

**GHG Emission Factor Development Project for Selected
Sources in the Natural Gas Industry**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Cooperative Agreement No. XA-83376101
awarded to The University of Texas at Austin

Quarterly Progress Report

Reporting Period: January 1, 2011 through March 31, 2011

Submitted to

Lisa Hanle, Project Officer
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue (6207J)
Washington, DC 20460

Prepared by

David T. Allen, Principal Investigator
The University of Texas at Austin
10100 Burnet Rd., M.S. R7100
Austin, TX 78758

June 13, 2011

Project Overview

Methane (CH₄) is the primary component of natural gas and is also a potent greenhouse gas (GHG). Emissions of CH₄ from natural gas production, processing, and distribution are among the top ten source categories of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States, expressed on a CO₂ equivalent basis. The overall goal of the project is to update default CH₄ emission factors for selected processes and equipment used in the natural gas industry. The default emission factors will be updated by compiling and synthesizing existing data for a variety of source categories and by acquiring new emission rate measurement data for selected sources where existing data have unacceptably large uncertainties or are insufficiently representative of current practices or equipment.

The project is organized into four tasks:

- *Task 1, Data Synthesis and Gap Analysis:* The purposes of this task are to: (1) identify, compile, and synthesize existing CH₄ emission factor and activity factor data; (2) critically review the quality and representativeness of the existing data; (3) recommend and prioritize emission source characteristics for new data collection efforts under Task 3.
- *Task 2, Technical Plan Development:* The purpose of this task is to develop technical work plans and detailed cost estimates for conducting data collection and measurement studies aimed at filling the emission data gaps identified in Task 1. In doing so, we will consider the range of potential activity data metrics that could be used for updating default emission factors and gather preliminary data on relevant metrics to ensure that all the major subgroups of equipment or processes are taken into account.
- *Task 3, Measurements and Analysis:* The purposes of this task are to: (1) execute the technical plans developed in Task 2, contingent on authorization by EPA; and (2) analyze the resulting data to develop new default emission factors and uncertainty estimates for the measured sources.
- *Task 4, Reporting and Dissemination:* The purpose of this task is to report on the default emission factors developed in Tasks 1 and 3 of this study, including the methods used in the process. Reporting and communication with stakeholders will be integrated into all of the tasks and a final reporting will disseminate project results.

Progress on Tasks

Task 1

A draft review of sources of emission factor and/or activity factor data that may have relevance to the natural gas sources of interest was prepared at the end of 2008. A series of stakeholder conference calls to solicit input on the report were organized (calls were held beginning in January, 2009) and an updated literature review was prepared. The updated review, dated March 31, 2009, was posted to the project web site:

(<http://www.utexas.edu/research/ceer/GHG/tasks.htm>)

On a subsequent conference call (May 12, 2009), stakeholders identified additional reports and reports that, while not currently available, would likely become available during the lifetime of the project. These reports will be incorporated into the Task 1 report as they emerge, so the report will continue to be updated throughout the project.

Task 2

During the first quarter of 2009 a work plan specifying methods and procedures for gathering additional data needed for updating factors used for estimating methane emissions from centrifugal and reciprocating compressors used in natural gas transmission and processing was drafted. A series of stakeholder conference calls to solicit input on the plan were organized (calls were held beginning in January, 2009). A second draft of the work plan was added to the project web site: (<http://www.utexas.edu/research/ceer/GHG/tasks.htm>). During the third quarter, final updates were made to the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) for compressor sampling, in anticipation of sampling beginning in the fourth quarter of 2009 and the first quarter of 2010. The QAPP for compressor sampling was approved in late October, prior to sampling in November.

Task 3

During the second and third quarters of 2009, the focus was on identifying compressor sampling sites. At least 4 different companies considered opening multiple sites to the study team. During the fourth quarter of 2009, site access agreements were finalized with two companies that provided initial sampling sites. The University has also procured additional liability insurance for sampling.

The compressor station sampling techniques were as follows:

- Station Fugitive screening by FLIR camera (non-quantitative)
- Fugitive measurement on found leakers by High Volume Sampler device
- Vent Measurement by alternate methods (pitot tube, anemometer, or calibrated bag)

Sampling at the first group of sites in east Texas, all belonging to a single company, occurred for a week in November, 2009. A second week of sampling occurred in February, 2010, at a group of sites belonging to a different company in west Texas. The strategy in conducting the sampling was to collect as much data as possible at the sites, using three different types of instruments, and to perform a cost analysis of the sampling program. Measurements included compressor related fugitive components (flanges, valves, open-ended-lines, pressure relief valves) as well as blowdown vent lines and compressor seal and rod packing emissions, the latter which were measured by anemometer and calibrated bag techniques. Table 1 describes the instruments that were deployed at the sites.

Table 1. Summary of sampling done to date

Ownership of site	Type/Number of Compressors	Date sampled	IR Screening	Hi Flow on Component leaks	Vent pipes measured
Company 1	Recip./6	11/3/09	√	√	√
Company 1	Recip./5	11/4/09	√	√	√
Company 1	Centrif./3	11/3/09	√	√	√
Company 2	Recip.	2/23/10	√	√	√
Company 2	Recip.	2/24/10	√	√	√

The most significant findings in this first round of sampling were high emission rates for some compressor vent pipes and emission rate variability in the vent pipes, summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Emissions from compressor vents

	scfm*	Mscfy**	GRI/EPA Data Mscf/compressor/year
Company 1 (3 sites)			
Average blowdown vent for compressors at idle	1.33	699	3683
Average blowdown vent for compressors running and idle	30.03	15,787	
Average packing vent	15.94	8,379	396
Company 2 (2 sites)			
Average blowdown vent for compressors at idle	27.30	14,347	3683
Average blowdown vent for compressors running	16.76	8,807	
Average packing vent	26.25	13,798	396

*standard cubic feet per minute

**thousand standard cubic feet per year

The overall emissions from fugitive emissions from valves, flanges, and other sources are reported as an average over all five sites in Table 3.

Table 3. Fugitive emissions from valves, flanges and other components

	scfm*	Mscfy**	GRI/EPA Data Mscf/ recip. compressor/year
Pressurized idle	0.114	60	180 per Recip compr;
Operating	0.091	48	
Average	0.099	52	

*standard cubic feet per minute

**thousand standard cubic feet per year

As was found in the previous GRI/EPA study, the largest single emission sources at a compressor station site are the compressor blowdown (BD) vent lines and the compressor seal vents. These remain the largest sources in the sampling for this project. For compressor vent lines, measurements at the Company 2 stations exceeded the values previously reported for the GRI/EPA study. However, measurements at the Company 1 stations had lower values for idle reciprocating compressors. One potential reason for the variability in compressor vent emissions at idle is differences in practices for pressurizing compressors at idle. Figure 1 shows a representation of a typical compressor blowdown line configuration. When compressors are idle

and pressurized, the small (often 2 inch size) valve to the open vent is the only open-ended line (OEL) leak point. However, if the compressor is isolated from the suction and discharge lines and blown-down, the OEL leak points are the very large suction and discharge block valves, which can leak at a much higher rate.




Figure 1. Compressor blowdown line configuration

At the Company 1 stations, the practice for idle compressors was to leave the compressor pressurized. This reduces leakage through the compressor BD line versus other practices.

While no statistical analysis have yet been made, it is unlikely that the data collected at the first two sites are statistically sufficient to replace the previous GRI/EPA data, which made direct measurements of the high emission components at 15 stations, and which gathered other activity data on a much larger sample set. Specifically, the values are the result of an average of zeros and a few high values, which would lead to high uncertainty limits. It was concluded that more stations would have to be visited across a broader geographic area to cover a representative sample of US transmission compressor stations and their operating practices.

During the first quarter of 2011, the project team made arrangements to visit sites provided by a new volunteer company participant. Multiple sites were offered; sites in New Mexico were selected because the volunteer company could provide many sites that could be sampled in one week from one base of operation. The available sites were production gathering stations; although not transmission sites, much of their compression equipment is of the same make and size as transmission sites and so should be comparable to transmission station data.

As will be described in the next quarterly report, the trip was made May 9-13, 2011. Six facilities were visited and measured for compressor seal emissions (rod packing leaks or centrifugal wet seal gas emissions), and for compressor blowdown line leakage. Three (3) gathering compressor stations were visited with medium sized reciprocating compressors (1500 HP), these data will be

reported, however, these are much smaller than transmission station reciprocating compressors, and the data is likely not comparable. One large centrifugal gathering station was visited and two natural gas processing plants were visited where the resid gas compressors were measured. These last three facilities should be comparable to transmission compressors.

In addition to our regular vent rate measurement equipment (anemometers, calibrated bags), the team also brought along a "through-valve acoustic leak detection device" as allowed by the new GHGRP Subpart W for gas plant and transmission compressors. A representative of the acoustic device manufacturer attended the tests. Dual measurements were taken, where possible, with both the acoustic device and the direct flow measurements.

Plans for Next Quarter

Task 1

The literature review will be updated, as appropriate, on an on-going basis.

Task 3

The measurement team has been working on the data and internal technical review, and has completed the draft results for the May data collection. Initial results of comparison between the direct measurement methods and the acoustic method indicate very little correlation exists. Because of common piping, some measurement data could only be taken on joined vents, rather than on individual compressors. We expect to review draft analysis for the project in late June, and to EPA thereafter.