

El Research report

Fire resistance testing of sealant materials and
system components for secondary containment
construction/expansion joints

RESEARCH REPORT: FIRE RESISTANCE TESTING OF SEALANT
MATERIALS AND SYSTEM COMPONENTS FOR SECONDARY
CONTAINMENT CONSTRUCTION/EXPANSION JOINTS

First edition

November 2019

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 20 000 individuals working in or studying energy and 200 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, 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:

BP Exploration Operating Co Ltd	Qatar Petroleum
BP Oil UK Ltd	Repsol Sinopec
Centrica	RWE npower
Chevron North Sea Ltd	Saudi Aramco
Chevron Products Company	Scottish Power
Chrysaor	SGS
CLH	Shell UK Oil Products Limited
ConocoPhillips Ltd	Shell U.K. Exploration and Production Ltd
DCC Energy	SSE
EDF Energy	TAQA Bratani
ENI	Total E&P UK Limited
E.ON UK	Total UK Limited
Equinor	Tullow Oil
ExxonMobil International Ltd	Uniper
Innogy	Valero
Kuwait Petroleum International Ltd	Vattenfall
Nexen CNOOC	Vitol Energy
Ørsted	Woodside
Perenco	World Fuel Services
Phillips 66	

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 © 2019 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 1 78725 071 0

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.

Hard copy and electronic access to EI and IP publications is available via our website, <https://publishing.energyinst.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
Acknowledgements	8
Executive summary	9
1 Introduction	11
2 Tests scope	12
3 Dry burn tests (Phase 1)	13
3.1 Test site	13
3.2 Dry burn test modules	13
3.3 Seal application	13
3.4 Joints/products tested	15
3.5 Testing sequence	17
3.6 Measurements and observations	18
3.7 Installation details	19
3.7.1 Module 1 – Product A and Product C	19
3.7.2 Module 2 – Product F and Products E/F	21
3.7.3 Module 3 – Product A with steel cover plates	24
3.7.4 Module 4 – Product D	25
3.8 Fire exposure test photographs	27
3.8.1 Module 1 – Product A and Product C	27
3.8.2 Module 2 – Product F and Products E/F	27
3.8.3 Module 3 – Product A with steel cover plates	28
3.8.4 Module 4 – Product D	30
3.9 Post-fire exposure test photographs/results	30
3.9.1 Module 1 – Product A and Product C	30
3.9.2 Module 2 – Product F and Products E/F	34
3.9.3 Module 3 – Product A with steel cover plates	36
3.9.4 Module 4 – Product D	39
3.9.5 Test parameter summary for dry burn tests	41
3.10 Main observations	43
3.10.1 Observations by product and system	43
3.11 Conclusions and recommendations taken forward (Phase 1)	44
4 Intermediate/real-world fire exposure tests (Phase 2)	47
4.1 Scope	47
4.2 General test set up	47
4.3 Joints/products tested	49
4.4 Seal installation	51
4.5 Pre-fire exposure hydrostatic testing	51
4.6 Initial test conditions	52
4.7 Ignition and burning	54
4.8 Fuel level maintenance	54
4.9 Firewater application simulation under fire exposure conditions	55
4.10 Post-fire exposure hydrostatic testing	56

Contents continued

	Page
4.11 Intermediate/real-world fire exposure test results and observations	58
4.11.1 Results summaries	58
4.11.2 Post-fire exposure hydrostatic testing results.	68
4.11.3 Joint excavation – general observations	69
4.11.4 Conclusions and observations (Phase 2)	73
4.11.5 Recommendations for additional extended duration fire exposure tests	75
5 Extended duration intermediate/real-world fire exposure tests (Phase 3)	76
5.1 Scope	76
5.2 Test set-up/products tested	76
5.3 Test parameters	76
5.4 Results/observations	80
5.5 Observations and excavation photographs (Phase 3)	82
5.6 Conclusions (Phase 3)	85
6 Project overall conclusions.	86
 Annexes	
Annex A Glossaries of terms, acronyms and abbreviations	92
A.1 Introduction	92
A.2 Glossary of terms	92
A.3 Glossary of acronyms and abbreviations	94
Annex B References.	95
Annex C Sealant material and system component product selection	96
Annex D End-user questionnaire on sealant materials and sealant system component selection criteria, performance requirements and operational experience	101
Annex E Media pack	110
E.1 Introduction	110
E.2 Link to access media pack	110
E.3 Media pack content	111
E.3.1 Slide pack	111
E.3.2 Test videos.	111

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

		Page
Figures		
Figure 1	Dry burn fire exposure test modules	14
Figure 2	Dry burn fire exposure test module fuel tray	14
Figure 3	Principle of sealant only test (plan view).	15
Figure 4	Plan view of a typical retrofit/remediation construction/expansion joint seal fitted with steel cover plate (replicated from HSE PSLG Final report) Contains public sector information published by the Health and Safety Executive and licensed under the Open Government Licence.	17
Figure 5	Product A – two-part intumescent sealant (left-hand side) and primer (right-hand side)	19
Figure 6	PE foam rod backer (recommended by manufacturer)	19
Figure 7	Fire rated SMP sealant (Product C)	20
Figure 8	PE foam rod backer	20
Figure 9	Module 1 with typical PE foam rod backer (top left-hand side) and Intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) (bottom right-hand side) and SMP sealant (Product C) (bottom left-hand side)	21
Figure 10	Typical intumescent foil backed sponge (Product F)	22
Figure 11	FR polyurethane sealant (Product E) supplied in 850 g ‘sausage’ for trowel application	22
Figure 12	Primer used to prime the concrete joint.	23
Figure 13	Module 2 with intumescent foil backed sponge strip (Product F) (left-hand side) and FR polyurethane sealant with intumescent foil backed sponge (Products E/F) (right-hand side)	23
Figure 14	Intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) with steel cover plates (PE foam rod backer – left-hand side, CF backer – right-hand side).	24
Figure 15	FR silicone sealant (Product D) supplied in tubes for gun application, and CF blanket (128 kg/m ³ density) as recommended by the manufacturer’s installation instructions	25
Figure 16	Primer as recommended by the manufacturer’s installation instructions	25
Figure 17	Module 4 with FR silicone sealant (Product D)	26
Figure 18	Module 4 with CF backer (also typical of backer installed in Module 3) and FR silicone sealant (Product D).	26
Figure 19	Module 1 with intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) (left-hand side) and SMP sealant (Product C) (right-hand side) before fire exposure test.	27
Figure 20	Module 2 with intumescent foil backed sponge strip (Product F) only and FR polyurethane sealant and intumescent foil backed sponge strip (Products E/F) before (above) and during (below) fire exposure test.	28
Figure 21	Module 3 with intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) before (above) and during (below) fire exposure test.	29
Figure 22	Module 4 with FR silicone sealant (Product D) and CF backer (left-hand side) before fire exposure test	30
Figure 23	Front view of Module 1 with intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) following dry burn test	31
Figure 24	Plan view of Module 1 with intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) following dry burn test	31
Figure 25	Rear view of Module 1 with intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) following dry burn test	31

List of figures and tables continued

	Page
Figure 26	Front view of Module 1 with SMP sealant (Product C) following dry burn test 32
Figure 27	Plan view of Module 1 with SMP sealant (Product C) following dry burn test 33
Figure 28	Rear view of Module 1 with SMP sealant (Product C) following dry burn test. 33
Figure 29	Front view of Module 2 with intumescent foil backed sponge strip (Product F) (left-hand side) and FR polyurethane sealant with intumescent foil backed sponge strip (Products E/F) (right-hand side) following dry burn test. 34
Figure 30	Plan view of Module 2 with intumescent foil backed sponge strip (Product F) following dry burn test 35
Figure 31	Plan view of Module 2 with FR polyurethane sealant with intumescent foil backed sponge strip (Products E/F) following dry burn test. 35
Figure 32	Rear view of Module 2 with FR polyurethane sealant with intumescent foil backed sponge strip (Products E/F) (left-hand side) and intumescent foil backed sponge strip (Product F) (right-hand side) following dry burn test. 36
Figure 33	Front view of Module 3 with intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) following dry burn test 37
Figure 34	Plan view of Module 3 with intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) following dry burn test 37
Figure 35	Rear view of Module 3 with intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) following dry burn test 38
Figure 36	Front view of Module 4 with FR silicone sealant (Product D) following dry burn test. . . . 39
Figure 37	Plan view of Module 4 with FR silicone sealant (Product D) following dry burn test 39
Figure 38	Rear view of Module 4 with FR silicone sealant (Product D) following dry burn test 40
Figure 39	Bund mock-up module and fuel/water fill lines 48
Figure 40	Bund mock-up modules prior to seal installation/testing 48
Figure 41	General test arrangement showing fuel and water supplies. 49
Figure 42	Illustration of installation sequence: primer/CF backer 128 kg/m ³ (rear view) (left-hand side), sealant (20 mm depth) (middle), stainless steel cover plate (right-hand side) 51
Figure 43	Phase 2 hydrostatic test module 52
Figure 44	Initial Phase 2 test conditions. 53
Figure 45	Steady-state fire conditions 54
Figure 46	Fuel reservoir showing top-up markers 55
Figure 47	Fuel top-up process for test duration = 0–120 min 55
Figure 48	Introduction of firewater process and impact on liquid levels at test duration = 120 min 56
Figure 49	Introduction of water to 200 mm below module top, post-fire exposure test. 57
Figure 50	Water/foam inside bund mock-up module, post-fire exposure test. 58
Figure 51	Module 1 with intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) steady-state burning – potentially noxious smoke emission 60
Figure 52	Module 1 with intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) burning – foam applied to running fuel fire 60
Figure 53	Module 2 with FR silicone sealant (Product D) steady-state burning – flame penetration 62
Figure 54	Module 1 with intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) (right-hand side) and Module 2 with FR silicone sealant (Product D) (left-hand side) – showing extent of foaming required to extinguish pool fires after failure 62
Figure 55	Module 3 with FR polyurethane sealant with compressible fireproof sponge (Products E/F) – steady-state burning 64
Figure 56	Module 3 FR polyurethane sealant with compressible fireproof sponge (Products E/F) – example of pool fire on seal failure 64

List of figures and tables continued

	Page
Figure 57	Small pool fire around rear of Module 4 with SMP sealant (Product C) 65
Figure 58	Module 5 with PSF and intumescent foil backed sponge strips (Products B/F) with steel cover plate – flame penetration 66
Figure 59	Module 6 with PSF and intumescent foil backed sponge strips (Products B/F) without steel cover plate – flame penetration 67
Figure 60	Hydrostatic test configuration (Phase 2) 68
Figure 61	Inside bund mock-up module, post-fire exposure test 70
Figure 62	Inside bund mock-up module, spalling behind steel cover plate 70
Figure 63	Bund mock-up module top and exterior faces, post-fire exposure test 71
Figure 64	Bund mock-up module interior – joint excavation, post-fire exposure test 72
Figure 65	Bund mock-up module interior – lower, undamaged portion of joint, post-fire exposure test 73
Figure 66	Phase 3 extended burns. No firewater (above) and early extinguishment test (below) 78
Figure 67	Ad hoc fire exposure testing of intumescent foil backed sponge strip (Product F) 79
Figure 68	Ad hoc fire exposure testing of intumescent foil backed sponge strip (Product F) showing extent of swelling of product under fire exposure 79
Figure 69	Cherry red glow of steel cover plate following >6 hr fire exposure test 82
Figure 70	Hot cover plate igniting heptane vapour 82
Figure 71	Excavation of joint system/sealant – intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) following >6 hr fire exposure test (fire-exposed side) 83
Figure 72	Top face of joint with intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) following >6 hr fire exposure test 84
Figure 73	Exterior (unexposed) face of joint with intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) following >6 hr fire exposure test 84

Tables

Table 1	Details of joints/products tested (dry burn tests) 15
Table 2	Dry burn fire exposure test activities 17
Table 3	Test parameter summary for dry burn tests 41
Table 4	Test parameter summary for dry burn tests 45
Table 5	Products/joints tested (intermediate/real-world fire exposure tests) 49
Table 6	Intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) results summary 59
Table 7	Silicone sealant (Product D) results summary 61
Table 8	FR polyurethane sealant (Product E) and intumescent foil backed sponge strips (Product F) 63
Table 9	SMP sealant (Product C) results summary 65
Table 10	PSF and intumescent foil backed sponge strips (Products B/F) and with steel cover plate results summary 66
Table 11	PSF and intumescent foil backed sponge strips (Products B/F) without steel cover plate results summary 67
Table 12	Hydrostatic test – final liquid depth and percentage loss by product (Phase 2) 69
Table 13	Intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) results summary (extended fire exposure test – Phase 3) 80
Table 14	Intumescent polysulfide sealant (Product A) results summary (early bund mock-up module fire extinguishment – Phase 3) 81

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The multi-phase project described in this research report was commissioned by EI's Containment Systems Working Group (CSWG), which is a working group of the EI's Process Safety Committee. Development work was contracted initially to Resource Protection International (RPI), which was acquired by Falck Fire Consulting. Final work was carried out by ENRg Consultants. Paul Watkins was the main researcher throughout the project phases; Dr Barbara Chisholm supported the project. IKM Consulting Ltd. designed the test modules. Initial testing (Phase 1) was undertaken at Centro Jovellanos (Asturias, Spain), whereas subsequent testing (Phases 2–3) was carried out at Falck Fire Services (Esbjerg, Denmark).

CSWG members provided technical direction to the project. Its members during the project were:

Katy Baker	Arcadis
Dr Colin Cartwright	Atkins
Dave Wright	BP
Stephen Clarke	BP
Kerry Sinclair (Secretary)	Energy Institute
Dr Mark Scanlon	Energy Institute
Paul Watkins	ENRg Consultants
David Tarttelin (Vice-Chair)	Environment Agency (EA)
Mark Palmer	Esso Petroleum Company Ltd
Tony Brown	Federation of Petroleum Suppliers (FPS)
Tammy Brantley	GB Oils
Liz Copeland	IKM Consulting
Steven Flynn	Rawell Environmental Ltd
Brian Blagden	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Dr Irene Anders	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Leighanne Moir	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Felix Nelson	Shell
Barrie Salmon	Tank Storage Association (TSA)
John Wormald	Total Lindsey Oil Refinery
Jamie Walker	UKPIA
Ian Goldsworthy (Chair)	Valero

The EI wishes to record its appreciation of the work carried out by the researchers and also its gratitude for the valuable contributions made by CSWG members during the course of the project. In addition, the EI acknowledges those industry end-users that participated in an initial questionnaire regarding the sealant materials and system components that were used at their installations, and what were their experiences in using them.

The EI acknowledges suppliers of commercially available sealant materials and system components that donated samples for testing.

1 INTRODUCTION

Resource Protection International (RPI)^[Note] was commissioned by the Energy Institute (EI) to consider the scope of and undertake fire exposure testing on commercially available sealant products or systems used to seal construction/expansion joints in secondary containment for aboveground storage tanks storing petroleum, petroleum products or other fuels. The tests would be independently conducted.

The intention of these tests was to investigate the fire resistance duration of the sealant products and systems used under real-world fire conditions as opposed to standardised furnace testing. The criteria for success were inherent fire resistance of the seal whilst also maintaining the liquid (fuel, water and fire-fighting foam) tightness of the joint.

Periods of fire resistance and integrity were investigated with a view to providing information about the seal to the oil and petrochemical industry end-users about these aspects over and above the information which is available from the PDSs.

It was not intended that the test results should give a product or system any commercial advantage when publishing the results contained in this research report. The primary aim was to furnish potential end users of the products, and the industry, with independently assessed information relating to the fire resistance and integrity of the sealant materials and systems for situations where extended periods of fire resistance are required such as in large, long duration bund fires.

Note:

RPI were acquired by the Falck Group part way through the project and therefore reference will be made to RPI/ Falck research report.

2 TESTS SCOPE

A number of products were considered for testing. Given the financial constraints on the project, product selectivity and prioritisation were considered important from an early stage.

In practice, in the UK and Europe, a well-known polysulfide intumescent product is probably the most widely used sealant for bunds. The most critical joints in the industry are remediation ones where the sealant is used behind a steel cover plate. This was considered to be a type of joint that was most in need of fire exposure testing. However, there are a number of other materials in use, or potentially useable that were proposed for testing. These materials were identified by an end user questionnaire conducted by the EI and RPI at an early stage of this project. A summary sheet detailing the products considered is presented in Annex C, and findings of the end-user questionnaire are provided in Annex D.

Whilst it was considered desirable to have the PSLG recommended new build detail tested as well, however, due to time and budgetary constraints this type of joint was not tested – therefore the scope and results of both dry burn and real-world fire exposure testing carried out and reported here are not applicable to new build joints – only remediation ones. Of course, it could be argued that conceptually a new build joint has little potential for loss of containment, since even if the sealant material loses integrity there is a stainless steel waterstop present. The most suitable product candidates based on the end user initial product questionnaire and subsequent meetings with suppliers were:

- Product A – intumescent polysulfide sealant.
- Product B – phenolic syntactic foam (PSF) sealant.
- Product C – silyl modified polyurethane (SMP) sealant.
- Product D – fire resistant (FR) silicone sealant.
- Product E – FR polyurethane sealant with Product F – intumescent foil backed sponge.

Phase 1 initial tests were set up as fire exposure tests with the aim of establishing how the sealants and joint configurations perform under high temperature. Fire exposure tests involved constructing a single joint in a simple wall module subjected to a heptane fire exposure. Burns were dry, i.e. no liquid (either fuel or water) was present against the seal; fuel used for the burn was contained in a steel pan and therefore the seals were subjected to flaming only throughout the test to ascertain how the materials performed under fire conditions. These tests were envisaged to see how the sealant system behaved and what timescales they could survive. They also were used to screen the sealant systems before proceeding to Phase 2 tests.

The aim of Phase 2 was to carry out fire exposure and liquid retention tests in small bund mock-up modules with a single joint on the fire-exposed side to enable visualisation of the behaviour of sealant systems and contained liquids under fire conditions. Hydrostatic tests were performed, and then the joints were subjected to fire exposure. At the end of the test period, the bunds were subjected to hydrostatic tests again to determine leak tightness.

Phase 3 tests were carried out at the end of the project based on further input from the CSWG and were aimed at ascertaining the resilience of double joints (i.e. where a sealant material is present in both exposed and unexposed faces of the bund) especially to an extended period of the exposure and to simulate addition of firewater to fire exposed joints.