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Degradation and renewal of water distribution pipes

• Replacement of water pipes: important expenditures
  – e.g. Burn et al. (2007): annual worldwide expenditure for water distribution pipes > US$ 33,000 million/year
  – should rise significantly in the future as existing assets increasingly come to the end of their useful lives

• Most of small diameter pipes installed < 1990 = metallic (ductile or gray cast iron)
Corrosion of water distribution pipes

Cast iron pipes (installation)

Corrosion over time
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Consequences of corrosion

- Increased frequency / probability of pipe breaks and leaks
- Increased costs + interruptions in water supply

**Solutions:**

- replace?
- repair?
- which pipes?
- when?

Source: http://video.monteregie.hebdosregionaux.ca

Source: http://www.cfgservices.fr
Existing tools to plan the renewal

• Prediction models and planning tools:
  – assess the required financial resources
  – prioritizing pipes that should be replaced and/or rehabilitated

• Decision to replace / repair a specific pipe:
  • requires assessment of its conditions
    ➢ observed breaks and leaks (indicators)
    ➢ observations from inspection
RFEC technique for the inspection of water distribution pipes

- Remote Field Eddy Current:
  - application well known for the identification and sizing of defects in metallic gas distribution pipes
  - can be applied to water distribution pipes

RFEC technique for the inspection of water distribution pipes

- Exciter transmits a low frequency magnetic field that can reach receivers by two paths:
  1. inside the pipe through the water (direct path)
  2. through the outside of the pipe (indirect path)

- Strength of magnetic field attenuated rapidly in direct path:
  - at ≈ two pipe diameters from exciter, indirect field dominates the direct field: the remote field zone begins
RFEC technique for the inspection of water distribution pipes

- Variations of wall thickness at the locations where the magnetic field goes through the pipe modify phase and/or amplitude of the signal
  - can be translated into wall thickness reduction and spatial extent of the detected flaw

- Does not measure the actual pipe-wall thickness: evaluation of the material loss percentage
Objective and general methodology

**Objective:** Assess the performance of an existing RFEC probe for the inspection of cast iron water pipes

1. Inspect 6 pipes with the probe

2. Compare size and location of corrosion defects estimations with values resulting from the processing of computed tomography (CT) images of the same pipes
## Analyzed pipes (excavated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated date of installation</th>
<th>Estimated age at inspection (years)</th>
<th>Diameter (mm)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Average wall thickness (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW-PIPE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILL-MAG-1A</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-MAN-1A</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-MAN-1B</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-MAN-2A</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-MAN-2B</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHSTCH-MC</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHSTCH-HOP</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- RFEC probe passed once in each pipe (laboratory = air)
- Comparison with *in situ* inspection for one pipe
## Inspection results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defect</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Thickness loss</th>
<th>Sensitivity zone coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-MAN-1A</strong></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-MAN-1B</strong></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-MAN-2A</strong></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-MAN-2B</strong></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LHSTCH-MC</strong></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LHSTCH-HOP</strong></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![NDT Diagram](image.png)
Condition evaluation with the CT scan

• Based on Lambert-Beer law:

\[ N = N_0 e^{-\mu x} \]

\( N \) = measured intensity after layer of thickness \( x \);

\( N_0 \) = incident radiation intensity (usually in keV);

\( \mu \) = linear attenuation coefficient \( \rightarrow \) depends linearly on the density of the material

• Output from CT scan computer:

\[ HU = \frac{\mu - \mu_{water}}{\mu_{water}} \times 1000 \]

• When viewed in Matlab:

\[ \text{pixel \_value} = \frac{HU + 10240}{10} \]
Condition evaluation with the CT scan

- Based on Lambert-Beer law:
  \[ N = \text{measured intensity after layer of thickness } x; \]
  \[ N_0 = \text{incident radiation intensity (usually in keV)}; \]
  \[ \mu = \text{linear attenuation coefficient} \]
  \[ \mu \rightarrow \text{depends linearly on the density of the material} \]

- Output from CT scan computer:

- When viewed in Matlab:

\[
pixel\_value = \frac{HU + 10240}{10}
\]

NDT in Canada 2017 Conference (June 6-8, 2017)
Condition evaluation with the CT scan

- Based on Lambert-Beer law:
  \[ N = \frac{N_0}{1 + \mu d} \]
  - \( N_0 \): incident radiation intensity (usually in keV);
  - \( \mu \) is the linear attenuation coefficient (depends linearly on the density of the material)

- Output from CT scan computer:

- When viewed in Matlab:

  \[
  \text{pixel \_value} = \frac{HU + 10240}{10}
  \]

Source: http://mriquestions.com/gibbs-artifact.html

NDT in Canada 2017 Conference (June 6-8, 2017)
Condition evaluation with the CT scan

- **Objective, to compare with the RFEC tool:**
  1. pipe thickness loss = percentage of lost material on 100 mm sensitivity zones, all along the pipes
  2. spatial extent of this loss

- **Steps:**
  1. Correction of artifacts
  2. Estimation of the mean percentage of material loss for 100 mm by 360° zones
  3. Estimation of the worst percentage of material loss on specific proportions of these 100 mm by 360° sensitivity zones
Correction of artifacts

\[ \rho v_{\text{reg}} = A + B \exp(-Cx) \]

\[ \Delta \rho v = B \exp(-Cx) \]

\[ \rho v_{\text{corr}} = \rho v - \Delta \rho v \]
Estimation of mean percentage of material loss

i. Compute mean corrected pixel value across the pipe wall for 180 different angles (2° apart)
Estimation of mean percentage of material loss

i. Compute mean corrected pixel value across the pipe wall for 180 different angles (2° apart)

Example for NEW-PIPE
Estimation of mean percentage of material loss

ii. Compute percentage of pipe-wall loss for each pixel

\[
\%\text{loss} = \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{p_v - p_{v_{\text{min}}}}{p_{v_{\text{max}}} - p_{v_{\text{min}}}} \right) \right] \times 100
\]

iii. Average the percentage of material loss (for 100-mm strips) over all 180 - 2° angles (360°)
Estimation of mean percentage of material loss

Example for NEW-PIPE
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Estimation of mean percentage of material loss

Example for NEW-PIPE
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Estimation of worst thickness loss

Example for SILL-MAG-1A
Estimation of worst thickness loss

Example for SILL-MAG-1A
Estimation of worst thickness loss

Example for SILL-MAG-1A
# Summary of results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipe</th>
<th>Defect</th>
<th>Location (m)</th>
<th>Thickness loss (%)</th>
<th>Sensitivity zone coverage (%)</th>
<th>Location (m)</th>
<th>Thickness loss (%)</th>
<th>Sensitivity zone coverage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-MAN-1A</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-MAN-1B</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0.7 - 0.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-MAN-2A</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1.2 - 1.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-MAN-2B</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt; 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHSTCH-MC</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHSTCH-HOP</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
<td>n.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.i.: not identified
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Conclusions

• Similar results for both techniques:
  – but RFEC tool: thickness loss $\geq 15\%$ when averaged on the 13% most corroded area of the tool’s sensitivity zone

• RFEC tool provides reliable information on the main corrosion defects and thus on the general structural state of water pipes

• RFEC tool cannot identify small corrosion pits:
  – could cause leaks and even initiate larger corrosion areas
  – better detected by leak detection methods (e.g. acoustic)

• Further tests required (more pipes, lined or coated pipes, ductile iron pipes)
Questions?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pixel size (mm)</th>
<th>Slice thickness (mm)</th>
<th>Spacing between slices (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW-PIPE</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILL-MAG-1A</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-MAN-1A</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-MAN-1B</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-MAN-2A</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-MAN-2B</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHSTCH-MC</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHSTCH-HOP</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>