



DWH Investigation

All Contents

DWH Investigation > Investigations > Did the AMF/Blind Shear Ram Performance Prevent sealing of the well?

Investigations: Did the AMF/Blind Shear Ram Performance Prevent sealing of the well?

X Delete this version | Restore this version | Version History

Question By	Farr, Dan (Houston)
Category	BOP
Investigation Title	Did the AMF/Blind Shear Ram Performance Prevent sealing of the well?
Team Lead	Farr, Dan (Houston)
Assigned To	Florence, Ewen (DWH Proj)
Associated Root Cause Diagram Ref.	BOP
Area of Investigation	Determine if criteria were met, whether the AMF functioned as designed and why it did not secure the well.
Investigation Actions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Determine if the AMF functioned. 2. Was the design criteria exceeded? 3. Were there any faults that prevented the AMF from sealing the well.
Method of Investigation	Review the following areas: Exceeded design criteria Ref. # 222 Shearing capability Ref. # 32 Insufficient pressure to shear and seal Accumulator condition Ref. # 326 Control system leak Ref. # 32 Solenoid failure electrical Ref. 329 & 120 Insufficient battery charge Ref. # 325 & 269
Evidence / Doc. Support	Yes
Documents Used	Sharepoint References: 32, 222, 326, 329, 120, 325 and 269
Summary of Investigation	The Transocean investigation team concluded that the AMF did operate as designed and closed the Blind Shear Rams, however, the well was not sealed because the shear rams were closed when there was high flow that damaged the rubber sealing components on the rams.
Findings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The AMF functioned as designed. 2. Design criteria of the BSR was exceeded due to well flow conditions that damaged the sealing components. 3. Battery conditions for the blue pod after retrieval indicate that there was probably a low 9 volt battery in one SEM prior to the incident but this condition would not have prevented the AMF from firing on the other SEM. The yellow pod batteries were satisfactory but a question was raised on the operation of the yellow pod Solenoid 103. Further testing at Michoud indicates that it was likely that this solenoid did fire to activate the AMF.
Recommendations	Not applicable
Other	Not applicable
Percent Complete	100%
Investigation Complete (By Assigned To)	Yes
Legal Review Completed	
Legal Review Completed By	
Investigation Completed Date	3/10/2011
Timeline Update	No
Timeline Updated By	Ward, Stephen (DWH Proj)
Team Lead Sign Off	Yes
Investigation Closed Out	
Completed Date/Time	

Version: 16.0

Created at 4/12/2011 3:55 PM by Ward, Stephen (DWH Proj)

