

World Oil[®]

Defining Technology for Exploration, Drilling and Production

October 2007

DRILLING REPORT

Heat-induced drill pipe failures



www.worldoil.com
Gulf Publishing Company

Rotating while packed off may cause unexpected heat-induced drill pipe tensile failures

Metallographic examination of a drill pipe reveals that frictional forces produced while rotating drillstring induced sufficient heat to either locally temper the pipe or cause a phase transformation of the drill pipe material.

Samit Gokhale and Sean Ellis, T H Hill Associates, Inc.; Nicholas Reynolds, SPE

The amount of tensile pull that can be applied to free a stuck drillstring is usually restricted by the drillstring's minimum Margin Of Overpull (MOP).¹ To free a stuck string, the drillstring is often rotated and pulled simultaneously. When this is done, the maximum permitted pull is reduced, depending on the amount of torque applied.

Application of pull, either based on MOP or the decreased tensile rating given the applied torque, has resulted in instances of overload failures of drill pipe. These failures have occurred at loads significantly lower than the drillstrings rated capacity. As the material gets locally heated, the material hardness decreases. The actual load capacity of the drillstring depends on the temperatures reached downhole.

This paper discusses the factors that contribute to these failures and provides test data to support the findings. In addition, the limitations of available methods used to determine the maximum allowable loads that may be applied when packed off with no circulation are presented.

TWO CASES OF HEAT-INDUCED DRILL PIPE TENSILE FAILURE

Case 1 – South Texas onshore. In December 2002, while making a connection at 11,756 ft MD, the wellbore packed off around the 5-in. 19.50-lb G-105 drill pipe. The drillstring was “worked” by applying torque and tension for about 45 min. The drillstring moved up the hole with a loss of 60 kips as noted by rig personnel. The drillstring was pulled and a fractured joint of the 5-in. 19.50-lb G-105 drill pipe was found at 9,553 ft. The downhole portion of the joint was subsequently recovered during fishing operations. Based on the appearance of the fracture surface, the proximate cause of the failure was readily recognized by the drilling engineer as ductile tensile overload. However, the tensile load applied at the time of failure was well below the calculated tensile capacity (decreased tensile rat-

ing based on the measured wall thickness and applied torque) of the 5-in. 19.50-lb G-105 drill pipe.

Case 2 – East Oklahoma. In April 2003, with the bit near the bottom at a 13,930 ft TD, the wellbore packed off around the 5-in. 19.50-lb S-135 drill pipe. The drillstring was stuck and circulation was lost. To free the stuck drillstring, the pipe was rotated and pulled. During these operations, the 5-in. 19.50-lb S-135 drill pipe parted at 11,666 ft. The tensile loads applied were well below the drill pipe's calculated tensile capacity (decreased tensile rating based on the measured wall thickness and applied torque). The fractured joint was pulled out, and the downhole portion of the joint was recovered during the fishing operation.

METALLURGICAL ANALYSIS OF FAILED JOINTS

Metallurgical analysis of the fractured 5-in. 19.50-lb G-105 drill pipe “Case 1” and the 5-in. 19.50-lb S-135 drill pipe “Case 2” was performed to evaluate the failure mechanism and the factors contributing to the failure.

To identify the fractured joints of drill pipe, the joints will be referred to as “C1” for the joint from “Case 1” and “C2” for the joint from “Case 2.”

Visual examination. The overall appearance and fracture morphology of joints C1 and C2 were strikingly similar. Both failures were located in drill pipe tube body, close to the pin connection tool joint. Joint C1 had parted 3 ft 11 in. from the pin connection shoulder, while joint C2 had parted 6 ft 5 in. from the pin connection shoulder. The fractured joints are presented in Figs. 1 and 2.

The fracture surfaces displayed evidence of a ductile separation under tensile loading. As shown in Fig. 3, the fractures propagated along a 45° plane relative to the axis of the pipe. The fracture regions also exhibited significant necking and extensive plastic



Fig. 1. As received condition of the failed 5-in. 19.50-lb G-105 drill pipe C1.



Uphole portion of failed joint



Downhole portion of failed joint

Fig. 2. As received condition of the failed 5-in.19.50-lb S-135 drill pipe C2.



Fig. 3. 45° fracture surface of joint C2.

deformation. However, the necking was different from that observed on classic ductile overload failures. Joints C1 and C2 presented multiple closely spaced necked areas near the fractured ends. Figure 4 presents the necking and the plastic deformation. Overall, the fracture morphology was indicative of a ductile tensile overload.

The outer surface of the joints near the fractured ends appeared “smooth” and “polished.” Formation cuts and abrasion marks were also visible. It is likely that this damage resulted from rotation of the drill pipe against the formation.

To evaluate the internal surface, the fractured joints were saw-cut longitudinally and split open. Figure 5 presents the condition of joint C1’s internal coating. The internal plastic coating was damaged close to the fractured end. The color and texture of the internal plastic coating also changed towards the fractured end. The damage appeared to have been caused by exposure to unusually high operating temperatures.

Material examination. The fracture mechanism was identified as ductile tensile overload. For a typical tensile overload failure, either (a) the operating load is greater than the rated tensile capacity of the pipe (accounting for applied torque and measured wall thickness) or (b) the material does not meet the minimum specification requirements. As the operating loads were well below the drill pipe’s calculated tensile capacity, the material properties had to be below the minimum requirements at the time of failure.




Fig. 4. Necking and plastic deformation observed near the fractured end of joint C2.

Material away from heat affected area. To verify the pipe’s inherent material properties, specimens were machined from joints C1 and C2. These specimens were removed from a location on the pipe at least five feet away from the heat affected area. The heat affected area is considered to be anywhere along the pipe where necking or damage to internal plastic coating is present. Chemical analysis, tensile tests, Charpy V-notch impact tests and microstructural examination were performed on these specimens.

The test results are summarized in Table 1. The material met the minimum requirements specified in API Specification 5D² for the respective grade of drill pipe. Material outside the heat affected area was identified as having a tempered martensitic grain structure, which is characteristic of quenched and tempered steel. S-135 and G-105 grade drill pipe is required to be quenched and tempered. This indicated that the failure was not caused by an inherent lack of strength or improperly heat treated drill pipe material.

Material close to fractured end. To examine the material properties near the fractured end, a longitudinal section was removed from the pipe that extended from inside the heat affected area near the fractured end to outside the heat affected area. A hardness survey at ¼-in. spacing was performed at mid wall along the length of this longitudinal section. The hardness values for joints C1 and C2 are presented in Figs. 6 and 7 respectively.

For joint C1 (G-105 drill pipe, typical Rockwell “C” hardness = 30 HRC), the average hardness reading outside the heat affected area was about 30 HRC. This hardness correlates to a tensile strength of about 136,000 psi. However, a drop in hardness to values as low as 15 HRC, which correlates to a tensile strength of about 100,000 psi, was observed near the fracture.

Similar to joint C1, a drop in hardness close to the fracture was observed on joint C2 (S-135 drill pipe, typical Rockwell “C” hardness = 35 HRC). The hardness values reduced from an average close to 35 HRC, which correlates to a tensile strength of about 157,000 psi, to values as low as 17.5 HRC near the fracture, which correlates to a tensile strength of about 104,000 psi.

In cases of ductile overload failures, the hardness in the necked region is greater than the inherent material hardness



Fig. 5. Damage to internal plastic coating of joint C1 from exposure to high temperatures.




Fig. 6. Hardness (HRC) readings along the length of longitudinal section removed from joint C1.

due to strain hardening. However, in the case of the failed drill pipe joints C1 and C2, the hardness in the heat affected area was significantly lower than the inherent material hardness. This reduction in hardness was indicative of localized heating near the fractured end to at least the tempering temperature.

“Tempering of steel is a process in which previously hardened steel is heated to a temperature below the transformation range and cooled at a suitable rate, primarily to increase ductility and toughness.”³ Tempering usually results in a decrease in hardness, tensile strength and yield strength, but an increase in ductility and toughness. Figure 8 shows the effect of tempering temperature on the hardness of 4130 alloy steel (this is the same material from which joints C1 and C2 were made).

Increased temperatures reduce the strength of steel. Yield strength decreases to zero when the material reaches the melting point. As joints C1 and C2 were locally heated near their fracture locations to temperatures greater than or equal to their tempering temperatures, their material hardness and strength decreased. The load capacities of the drill pipe tubes were reduced resulting in the ductile tensile overload failures. The hardness values and corresponding tensile strengths reported for joints C1 and C2 were measured after the joints had been cooled. The actual hardness and corresponding tensile strength




Fig. 7. Hardness (HRC) readings along the length of longitudinal section removed from joint C2.




Fig. 8. Hardness of 4130 Alloy steel after tempering.⁴

values at the time of the failures would have been much lower. However, because there is no way of knowing what temperatures the drill pipe joints reached when rotated while packed off, the tensile strength at the time of failure is unknown.

Microstructural examination. The drop in hardness in the heat affected area indicates that the drill pipe was locally heated to a temperature equal to or greater than the tempering temperature. One way to determine the approximate temperature range to which the pipe was heated is to examine the microstructure in the heat affected area and compare it with the microstructure outside the heat affected area. A change in the microstructure (from the inherent structure) in the heat affected area would mean that the temperatures reached were greater than the austenitic transformation temperature. This minimum phase transformation temperature is represented by line “AC3” on the carbon-iron phase diagram shown in Fig. 9.

Specimens were removed from both inside and outside of the heat affected area of joint C2. Material from outside the heat affected area presented a tempered martensitic structure, which is characteristic of quenched and tempered (Q&T) steel, as required for S-135 grade drill pipe. This was the inherent drill pipe material structure. Material inside the heat affected area presented a mixed ferritic and pearlitic structure. Figures 10 and 11 present the two microstructures. Transformation of the grain structure in the heat affected area indicated that localized heating resulted in temperatures above 1,500°F (aus-




Fig. 9. Carbon-iron phase diagram.⁵




Fig. 11. Microstructure near fractured end of joint C2 (200X).




Fig. 10. Inherent microstructure of joint C2 (200X).




Fig. 12. Inherent microstructure of joint C1 (200X).

TABLE 1. Material properties of the tube of joints C1 and C2, outside the heat affected areas

Material properties		Joint C1 values		Joint C2 values	
		G-105 grade requirements	Test results	S-135 grade requirements	Test results
Tensile test	Yield strength, ksi	105 (min) 135 (max)	129.5	135 (min) 165 (max)	150.7
	Ultimate tensile str, ksi	115 (min)	142.1	145 (min)	166.1
	Elongation, %	14% (min)	22.95	12.5% (min)	18
Chemical analysis	Phosphorus, %	0.030 (max)	0.012	0.030 (max)	0.012
	Sulfur, %	0.030 (max)	0.005	0.030 (max)	0.005
Charpy V-notch impact test	Average, ft-lbs	32 (min)	62	32 (min)	36
	Minimum, ft-lbs	28 (min)	61	28 (min)	34

LIMITATIONS OF STUCK PIPE OVERLOAD DESIGN METHODOLOGY

The standard design practice for preventing tensile overload failures in stuck pipe situations is to design with a margin of overpull (MOP). MOP is the difference between the tensile capacity of the weakest component in the drillstring and the maximum anticipated load that the drillstring will experience. Simply put, MOP is the additional available tensile load that can be safely applied to the drillstring in the case of a stuck pipe situation. Since loads are applied from the surface, the limiting component in the drillstring will almost always be the drill pipe. As seen in the failure cases previously discussed in this paper, if the drill pipe is rotated while packed off and sufficient heat is generated, the designer may not be able to count on the design MOP.

tenitic transformation temperature for joint C2 material, as shown in Fig. 9).

Specimens for microstructural examination were also removed from both inside and outside of the heat affected area of joint C1. However, unlike the change in structure observed on joint C2, both specimens removed from joint C1 presented a tempered martensitic structure. This is shown in Figs. 12 and 13. Presence of a similar structure meant that the temperatures reached in the heat affected area of joint C1 did not exceed the austenitic transformation temperature (~1,500°F). Instead the temperatures reached were closer to the typical tempering temperature for G-105 grade drill pipe material (~1,000°F).

The tensile capacity of a drillstring component is defined as the lower of that component's body or connection tensile capacity, and should always take into account any derating due to pressure and/or torsional loads. Typically in a stuck pipe situation the string is simultaneously pulled and rotated, so there will be both tension and torsion loads applied to the string. For drill pipe tubes, simultaneous torsion will decrease the tube's tensile capacity and vice versa. External pressure will also decrease the tube's tensile capacity. Internal pressure may




Fig. 13. Microstructure near fractured end of joint C1 (200X).

increase or decrease the tube's tensile capacity depending on how much pressure is applied. However, any gain in tensile capacity due to internal pressure is usually ignored for safety. For tool joints, the effect of torque on tensile capacity depends on whether or not the applied torque is greater than makeup torque (MUT), and in the case where torque is greater than MUT, on whether tension or torque is applied first. See Baryshnikov's, et al., paper⁶ on combined load capacity of tool joints for more details about determining tool joint tensile capacity. The effects of pressure on tool joint tensile capacity are usually accounted for by applying a safety factor.

Even though the designer may have carefully calculated the tensile capacities of the drillstring accounting for various combined loading scenarios, and has calculated the maximum anticipated loads using torque and drag programs, there is no way to design for these unexpected heat-induced drill pipe failures. The actual capacity of the drillstring depends on the temperatures reached downhole, and there is no way of knowing what temperature the drill pipe will be heated to in situations where the drill pipe is packed off with no circulation.

CONCLUSIONS

Frictional forces produced while rotating a packed off drillstring with no circulation can induce sufficient heat to either locally temper the drill pipe or cause a phase transformation of the drill pipe material.

Localized heating of the drill pipe decreases the material's hardness and can significantly reduce the tensile capacity of the drill pipe depending on the temperature reached.

Overload failures have occurred at loads well below the drill pipe's tensile and combined load capacity under these stuck pipe conditions.

Characteristic features of this type of failure include, multiple necking sites near the fracture, 45° fracture plane, polished outer surface near the fracture, and discolored or burned out internal plastic coating near fracture. The fracture location is characteristically in the drill pipe tube near the pin tool joint.

The reduction in tensile capacity of the drill pipe cannot be predicted because there is no method for predicting the downhole temperature of the drill pipe. **WO**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This article was prepared from IADC/SPE 92429 presented at the IADC/SPE Drilling Conference held in Amsterdam, Feb. 23-25, 2005.

LITERATURE CITED

- ¹ Hill, T.H., *Drillstring Design and Failure Prevention*, T H Hill Associates, Inc., September 2002.
- ² *API Specification 5D, Specification for Drill Pipe*, 5th ed., American Petroleum Institute, October 2001.
- ³ *Metals Handbook, Volume 4, Heat Treatment*, 9th ed., American Society of Metals, November 1981, 70.
- ⁴ *Metals Handbook, Volume 4, Heat Treatment*, 9th ed., American Society of Metals, November 1981, 71.
- ⁵ *Metals Handbook, Volume 8, Metallography, Structures and Phase Diagrams*, 8th ed., American Society of Metals, September 1973, 276.
- ⁶ Baryshnikov, A., Schenato, A., Ligrono, A., Ferrara, P., "Optimization of rotary-shouldered connection reliability and failure analysis. Part 1: Static loading," SPE/IADC 27535, paper presented at the Spring Drilling Conference, Dallas, Texas, 1994.

THE AUTHORS



Samit Gokhale, manager of engineering projects at T H Hill Associates, Inc., has been with the company since 2001. At T H Hill Associates, Inc. he has worked on and managed numerous failure investigations and projects involving drillstring design, deep water landing string design, fatigue design and stress analysis. He manages all engineering projects and is an instructor for drill string design and failure prevention courses. He also provides expert witness support for investigations that lead to litigation. Prior to joining T H Hill Associates, Inc. he worked as a design engineer with Tata Motors. He holds a MS in mechanical engineering from University of Florida.

Sean Ellis joined T H Hill Associates, Inc. in Houston in 1998 as a project engineer, and has since worked within the organization as manager of Mechanical Design and Failure Analysis, vice president of research and development, and vice president of sales and marketing. Throughout his career at T H Hill Associates, Ellis has been involved in developing new technology to assist in failure prevention and in the design and design review of many drill stem components used in challenging wells. He holds a BS in mechanical engineering from the University of Florida.



FAILURE ANALYSIS



As a company that specializes in preventing structural failure in drilling components, we can state, with some authority, you can not prevent all failures, but you can certainly learn from them when they occur. We have performed more than one thousand failure analyses in the past 25 years, all on drilling equipment and OCTG, and each has contributed to our corporate knowledge on failures—and how to prevent them. As industry leaders in engineering and quality assurance services,

T H Hill can find the root cause of a failure *and* give you practical recommendations on how to avoid similar failures in future operations. After all, the value in analyzing a failure should come from not having to pay for it more than once.

CONTACT US

Contact us if you have experienced a failure in any of the following types of equipment:

- Drill String Components
- Specialty Tools
- Casing & Tubing
- Landing String Components
- Lifting & Handling Equipment

The cost of a single downhole failure can easily reach seven figures, so multiple failures of the same type can be catastrophic.

What Happened?



Was it...

The material?


The equipment quality?

The design?

The operating conditions?



The first step in addressing a failure is determining why it occurred. The root cause of a failure may be simple and established by traditional metallurgical and material testing. Or it may be complex and involve analysis of operating loads and design, and their resulting impact at the string or tool level. To arrive at the correct and complete answer, you need to approach the problem with the proper set of skills. T H Hill has written industry standards for manufacturing, design & operation, and inspection to define the optimal properties, criteria and processes for reducing the risk of downhole failure. This experience, when coupled with our engineering and field expertise, gives us a unique perspective on failures and their causes.



How Do I Avoid Another Failure?

Should I ...

Change my inspection practices?

Modify my designs?

Replace my equipment?

Address my operating parameters?

These are literally the million dollar questions. The cost of a single downhole failure can easily reach seven figures, so multiple failures of the same type can be catastrophic. Determining the cause of a failure is just the first step. We give you practical steps to avoid similar failures in future operations. We routinely work, in both engineering and quality assurance functions, on the most complex and challenging wells in the world. We use this corporate knowledge to provide you with specific recommendations on inspection, design and operating changes that will address the root cause of the failure and reduce your risk of experiencing the same problem again.

