
From: GPB, GC1/GC2/Fld Proc Engr
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2001 05:45 AM
To: GPB, Fld AMC
Subject: FW: MOC Velocity change & Removal of additional corrosion inhibitor

Attachments: FW: Operational Limits for Management of Erosion and Corrosion

Jerry
here is the gist of it.
Richard

-----Original Message-----

From: GPB, Ops Mgr
Sent: Saturday, October 13, 2001 10:59 PM
To: Demby, Richard A; Powell, Jim E
Cc: GPB, Fld TL; GPB, FS1 TL; GPB, FS2 TL; GPB, FS3/GC3 TL; NSU, CIC TL; GPB, Prod Opt TL
Subject: MOC Velocity change & Removal of additional corrosion inhibitor

Richard and Jim,
I was wondering if you guys would take the lead on putting together the MOC raising the allowable erosional flow velocity for the WOA to match that used on the EOA. Attached is the recommendation sent to Ruth and I in August by the CIC Group. If you need additional information or insight from me, let me know. If you have any other questions, please give Dominic or John a call.

Thanks in advance for your assistance,
Jack

-----Original Message-----

From: NSU, CIC TL
Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2001 1:58 PM
To: GPB, Ops Mgr; GPB, Prod Opt TL; GPB, Gas Lift Engr
Cc: Woollam, Richard C; G SST Corr Engrs
Subject: Removal of additional corrosion inhibitor

Jack, Hal & Russ,

We have made the decision to stop the practice of adding extra corrosion inhibitor to mitigate corrosion at elevated flow velocities, in order to meet our 2001 budget.

The practice of adding extra chemical was introduced last year and enabled CIC and Operations to raise the allowable flow velocities by 25 ft/sec and therefore increase production. In the new unified velocity guidelines we proposed dropping this program as it is inefficient, both in terms of chemical management and time. Our proposed guidelines allow for elevated flow velocities typically 10 to 15 ft/sec higher than the old guidelines without the requirement for additional chemical to be added proactively; rather we will add extra corrosion inhibitor in response to observed corrosion through our monitoring programs, as we have always done. The new guidelines also recommend raising the allowable erosional flow velocity (V/V_e) from 2.0 to 2.5, thereby increasing production. I believe therefore that implementation of the new guidelines should be broadly production neutral, relative to the current status although Russ will know much better.

As the proposed guidelines have not been formally adopted, the removal of the extra chemical program will return us to the previous default velocity limits. There will clearly be a production impact associated with this and therefore we should re-visit the recommendations to see if and when we can implement them. To quote from the recommendations:

"It should be recognized that these are only recommendations; unlike other operational parameters such as temperature

and pressure, there are no codified limits for flow velocity and therefore you may accept or reject these recommendations. These recommendations are presented as appropriate technical limits that aim to maintain the integrity of equipment whilst enabling high production rates and minimizing operational costs such as chemical consumption and equipment repair or replacement."

What this means in practice is that *CIC* and Operations can work together to implement a program quickly that meets the main requirements of the guidelines while maintaining production and this should probably be done via an MoC. Let me know how you want to proceed,



FW: Operational
Limits for Man...

Cheers,

Dominic
Dominic Paisley
North Slope Team Leader
Corrosion, Inspection & Chemicals Team
BPX Alaska
E-mail: nsucictl@bp.com
Phone: +1 (907) 659 5050
Fax: +1 (907) 659 5152
Pager: +1 (907) 659 5100, pager 2267