

A Finite Element-Based Analysis Approach for Computing the Remaining Strength of the Pressure Equipment with a Local Thin Area Defect

Presenter: Yen-Ju Lu Advisor: Prof. Chen-hua Wang



國立高雄科技大学

National Kaohsiung University of Science and Technology

The importance of petrochemical industry and equipment





Property losses caused by catastrophic accidents are listed below :

- shutdown
- compensation
- penalize
- Environmental rehabilitation
- Other fees
- •
- Equipment is the primary control object in disaster prevention operations
- The problem with static equipment is mostly due to corrosion or other degradation mechanism that causes the strength of equipment to fall below required strength.



Df

60% of them are caused by the breakage of static equipment.

thickness = strength



- If we wish the equipment can late till this date
- Operating' conditions must be adjusted





Theoretically Method

- Is there a thing that can respondent strength of the equipment ...?
 Remaining Strength Factor
 - **1**=New, perfect strength fresh at day 1
 - **0.9**= lowest allowable strength, RSFa
- ◆ For equipment to be acceptable for continued operation

RSF≧**RSF**a

RSF is needed for assessing equipment with defect

 $\sigma_{eq,\max} \leq \sigma_y \Rightarrow healthy$

The process for doing this is called Fitness for Service This study is based on "API 579-1/ASME-1 FFS"

Type of Defects

- 1. GML
- **2. LTA**
- 3. Pitting
- 4. Dent
- 5. Gouge
- 6. ...



Ref: http://www.autsolutions.net/ProScan.html



FFS is a method for engineers and expert to assess whether the equipment with defects is acceptable.

 \rightarrow simple, practical, and accurate



- 1. L1 and L2 have limitations in use, so some situations still have to conduct by L3.
- 2. But there is currently no standardized implementation of L3.
- 3. In the FFS article, the FEM method is recommended.



The analysis can be

divided into 3 levels

Prior study : LTA analysis by FEM

- 1. Most studies found LTA difficult to use the actual profile and rather settle with a simplified profile, some with a parabolic shape and some with a rectangular cut-out. (Lee, G. H. et al., 2015., Jin-Weon Kim, 2008., Tan, W., Zhang, J. et al., 2012., Peng, J. et al., 2011., Duan, Z. X., & Shen, S. M., 2006., Xu, L. Y., & Cheng, Y. F., 2012., Hui, H., & Li, P., 2010., Tahara, T, 2003.)
- 2. A simplified finite element model with the LTA modeled as a symmetric shape and perform stress analysis on half or a quarter of the model, while some on a simplified 2D model, all for the purpose of saving computing time.(Lee, Geon Ho, et al. 2015) (Peng, Jian, et al., 2011) (Duan, Zhi-Xiang et al., 2006) (Bao, S. et al., 2019.



(Ref : Safety assessment of pipes with multiple local wall thinning defects under pressure and bending moment.,2011)

The fact is that the LTA is not regular, symmetric, and the weakest spot is located somewhere within the LTA.

The LTA model should not be replaced with any sort of simplified shape when used in assessing the remaining strength.



We aim is to develop a standardized Level 3 method that meets the API 579 evaluation criteria based on FEM to more accurately measure the remaining strength of the LTA.

Experimental object description(1/4)-equipment



7

main model		_
parameter	Unit	
Nominal thickness	mm	31.75
Inner diameter	mm	762
Equipment high	mm	6096
t _{min}	mm	25.40
Design Pressure	MPa	3.93
Design Temperature	оС	343
Material specification		SA-516 Grade 70



Experimental object description(2/4)-defect

8

M3 M2 M1

			31.7 ←	5mm →												
		C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C_CTP			
۶۸	M1	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21]↑ \		
Ē	M2	29.21	25.40	25.91	26.67	24.89	25.40	24.64	24.13	24.64	25.40	29.21	24.13			
Ľ.	M3	29.21	24.64	24.89	23.37	22.86	23.37	24.13	23.37	24.13	24.38	29.21	22.86			
'nΨ	M4	29.21	25.40	24.13	22.10	22.10	22.61	23.62	22.86	23.37	25.40	29.21	22.1			
	M5	29.21	24.38	23.62	21.59	21.84	21.84	22.86	22.10	22.86	24.38	29.21	21.59			
-	M6	29.21	25.91	23.37	21.34	22.10	22.35	21.08	22.61	23.37	25.91	29.21	21.08			
	M7	29.21	24.89	23.88	21.84	22.61	22.10	21.59	22.86	22.86	24.89	29.21	21.59			
	M8	29.21	25.40	24.13	23.88	21.84	22.61	23.37	23.88	23.37	25.40	29.21	21.84	U		
	M9	29.21	24.38	23.37	23.37	22.10	23.37	24.64	22.86	24.13	24.38	29.21	22.1			
	M10	29.21	25.40	24.64	24.13	23.37	24.89	25.40	26.67	25.40	25.40	29.21	23.37		1	
	M11	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21	29.21			
	L_CTP	29.21	24.38	23.37	21.34	21.84	21.84	21.08	22.1	22.86	24.38	29.21	(<i>in</i>)] /		
	✓ S=317.5mm ///////////////////////////////////															
	 A defect from the equipment by NDE. We used a grid method to obtain a detailed thickness distribution of defect. Longitudinally and circumferentially measure 11 points, ar the spacing is 31.75 mm. 															

4. This defect is a square defect,



2.Defect submodel



3.Analysis-PCL & 4. RSF





Result

 To ensure the convergence of numerical analysis, a relative error method is used herein to make sure the element size is proper, and the result of PCL converges.



 the 14,400 elements model is selected to use throughout the whole study.

	Main model	defect submodel
Collapse load (MPa)	13.2379	11.9279
RSF	1.000	0.901





Conclusion

- This study develop a standardized Level-3 method that complies with API 579 evaluation criteria. It is an analytical method without any simplification so that the true remaining strength of the structure can be obtained.
- There are several important results obtained herein.
 - 1. The rendering method of real LTA is proposed.
 - 2. Submodel analysis of LTA is performed.
 - 3. PCL calculation procedure of a defect is proposed.







