

JD Roche

From: Andy Parker
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2004 10:34 AM
To: Document Control
Subject: FW: Flowline Break
Categories: 30-008-8, CP54-011

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

From: Thillet, Marielle [mailto:marielle.thillet@encana.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2004 3:50 PM
To: Eric Theriault
Cc: Andy Parker; Beth Vardy; friederike.kirstein@ec.gc.ca; Farrell, Hugh; Trask, David
Subject: RE: Flowline Break

Hi Eric,

Please see below the details requested on the break in the Cohasset flowline. It is also worth noting that the flowline flushing programs were designed with the consideration that the preservation fluid could be released to the ocean without adverse environmental impact. Hence the original screening of the preservation chemicals through the Offshore Chemical Selection Guidelines.

It was determined during the 2003 riser fluid sampling program that the Cohasset Export Flowline was likely "open to the sea" and the cause was unknown.

During the 2004 subsea ROV survey :

1. It was determined that the integrity of the blind flange that was installed on the Cohasset PLEM was compromised. This blind flange was installed during the 1997 Extended Cohasset Project (ECP) by divers and was confirmed by reviewing both the project daily reports and diver log records. The 1998 subsea inspection tape for the Cohasset PLEM was reviewed and the blind flange was observed. The reason for the blind flange condition in 2004 is due to improper fastening technique during 1997.
2. The PLEM valve was not observed because it was covered and thus it could not be confirmed if the valve was open or closed. The ECP project daily reports and diver log records were reviewed and there was no mention that the divers closed the PLEM valve. The 1998 subsea inspection tape for the Cohasset PLEM was reviewed and the PLEM valve was not observed as it was covered with what appears to be either a significant amount of marine growth or an artificial seamat. If this marine growth or seamat was present in 1997 (as one would likely expect) then the ROV would be unable to close the PLEM valve. The ECP document 96-ES-104 "Export System Relocation Program" was reviewed and no mention of either closing the PLEM valve or installing a blind flange was mentioned in the procedures.
3. No other indication of damage or break to the remainder of the flowline was observed.

Thus, the most likely reason for the Cohasset Export Flowline being "open to the sea" is that the integrity of the blind flange on the Cohasset PLEM has been compromised (confirmed) and the PLEM valve was not closed (unconfirmed). It could not be determined from available records what method was initially intended to be used for blocking the PLEM end (i.e. valve only, blind only or both valve and blind).

I hope that answers your question.

Regards,

Marielle.

11/2/2004

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

From: Eric Theriault [mailto:etheriault@cnsopb.ns.ca]

Sent: Friday, October 15, 2004 9:40 PM

To: Thillet, Marielle

Cc: Andy Parker; Beth Vardy; friederike.kirstein@ec.gc.ca

Subject: Flowline Break

Hello Marielle:

Could you provide some details (cause? lessons learned?) on the break in the Cohasset flowline.

Eric