

A comparison of risks related to the storage of hydrocarbons in above-ground and underground tanks at petrol filling stations



A COMPARISON OF RISKS RELATED TO THE STORAGE OF HYDROCARBONS
IN ABOVE-GROUND AND UNDERGROUND TANKS
AT PETROL FILLING STATIONS

1st edition

July 2014

Published by

ENERGY INSTITUTE, LONDON

The Energy Institute is a professional membership body incorporated by Royal Charter 2003

Registered charity number 1097899

The Energy Institute (EI) is the chartered professional membership body for the energy industry, supporting over 16 000 individuals working in or studying energy and 250 energy companies worldwide. The EI provides learning and networking opportunities to support professional development, as well as professional recognition and technical and scientific knowledge resources on energy in all its forms and applications.

The EI's purpose is to develop and disseminate knowledge, skills and good practice towards a safe, secure and sustainable energy system. In fulfilling this mission, the EI addresses the depth and breadth of the energy sector, from fuels and fuels distribution to health and safety, sustainability and the environment. It also informs policy by providing a platform for debate and scientifically-sound information on energy issues.

The EI is licensed by:

- the Engineering Council to award Chartered, Incorporated and Engineering Technician status;
- the Science Council to award Chartered Scientist status, and
- the Society for the Environment to award Chartered Environmentalist status.

It also offers its own Chartered Energy Engineer, Chartered Petroleum Engineer and Chartered Energy Manager titles.

A registered charity, the EI serves society with independence, professionalism and a wealth of expertise in all energy matters.

This publication has been produced as a result of work carried out within the Technical Team of the EI, funded by the EI's Technical Partners. The EI's Technical Work Programme provides industry with cost-effective, value-adding knowledge on key current and future issues affecting those operating in the energy sector, both in the UK and internationally.

For further information, please visit <http://www.energyinst.org>

The EI gratefully acknowledges the financial contributions towards the scientific and technical programme from the following companies

BG Group	Premier Oil
BP Exploration Operating Co Ltd	RWE npower
BP Oil UK Ltd	Saudi Aramco
Centrica	Scottish Power
Chevron	SGS
ConocoPhillips Ltd	Shell UK Oil Products Limited
Dana Petroleum	Shell U.K. Exploration and Production Ltd
DONG Energy	SSE
EDF Energy	Statkraft
ENI	Statoil
E. ON UK	Talisman Sinopec Energy UK Ltd
ExxonMobil International Ltd	Total E&P UK Limited
International Power	Total UK Limited
Kuwait Petroleum International Ltd	Tullow
Maersk Oil North Sea UK Limited	Valero
Murco Petroleum Ltd	Vattenfall
Nexen	Vitol
Phillips 66	World Fuel Services

However, it should be noted that the above organisations have not all been directly involved in the development of this publication, nor do they necessarily endorse its content.

Copyright © 2014 by the Energy Institute, London.
The Energy Institute is a professional membership body incorporated by Royal Charter 2003.
Registered charity number 1097899, England
All rights reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced by any means, or transmitted or translated into a machine language without the written permission of the publisher.

ISBN 978 0 85293 693 1

Published by the Energy Institute

The information contained in this publication is provided for general information purposes only. Whilst the Energy Institute and the contributors have applied reasonable care in developing this publication, no representations or warranties, express or implied, are made by the Energy Institute or any of the contributors concerning the applicability, suitability, accuracy or completeness of the information contained herein and the Energy Institute and the contributors accept no responsibility whatsoever for the use of this information. Neither the Energy Institute nor any of the contributors shall be liable in any way for any liability, loss, cost or damage incurred as a result of the receipt or use of the information contained herein.

Electronic access to EI and IP publications is available via our website, www.energypublishing.org.
Documents can be purchased online as downloadable pdfs or on an annual subscription for single users and companies.
For more information, contact the EI Publications Team.
e: pubs@energyinst.org

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	5
Acknowledgements	6
1 Executive summary	7
1.1 Scope of work	7
1.2 Principles of site-specific risk assessment	7
2 Introduction	9
2.1 Background	9
2.2 Project objectives and scope	9
3 Description of storage assessed	11
3.1 Tank operations	11
3.1.1 Filling	11
3.1.2 Wetstock management	11
3.1.3 Vapour management	12
3.1.4 Distribution and dispensing	12
3.1.5 Site drainage	13
3.2 Underground storage tanks (USTs)	13
3.2.1 Single skin USTs	13
3.2.2 Lined single skin USTs	13
3.2.3 Modern double skin USTs	13
3.3 Above-ground storage tanks (ASTs)	14
3.4 Layers of protection and principles to minimise spill risk	14
3.5 Retail fuel storage in other European countries	15
3.5.1 Germany	15
3.5.2 The Netherlands	15
3.5.3 Conclusion	15
4 Review of historical data	16
4.1 Retail petrol filling station leaks and fires	16
4.2 Leakage data provided by project stakeholders	16
4.2.1 Environment Agency	16
4.2.2 Fuel supply industry	17
5 Hazard identification	18
6 Frequency analysis	19
7 Consequence analysis	20
7.1 Consequence to the environment	20
7.2 Consequence to human safety	20
7.3 Comparison of environmental and safety impacts	20
8 Risk analysis	21
8.1 Description of relative risk assessment methodology and key assumptions	21
8.2 Description of generic petrol filling stations	22
8.3 Bow-tie models	29

Contents continued...

	Page
8.4 Description of risk analysis method	35
8.5 Risk analysis results and discussion.	35
9 Discussion	40
10 Conclusions and recommendations	42
11 References.	43
Annex A Principles of site specific risk assessment.	44
Annex B The Environment Agency's <i>Groundwater protection: principles and practice (GP3)</i>	46
Annex C Review of accidents at fuel retail stations	48
Annex D Theoretical analysis of storage leak risk from multi-walled tanks	51
Annex E Consequences to human safety	53

FOREWORD

In 2012 the Environment Agency and the Energy Institute (EI) commissioned a project to compare the risks associated with different tank storage and dispensing options at retail petrol filling stations (PFS)s.

This was done to progress practical protective solutions to industry's ongoing challenges arising from the position statements set out in *Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3)* (see Environment Agency, 2012 and Annex B) particularly arising from the Environment Agency's approach for above-ground storage in the most sensitive locations.

The project compares both the qualitative spill and other risks of contamination to groundwater resources and the relative risks to human safety from above-ground and underground storage solutions. The main conclusions are set out as follows.

The report informs the position on underground storage tanks (UST)s and above-ground storage tanks (AST)s. The Environment Agency and the EI will agree how to compare effectively the relative risks from each. The plan is to use the outputs from the report as a basis for further collaborative work, including a joint workshop, before consideration is given to updating the current position in GP3.

At this time the published position in GP3 will remain in force although users should recognise the Important Note (page 53 and page 68 of Environment Agency, 2012) in the position statement on the storage of pollutants.

Main conclusions

- The key benefit of double skinned systems (tanks and lines) is not the double skin *per se*, but is the ability to perform leak detection between the double skins and to identify and rectify leaks before the second skin has also failed. Such systems, if correctly operated and maintained, should virtually eliminate leaks into the environment.
- Double skinned systems (USTs and ASTs) have lower spill risks to the environment than the single skinned storage systems considered in this report.
- Double skinned USTs with continuous leak detection monitoring and double skinned ASTs with leak detection applied between the skins and a bund with periodic inspection have comparable spill and other risks to the environment. ASTs have higher safety risks than USTs but this safety risk difference may or may not be material. In making this conclusion, the report has made certain assumptions regarding the performance of the leak detection system applied to the UST, as described in section 8.
- Currently, both USTs and ASTs may use underground pipework without explicit leak detection systems applied. The report questions if this is best available practice and the preference is to see all underground fuel pipework protected by active leak detection systems, especially if the environment is considered to be vulnerable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was commissioned by the Energy Institute's (EI) Soil Waste and Groundwater Group (SWG) in cooperation with the EI Service Station Panel (SSP).

The work was undertaken by the Det Norske Veritas Ltd (DNV) UK project team: Mark Hunter, Consultant; Philip Nalpanis, Principal Consultant and Tim Fowler, Principal Consultant.

The project was steered by a joint EI and Environment Agency Steering Group.

The EI wishes to thank Clare Robertson, Simon Deacon and Paul Doherty from the Environment Agency for their contribution to this report, and also record its appreciation of the work of the SWG and SSP members from the following companies/organisations:

BP
Certas Energy Ltd
ExxonMobil
Retail Motor Industry Petrol/Petroleum Equipment Installers and Maintenance Federation
Rontec Watford Limited
Shell

The Energy Institute wishes to record its appreciation of the work carried out by the project team and also its gratitude for the valuable contributions made by the steering panel during the course of the project. In particular the EI would like to acknowledge Tim Fowler as the principal author and express its thanks to him.