



**Islamic Azad University
Tehran South Branch
Graduate School**

**Chemical Engineering Department
Process Design Section**

Subject:

**A Review of Hazard Indices for
Inherently Safer Conceptual Design of
Chemical Processes**

Advisor:

By:



دانشگاه آزاد اسلامی
واحد تهران جنوب
دانشکده تحصیلات تکمیلی

گروه مهندسی شیمی گرایش طراحی فرآیند

عنوان:

بررسی شاخص های مخاطرات
برای طراحی مفهومی ذاتا ایمن تر فرآیندهای شیمیایی

استاد راهنما:

نگارش:

ABSTRACT

The term ‘inherently safer’ implies that the process is safe by its very nature and not externally constrained to be safe by the use of add-on systems and devices, hence making it a proactive approach to process safety. It is very effective in risk reduction if applied at the beginning stages of design, leading to cost effective and timely solutions and modifications. In this work Inherently Safer Design (ISD) - as well as its quantification by indices both developed non-specifically and specifically for ISD - is elaborated, in order to rank alternative processes based on their inherent safety adaptability and considering the advantages and the shortcomings of ISD quantification indices in the literature, covering ISD aspects of a process at conceptual design stage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xii
INTRODUCTION	1
I SCOPE OF THE PROJECT.....	2
II INHERENTLY SAFER CHEMICAL PROCESS DESIGN.....	4
2.1 Definition of an inherently safer process.....	5
2.2 History of inherently safer process design.....	6
2.3 Inherently safer process design strategies.....	9
2.3.1 Minimize.....	10
2.3.2 Substitute.....	14
2.3.3 Moderate.....	17
2.3.4 Simplify.....	21
2.4 Inherent safety and the process life cycle.....	22
2.5 Inherent safety conflicts.....	24
2.6 Resolving inherent safety conflicts.....	25

III	A REVIEW OF INHERENTLY SAFER CHEMICAL PROCESS DESIGN	
	HAZARD INDICIES.....	27
	3.1 Introduction to hazard indices.....	28
	3.2 Hazard indices <i>not specifically</i> developed for inherent safety.....	29
	3.2.1 Dow indices.....	29
	3.2.1.1 Dow's fire and explosion index.....	29
	3.2.1.2 Dow's chemical exposure index.....	33
	3.2.2 Mond index.....	35
	3.2.3 The instantaneous fractional annual loss (IFAL) index.....	38
	3.2.4 Hazard identification and ranking (HIRA).....	41
	3.2.5 Safety weighted hazard index (SWeHI).....	45
	3.3 hazard indices <i>specifically</i> developed for inherent safety	49
	3.3.1 INSIDE project and INSET toolkit.....	49
	3.3.2 Fuzzy based inherent safety index.....	55
	3.3.3 Integrated inherent safety index (I2SI).....	61
	3.3.4 Graphical method.....	63
IV	CRITICAL REVIEW OF MAINSTREM INHERENTLY SAFER CHEMICAL PROCESS DESIGN HAZARD INDICIES.....	73
	4.1 Introduction to mainstream indices.....	74
	4.2 Prototype index of inherent safety (PIIS).....	74
	4.3 Inherent safety index (ISI).....	84
	4.4 Modified inherent safety index (m-ISI).....	93
V	CONCLUSIONS & FUTURE WORK.....	100

5.1 Conclusions.....	101
5.2 Future work.....	101
APPENDIX.....	103
A. Three significant disasters.....	104
A.1. Flixborough, England.....	104
A.2. Bhopal, India.....	106
A.3. Seveso, Italy.....	108
FARSI ABSTRACT.....	110
REFERENCES.....	111

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
2.1	Effect of refrigeration on distance to ERPG-3 concentration for a 5.1 cm monomethylamine pipe rupture.....	19
3.1 (a, b)	Relative values of p factor for some plants and relative contribution of hazards on an EB plant in IFAL.....	41
3.2	INSET stages, key issues & information used.....	52
3.3	List of tools in INSET.....	53
3.4	List of required input parameters (linguistic variables).....	56
3.5	List of required input parameters for adaptive membership design.....	57
3.6	Fuzzy IF-THEN rules for ISI.....	59
3.7	Guidelines for the extent of requirement of add-on system.....	64
3.8	Guidelines for the extent of applicability of IS guidewords.....	66
4.1	Parameters considered and selected in PIIS.....	75
4.2 (a ~ g)	Scores in PIIS.....	76
4.3	Routes to MMA production.....	77
4.4	Scores for each step of each route to MMA production.....	78
5.5	Scores each route to MMA production.....	79
4.6	Process safety experts who commented on PIIS.....	80
4.7	Criteria used in PIIS and ISI and their source.....	85
4.8	ISI symbols of sub-indices.....	85
4.9 (a ~ k)	ISI scores of sub-indices.....	86 ~ 88
4.10	Routes to acetic acid production.....	96
4.11	Individual chemical index calculation in M-ISI for carbonylation process for acetic acid production.....	96

4.12	M-ISI for carbonylation process for acetic acid production.....	97
4.13	M-ISI for routes to acetic acid production.....	97

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
2.1	The conventional design for the manufacture of methyl acetate.....	13
2.2	The reactive distillation design for the manufacture of methyl acetate.....	14
2.3	Comparison of centerline vapor cloud concentration as a function of distance from the release for anhydrous and 28% aqueous ammonia storage for two release scenarios (Weather - D Stability, 3.4 mph wind speed).....	18
2.4	Address safety at the very beginning of project life cycle.....	23
3.1	Procedure for calculating Dow's F&EI.....	30
3.2	Procedure for calculating Mond's F, E&TI.....	37
3.3	Procedure for calculating The IFAL index.....	40
3.4	Methodology of HIRA computation.....	42
3.5	Methodology of SWeHI computation.....	46
3.6 (a)	Hierarchical tree for Layer 1 and Layers 2.1 and 2.2.....	58
3.6 (b, c)	Hierarchical tree for (b) the evaluation of fire and explosion hazards (c) the evaluation of hazards due to chemical properties.....	58
3.6 (d)	Hierarchical tree for the evaluation of mechanical failure.....	59
3.7	Methodology of I2SI computation.....	62
3.8	Monograph for PHCI.....	64
3.9	ISI for different guidewords a) minimization b) substitution c) attenuation d) limiting of.....	66
3.10	Graphical IS measurement for MMA routes.....	70
4.1	Number of usage of keywords by the eight process safety experts.....	90