea equipment should be carefully evaluated and reported by experts in both fracture mechanics and in environmental loads that are applied to subsea equipment.

Elastic-Plastic FEA as an Allowable Method by API

On page 75 of the peer review, one reviewer states that the statement in the Argonne report that elastic-plastic FEA was not allowed prior to 2015 is misleading. The reason given by that reviewer was that BSEE was reviewing analysis by elastic-plastic methods prior to 2015. The intent of the statement in the Argonne report was that API did not explicitly allow elastic-plastic FEA prior to 2015. Publication of API 17TR8 was the first API document related to subsea equipment that allowed elastic-plastic FEA.

Comparison of Subsea Equipment and Pressure Vessels

A reviewer in page 56 of the peer review states that it is a misconception that subsea equipment is unique and completely different from other equipment that contains internal pressure, operates at high temperatures, and is exposed to a corrosive environment and subjected to highly cyclical loads. Text in API 17TR8 does not support the "misconception" asserted by the reviewer. As stated previously, the following statement is in Section 4.2.1.4 in API 17TR8:

"..... Oilfield equipment are of complex geometry, far from a simple cylindrical pressure vessel or piping union design. They are typically subjected to a variety of extreme external loading conditions and they are not explicitly addressed in ASME BPVC....."

Section 4.3 in API 17TR8 provides additional statements that subsea equipment is exposed to loads different from those included in the ASME BPVC.

Linear-Elastic as a "Gold Standard"

On page 82 of the peer review, a reviewer makes the following statement:

"It would seem that the linear-elastic methods are being used as a 'gold standard' which the newer, more rigorous modern methods are being held to."

This is an incorrect statement. The Argonne study did not conclude or state that the "newer, more rigorous modern methods" adopted in API 17TR8 should produce the same load ratings as those from linear-elastic analysis. Historically, the subsea industry has rated subsea equipment using linear-elastic analysis. Furthermore, subsea equipment rated by this method has operated successfully for several decades. The Argonne study simply pointed out that load ratings from some more modern methods are higher and thereby less conservative. Since equipment based on more modern methods has not been validated by extensive successful operation, it must be validated by engineering studies or load tests.

Numerical Analysis Compared to Test Results

On page 74 of the peer review, Richard Biel states the following:

"The report draws a false conclusion from Table 6.1 that the numerical analysis should exactly match the results of the physical test."

This was not a conclusion of the report. It would be unfounded to make this conclusion when comparing any analysis results with test results. Theoretical results from scientific and engineering studies rarely match test results exactly.

Plastic Collapse and Ultimate Tensile Strength

A comment by a reviewer on page 63 of the peer review states that it is a gross simplification that the elastic-plastic analysis is solely based on tensile strength, as is stated in the Argonne report. It is true that yield strength and other variables do affect the plastic collapse load from an elastic-plastic analysis. However, the ultimate tensile strength is the most dominant material property that controls the burst pressure. Simple engineering studies will confirm this is true. Therefore, it is not a "gross simplification" to state that the burst pressure is predominately controlled by the tensile strength.

No FMECA

Page 68 in the peer review includes a statement by one reviewer that a FMECA should have been performed to identify all failure modes. As a part of the design process, an informal FMECA was performed to identify all possible modes of failure and to assure that failure would occur in the neck sections of the two test bodies. Since the Argonne study was a research project and not a design project, the FMECA was not included in the report.

<u>"Design Margin" Term</u>

The Argonne report uses the terms *margin of safety* and *factor-of-safety* when comparing load ratings to failure loads. Two reviewers, both from the pressure-vessel industry, strongly state that the Argonne report should use the term *design margin* rather than the terms *factor-of-safety* or *margin of safety*. *Design margin* is the term used in the pressure-vessel industry. However, different industries use different terms when describing the margin between operating loads and failure loads. For example, *stress utilization* is the most common term to describe this margin in the subsea industry.

Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments

10.0 Conclusions

The following are the important conclusions of the Argonne study. These conclusions are based on results of the elastic-plastic FEA and hydro-tests that were performed as part of this study. The conclusions apply to HPHT subsea equipment rated for 20 ksi or less. No consideration has been given to equipment rated for pressures greater than 20 ksi. However, there is no apparent reason that these conclusions would not apply to equipment rated for pressures higher than 20 ksi.

These conclusions were marginally revised after the consideration of peer-review comments. The majority of the revisions are in the discussion section after each conclusion. These revisions were made to clarify a few misunderstandings that were evident from the peer-review comments. The content of the conclusions themselves has not substantially changed.

The Division 3 elastic-plastic method is not recommended for HPHT subsea equipment as published with a 1.8 design load factor until supplementary validation is performed.

ASME, Division 3, allows a 1.8 load factor for calculating load ratings based on elastic-plastic FEA. This is lower than the 2.4 load factor allowed by ASME, Division 2. The Argonne study shows that the equivalent load factor for existing subsea equipment is about 2.1 for simple shapes. Decades of successful operating experience show that the equivalent load factor of 2.1 has produced safe, reliable subsea equipment.

Pressure-vessel experts working with ASME have determined that a 1.8 load factor is suitable for pressure vessels designed and manufactured in accordance with the rules in Division 3. The Argonne study did not consider pressure vessels and does not question the use of a 1.8 load factor for Division 3 pressure vessels.

Nonetheless, just because a 1.8 load factor is suitable for pressure vessels does not mean it is suitable for HPHT subsea equipment. Many important characteristics of HPHT subsea equipment are significantly different from pressure vessels, as acknowledged in the following quote from Section 4.2.1.4 in TR8:

"....Oilfield equipment are of complex geometry, far from a simple cylindrical pressure vessel or piping union design. They are typically subjected to a variety of extreme external loading conditions and they are not explicitly addressed in ASME BPVC......"

Another important consideration is that TR8 does not require that all the rules and requirements in Division 3 be used. TR8 adopts only a small part of Division 3.

A 1.8 load factor may produce HPHT equipment that is reliable and safe for subsea operation. However, TR8 does not provide any references validating that a 1.8 load factor is suitable for HPHT subsea equipment. Until scientific studies or tests are offered that validate the suitability of a 1.8 load factor for HPHT subsea equipment, it is recommended that a larger load factor be used for HPHT subsea equipment.

The Division 3 elastic-plastic method with a design load factor of 2.1 is recommended to calculate load ratings for HPHT subsea equipment.

This recommendation is based on the results of the Argonne study and the validation data currently available in the public domain. If scientific studies or tests exist in the public domain that validate a 1.8 load factor, then it is recommended that the TR8 committee publish a paper presenting this work so that it can be peer-reviewed. If the TR8 committee cannot do this, then the committee should commission appropriate scientific studies or tests validating that a 1.8 load factor is adequate for HPHT subsea equipment.

A Division 3 analysis with a design load factor of 1.8 is acceptable if the factor is applied to results of a load test, and validation is provided that demonstrates the additional requirements in TR8 and Division 3 sufficiently reduce the risk of failure.

Paragraph KD-1254 in Division 3 provides a procedure for rating equipment based on a proof test. This confirms that a proof test to failure is acceptable by Division 3 as a means to pressure-rate equipment.

The design load factor in Division 2 is 2.4, which is 33% greater than the design load factor of 1.8 in Division 3. ASME and TR8 state that this reduction in the margin of safety is validated by additional requirements, such as fracture mechanics in Division 3. HPHT subsea equipment in general has more complex shapes, more multibody contacts of components, and different materials as compared to pressure vessels. Before a load rating for HPHT subsea equipment is determined by dividing the test loads by a design load factor of 1.8, the user should confirm that the reduction in margin of safety has been validated.

For a Division 2 linear-elastic analysis, it is recommended that stress intensities are compared with allowable stresses and not von Mises stresses until supplementary validation is performed.

The Division 2 linear-elastic method is an acceptable method in TR8 to rate HPHT subsea equipment for pressures of 20 ksi or less. Division 2 allows that von Mises stresses be compared with allowable stresses, whereas API historically has compared stress intensities with allowable stresses.

The Argonne study revealed that the use of von Mises stresses allows higher pressure ratings for subsea equipment. Since subsea equipment has historically been rated using linear-elastic analysis with stress intensity, the design margins based on von Mises stresses will be lower than the design margins of historically successful equipment. The safety of reduced design margins based on the use of von Mises stresses should be investigated before the subsea industry makes this change. Until this issue is investigated, it is recommended that the HPHT subsea industry continue using stress intensities.

Note that this is not a question about the accuracy of von Mises stress, but about the safety of reduced margins of safety. Scientific studies and tests have confirmed that von Mises stress is a more accurate predictor of yield than stress intensity. Stress intensity is always greater than or equal to von Mises stress.

It is recommended that the subsea industry compare collapse pressures from FEA with burst pressures from hydro-tests for a variety of subsea equipment.

For numerous subsea components, the subsea industry should compare the collapse pressures from elastic-plastic FEA with the actual burst pressures from hydro-tests. This is necessary to validate the accuracy of collapse pressures by FEA. The reason for this recommendation is that
the Argonne study showed that collapse pressures from FEA were higher than burst pressures for the two test bodies that were evaluated in this study.

This is an especially concerning outcome for subsea equipment because the two test bodies in this study were simple shapes. Many subsea components have much more complex geometries, and many have geometries with multibody contacts. It is possible that more complex shapes with multibody contacts will be even less conservative than the simple shapes evaluated in this study.

The subsea industry should confirm that performing the fracture mechanics analysis required by Division 3 justifies reduction of the design load factor to 1.8.

Reduction of the design margin based on performance of fracture mechanics may not be suitable for HPHT subsea equipment. The following are two important reasons this is true:

- 1. Division 3 justifies the reduction of the design load factor based on the requirement of fracture mechanics analysis. The purpose of a fracture mechanics analysis is to ensure that defects do not propagate to the critical crack size and cause a rapid, brittle failure. This may not be a critical failure mode for subsea equipment. TR8 requires that all pressure-containing components meet the material requirements in API 6A and NACE MR0175. Material that meets the requirements of these two codes will be ductile, have high impact strengths, and have high fracture toughness. Materials with these properties are not susceptible to brittle failures. Operating history confirms that subsea equipment made of materials that meet these requirements are not susceptible to brittle failures. A reduced design margin should not be justified by requiring an analysis to prevent brittle failure if brittle fracture has historically not been a problem and is not expected to be a problem in the future.
- 2. To perform a fracture mechanics analysis, Division 3 requires a load histogram with loads in the same sequence that they will be applied in service. This is usually easy for the pressure vessels for which Division 3 was written. However, developing a load histogram with loads in the proper sequence may not be practical or perhaps even possible for HPHT subsea equipment. The reason is that the highly cyclic loads on subsea equipment capable of causing fatigue cracks are randomly applied by the environment. This means that load histograms for subsea equipment must be statistically defined in load bins with a percent occurrence time for each load bin. The sequence of application is random and unpredictable. It may be possible to convert a statistically based load histogram into a conservative sequence. However, this has not been demonstrated in a published and peer-reviewed format. This should be done before subsea equipment design margins are reduced based on fracture mechanics analysis.

Comments Outside of Peer Review Charge

One reviewer chose to go beyond the charge questions provided as guidance for the peer reviewers. Specifically this reviewer commented on the competence of the performer. There are no Argonne project team responses to these comments.

Appendix A- Cross Tabulation of Responses to Peer-Review Report Text as Tabulated in Section 4.2⁸

The following table tabulates peer review comments with the responses provided in the foregoing text. When paragraphs appear on two pages, that paragraph is referenced as one paragraph for comment tabulation purposes.

							Peer Review Report Subsection
56	56	56	56	56	56	56	Peer Review Report Page
5	5	4	4	3	2	1	Peer Review Report Paragraph
DP	DP	DP	DP	DP	DP	DP	Peer Reviewer
Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	None needed	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable
Linear-Elastic as a "Gold Standard"	Least Conservative Pressure Rating	Literature Review	Comparison of Subsea Equipment and Pressure Vessels	Literature Review	Opinions and Expanding Scope of Current Argonne Study		Response Report Subsection

⁸ Section 4.2 is peer-reviewer comments arranged by charge questions. These comments appear on pages 56-87 inclusive.

⁹ Reviewer Key: DP = Dan Peters, PB = Paul Bunch, and RB = Richard Bihl.

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
	56	5	DP	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
	56	6	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Only Two Burst Tests Performed
	56	6	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	No FMECA
	56	6	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Least Conservative Pressure Rating
	56	6	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Collapse Pressure and Strain Limit
	57	1	PB	Introduction and Background	Introduction and Background
	57	2	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Material Properties from Prolongation
	57	2	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Inaccurately Modeled Components
	57	2	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Purpose of Strain Gages
	57	2	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Elastic-Plastic Material Properties
	57	3	PB	None needed	
	58	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project)-Materials	Materials

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
	58	2	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Purpose of Strain Gages
	58	3	PB	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
	58	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Plastic Collapse and Ultimate Tensile Strength
	58	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Pressure Ratings by Hydro-test
	58	4	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Only Two Burst Tests Performed
	58	4	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Statistical Relevance
	58	5	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Performance of Burst Test Is Expensive and Dangerous
	58	5	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Statistical Relevance
	59	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Validation
	59	2	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
	59	3	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	"Design Margin" Term

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
	59	4	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	"Design Margin" Term
	59	5	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) –FEA	Independent FEA
	59	6	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) –FEA	FEA Solutions to Plastic Collapse
	59	6	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
	60	1	RB	Comments Outside of Peer Review Charge	Comments Outside of Peer Review Charge
	60	1	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	"Design Margin" Term
1.1.1	60	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Statistical Relevance
1.1.1	60	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Design and Geometry of Test Bodies	Flanges, Bolts, and Seals
1.1.1	60	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Opinions and Expanding Scope of Current Argonne Study
1.1.1	60	5	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Material Properties from Prolongation
1.1.1	60	5	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Standards Released Subsequent to BSEE Project Start

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
1.1.1	60	5	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
1.1.1	61	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Standards Released Subsequent to BSEE Project Start
1.1.1	61	2	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Material Properties from Prolongation
1.1.1	61	2	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Elastic-Plastic Material Properties
1.1.1	61	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Material Properties from Prolongation
1.1.1	61	4	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Material Properties from Prolongation
1.1.1	61	5	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
1.1.2	62	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	"Design Margin" Term
1.1.2	62	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
1.1.2	62	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Linear-Elastic as a "Gold Standard"
1.1.2	63	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
1.1.2	63	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Validation
1.1.2	63	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
1.1.2	63	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Plastic Collapse and Ultimate Tensile Strength
1.1.2	63	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
1.1.2	63	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
1.1.2	63	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
1.1.2	64	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Standards Released Subsequent to BSEE Project Start
1.1.2	64	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Von Mises Flow Rule
1.1.2	64	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Pressure Ratings by Hydro-test
1.1.2	64	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Plastic Collapse and Ultimate Tensile Strength
1.1.2	64	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
1.1.2	64	1	РВ	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Pressure Ratings by Hydro-test
1.1.2	64	2	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
1.1.3	64	3	DP	None needed	
1.1.3	64	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	FEA Solutions to Plastic Collapse
1.1.3	64	5	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
1.1.3	65	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Pressure Ratings by Hydro-test
1.1.3	65	2	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
1.1.3	65	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
1.1.3	65	4	RB	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
1.1.3	65	4	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
1.1.4	66	1	DP	None needed	
1.1.4	66	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Model Dimensions

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
1.1.4	66	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Forging Reduction at Burst Region
1.1.4	66	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Heat-Treat Quenching and Grain Structure at Burst Region
1.1.4	66	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Material Properties from Prolongation
1.1.4	66	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Design and Geometry of Test Bodies	Flanges, Bolts, and Seals
1.1.4	67	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
1.1.4	67	2	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	UY Displacement Constraint
1.1.4	67	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Von Mises Flow Rule
1.1.4	67	4	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Elastic-Plastic Material Properties
1.1.4	67	5	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Design and Geometry of Test Bodies	Flanges, Bolts, and Seals
1.1.4	67	6	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Model Dimensions

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
1.1.4	67	7	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
1.1.5	67	8	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
1.1.5	67	8	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Validation
1.1.5	68	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Purpose of Strain Gages
1.1.5	68	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Von Mises Flow Rule
1.1.5	68	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	No FMECA
1.1.5	68	4	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Purpose of Strain Gages
1.1.5	69	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Inaccurately Modeled Components
1.1.5	68	2	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
1.1.5	68	2	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Least Conservative Pressure Rating
1.1.6	68	3	PB	None needed	

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
1.1.6	68	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
1.1.6	69	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Material Properties from Prolongation
1.1.6	69	5	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Heat-Treat Quenching and Grain Structure at Burst Region
1.1.6	70	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Material Properties from Prolongation
1.1.6	70	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Post Burst Testing Material Examination
1.1.6	70	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Standards Released Subsequent to BSEE Project Start
1.1.6	70	2	PB	Forged Products Table in Report	
1.1.6	70	3	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
1.1.6	70	4	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
1.1.7	70	5	DP	None needed	
1.1.7	71	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Post-Failure Metallurgical Examination
1.1.7	71	2	DP	No welding on test articles	

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
1.1.7	71	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Forging Reduction at Burst Region
1.1.7	71	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Heat-Treat Quenching and Grain Structure at Burst Region
1.1.7	71	4	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Examination for Preexisting Defects
1.1.7	71	5	PB	None needed	
1.1.7	71	6	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Forging Reduction at Burst Region
1.1.7	71	6	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Heat-Treat Quenching and Grain Structure at Burst Region
1.1.8	72	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Elastic-Plastic Material Properties
1.1.8	72	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
1.1.8	72	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Validation
1.1.8	72	3	DP	None needed	
1.1.8	72	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Validation
1.1.8	72	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
1.1.8	72	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Statistical Relevance
1.1.8	73	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
1.1.8	73	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Material Properties from Prolongation
1.1.8	73	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Heat-Treat Quenching and Grain Structure at Burst Region
1.1.8	73	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Purpose of Strain Gages
1.1.8	73	3	PB	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
1.1.8	73	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Statistical Relevance
1.1.8	73	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
1.1.8	74	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Validation
1.1.8	74	2	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Numerical Analysis Compared to Test Results
1.1.9	74	3	DP	None needed	
1.1.9	74	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Elastic-Plastic FEA as an Allowable Method by API

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
1.1.9	75	1	DP	None needed	
1.1.9	75	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
1.1.9	75	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Least Conservative Pressure Rating
1.1.9	75	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Validation
1.1.9	75	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
1.1.9	75	5	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Elastic-Plastic FEA as an Allowable Method by API
1.1.9	76	1	DP	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
1.1.9	75	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Validation
1.1.9	76	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
1.1.9	76	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Validation
1.1.9	76	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Histogram Load Sequence
1.1.9	76	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
1.1.9	76	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Comparison of Subsea Equipment and Pressure Vessels
1.1.9	76	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Examination for Preexisting Defects
1.1.9	76	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Post-Failure Metallurgical Examination
1.1.9	77	1	PB	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
1.1.9	77	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Purpose of Strain Gages
1.1.9	77	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
1.1.9	77	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Purpose of Strain Gages
1.1.9	77	2	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
1.1.9	77	2	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Material Properties from Prolongation
1.1.9	77	2	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
2.2.1	77	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
2.2.1	77	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
2.2.1	78	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
2.2.1	78	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Elastic-Plastic Material Properties
2.2.1	78	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Mesh Sensitivity
2.2.1	78	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Design and Geometry of Test Bodies	Flanges, Bolts, and Seals
2.2.1	78	4	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Independent FEA
2.2.1	78	4	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
2.2.2	79	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Mesh Sensitivity
2.2.2	79	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Design and Geometry of Test Bodies	Shapes of Test Bodies
2.2.2	79	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Material Properties from Prolongation

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
2.2.2	79	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
2.2.2	79	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Independent FEA
2.2.2	79	5	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
2.2.2	79	6	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Design and Geometry of Test Bodies	Shapes of Test Bodies
2.2.2	79	6	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Histogram Load Sequence
2.2.2	79	7	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Model Dimensions
2.2.2	80	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Design and Geometry of Test Bodies	Flanges, Bolts, and Seals
2.2.2	80	2	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Independent FEA
2.2.2	80	2	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Elastic-Plastic Material Properties
2.2.2	80	3	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Load-Displacement Curves

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
2.2.2	80	4	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
3	80	5	DP	None needed	
3	81	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Statistical Relevance
3	81	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
3	81	2	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Von Mises Flow Rule
3	81	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Independent FEA
3	81	4	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Design and Geometry of Test Bodies	Flanges, Bolts, and Seals
3	81	5	RB	None needed	
4	82	1	DP	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
4	82	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Linear-Elastic as a "Gold Standard"
4	82	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
4	82	4	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Independent FEA

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
4	82	5	RB	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
3	82	5	RB	Comments Outside of Peer Review Charge	Comments Outside of Peer Review Charge
5	83	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Linear-Elastic as a "Gold Standard"
5	83	2	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	"Design Margin" Term
5	83	3	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Performance of Burst Test Is Expensive and Dangerous
5	83	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
5	83	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Comparison of Subsea Equipment and Pressure Vessels
5	83	4	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Proof Testing Contradiction
5	83	5	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Performance of Burst Test Is Expensive and Dangerous
5	84	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Burst Tests	Purpose of Strain Gages
5	84	2	PB	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
5	84	3	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
6	84	4	DP	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
6	84	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
6	84	4	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Validation
6	84	5	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Comparison of Subsea Equipment and Pressure Vessels
6	84	5	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
6	84	6	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
6	85	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
6	85	1	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Validation
6	85	2	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	Histogram Load Sequence
6	85	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
6	85	4	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
6	85	5	RB	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
7	86	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Statistical Relevance
7	86	2	DP	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
7	86	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
7	86	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
7	86	4	PB	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
7	86	5	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Performance of Burst Test Is Expensive and Dangerous
7	86	6	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Statistical Relevance
7	86	6	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
8	87	1	DP	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Non-pressure-Related Failure Modes
8	87	2	DP	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments	Restated Conclusions Based on Peer-Review Comments
8	87	3	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Statistical Relevance

Peer Review Report Subsection	Peer Review Report Page	Peer Review Report Paragraph	Peer Reviewer	Response Report Heading with Subsection as Applicable	Response Report Subsection
8	87	4	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
8	87	5	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Validation
8	87	5	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	Literature Review
8	87	6	PB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Validation
8	87	7	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -FEA	Elastic-Plastic Material Properties
8	87	7	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Materials	Material Properties from Prolongation
8	87	7	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Not Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project Scope)	ASME BPVC Is Guidance
8	87	8	RB	Argonne Project Team Responses (Directly Relevant to BSEE/Argonne Project) -Miscellaneous	"Design Margin" Term