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Compressors: Agenda

- Methane Losses from Reciprocating Compressors
- Methane Savings through Economic Rod Packing Replacement
- Is Rod Packing Replacement Profitable?
- Methane Losses from Centrifugal Compressors
- Methane Savings through Dry Seals
- Is Wet Seal Replacement Profitable?
- Directed Inspection and Maintenance (DI&M) at Compressor Stations
- Discussion Questions
Oil & Gas Methane Emissions Without Gas STAR Program (2003)

- **Production**
  - Emissions: 148 Bcf
  - Reductions: 24 Bcf

- **Transmission / Storage**
  - Emissions: 101 Bcf
  - Reductions: 18 Bcf

- **Distribution**
  - Emissions: 68 Bcf
  - Reductions: 7 Bcf

- **Processing**
  - Emissions: 36 Bcf
  - Reductions: 1 Bcf

- **Oil Downstream**
  - Emissions: 2 Bcf

Compressor Methane Emissions
What is the problem?

- Methane emissions from the ~45,000 compressors in the natural gas industry account for 86 Bcf/yr or about 28% of all methane emissions from the natural gas industry.
Methane Losses from Reciprocating Compressors

- Reciprocating compressor rod packing leaks some gas by design
  - Newly installed packing may leak 60 cubic feet per hour (cf/hr)
  - Worn packing has been reported to leak up to 900 cf/hr

Reciprocating Compressor Rod Packing

- A series of flexible rings fit around the shaft to prevent leakage
- Leakage may still occur through nose gasket, between packing cups, around the rings and between rings and shaft
Methane Losses from Rod Packing

| Emission from Running Compressor | 870 Mcf/year-packing |
| Emission from Idle/Pressurized Compressor | 1270 Mcf/year-packing |
| Leakage from Packing Cup | 690 Mcf/year-packing |
| Leakage from Distance Piece | 300 Mcf/year-packing |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leakage from Rod Packing on Running Compressors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packing Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leak Rate (Mcf/yr)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leakage from Rod Packing on Idle/Pressurized Compressors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packing Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leak Rate (Mcf/yr)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cost Effective Leak Mitigation at Natural Gas Transmission Compressor Stations – PRCI/ GRI/ EPA

Methane Savings Through Economic Rod Packing Replacement

- Assess costs of replacements
  - A set of rings: $500 to $800
  - (with cups and case) $1500 to $2500
  - Rods: $1800 to $10000
  - Special coatings such as ceramic, tungsten carbide, or chromium can increase rod costs
- Determine economic replacement threshold
- Partners can determine economic threshold for all replacements

Economic Replacement Threshold (Economic formula): \( OR \cdot DF \cdot 1,000 \)

\[ OR = \text{Cost of replacement ($)} \]
\[ DF = \frac{H \cdot GF}{(1+I)^H} \]
\[ H = \text{Hours of compressor operation per year} \]
\[ GF = \text{Gas price ($/Mcf)} \]

Where:

- OR = Cost of replacement ($)
- DF = Discount factor \((I)\) @ interest \(I\)
- H = Hours of compressor operation per year
- GF = Gas price ($/Mcf)
Is Rod Packing Replacement Profitable?

- Periodically measure leakage increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rings Only</th>
<th>Rod and Rings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rings:</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas:</td>
<td>$10/Mcf</td>
<td>$10/Mcf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating:</td>
<td>8,000 hrs/yr</td>
<td>8,000 hrs/yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leak Reduction Expected (scfh)</th>
<th>Payback (yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leak Reduction Expected (scfh)</th>
<th>Payback (yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on 10% interest rate
Mcf = thousand cubic feet, scfh = standard cubic feet per hour

Methane Losses from Centrifugal Compressors

- Centrifugal compressor wet seals leak little gas at the seal face
  - Seal oil degassing may vent 40 to 200 cubic feet per minute (cf/m) to the atmosphere
  - A Natural Gas STAR partner reported wet seal emissions of 75 Mcf/day (52 cf/m)
Centrifugal Compressor Wet Seals

- High pressure seal oil circulates between rings around the compressor shaft
- Gas absorbs in the oil on the inboard side
- Little gas leaks through the oil seal
- Seal oil degassing vents methane to the atmosphere

Gas STAR Partners Reduce Emissions with Dry Seals

- Dry seal springs press the stationary ring in the seal housing against the rotating ring when the compressor is not rotating
- At high rotation speed, gas is pumped between the seal rings creating a high pressure barrier to leakage
- Only a very small amount of gas escapes through the gap
- 2 seals are often used in tandem
- Can operate for compressors up to 3,000 psig safely
Methane Savings through Dry Seals

- Dry seals typically leak at a rate of only 0.5 to 3 cf/m
- Significantly less than the 40 to 200 cf/m emissions from wet seals
- Gas savings translate to approximately $160,000 to $930,000 at $10/Mcf

Economics of Replacing Seals

- Compare costs and savings for a 6-inch shaft beam compressor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Dry Seal ($)</th>
<th>Wet Seal ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal costs (2 dry @ $10,000/shaft-inch, w/testing)</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal costs (2 wet @ $5,000/shaft-inch)</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs (engineering, equipment installation)</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Implementation Costs</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual O&amp;M</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Methane Emissions (@ $10/Mcf; 8,000 h/yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 dry seals at a total of 6 scfm</td>
<td>$28,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 wet seals at a total of 100 scfm</td>
<td></td>
<td>$480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs Over 5-Year Period</td>
<td>$434,000</td>
<td>$2,825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dry Seal Savings Over 5 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>$2,391,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methane Emissions Reductions (Mcf; at 45,120 Mcf/yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>225,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Flowsserve Corporation
Is Wet Seal Replacement Profitable?

- Replacing wet seals in a 6 inch shaft beam compressor operating 8,000 hr/yr
  - Net Present Value = $1,729,000
    - Assuming a 10% discount over 5 years
  - Internal Rate of Return = 233%
  - Payback Period = 6 months
    - Ranges from 3 to 13 months based on wet seal leakage rates between 40 and 200 cf/m

- Economics are better for new installations
  - Vendors report that 90% of compressors sold to the natural gas industry are centrifugal with dry seals

Directed Inspection and Maintenance at Compressor Stations

- 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
  - Facility fugitive methane emissions depend on operating practices, equipment age and maintenance
Natural Gas Losses by Equipment Type

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

Clearstone Engineering, 2002

Methane Losses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant No.</th>
<th>Gas Losses From Top 10 Leakers (Mcf/d)</th>
<th>Gas Losses From All Equipment Leakers (Mcf/d)</th>
<th>Contribution By Top 10 Leakers (%)</th>
<th>Percent of Plant Components that Leak</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>

Excluding leakage into flare system
How Can These Losses Be Reduced?

- Implementing a Directed Inspection and Maintenance (DI&M) Program

What is a DI&M Program?

- Voluntary program to identify and fix leaks that are cost-effective to repair
- Outside of mandatory LDAR
- Survey cost will pay out in the first year
- Provides valuable data on leakers
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
$$ - Largest capital cost

Cost-Effective Repairs

Repair the Cost Effective Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Value of Lost Gas ($)</th>
<th>Estimated Repair Cost ($)</th>
<th>Payback (Months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plug Valve: Valve Body</td>
<td>42,137</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union: Fuel Gas Line</td>
<td>40,517</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threaded Connection</td>
<td>34,820</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Piece: Rod Packing</td>
<td>25,496</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-Ended Line</td>
<td>23,197</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressor Seals</td>
<td>19,276</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate Valve</td>
<td>15,763</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on $10/Mcf gas price
How Much Gas Can Be Saved?

Natural Gas STAR Lessons Learned study for DI&M at compressor stations estimates

- Potential Average Gas Savings ~ 29,000 Mcf/yr/compressor station
- Value of gas saved ~ $290,000 per compressor station (at gas price of $10/Mcf)
- Average initial implementation cost ~ $26,000 per compressor station

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 compressors?
- What are the barriers (technological, economic, lack of information, regulatory, focus, manpower, etc.) that are preventing you from implementing these practices?