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Directed Inspection and Maintenance (DI&M): Agenda

- Methane Losses
- Methane Recovery
- Is Recovery Profitable?
- Industry Experience
- Discussion Questions
Methane Losses by Equipment Type

- Compressor Seals: 23.4%
- Connectors: 24.4%
- Valves: 26.0%
- Blowdowns: 0.8%
- Crankcase Vents: 4.2%
- Control Valves: 4.0%
- Open-Ended Lines: 11.1%
- Pressure Relief Valves: 3.5%
- Orifice Meters: 0.1%
- Other Flow Meters: 0.2%
- Pump Seals: 1.9%
- Pressure Regulators: 0.4%

Source: Clearstone Engineering, 2002
What is the Problem?

Gas leaks are **invisible, unregulated** and **go unnoticed**.

Gas STAR Partners find that valves, connectors, compressor seals and open-ended lines (OELs) are major sources.

- 27 Bcf of methane emitted per year by reciprocating compressors seals and OELs, each contributing equally to the emissions.
What are the Sources of Emissions?
# How Much Methane is Emitted?

## Methane Emissions from Leaking Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Type</th>
<th>% of Total Methane Emissions</th>
<th>% Leaks</th>
<th>Estimated Average Methane Emissions per Leaking Component (Mcf/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valves (Block &amp; Control)</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectors</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-Ended Lines</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure Relief Valves</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Much Methane is Emitted?

A total of 101,193 components were screened at four processing plants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant No.</th>
<th>Gas Losses From Top 10 Leakers (Mcfd)</th>
<th>Gas Losses From All Equipment Leakers (Mcfd)</th>
<th>Contribution By Top 10 Leakers (%)</th>
<th>Contribution By Total Leakers (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>122.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>206.5</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>224.1</td>
<td>352.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>211.3</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>477.8</td>
<td>892.84</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Excluding leakage into flare system
Methane Recovery

- Fugitive losses can be dramatically reduced by implementing a DI&M program
  - Voluntary program to identify and fix leaks that are cost effective to repair
  - Survey cost will pay out in the first year
  - Provides valuable data on leakers with information of where to look
What is DI&M?

- Direct Inspection and Maintenance
  - Cost-effective practice by definition
  - Find and fix significant leaks
  - Choice of leak detection technologies
  - Strictly tailored to company’s needs

- DI&M is NOT the regulated volatile organic compound (VOC) leak detection and repair (LDAR) program
How Do You Implement DI&M?

1. **CONDUCT** baseline survey
2. **SCREEN and MEASURE** leaks
3. **FIX** on the spot leaks
4. **ESTIMATE** repair cost, fix to a payback criteria
5. **DEVELOP** a plan for future DI&M
6. **RECORD** savings/REPORT to Gas STAR
### Screening and Measurement

#### Summary of Screening and Measurement Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument/Technique</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Approximate Capital Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soap Solution</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Gas Detectors</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustic Detection/Ultrasound Detection</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVA (FID)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagging</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Volume Sampler</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotameter</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrared Detection</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Least effective at screening/measurement
*** - Most effective at screening/measurement

$ - Smallest capital cost

$$ - Large capital cost

$** - Largest capital cost
How Do You Implement DI&M?

- Evaluate the leaks detected - measure results
  - High Volume Sampler
  - Toxic Vapor Analyzer (correlation factors)
  - Rotameters
  - Calibrated bag
## Is Recovery Profitable?

### Repair the Cost Effective Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Value of Lost Gas ($\dagger$)</th>
<th>Estimated Repair Cost ($)</th>
<th>Payback (Months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plug Valve: Valve Body</td>
<td>29,496</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union: Fuel Gas Line</td>
<td>28,362</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threaded Connection</td>
<td>24,374</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Piece: Rod Packing</td>
<td>17,847</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-Ended Line</td>
<td>16,238</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressor Seals</td>
<td>13,493</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate Valve</td>
<td>11,034</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\dagger Based on $7/Mcf gas price
DI&M - Lessons Learned

- A successful, cost-effective DI&M program requires measurement of the leaks.
- A high volume sampler is an effective tool for quantifying leaks and identifying cost-effective repairs.
- Open-ended lines, compressor seals, blowdown, engine-starter and pressure relief valves represent <3% of components but >60% of methane emissions.
- The business of leak detection has changed dramatically with new technology.
DI&M - Industry Experience

Partner A: Leaking cylinder head was tightened, which reduced the methane emissions from almost 64,000 Mcf/year to 3,300 Mcf/year
- Repair required 9 man-hours of labor
- Gas savings were approximately 60,700 Mcf/year
- Value of gas saved was $424,900/year at $7/Mcf

Partner B: One-inch pressure relief valve emitted almost 36,774 Mcf/year
- Required five man-hours of labor and $125 of materials
- Value of the gas saved was $257,400 at $7/Mcf
Discussion Questions

- To what extent are you implementing these opportunities?
- How could these opportunities be improved upon or altered for use in your operation?
- Can you suggest other methods for reducing emissions from leaking components?
- What are the barriers (technological, economic, lack of information, manpower, etc.) that are preventing you from implementing these practices?