An Examination of Major Process Safety Incidents in Refineries: Case Studies in Investigation and Systemic Failures

I. Introduction

The refining industry, while critical to global energy supply, inherently involves processes operating at high temperatures and pressures with hazardous materials. Maintaining process safety is paramount to prevent catastrophic incidents that can lead to fatalities, significant injuries, environmental damage, and substantial economic losses. Despite advancements in safety management systems and technologies, major accidents continue to occur. This report provides an in-depth analysis of selected major process safety incidents in refineries worldwide. Each case study examines the incident's timeline, the ensuing investigation, identified root causes spanning technical, human, and organizational factors, the detailed consequences, key lessons learned, and the recommendations put forth by investigating bodies. Through these comprehensive examinations, recurring themes of systemic failures emerge, offering critical learning opportunities for enhancing process safety performance across the industry. The objective is to foster a deeper understanding of how complex interactions between equipment, procedures, and human and organizational factors contribute to disasters, and how such events can be prevented.

II. Case Study 1: BP Texas City Refinery Explosion, 2005

A. Incident Overview

- **Date & Location:** March 23, 2005, BP Texas City Refinery, Texas City, Texas, USA. [1]
- **Event Description:** During the startup of the Isomerization (ISOM) unit's raffinate splitter tower after a maintenance outage, a sequence of operational errors and equipment malfunctions led to the overfilling and overheating of the tower. This resulted in a geyser-like release of highly flammable liquid hydrocarbons from an atmospheric vent stack of an outdated blowdown drum. The released hydrocarbons formed a large, dense vapor cloud that ignited, causing a series of powerful explosions. [1] The unit was operating without a flare system on the vent stack, a critical safety element, relying instead on atmospheric venting. [5] The liquid level in the distillation tower reached over 20 times higher than safe operating levels. [5]

B. Investigation Process

- **Investigating Body:** The U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (CSB) conducted the primary investigation. BP also conducted an internal investigation (Fatal Accident Investigation Report). [2] Additionally, an independent panel, known as the Baker Panel, was commissioned by BP at the CSB's recommendation to assess BP North America's corporate safety culture and oversight. [2]
- **Key Methodologies:** The CSB's investigation was its longest and most complex at the time, involving extensive fieldwork, witness interviews, equipment testing, and analysis of BP's safety management systems, corporate safety culture, and regulatory compliance. [6] The investigation scrutinized operational procedures, training, maintenance practices, alarm systems, and the siting of temporary work trailers. The CSB released its final report in March 2007. [2]

C. Root Causes and Contributing Factors

- **1. Technical Deficiencies:**
  - **Outdated Blowdown Drum and Vent System:** The raffinate splitter tower's pressure relief system vented directly to the atmosphere through an antiquated blowdown drum and stack, lacking a flare to safely combust released flammable vapors. This design was recognized as hazardous, with industry practice moving towards closed relief systems to flares. [2]
  - **Faulty Instrumentation:** Critical instruments, including level transmitters and high-level alarms on the splitter tower and blowdown drum, were unreliable, failed to function correctly, or were ignored. For instance, a work order acknowledged the level transmitter needed repairs but deferred these until after startup. [3] The PSSR (Pre-Startup Safety Review) on the day of the incident, which should have identified the failure of a second high-level switch, was not conducted. [3]
  - **Control Valve Issues:** The pressure control valve for the "3-lb" vent system did not function in pre-startup checks and failed to operate effectively during post-accident testing. [9]
  - **Poor Control Room Interface:** The design of the control screen for monitoring feed levels was poor, with readings on separate pages, reducing visibility and the perceived importance of monitoring liquid in versus out. [3]
- **2. Human Factors:**
  - **Procedural Violations & Non-Compliance:** Operators did not follow established startup procedures, which were themselves incomplete and outdated. For example, the tower was filled above prescribed levels, and heating of the contents began too early and too rapidly. [5]
  - **Inadequate Training and Competency:** Operator training was insufficient,

particularly for abnormal situations like the ISOM unit startup. There was a significant reduction in trainers at the refinery from 38 in 1998 to 9 in 2005. [3]
    - **Fatigue:** Key personnel, including operators, had worked excessively long hours (e.g., 30 straight 12-hour days for some) leading up to the incident, contributing to diminished vigilance and decision-making capability. [2]
    - **Communication Failures:** Shift handover communication was ineffective, lacking a formal logbook to ensure critical information was adequately disseminated. [3]
    - **Supervisory Deficiencies:** No supervisor with appropriate experience was overseeing the startup on the day of the incident. The day supervisor arrived late, missing the handover..[6][10]
- **3. Organizational and Management System Failures:**
    - **Deficient Safety Culture:** BP had a deficient corporate safety culture that tolerated serious and longstanding deviations from good safety practice. Process safety was not effectively incorporated into management decision-making at all levels. [2]
    - **Cost-Cutting Impacts on Safety:** Significant budget cuts (25% in 1999, another 25% planned in 2005 by the previous and then current owner) negatively impacted safety-critical maintenance, training, and staffing levels. Investment in infrastructure and equipment was insufficient. [3]
    - **Ineffective Management of Change (MOC):** MOC procedures were not properly applied, particularly concerning the siting of temporary work trailers near hazardous process units and organizational changes. [2]
    - **Failure to Learn from Past Incidents:** The refinery had a history of abnormal startups of the raffinate splitter tower (17 from April 2000 to March 2005 exhibiting high pressures/levels, including likely relief valve openings) and other serious releases from the ISOM blowdown stack, which were not adequately investigated as near-misses. [3] Two fatal incidents occurred in 2004, and a major hydrogen fire in July 2005. [9]
    - **Flawed Hazard Analysis and Risk Assessment:** Process Hazard Analyses (PHAs) failed to identify or adequately address the hazards of overfilling the splitter tower, the potential for a geyser-like release, or the risks associated with the outdated blowdown system. The siting of trailers was done without a proper MOC analysis. [5]
    - **Misleading Safety Metrics:** Leadership relied on personal injury rates as the key indicator of safety performance, which did not provide an accurate picture of process safety performance or the health of the safety culture. [3]
    - **Inadequate Trailer Siting:** Temporary office trailers were placed dangerously close (as close as 121 feet) to the ISOM unit's blowdown stack, an area with a

known history of flammable releases, largely for convenience. This placed workers directly "in the line of fire." [3]

D. Detailed Consequences

- **Personnel:** 15 workers were killed, and 180 others were injured. All fatalities and many serious injuries occurred in or around the temporary contractor trailers. [1]
- **Asset Damage:** Extensive damage to the ISOM unit and surrounding refinery infrastructure. 13 temporary trailers were totally destroyed, and 43 were damaged. [1]
- **Economic Loss:** Total costs, including fatalities, injuries, damage to refinery equipment, and lost production, were estimated to be over $1.5 billion to $2 billion. [4]
- **Regulatory & Legal:** BP faced significant fines from OSHA (initially $21 million, later settled) and numerous lawsuits from victims and their families. [6]
- **Reputational Damage:** The incident severely damaged BP's reputation globally. [4]

E. Key Lessons Learned

- **Importance of Robust Safety Culture:** A strong, positive safety culture, driven by leadership commitment and involving all levels of the workforce, is fundamental to preventing catastrophic incidents. Relying on lagging indicators like personal injury rates can create a false sense of security regarding process safety. [2]
- **Adequacy of Process Safety Management Systems:** All elements of PSM, including MOC, PHA, operating procedures, mechanical integrity, and training, must be rigorously implemented and continuously improved. Deficiencies in any one area can have cascading effects. [4]
- **Safe Siting of Occupied Buildings:** Temporary structures like trailers must be sited safely away from hazardous process areas, considering credible worst-case scenarios. Convenience should not override safety. [3]
- **Modernization of Relief Systems:** Outdated atmospheric relief systems for flammable materials should be replaced with inherently safer designs, such as closed systems routed to flares. [2]
- **Reliability of Safety Critical Equipment:** Instrumentation, alarms, and control systems critical for safety must be properly designed, maintained, tested, and operators must be trained to respond to their indications. [3]
- **Managing Human Factors:** Issues like fatigue, staffing levels, training adequacy, and communication effectiveness must be proactively managed. [2]
- **Learning from Incidents and Near-Misses:** All incidents, including near-misses and abnormal operations, must be thoroughly investigated, and lessons learned

must be effectively disseminated and implemented to prevent recurrence. [3]

- **Corporate Oversight and Accountability:** Corporate management has a responsibility to ensure adequate resources for process safety and to effectively oversee safety performance at their facilities, including those acquired through mergers. [2]

The failure to address known deficiencies in the raffinate splitter system, despite numerous abnormal startups and a history of releases, points to a significant breakdown in organizational learning. Each abnormal startup was a missed opportunity to recognize and rectify the underlying hazards. This pattern suggests a normalization of deviance, where repeated deviations from safe operating parameters became accepted, eroding safety margins until the catastrophic failure occurred. Furthermore, the decision to defer critical instrument repairs until after startup, despite their importance for safe operation, highlights a culture where production pressures may have overshadowed safety imperatives. [3]

The significant budget cuts imposed on the refinery had tangible impacts on safety-critical areas like maintenance and training. [3] This illustrates how financial decisions made at higher corporate levels can cascade down to affect site-level safety performance. A lack of investment in safety infrastructure and human capital created latent conditions that contributed directly to the incident. This underscores that safety should be treated as a core value and a non-negotiable aspect of operations, rather than a discretionary cost center vulnerable to budget reductions. The reliance on personal injury rates as the primary safety metric masked these growing process safety risks, creating a dangerous illusion of safety. [3]

F. Recommendations from Investigation Report (CSB)

The CSB issued 26 safety recommendations to nine entities, including BP, the American Petroleum Institute (API), OSHA, and labor unions. Over two decades, all but one (to OSHA regarding MOC for organizational changes) have been successfully closed. [8] Key recommendations included:

- **To BP Global Executive Board & BP Texas City:**
  - Commission an independent panel to assess corporate safety oversight and culture (led to the Baker Panel Report). [2]
  - Improve incident reporting, mechanical integrity, hazard analysis, MOC, operating procedures, and trailer siting policies. [2]
  - Revise maintenance quality control for positive material identification. [2]
  - Ensure critical instrumentation is properly maintained and tested. [2]
  - Improve operator training, staffing for hazardous operations, and supervisory

    - presence. [2]
    - Use leading and lagging process safety indicators. [2]
- **To API:**
    - Revise RP 752 (Trailer Siting) to ensure safe placement of temporary structures, establishing minimum safe distances and separate evaluation methodologies. [2]
    - Revise RP 521 (Pressure Relieving Systems) to address overfilling hazards, adequate sizing of disposal drums, and warn against atmospheric blowdown drums for flammable discharges, urging safer alternatives like flares. [2]
    - Develop new ANSI standards for process safety performance indicators and fatigue prevention guidelines. [2]
- **To OSHA:**
    - Implement a national emphasis program for refineries focusing on blowdown drum hazards and PSM enforcement. [2]
    - Amend the PSM standard to require MOC review for organizational changes (e.g., staffing, budget cuts, reorganizations) that may impact process safety (this recommendation remains open). [2]
- **To United Steelworkers (USWA) and USW Local 13-1:**
    - Work with API on new standards for safety indicators and fatigue prevention. [2]
    - Work with BP on a joint program for incident reporting and investigation. [2]

A summary of these recommendations is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Key CSB Recommendations for BP Texas City and Status

Rec. ID	To Whom	Summary of Recommendation	Status (as of March 2025)
2005-4-I-TX-1	BP Global Executive Board	Commission independent panel on corporate safety oversight and culture (Baker Panel).	Closed - Acceptable Action
2005-4-I-TX-2	API	Revise RP 752 (Trailer Siting) for safe placement of temporary structures.	Closed - Acceptable Action
2005-4-I-TX-4	API	Revise RP 521 (Pressure Relief) to	Closed - Acceptable

		address overfilling, sizing, and warn against atmospheric blowdown drums for flammables.	Action
2005-4-I-TX-6	API & USWA	Develop ANSI standard for process safety performance indicators.	Closed - Acceptable Action
2005-4-I-TX-7	API & USWA	Develop ANSI standard for fatigue prevention guidelines.	Closed - Acceptable Action
2005-4-I-TX-9	OSHA	Amend PSM standard to require MOC for organizational changes impacting process safety.	Open - Unacceptable Response
2005-4-I-TX-13	BP Global Executive Board	Ensure senior executives use leading/lagging process safety indicators.	Closed - Acceptable Action
2005-4-I-TX-14	BP Texas City Refinery	Evaluate units for safe design of critical equipment (e.g., distillation tower instrumentation, control board displays).	Closed - Acceptable Action
2005-4-I-TX-15	BP Texas City Refinery	Ensure proper maintenance and testing of safety-critical instrumentation and equipment.	Closed - Acceptable Action

2005-4-I-TX-17	BP Texas City Refinery	Improve operator training program (face-to-face, competency assessment, abnormal situation handling).	Closed - Acceptable Action

Source: [2]

The extensive list of recommendations underscores the multifaceted nature of the failures. The call for revising industry standards like API RP 752 and RP 521 indicates that the incident exposed gaps in existing industry guidance. Similarly, the recommendations to OSHA aimed to strengthen regulatory enforcement and the PSM standard itself. The focus on safety culture, corporate oversight, and process safety indicators reflects a shift towards understanding safety as a systemic property of an organization, not just a collection of technical safeguards.

III. Case Study 2: Tesoro Anacortes Refinery Heat Exchanger Rupture, 2010

A. Incident Overview

- **Date & Location:** April 2, 2010, Tesoro Refinery (now Marathon Anacortes Refinery), Anacortes, Washington, USA. [12]
- **Event Description:** During a maintenance restart operation involving the switching of feed flow between two parallel banks of heat exchangers in the Naphtha Hydrotreater (NHT) unit, one of the heat exchangers (Bank E) catastrophically ruptured. The shell of the nearly 40-year-old carbon steel heat exchanger burst along its weld seams, releasing a large volume of very hot hydrogen and naphtha, which autoignited, causing a massive explosion and fire. Seven employees were fatally burned. [12] The equipment had insufficient instrumentation at the time. [12]

B. Investigation Process

- **Investigating Body:** U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (CSB). Tesoro also conducted an internal investigation using its "Take Ownership Program" (TOP), which included union representation. [14]
- **Key Methodologies:** The CSB investigation involved metallurgical analysis (with the National Institute of Standards and Technology - NIST), sophisticated

computer modeling of process conditions, review of industry standards (API RP 941 "Nelson Curves"), company safety culture assessment, and evaluation of regulatory oversight. The CSB released its draft report in January 2014 and its final report in May 2014. [14]

C. Root Causes and Contributing Factors

- **1. Technical Deficiencies:**
    - **High Temperature Hydrogen Attack (HTHA):** The primary cause of the heat exchanger rupture was HTHA, a damage mechanism that severely cracked and weakened the carbon steel shell, particularly near welds. HTHA occurs when carbon steel is exposed to hydrogen at elevated temperatures and pressures. [14]
    - **Inaccuracy of Nelson Curves (API RP 941):** The industry-standard Nelson Curves, used to predict susceptibility to HTHA, were found to be inaccurate and non-conservative. The failed heat exchanger operated under conditions deemed "safe" by the applicable Nelson Curve. The CSB's modeling showed HTHA occurred in regions operating below the curve. [14]
    - **Material Selection:** The use of carbon steel for this service, although predicted safe by Nelson Curves, proved inadequate. Inherently safer materials (e.g., high chromium steels) would have prevented HTHA. [14]
    - **Heat Exchanger Fouling:** Fouling within the heat exchangers likely led to actual operating temperatures being higher than design conditions used for HTHA assessment, increasing susceptibility. [17]
- **2. Human Factors:**
    - **Normalization of Deviance (Leaks):** The NHT heat exchangers had a history of frequent, hazardous leaks of flammable liquid from flanges during startups, sometimes causing fires. These leaks became an "accepted and normalized hazardous condition" and were not effectively resolved despite maintenance attempts. [14]
    - **Increased Personnel Exposure:** Due to recurring leaks and the need to manually operate long-winded valves (requiring over one hundred turns), a supervisor requested five additional workers to assist with the hazardous non-routine startup, increasing the number of personnel exposed when the rupture occurred. [14]
- **3. Organizational and Management System Failures:**
    - **Deficient Safety Culture:** The CSB cited a deficient refinery safety culture that led to a "complacent" attitude toward flammable leaks and fires. There was a failure to correct the history of hazardous conditions. [14]
    - **Inadequate Process Hazard Analyses (PHAs):** Required PHAs repeatedly

failed to ensure that hazards associated with HTHA and the hazardous non-routine startup (including recurring leaks) were controlled, and that the number of exposed workers was minimized. Past PHAs cited judgment-based safeguards without verifying their effectiveness. [14]
    - **Flawed Damage Mechanism Reviews:** Corrosion reviews and inspection strategies relied on design operating conditions rather than verifying actual operating parameters, failing to account for temperature increases due to fouling. [14]
    - **Weak Industry Standards:** API RP 941 was described as "permissively written" with no minimum requirements to prevent HTHA failures. It lacked requirements for inherently safer design or verification of actual operating conditions. Nelson Curve data is based on voluntary, unverified company submissions. [14]
    - **Insufficient Management of Change (MOC):** An MOC for new steam stations was conducted, but a hazard evaluation was deemed not required for "minor utility system changes," overlooking the safety implications of adding personnel to the hazardous startup. [17]
    - **Regulatory Deficiencies (Washington State):** State PSM regulations, modeled on federal OSHA, were found to be activity-based rather than outcome-oriented, lacking risk reduction targets and effective workforce involvement. The state regulator (DOSH) lacked sufficient staff with technical expertise for adequate oversight of refineries. [17]

D. Detailed Consequences

- **Personnel:** Seven employees received fatal burns. [12]
- **Economic Loss:** The refinery was out of commission for over seven months. [17] Tesoro settled a lawsuit with victims' families for $39 million. The refinery had previously been fined for serious safety violations. [15]
- **Industry Impact:** The incident highlighted industry-wide problems with the reliability of the carbon steel Nelson Curve for predicting HTHA. [17]

E. Key Lessons Learned

- **Limitations of Industry Standards:** Reliance on potentially non-conservative or permissive industry standards (like the Nelson Curves for HTHA) can lead to catastrophic failures. Standards need to be rigorously validated and updated based on incident learnings and research. [14]
- **Importance of Inherently Safer Design (ISD):** The use of inherently safer materials (e.g., high chromium steels for HTHA service) is the most effective way to prevent certain types of equipment failures. [14]

- **Verification of Actual Operating Conditions:** Damage mechanism assessments must be based on actual, verified operating conditions, not just design data, accounting for factors like fouling. [14]
- **Addressing Normalization of Deviance:** Frequent leaks or other hazardous conditions must not become normalized. They are indicators of underlying problems that require effective resolution. [14]
- **Rigorous Management of Non-Routine Operations:** Hazardous non-routine work, such as unit startups with known issues, requires meticulous planning, robust hazard analysis, minimization of personnel exposure, and strong supervisory oversight. [14]
- **Strengthening Regulatory Oversight:** Regulatory frameworks should be outcome-based, promote the use of ISD and hierarchy of controls, ensure robust workforce participation, and be supported by adequately resourced and technically competent regulators. A "Safety Case" regime was suggested as a more effective model. [14]
- **Proactive Safety Culture:** A proactive safety culture is essential, characterized by management commitment, open reporting, learning from incidents, and a questioning attitude towards existing safeguards. [14]

The Tesoro Anacortes incident serves as a stark illustration of how reliance on flawed industry guidance, coupled with organizational acceptance of recurring hazardous conditions, can lead to tragedy. The fact that the HTHA failure occurred under conditions deemed "safe" by the Nelson Curves was a critical finding, shaking confidence in a long-standing industry tool. [14] This points to a systemic vulnerability: if the very standards designed to ensure safety are inadequate, then compliance alone is insufficient to prevent accidents. It underscores the need for operators to adopt a more fundamental approach to risk assessment, critically evaluating the basis of industry guidance and seeking inherently safer solutions rather than merely meeting minimum accepted practices.

The normalization of frequent leaks during startups is a classic example of how operational deviations can become dangerously accepted over time. [14] Each successful startup, despite the leaks, may have inadvertently reinforced the belief that the condition was manageable, while the underlying risk of a catastrophic heat exchanger failure due to HTHA remained unaddressed and potentially worsened. This highlights the importance of maintaining a chronic sense of unease and rigorously investigating any deviation from safe operating parameters, no matter how frequent or seemingly minor. The decision to bring in additional personnel to manage these known leaky conditions, rather than resolving the leaks themselves, tragically increased the number of victims. [14]

F. Recommendations from Investigation Report (CSB)

The CSB issued far-reaching draft recommendations to various entities, including API, EPA, Washington State, and Tesoro. [14] Key recommendations included:

- **To API:**
  - Revise API RP 941 and RP 581 to establish minimum "shall" requirements to prevent HTHA, require ISD (e.g., prohibit carbon steel above 400∘F and 50 psia hydrogen partial pressure), and require verification of actual operating conditions. [19]
- **To EPA:**
  - Revise Chemical Accident Prevention Provisions (40 CFR Part 68) to require documented use of inherently safer systems analysis and the hierarchy of controls. [19]
- **To Washington State Legislature and Governor:**
  - Augment PSM regulations for refineries towards a more rigorous "Safety Case" regime, requiring comprehensive PHAs, documented use of ISD/hierarchy of controls, robust damage mechanism reviews, increased worker participation, public reporting of safety indicators, and a well-funded, technically qualified regulator. [19]
- **To Tesoro Refining & Marketing Company and Tesoro Anacortes Refinery:**
  - Participate with API in revising standards. [19]
  - Implement a process safety culture continuous improvement program with oversight from a tripartite committee (management, union, regulators). [19]
  - Revise and improve PHA, Integrity Operating Window (IOW), and damage mechanism hazard review programs. [19]

A summary of these recommendations is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Key CSB Recommendations for Tesoro Anacortes and Status

Rec. ID	To Whom	Summary of Recommendation	Status (as of latest CSB update)
2010-08-I-WA-R10	API	Revise API RP 941: establish minimum "shall" requirements for HTHA prevention, require ISD, verify	Closed - Unacceptable Action

		actual operating conditions, prohibit carbon steel in certain HTHA-susceptible services.	
2010-08-I-WA-R1	EPA	Revise 40 CFR Part 68 to require documented use of inherently safer systems analysis and hierarchy of controls.	Closed - Acceptable Alt. Action
2010-08-I-WA-R4	Governor & Legislature of WA	Augment WA PSM regulations for refineries towards a Safety Case regime (comprehensive PHAs, ISD, damage mechanism reviews, worker participation, public reporting, qualified regulator).	Closed - Acceptable Alt. Action
2010-08-I-WA-R15	Tesoro Anacortes Refinery	Implement a process safety culture continuous improvement program with tripartite oversight.	Closed - Acceptable Alt. Action
2010-08-I-WA-R17	Tesoro Refining & Marketing Company LLC	Revise and improve PHA, IOW, and damage mechanism hazard review programs.	Closed - Acceptable Action

Source: [19]

The recommendations stemming from the Tesoro Anacortes incident strongly advocated for a paradigm shift in how HTHA is managed and how refinery safety is regulated, pushing for more proactive, inherently safer approaches rather than reliance on potentially flawed predictive models and activity-based compliance. The call for a Safety Case regime in Washington State was particularly significant, signaling a move towards requiring operators to demonstrate safety rather than regulators having to find non-compliance.

IV. Case Study 3: Chevron Richmond Refinery Fire, 2012

A. Incident Overview

- **Date & Location:** August 6, 2012, Chevron U.S.A. Inc. Refinery, Richmond, California, USA. [20]
- **Event Description:** A catastrophic pipe rupture occurred in the #4 Crude Unit's "4-sidecut" stream, an 8-inch carbon steel pipe. The pipe, severely thinned by sulfidation corrosion (particularly due to low silicon content), initially developed a small leak of hot "gas oil." Instead of an immediate unit shutdown, troubleshooting was attempted. Actions to remove insulation likely punctured the already thinned pipe. The pipe then ripped open, releasing flammable, high-temperature light gas oil. This material partially vaporized, forming a large, opaque vapor cloud that engulfed 19 workers. Approximately 2 minutes later, the cloud ignited, causing a large fire and a plume of particulates over the surrounding area. [20]

B. Investigation Process

- **Investigating Body:** U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (CSB). Chevron also conducted an internal investigation. [20]
- **Key Methodologies:** The CSB investigation included metallurgical testing of the failed pipe, review of Chevron's internal recommendations, decision-making processes regarding piping inspection and replacement (particularly for sulfidation corrosion), assessment of safety culture, and evaluation of regulatory oversight by Cal/OSHA and local agencies. The CSB released an Interim Report, a Regulatory Report, and a Final Report (approved January 2015). [20]

C. Root Causes and Contributing Factors

- **1. Technical Deficiencies:**
  - **Sulfidation Corrosion:** The primary cause of the pipe rupture was severe wall thinning due to sulfidation corrosion. The specific 52-inch component that failed was made of ASTM A53B carbon steel with a very low silicon content (0.01 wt%), making it highly susceptible to accelerated sulfidation corrosion. Piping installed before the mid-1980s often had variable silicon content. [20]
  - **Material Selection:** Failure to upgrade the low-silicon carbon steel piping in the 4-sidecut to a more corrosion-resistant material (e.g., higher chromium steel like 9-Chrome, or stainless steel) despite known susceptibility and

internal recommendations over a ten-year period. [20]

  - **Inadequate Inspection Practices:** Chevron failed to inspect all susceptible components within the 4-sidecut piping. Recommendations for 100% component inspection of low-silicon lines were not effectively implemented. Decisions not to replace the critical section were sometimes based on inspection data from less susceptible components (e.g., elbows or higher silicon pipes within the same circuit). [20]
- **2. Human Factors:**
  - **Failure to Follow Procedures:** Instead of shutting down the unit when the leak was detected (Chevron's procedure for such leaks was to shut down and then troubleshoot), personnel attempted to troubleshoot the problem and apply a clamp device while the unit remained online. [20]
  - **Actions During Leak Investigation:** Firefighters' attempts to remove insulation using a pike pole likely punctured the already severely thinned pipe, exacerbating the leak. [20]
  - **Flawed Decision-Making During Leak Response:** There was no formal leak response protocol to guide actions. An evaluation based on a proper protocol might have led to the conclusion that the leak was due to general thinning, making clamping unviable and necessitating an immediate shutdown. [20]
  - **Stop Work Authority Concerns:** Some workers reported feeling pressured not to exercise their stop work authority, indicating potential cultural issues affecting safety-critical decisions during the unfolding event. [21]
- **3. Organizational and Management System Failures:**
  - **Missed Opportunities for Inherently Safer Design (ISD):** Chevron repeatedly failed over a ten-year period to apply ISD principles by not upgrading the corroded piping from carbon steel to a more suitable alloy, despite internal policies calling for the use of ISD. [20]
  - **Ineffective Management of Change (MOC) / Project Approval Process:** The turnaround management program and its data-driven framework unintentionally led to denying or deferring critical safety upgrades. Recommendations for upgrades were denied because "hard data" from the specific failing component was lacking, even though expert groups recommended action based on known damage mechanisms. [22]
  - **Failure to Implement Internal Recommendations:** Multiple internal recommendations from Chevron's own experts (e.g., Energy Technology Company - ETC, Fixed Equipment Reliability Business Improvement Network - FER BIN) over a decade to inspect or upgrade the 4-sidecut piping were not effectively implemented or tracked to completion. [20]
  - **Organizational Silos & Lack of Authority for Expert Groups:** Technical

expert groups like ETC provided recommendations but had limited authority to enforce their implementation at the refinery level. There was no formal tracking method for these critical recommendations. [22]
  - **Deficient Safety Culture:** The CSB and local officials pointed to lapses in Chevron's safety culture, including a reluctance to heed warnings from its own experts and a system that did not sufficiently empower workers or ensure accountability for implementing safety recommendations. Chevron contested this depiction of its safety culture. [21]
  - **Inadequate Regulatory Oversight:** Cal/OSHA was found to be under-resourced and ill-equipped for effective refinery oversight. Existing local and state regulations did not mandate ISD or sufficiently rigorous damage mechanism reviews as part of hazard identification and control. [20]

D. Detailed Consequences

- **Personnel:** 19 workers were engulfed in the vapor cloud and narrowly escaped serious injury or death. Six employees sustained minor injuries during the incident and emergency response. Approximately 15,000 residents from the surrounding area sought medical treatment in the weeks following for ailments including breathing problems, chest pain, shortness of breath, sore throat, and headaches; about 20 were admitted to hospitals. [20]
- **Environmental Impact:** A large plume of unknown particulates and vapor traveled across the surrounding area. [20]
- **Community Impact:** Significant public concern and impact on the local community, leading to calls for improved safety, transparency, and regulatory oversight. [20]
- **Operational Impact:** The #4 Crude Unit was shut down, requiring significant repairs.

E. Key Lessons Learned

- **Proactive Implementation of ISD:** Refineries must proactively identify and implement ISD opportunities, especially for known hazards like sulfidation corrosion in aging equipment. This includes upgrading materials of construction where appropriate. [20]
- **Effective Damage Mechanism Management:** Robust programs for identifying, inspecting, and mitigating known damage mechanisms (such as sulfidation of low-silicon carbon steel) are crucial. This includes performing 100% component inspection of susceptible circuits where necessary, rather than relying on statistical or selective inspection. [22]
- **Bridging the Gap Between Technical Expertise and Management Action:**

Clear mechanisms are needed to ensure that recommendations from internal technical experts are given due weight, effectively implemented, funded, and tracked to completion, with clear accountability at management levels. [22]

- **Strengthening Safety Culture:** A safety culture that genuinely empowers workers to stop unsafe work, values proactive hazard identification, learns from warnings and near-misses, and holds management accountable for safety performance is essential. [21]
- **Robust Leak Response Protocols:** Formal, clear, and practiced protocols for responding to hazardous material leaks are necessary to guide decision-making, ensure appropriate actions (like unit shutdown), and prevent incident escalation. [20]
- **Need for Enhanced and Proactive Regulatory Oversight:** Regulators require adequate resources, deep technical expertise, and stronger, more prescriptive regulatory frameworks (e.g., mandating ISD, Safety Cases, specific damage mechanism reviews) to effectively oversee complex, high-hazard facilities. [20]

A critical aspect of this incident was the repeated failure to act on known risks. Chevron's own technical experts had, for years, identified the hazards associated with sulfidation corrosion in low-silicon piping and had recommended more thorough inspections or material upgrades for the very section of pipe that failed. [20] However, these recommendations were not effectively implemented due to systemic issues within Chevron's project approval and turnaround management processes. These processes, while intended to be data-driven, paradoxically created barriers to proactive safety investments. For instance, requests for upgrades were sometimes denied because "hard data" demonstrating thinning in *that specific component* was lacking, even though the general vulnerability of such components was well-understood by experts. [22] This illustrates a dangerous organizational dynamic where knowledge of a hazard exists within the company, but systemic flaws prevent that knowledge from being translated into effective preventative action. It highlights the need for management systems that not only gather technical expertise but also ensure that this expertise can influence critical safety decisions and resource allocation, with clear lines of accountability.

The regulatory environment also played a significant role. The investigation found that Cal/OSHA was under-resourced and that existing state and local regulations did not sufficiently compel refineries to adopt inherently safer designs or conduct the rigorous damage mechanism reviews needed to prevent such failures. [20] This points to a broader challenge in regulating high-hazard industries: if oversight is not sufficiently robust, technically deep, and backed by strong enforcement mechanisms, companies may not be adequately incentivized to go beyond minimum compliance or to address known but not yet mandated safety improvements. The incident spurred calls for a more proactive, performance-based regulatory approach in California, similar to Safety Case regimes, to drive down risks to "as low as reasonably practicable" (ALARP).

Furthermore, the events on the day of the incident, particularly the decision not to immediately shut down the unit upon leak detection and the subsequent actions during the attempt to remove insulation, underscore the importance of clear, unambiguous emergency procedures and a safety culture that empowers all personnel, including operators and emergency responders, to take decisive safety actions. [20] The reported concerns about exercising stop-work authority suggest that this critical safety barrier may have been weakened. [21]

F. Recommendations from Investigation Report (CSB)

The CSB issued numerous recommendations to Chevron, API, ASME, Contra Costa County, the City of Richmond, the Governor and Legislature of California, and the EPA. [25] Key areas included:

- **To Chevron:**
  - Perform documented damage mechanism hazard reviews at all U.S. refineries as part of the PHA cycle. [25]
  - Report leading and lagging process safety indicators to regulatory agencies. [25]
  - Develop methods to assign accountability for implementing ETC-recommended programs or industry best practices, and track deferred turnaround work. [25]
  - Develop an approval process for resetting minimum alert thicknesses in inspection databases. [25]
- **To API:**
  - Revise multiple Recommended Practices (RP 939-C, RP 571, API 570, RP 578, RP 574, RP 2001) to address:
    - Minimum requirements for preventing catastrophic rupture of low-silicon carbon steel piping due to sulfidation corrosion (e.g., requiring 100% component inspection or replacement). [25]
    - Consistent terminology and inspection requirements for low-silicon components. [25]
    - Requirements for facilities to develop specific process fluid leak response protocols. [25]
- **To ASME:**

    - Revise ASME PCC-2-2011 (Repair of Pressure Equipment and Piping) to require users to follow minimum leak response requirements before conducting repairs. [25]
- **To Contra Costa County & City of Richmond:**
    - Revise Industrial Safety Ordinances (ISO) to require more rigorous PHAs (including documented safeguard effectiveness), documented use of ISD and hierarchy of controls to ALARP, oversight of damage mechanism review programs, and programs for continuous improvement of process safety culture. [25]
- **To Governor & Legislature of California:**
    - Revise California's PSM regulations to require improved mechanical integrity and PHA programs (including damage mechanism reviews, ISD), reporting of safety indicators, and establish a multi-agency process safety regulatory program for refineries. [25]
    - Enhance and restructure PSM regulations for refineries towards a goal-setting, performance-based approach with expanded worker roles and public information. [25]
    - Implement compensation systems to attract and retain technically competent regulatory staff. [25]
- **To EPA:**
    - Jointly plan and conduct inspections with Cal/OSHA and other state/local agencies to monitor implementation of damage mechanism hazard review and disclosure requirements. [25]

A summary of these recommendations is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Key CSB Recommendations for Chevron Richmond Incident and Status

Rec. ID	To Whom	Summary of Recommendation	Status (as of latest CSB update)
2012-03-I-CA-1	Chevron USA	At all Chevron U.S. refineries, perform documented damage mechanism hazard reviews as integral part of PHA cycle for all PSM-covered piping/equipment.	Closed - Acceptable Action

2012-03-I-CA-26	API	Revise API RP 939-C for minimum requirements for preventing rupture of low-silicon carbon steel (100% inspection/replacement, designate CMLs).	Closed - Acceptable Alt. Action
2012-03-I-CA-31	API	Revise API RP 2001 to require users to develop facility-specific process fluid leak response protocol.	Closed - Acceptable Alt. Action
2012-03-I-CA-7	Board of Supervisors, Contra Costa County, CA	Revise ISO for documented use of ISD/hierarchy of controls to ALARP, triggered for MOC, PHA, new processes, rebuilds, significant repairs, corrective actions.	Closed - Acceptable Alt. Action
2012-03-I-CA-9	Governor & Legislature of CA	Revise CA PSM regulations for improved mechanical integrity & PHA programs (damage mechanism reviews, ISD incorporation).	Closed - Acceptable Action
2012-03-I-CA-11	Governor & Legislature of CA	Establish multi-agency process safety regulatory program for CA oil refineries (accountability, transparency, performance of accident prevention/mechanical integrity, safety	Closed - Acceptable Alt. Action

		indicators, workforce/public participation).	
2012-03-I-CA-36	Board of Supervisors, Contra Costa County, CA	Revise ISO for petroleum refineries to require process safety culture continuous improvement program (surveys, oversight committee).	Closed - Acceptable Alt. Action

Source: [25]

The breadth of recommendations, targeting the company, industry standard-setting bodies, and multiple levels of government, reflects the CSB's finding that systemic changes were needed to prevent similar incidents. The strong push for adopting inherently safer design principles and for strengthening regulatory oversight to drive proactive risk reduction were central themes.

V. Case Study 4: Philadelphia Energy Solutions (PES) Refinery Explosion and Fire, 2019

A. Incident Overview

- **Date & Location:** June 21, 2019, Philadelphia Energy Solutions (PES) Refinery, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. [26]
- **Event Description:** The incident initiated with a leak of liquefied hydrocarbon gas, predominantly propane containing approximately 2.5% hydrofluoric acid (HF), from a ruptured pipe elbow in the refinery's alkylation unit. This elbow was on the discharge piping of a depropanizer accumulator pump that was not operating at the time. A ground-hugging vapor cloud formed and, at 4:02 AM, ignited, causing a massive fire. This was followed by three explosions over the next 20 minutes. The largest was a Boiling Liquid Expanding Vapor Explosion (BLEVE) of the V-1 Treater Feed Surge Drum (containing butylene, isobutane, and n-butane) at 4:22 AM, which propelled a vessel fragment weighing approximately 38,000 pounds about 2,000 feet across the Schuylkill River. [24]

B. Investigation Process

- **Investigating Body:** U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (CSB).

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) also conducted an investigation and reached a settlement with PES. [26]

- **Key Methodologies:** The CSB investigation involved metallurgical analysis of the failed pipe elbow, review of the refinery's risk assessment and mechanical integrity programs, and evaluation of the HF alkylation unit's safety systems and emergency response. The CSB released a factual update in October 2019 and its final investigation report on October 11, 2022. [24]

C. Root Causes and Contributing Factors

- **1. Technical Deficiencies:**
  - **Corroded Pipe Elbow:** The initiating event was the rupture of a carbon steel pipe elbow, installed in 1973, due to "extensive" internal corrosion, primarily by hydrofluoric acid. The elbow was found to be significantly thinner than its designated retirement thickness. [24]
  - **Material Degradation:** The CSB's investigation likely found (as inferred from recommendations regarding ASTM A234 for HF service) that the material composition or condition of the elbow made it particularly susceptible to accelerated corrosion in the HF environment. [27]
  - **Failure of Emergency Safety Systems:** Water cannons designed to mitigate airborne HF releases by vapor suppression failed to activate. Their associated control system had failed at the time of ignition, and its backup uninterruptible power supply (UPS) failed 9 seconds later. An operator's attempt to manually activate water pumps was initially thwarted by extreme heat. [26]
- **2. Human Factors:**
  - While specific operator errors leading directly to the pipe failure were not the primary focus in the provided summaries, the systemic failures in inspection and risk assessment point to human elements within the organizational system.
- **3. Organizational and Management System Failures:**
  - **Inadequate Risk Assessment & Inspection:** PES failed to identify and adequately assess the risk posed by the aging, corroded pipe elbow in the critical HF alkylation unit. The EPA found this to be a violation of the Clean Air Act's General Duty Clause. The refinery's inspection program did not detect or address the severely corroded elbow before its failure. [26]
  - **Financial Pressures & Deferred Maintenance:** The refinery was under significant financial distress, having filed for bankruptcy previously and was reliant on expensive imported oils. In January 2019, PES abandoned a major maintenance turnaround one week before its planned execution. Such financial strain and deferred maintenance likely compromised the integrity of

aging equipment and the thoroughness of inspection programs. [26]

- **Deficient Mechanical Integrity Program:** The failure of a critical pipe elbow that was well below its retirement thickness indicates severe deficiencies in the refinery's mechanical integrity program, specifically concerning inspection frequency, thoroughness, non-destructive examination (NDE) techniques for HF service, and timely replacement of degraded piping.
- **Hydrofluoric Acid (HF) Safety Concerns:** The incident once again highlighted the significant hazards associated with HF alkylation units, including the potential for rapid escalation and severe off-site consequences from an HF release.
- **Emergency Response System Deficiencies:** The failure of the water cannons and their backup power points to potential issues in the design, maintenance, testing, and overall reliability of critical emergency response equipment intended for HF release mitigation. [26]

D. Detailed Consequences

- **Personnel:** Five employees sustained minor injuries. Fortunately, there were no fatalities. [26]
- **Asset Damage:** Massive fire and multiple explosions, including a significant BLEVE, caused extensive damage to the alkylation unit. Large vessel fragments were propelled considerable distances, one landing across the Schuylkill River. [24]
- **Financial Loss & Operational Impact:** PES announced the permanent closure of the refinery complex shortly after the incident and filed for bankruptcy for a second time. [26] The shutdown reduced U.S. East Coast refining capacity by a notable margin (PES was the largest refinery on the East Coast, and its closure impacted about 2% of total U.S. refining capacity). [26] PES reached a $4.2 million settlement with the EPA regarding Clean Air Act violations. [26]
- **Environmental Impact:** An estimated 676,000 pounds of hydrocarbons were released, of which approximately 608,000 pounds were combusted. An estimated 5,239 pounds of hydrofluoric acid were also released to the atmosphere from failed piping and equipment. [24] A shelter-in-place order was issued for residents east of the plant. The fire burned for over 24 hours. [26]
- **Community Impact:** Significant public concern arose over the HF release and the overall safety of the aging refinery, which was located in a densely populated urban area. [28]

E. Key Lessons Learned

- **Criticality of Mechanical Integrity for Aging Infrastructure in HF Service:** Aging equipment, especially piping in highly corrosive services like hydrofluoric acid alkylation, requires exceptionally rigorous inspection programs, appropriate NDE techniques, accurate remaining life assessments, and timely replacement to prevent catastrophic failures. The failure of a component installed in 1973 underscores this. [26]

- **Thorough Risk Assessment and Management for HF Alkylation Units:** The unique and severe hazards of HF necessitate extremely thorough, regularly updated risk assessments that specifically address corrosion mechanisms and the potential for rapid failure. Mitigation measures must be robust and regularly verified. [26]
- **Impact of Financial Distress on Process Safety Performance:** Sustained financial pressures can lead to the deferral of critical maintenance, inspections, and safety upgrades, thereby increasing the risk of major accidents. The abandonment of a planned turnaround at PES is a strong indicator of this pressure. [26]
- **Reliability and Robustness of Emergency Response Systems:** Critical emergency mitigation systems, such as water cannons for HF vapor suppression and their associated power supplies, must be designed for high reliability, protected from incident effects (fire, explosion), regularly tested, and maintained to ensure they function as intended during an emergency. [26]
- **Importance of Inherently Safer Technology (IST) Evaluation:** The incident reinforced the need for the refining industry to seriously evaluate and, where practicable, adopt inherently safer technologies to reduce or eliminate catastrophic hazards like those posed by large inventories of HF. [27]

The failure of a single, decades-old pipe elbow in the PES refinery's HF alkylation unit set off a chain of events that led to a major disaster, including multiple explosions and a BLEVE. [24] This underscores the immense destructive potential housed within such units and the critical importance of ensuring the integrity of every component. A localized mechanical integrity failure, if it occurs in a system handling highly hazardous materials like HF and flammable hydrocarbons, can rapidly escalate, overwhelming containment and emergency response capabilities. The failure of the emergency water cannons due to control system and backup power loss further compounded the situation, highlighting how common-cause failures can disable multiple layers of protection. [26] This points to the necessity of designing emergency systems with resilience against the very events they are meant to mitigate.

The financial condition of Philadelphia Energy Solutions appears to have been a significant underlying factor. Reports indicate the refinery was struggling economically and had deferred a major maintenance turnaround. [26] Such circumstances often create immense pressure to cut costs, and areas like proactive maintenance, detailed inspections beyond minimum requirements, and capital-intensive safety upgrades can become targets for deferral. This creates a dangerous environment where the physical condition of aging equipment can deteriorate unaddressed, leading to an increased likelihood of failure. The PES incident suggests that the long-term financial viability and commitment to reinvestment in safety are crucial precursors to sustained, safe operation, particularly for older facilities handling high-hazard processes.

The hazards of hydrofluoric acid are well-documented, and its use in alkylation units has long been a subject of safety concern. The PES incident brought these concerns to the forefront again. The release of HF, even if a portion was combusted or mitigated, poses a severe threat to workers and the surrounding community. The extensive CSB recommendations focusing on HF alkylation unit safety, including calls for updating industry standards (API RP 751), improving material specifications (ASTM A234), and mandating Safer Technology and Alternatives Analyses (STAA) by the EPA, signal a strong regulatory and investigative push to address these specific risks more comprehensively. [27] This incident serves as a powerful reminder that managing known, high-consequence hazards like HF requires unceasing vigilance, robust safety barriers, and a continuous drive towards inherently safer solutions.

F. Recommendations from Investigation Report (CSB)

The CSB issued several key recommendations targeting industry standards bodies and regulatory agencies to improve the safety of HF alkylation units:

- **To American Petroleum Institute (API):**
    - Update API RP 751 *Safe Operation of Hydrofluoric Acid Alkylation Units* to require:
        1. Protection of critical safeguards and associated control system components (including wiring, cabling, and primary/backup power supplies) from fire and explosion hazards (e.g., radiant heat, projectiles).
        2. Installation of remotely-operated emergency isolation valves on inlets and outlets of all HF-containing vessels and hydrocarbon-containing vessels meeting defined threshold quantities. [27]
- **To ASTM International:**
    - Revise ASTM A234 *Piping Fittings of Wrought Carbon Steel and Alloy Steel for Moderate and High Temperature Service* to incorporate supplementary requirements for piping used in HF service, referencing specific requirements from ASTM A106. [27]

- **To Environmental Protection Agency (EPA):**
  - Develop a program to prioritize and emphasize inspections of refinery HF alkylation units, verifying compliance with API RP 751, including special emphasis on carbon steel component inspection, protection of safety-critical safeguards, and installation of remote isolation valves. [27]
  - Revise 40 C.F.R. Part 68 (EPA Risk Management Plan) to require new and existing petroleum refineries with HF alkylation units to conduct a Safer Technology and Alternatives Analysis (STAA) and evaluate the practicability of any identified Inherently Safer Technology (IST) every 5 years. [27]
  - Initiate prioritization to evaluate hydrofluoric acid as a High-Priority Substance for risk evaluation under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). (This was later superseded by a broader recommendation). [27]

A summary of these recommendations is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Key CSB Recommendations for PES Refinery Incident and Status

Rec. ID	**To Whom**	**Summary of Recommendation**	**Status (as of latest CSB update)**
2019-04-I-PA-4	API	Update API RP 751 (HF Alkylation) to require protection of critical safeguards/controls and remotely-operated emergency isolation valves.	Open - Awaiting Response
2019-04-I-PA-5	ASTM International	Revise ASTM A234 (Piping Fittings) to incorporate supplementary requirements for piping in HF service.	Closed - Reconsidered/Superseded
2019-04-I-PA-1	EPA	Develop program for prioritized inspection of refinery HF alkylation units, verify API RP 751 compliance	Open - Acceptable Response

		(corrosion inspection, safeguard protection, isolation valves).	
2019-04-I-PA-2	EPA	Revise RMP rule (40 CFR Part 68) to require refineries with HF alkylation units to conduct Safer Technology and Alternatives Analysis (STAA) and evaluate IST practicability every 5 years.	Closed - Acceptable Action

Source: [27]

These recommendations underscore a clear focus on enhancing the specific safety requirements for HF alkylation units, pushing for improvements in both industry standards and regulatory mandates to better control the significant risks associated with HF.

VI. Case Study 5: Husky Energy Superior Refinery Explosion and Fire, 2018

A. Incident Overview

- **Date & Location:** April 26, 2018, Husky Energy Oil Refinery (later acquired by Cenovus Energy), Superior, Wisconsin, USA. [29]
- **Event Description:** An explosion occurred in the Fluid Catalytic Cracking Unit (FCCU) at approximately 10:00 AM while the unit was being shut down for planned routine maintenance. Workers attempted to stop the flow of hydrocarbons to the regenerator; however, a worn or corroded slide valve failed to provide an adequate barrier, allowing air from the regenerator to mix with flammable hydrocarbons in the reactor. This mixture ignited, causing a massive explosion in the FCCU. Debris from this explosion, with fragments propelled up to 1,200 feet, punctured a nearby above-ground storage tank containing approximately 50,000 barrels of hot asphalt. The spilled asphalt ignited, leading to a large, prolonged fire that produced a thick plume of black smoke. [29]

B. Investigation Process

- **Investigating Body:** U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (CSB). [30]
- **Key Methodologies:** The CSB investigation focused on the FCCU transient operations (shutdown procedures), the integrity of the slide valves, process safety management systems, industry knowledge sharing and learning from past incidents, vessel material properties (specifically related to brittle fracture), and emergency preparedness, including the potential risk from nearby hydrofluoric acid (HF) storage. The CSB released its final report on December 29, 2022. [30]

C. Root Causes and Contributing Factors

- **1. Technical Deficiencies:**
  - **Worn/Corroded Slide Valve:** A critical slide valve in the FCCU, intended to isolate hydrocarbons from air during shutdown, was worn or corroded and failed to effectively seal. This allowed air to flow into equipment containing flammable hydrocarbons, creating an explosive atmosphere. [29]
  - **Brittle Fracture of FCCU Vessels:** The primary absorber and sponge absorber vessels in the FCCU failed by brittle fracture, shattering like glass and generating numerous high-velocity metal fragments. These vessels were constructed of older steel grades that lacked the toughness properties of newer, recommended steels, which would tend to tear rather than shatter. [30]
  - **Outdated Equipment:** The FCCU vessels that exploded were described as outdated. [31]
- **2. Human Factors:**
  - While specific operator errors were not the primary focus of the summaries, the lack of process knowledge and inadequate training for transient operations are significant human factors elements within the organizational failures.
- **3. Organizational and Management System Failures:**
  - **Inadequate Transient Operation Safeguards:** Essential safeguards for managing the FCCU during shutdown (a transient operation), specifically to prevent the mixing of air and flammable hydrocarbons, were either not implemented or were ineffective at the time of the incident. [30]
  - **Deficient Process Knowledge:** Husky Superior Refinery employees did not adequately understand or know how to effectively control the FCCU's transient operation hazards. FCC expertise at the refinery was mostly in-house, with limited use of external experts and minimal technical engagement with other refineries. Husky Energy had owned the plant for only six months prior to the incident. [30]
  - **Inadequate Process Safety Management (PSM):** The refinery failed to

adequately maintain process safety information, operating procedures, process hazard analyses (PHAs), and operator training related to its FCCU operations, particularly for transient states. [30]

  - **Failure to Learn from Similar Incidents (Industry Knowledge Gap):** Despite the CSB releasing an investigation report on a similar FCCU incident in California less than a year prior, and industry trade groups distributing lessons from it, Husky Superior Refinery employees were reportedly unaware of or did not learn from the 2015 California incident. [30]
  - **Lack of Common Industry Guidance for FCC Units:** The CSB highlighted that there is no single, comprehensive industry publication establishing common basic process safety expectations for all FCC units, which often have varied designs from multiple licensors and may have undergone multiple revamps. [30]
  - **Emergency Preparedness Gaps:** Husky Superior Refinery was unable to prevent the spilled asphalt from igniting and causing a major fire, due to the large volume of asphalt released and competing priorities arising from the initial FCCU explosion, such as attending to worker injuries and extinguishing existing fires at the FCCU. [30]
  - **Hydrofluoric Acid (HF) Proximity Risk (Latent Hazard):** Although no HF was released, the refinery's HF storage tank was closer to the point of the FCCU explosion than the asphalt tank that was punctured. The potential for an HF release due to projectile impact was a significant concern and influenced evacuation decisions for the surrounding community. [30]

D. Detailed Consequences

- **Personnel:** 36 workers were injured, including 11 refinery employees. There were no fatalities. [29]
- **Asset Damage:** Approximately $550 million in damage to the facility. The cost to rebuild the refinery eventually grew to $1.2 billion. [30]
- **Environmental Impact:** Release of approximately 39,000 pounds (17.7 tons) of flammable hydrocarbon vapor into the air. [30] The large asphalt fire produced a thick black smoke plume visible for miles, which was picked up on weather radar. [29]
- **Community Impact:** Evacuation of over 2,500 residents in the City of Superior and a shelter-in-place order issued for the City of Duluth, Minnesota, due to the smoke and the potential risk of an HF release. [29] The refinery closure had economic impacts on the local community, including increased water rates for Superior residents (as the refinery was a major customer) and loss of refinery jobs

until the rebuild. [31]

E. Key Lessons Learned

- **Criticality of Robust Safeguards for Transient Operations:** FCCU shutdowns and startups are high-risk transient operations that require meticulously planned, implemented, and verified safeguards to prevent the hazardous mixing of air and hydrocarbons. [30]
- **Importance of Deep Process-Specific Knowledge and Continuous Learning:** A thorough understanding of unit-specific hazards, especially for complex and potentially varied units like FCCUs, is vital. This includes actively seeking and internalizing lessons from internal and external incidents, such as CSB reports and industry alerts. [30]
- **Material Selection for Vessel Integrity to Prevent Brittle Fracture:** Using materials of construction with adequate toughness properties, especially for vessels in services with explosion potential, can prevent brittle fracture and significantly reduce the risk of high-energy projectile generation during an overpressure event. [30]
- **Need for Standardized FCCU Safety Guidance:** The lack of common, comprehensive industry-wide safety expectations and guidance for FCC unit design and operation, particularly covering transient states, represents a significant gap that needs to be addressed by industry bodies. [30]
- **Comprehensive Emergency Preparedness and Domino Effect Consideration:** Emergency plans must account for the potential for multiple concurrent events (e.g., explosion, fire, mass casualty) and the escalation of an incident due to domino effects, such as projectiles damaging adjacent units or storage tanks containing hazardous materials (like asphalt or HF). [32]
- **Thorough Due Diligence During Refinery Acquisitions:** Companies acquiring existing refinery assets must conduct extremely thorough due diligence to ensure a deep understanding of the facility's process safety systems, equipment condition, existing hazards, and the competency of the workforce to manage those hazards. The short period of ownership by Husky Energy before the incident highlights this challenge. [30]

The Husky Superior incident underscores the severe consequences that can arise from weaknesses in managing transient operations in complex units like FCCUs. The failure of a single slide valve, allowing air and hydrocarbons to mix, initiated the disaster. [29] This highlights the necessity of multiple, robust, and independent layers of protection for such critical safety functions. The subsequent brittle fracture of FCCU vessels, which turned them into sources of numerous high-energy projectiles, dramatically escalated the event by breaching the asphalt tank. [30] This "domino effect" is a crucial consideration in refinery layout and equipment design; the integrity of one unit can directly impact the safety of others. The choice of materials for pressure vessels in hazardous service must therefore consider not only pressure containment under normal conditions but also behavior under extreme conditions like explosions, favoring ductile failure modes over brittle fracture.

A significant contributing factor was the apparent lack of deep process knowledge regarding FCCU transient operations within the refinery, compounded by a failure to learn from readily available industry experience, such as a recent CSB report on a similar FCCU incident. [30] This points to potential deficiencies in organizational learning processes and in the systems for disseminating and internalizing critical safety information. For a company that had recently acquired the refinery, ensuring that such specialized knowledge was either present or rapidly developed should have been a priority. This situation emphasizes that process safety is not static; it requires continuous learning, adaptation, and proactive engagement with both internal and external sources of safety intelligence.

The proximity of the hydrofluoric acid storage to the FCCU, although it did not result in an HF release, was a major factor in the scale of the community evacuation and the perceived risk. [30] This highlights the importance of considering co-location hazards in facility siting and layout, and ensuring that robust safeguards are in place to protect highly toxic material inventories from external events originating in other process units.

F. Recommendations from Investigation Report (CSB)

The CSB's final report issued 16 safety recommendations to several entities, including Cenovus Energy (the current owner), the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the American Petroleum Institute (API). [30] Key areas of recommendation included:

- **To Cenovus Energy (formerly Husky Energy):**
  - Implement actions to improve the Superior refinery’s operations, including a new control system, enhanced training materials, and improved safeguards in the FCCU, particularly for transient operations. (Many of these were reportedly incorporated into the $1.2 billion rebuild). [31]
- **To U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA):**
  - Develop a program that prioritizes inspections of FCC units in refineries that also operate HF alkylation units. This program should verify FCC safeguards designed to prevent explosions during transient operations. [30]

- **To U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and American Petroleum Institute (API):**
  - Specific recommendations aimed at addressing the identified safety issues, likely covering areas such as industry guidance for FCCU safety (especially transient operations), material selection to prevent brittle fracture, and process safety management elements. (Details of all 16 recommendations are not fully enumerated in the provided snippets). [32]

A summary of these recommendation areas is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Key CSB Recommendation Areas for Husky Superior Refinery Incident

Recommendation Focus Area	Target Entities (Examples)	Summary of Implied Corrective Action
FCCU Transient Operation Safeguards & Process Knowledge	Cenovus Energy, API, OSHA	Improve procedures, training, and engineering safeguards for FCCU shutdowns/startups. Develop better industry guidance.
Vessel Integrity & Brittle Fracture Prevention	Cenovus Energy, API	Ensure use of materials with adequate toughness to prevent brittle fracture of pressure vessels. Update relevant industry standards.
Process Safety Management (Information, PHA, Training)	Cenovus Energy, OSHA	Strengthen all elements of PSM related to FCCU operations.
Industry Learning & Guidance for FCC Units	API, Industry Operators	Develop and disseminate common, basic process safety expectations and guidance for FCC units, incorporating lessons from past incidents.
Emergency Preparedness & Domino Effect Mitigation	Cenovus Energy, Local Responders	Enhance emergency plans to address complex, cascading events and co-location hazards (e.g., HF).

Regulatory Oversight of FCCUs with HF Alkylation Units	EPA	Increase regulatory scrutiny of FCCUs, especially those near HF units, focusing on transient operation safety.

Source: Inferred from [30]

The recommendations aim to address the specific failures at the Husky Superior refinery and to drive broader industry and regulatory improvements, particularly concerning the safety of FCCUs during non-steady-state conditions and the risks posed by aging equipment and co-located hazards.

VII. Case Study 6: Texaco Milford Haven Refinery Explosion, 1994

A. Incident Overview

- **Date & Location:** July 24, 1994, Texaco Refinery (specifically the Pembroke Cracking Company plant), Milford Haven, Pembrokeshire, UK. [12]
- **Event Description:** The sequence of events began on a Sunday morning when a severe electrical storm caused widespread plant disturbances. This included the shutdown of the crude distillation unit due to a fire started by a lightning strike. While most other units were shut down, attempts were made to keep the Fluidised Catalytic Cracking Unit (FCCU) operational. Approximately five hours later, a combination of failures in management, equipment, and control systems during this plant upset led to a catastrophic release. Flammable hydrocarbon liquid was continuously pumped into a process vessel whose outlet was closed due to a control valve malfunction (the control system indicated it was open). Once the vessel was full, the only escape for the hydrocarbons was via the pressure relief system to the flare line. The flare system, particularly the flare knock-out (KO) drum, was not designed to handle such a large liquid carryover and failed at an outlet pipe. This resulted in the release of approximately 20 tonnes of a mixture of hydrocarbon liquid and vapor. The released cloud drifted and found an ignition source about 110 meters from the flare drum, causing a massive explosion (equivalent to at least four tonnes of high explosive) and subsequent major hydrocarbon fires. [33]

B. Investigation Process

- **Investigating Body:** The UK Health and Safety Executive (HSE). [33]
- **Key Methodologies:** HSE personnel attended the site on the evening of the incident. The investigation commenced as soon as the fires were under control

and proceeded for many weeks. It involved examining the sequence of events leading to the release, the failures of equipment (like the control valve and flare system) and control systems, and the management actions and decisions taken during the plant upset caused by the electrical storm. The HSE published a detailed report in 1997 ("The explosion and fires at the Texaco Refinery, Milford Haven, 24 July 1994," ISBN 0 7176 1413 1). [34]

C. Root Causes and Contributing Factors

- **1. Technical Deficiencies:**
  - **Control Valve Malfunction & Misleading Indication:** A critical control valve on the outlet of a process vessel was shut, but the control system erroneously indicated it was open. This was a primary factor in the vessel overfilling. [34]
  - **Inadequate Flare System Design for Liquid Overload:** The flare system, including the flare knock-out drum and its outlet piping, was not designed to cope with the large volume of liquid hydrocarbon continuously pumped into it during the overfill scenario. This led to liquid breakthrough and failure of the outlet pipe. [34]
  - **Deficient Control Panel Graphics and Alarm Management:** The control panel graphics did not provide operators with necessary process overviews, making it difficult to understand the plant's status. An excessive number of alarms during the emergency situation overwhelmed operators and reduced the effectiveness of their response. Safety-critical alarms were not sufficiently distinguishable. [34]
  - **Inadequate Maintenance of Plant and Instrumentation:** This was implied by the control valve malfunction and the general state of the control systems. [34]
- **2. Human Factors:**
  - **Attempts to Keep Unit Running Under Severe Upset:** There were attempts by operators/management to keep the FCCU running when the overall plant situation and specific unit conditions indicated it should have been safely shut down. [34]
  - **Operator Response to Alarms:** The HSE report highlighted that ultimate plant safety should not rely solely on operator response to alarms, especially when alarm systems are poorly designed or overwhelming. [36]
- **3. Organizational and Management System Failures:**
  - **Unauthorized/Unassessed Plant Modifications:** Modifications had been made to the plant without a thorough assessment (e.g., via HAZOP or other MOC procedures) of their potential consequences on safety. [34]
  - **Inadequate Maintenance Procedures and Systems:** Systemic failures in

maintenance contributed to the unreliability of critical equipment. [34]
   - **Deficient Emergency Operating Procedures and Training:** Procedures and training for handling major plant upsets and emergencies were found lacking. [34]
   - **Management Failures During Plant Upset:** The overall management of the situation during the plant upset initiated by the electrical storm was identified as a contributing factor. [34]

D. Detailed Consequences

- **Personnel:** 26 individuals sustained injuries. [12] Fortunately, there were no fatalities. This was attributed partly to good fortune: the incident occurred on a Sunday afternoon when site population was relatively low, and those nearby happened to be in advantageous locations that shielded them from the worst effects of the blast. [36]
- **Asset Damage:** The explosion caused a major hydrocarbon fire at the flare drum outlet and several secondary fires. The flare relief system itself was incapacitated by the explosion. Rebuilding the damaged refinery infrastructure cost an estimated £48 million. [34]
- **Operational Impact:** The incident significantly affected UK refining capacity due to the damage and subsequent business interruptions. The fires burned for two days, being finally extinguished on the evening of Tuesday, July 26, 1994. [34]
- **Environmental Impact:** Release of approximately 20 tonnes of flammable hydrocarbons into the environment. [34]
- **Regulatory Impact:** The major accident was notified to the European Union. [36]

E. Key Lessons Learned

- **Importance of Accurate Control System Feedback and Instrumentation Reliability:** Control systems must accurately reflect the true state of plant equipment (e.g., valve positions), and critical instrumentation must be reliable and well-maintained. Misleading information can lead to disastrous operational decisions. [34]
- **Robust Design of Pressure Relief and Flare Systems for Credible Upset Scenarios:** Flare and pressure relief systems must be rigorously designed to handle all credible upset scenarios, including significant liquid carryover. The design must account for the dynamics of such releases to prevent system failure. [34]
- **Effective Human-Machine Interface (HMI) Design and Alarm Management:** Control panel graphics should provide clear process overviews, and alarm systems must be rationalized to prevent operator overload during emergencies.

Critical alarms need to be distinct and actionable. [34]

- **Rigorous Management of Change (MOC):** All plant modifications, regardless of perceived size, must undergo thorough hazard assessment (e.g., HAZOP) to identify and mitigate any potential negative impacts on safety before implementation. [34]
- **Clear Decision-Making Criteria for Shutdown During Upsets:** Operators and management need clear, pre-defined procedures and training for deciding when to safely shut down units during major plant upsets rather than attempting to continue operation under abnormal and deteriorating conditions. [34]
- **Resilience to External Events:** Process safety management systems must consider the impact of foreseeable external events (like severe electrical storms) and ensure that plants can be brought to a safe state or safely managed through such disruptions. [34]

The Texaco Milford Haven incident serves as a compelling example of how external triggers, such as severe weather, can expose and amplify pre-existing latent failures within a complex system. [34] While the electrical storm initiated the plant disturbances, it was the subsequent combination of equipment malfunctions (the misleading control valve), design inadequacies (the flare system's inability to handle liquid), control system deficiencies (poor HMI and alarm flooding), and questionable operational decisions (continuing to run the FCCU) that led directly to the catastrophic release and explosion. This highlights that robust process safety relies not only on preventing initial deviations but also on the capacity of the system and its operators to safely manage the plant once an upset has occurred.

The failures in the human-machine interface, particularly the overwhelming number of alarms and unclear control panel graphics, were critical. [34] During high-stress emergency situations, operators are heavily reliant on the information provided by the control system. If this information is confusing, misleading, or excessive, it can severely impair their ability to diagnose the problem accurately and take timely, correct actions. Instead of aiding the operators, a poorly designed HMI can contribute to cognitive overload and human error, thereby escalating the incident. This incident was one of several in that era that underscored the urgent need for improved human factors engineering in control room design and alarm management philosophy, leading to significant industry efforts in these areas.

The finding that unassessed plant modifications had been carried out also points to a significant organizational system weakness. [34] Such modifications can introduce new, unrecognized hazards or compromise existing safety barriers. These become latent conditions, essentially hidden flaws within the system, that may only manifest under specific circumstances, such as a major plant upset. This underscores the absolute necessity of a rigorous and universally applied Management of Change (MOC) process. Every change, whether to hardware, software, procedures, or even staffing, must be subjected to a thorough risk assessment to understand its potential safety implications before it is implemented.

F. Recommendations from Investigation Report (HSE)

While the full list of recommendations from the 1997 HSE report is not detailed in the provided snippets, [36] offers specific examples related to alarm management and flare system operation:

- **Recommendation 6 (Alarms):** The use and configuration of alarms should ensure that safety-critical alarms, including those for flare systems, are distinguishable from other operational alarms; alarms should be limited to a number that an operator can effectively monitor; and ultimate plant safety should not rely solely on operator response to alarms. [36]
- **Recommendation 9 (Flare KO Drum Slops Removal):** In processes employing a flare system, there should be effective arrangements for the removal of slops from a flare knock-out drum that ensure the removal is promptly initiated and occurs at an adequate rate to prevent overfilling the drum. [36]

Other recommendations would have logically addressed the other identified root causes, such as ensuring accurate valve position indication, robust MOC procedures, adequate maintenance of critical equipment, and improved emergency operating procedures and training. [34]

Table 6: Illustrative HSE Recommendations for Texaco Milford Haven [36]

Rec. ID (Illustrative)	Focus Area	Summary of Recommendation (Illustrative based on findings)
HSE Rec 6 (Actual)	Alarm Management	Ensure safety-critical alarms are distinguishable, limited in number, and plant safety does not rely solely on operator alarm response. [36]

HSE Rec 9 (Actual)	Flare System Design & Operation	Ensure effective, prompt, and adequate removal of slops from flare KO drums to prevent overfilling. [36]
N/A	Control Valve & Indication Integrity	Implement systems to ensure control valve positions are accurately reflected in the control room and that valves function as designed.
N/A	Management of Change (MOC)	Ensure all plant modifications undergo rigorous hazard assessment (e.g., HAZOP) prior to implementation.
N/A	Human-Machine Interface (HMI) Design	Improve control panel graphics for clarity and provide operators with effective process overviews, especially during upsets.
N/A	Emergency Operating Procedures & Training	Develop and implement comprehensive emergency operating procedures for major plant upsets, including clear criteria for unit shutdown, and provide realistic training on these procedures.

Source: [34]

The recommendations aimed to rectify the specific technical and systemic failures that aligned to cause the Milford Haven disaster, emphasizing the need for reliable safety systems and well-managed operations, especially during abnormal conditions.

VIII. Case Study 7: Grangemouth Refinery Incidents, 2000

A. Incident Overview

- **Date & Location:** A series of three major incidents occurred in May-June 2000 at the BP Grangemouth Refinery and Petrochemical Complex, Grangemouth, UK. [9]
- **Event Description:**

1. **May 29, 2000: Power Distribution Failure:** At 18:07, a total power loss affected three electrical substations supplying the North Side of the complex, which included the oil refinery, various chemical plants, and utility plants. This was caused by an earth fault on a 33kV underground power cable (previously damaged by an air-powered clayspade during trench excavation work around April 18, 2000, allowing water ingress) and the critical failure of a 33kV circuit breaker in No. 1 substation to trip and clear the fault. The circuit breaker's earth protection relay had been deliberately disabled by the insertion of two small sections of plastic (cut-off cable ties) in its connections. This led to emergency shutdowns of the refinery and chemical plants, affecting utility plants and necessitating controlled shutdowns elsewhere on site due to loss of steam for flare systems. [11]
2. **June 7, 2000: Steam Main Rupture:** An 18-inch medium pressure (MP) steam main near a main road ruptured catastrophically. This was a consequence of an earlier human error: a steam trap on the line had been closed for inspection (to investigate flooding following the May 29 power failure) and was not subsequently re-opened. This allowed condensate to accumulate, trapping steam between the hot condensate and closed isolation valves, leading to gross over-pressure in the pipeline, significantly exceeding its design pressure. The rupture caused a significant steam release, damaged fencing, blew debris across the road (which was closed for two weeks), and disrupted the complex's steam supply. [11]
3. **June 10, 2000: FCCU Fire:** At approximately 03:20 AM, during startup procedures for the Fluidised Catalytic Cracker Unit (FCCU), which had been shut down following the May 29 power failure, a significant leak of hydrocarbons occurred. The leak originated from the fracture of an unsupported 6"x3" reducing tee branch pipe on the main transfer line between the Debutaniser column and the Re-run column, due to fatigue failure. The released hydrocarbons formed a vapor cloud that ignited, resulting in a serious fire. The fire was controlled in about 90 minutes. Some asbestos cladding was damaged, and contaminated firewater run-off entered the River Forth. [11]

B. Investigation Process

- **Investigating Body:** The UK Health and Safety Executive (HSE). [37]
- **Key Methodologies:** The HSE investigation involved forensic examination of failed components (e.g., the power cable, the ruptured steam line, the fractured FCCU pipework), analysis of operational procedures, maintenance practices, risk assessments, permit-to-work systems, management of change, and the

overarching process safety management systems and safety culture at the Grangemouth complex. The HSE produced a "Major incident investigation report - BP Grangemouth, Scotland, May - June 2000." [38]

C. Root Causes and Contributing Factors

- **1. Technical Deficiencies:**
  - **Power System (May 29):** Underground 33kV cable damaged (breached lead sheath allowing water ingress); 33kV circuit breaker earth protection relay disabled. [37]
  - **Steam System (June 7):** Design vulnerability to overpressure if steam trap isolation procedures are not strictly followed.
  - **FCCU Pipework (June 10):** Fatigue failure of an unsupported 6"x3" reducing tee branch pipe due to vibration or other stresses; inadequate mechanical support for the pipework. [11]
  - **Asbestos Cladding Damage:** Resulting from the FCCU fire and firefighting efforts. [11]
- **2. Human Factors:**
  - **Power System (May 29):** Physical damage to the power cable during earlier excavation work using a clayspade, which was not reported; deliberate and unauthorized disabling of the circuit breaker's earth protection relay by inserting plastic cable ties. [37]
  - **Steam System (June 7):** Human failure to re-open a steam trap after it had been closed for inspection/maintenance related to the May 29 power failure. [37]
  - **FCCU (June 10):** Inadequate response to serious operational problems associated with FCCU modifications made in 1997/98; findings from an earlier 2000 review of the FCCU (which identified a blocked cyclone dip leg) were not implemented or communicated properly. [40]
- **3. Organizational and Management System Failures:**
  - **Deficient Systems of Work & Procedures:** For excavation near buried cables, testing and maintenance of electrical protection systems (circuit breakers), operation and maintenance of steam traps, and inspection and maintenance of process pipework (especially for fatigue and vibration). [11]
  - **Inadequate Risk Assessment:** For excavation activities, FCCU operations (particularly after modifications), and management of utilities during complex-wide upsets. [11]
  - **Poor Management of Change (MOC):** Serious operational problems following FCCU modifications in 1997/98 were inadequately addressed. The need to evaluate organizational changes for potential hazards was also highlighted. [11]

- **Inconsistent and Deficient Permit-to-Work (PTW) System Application:** Particularly noted in relation to the excavation work that damaged the power cable. [39]
- **Communication Failures:** Findings from the FCCU review were not properly communicated or implemented. [40]
- **Inadequate Supervision & Planning:** Evident in the circumstances leading to the power cable damage and the disabling of the protection relay. [39]
- **Pipework Integrity Management:** A general lesson was that pipework systems were often not subjected to the same rigorous levels of inspection and maintenance as major pressure vessels and equipment. [11]
- **Misleading Safety Performance Indicators:** Reliance on conventional safety indicators like "days away from work" (high frequency/low consequence events) did not provide an accurate measure of process safety performance relevant to major accident hazards (low frequency/high consequence events) and could give a false impression of safety. [11]
- **Organizational and Cultural Issues:** The HSE investigation into the BP Grangemouth incidents (as referenced in CSB documents regarding BP Texas City) concluded that "BP Group Policies set high expectations but these were not consistently achieved because of organisational and cultural reasons." [9] The HSE also noted that BP was taking steps to address historic organizational structure issues at Grangemouth when the incidents occurred. [40]

D. Detailed Consequences

- **Personnel:** No injuries were reported in any of the three incidents. However, the HSE noted that the FCCU fire had the potential for fatal or serious injury to the four or five workers in the immediate vicinity, who escaped due to a combination of how the fire progressed, their positioning, and quick thinking. [11]
- **Asset Damage:** Damaged fencing from the steam leak; damage to asbestos cladding on pipework and vessels during the FCCU fire. [11]
- **Operational Impact:** Emergency shutdown of the oil refinery and chemical plants on the North Side due to the power failure; significant disruption to the complex's steam supply system for approximately one hour due to the steam main rupture; the main road adjacent to the steam leak was closed to the public for two weeks for repairs. The FCCU fire was brought under control in approximately 90 minutes and extinguished by 10:30 AM. [11]
- **Environmental Impact:** Some hydrocarbons in contaminated firewater run-off were discharged directly into the River Forth following the FCCU fire. Smoky flaring was visible as a result of the emergency shutdown during the power

failure. Overall, the environmental impact was considered short-term. [11]

E. Key Lessons Learned

- **Comprehensive Process Safety Management (PSM) Focus:** The control of major accident hazards requires a specific and dedicated focus on all elements of process safety management, over and above conventional occupational safety management. [11]
- **Robust Management of Change (MOC) Procedures:** All changes, whether technical (like plant modifications) or organizational, must be fully evaluated for potential hazards before implementation. [11]
- **Pipework Integrity as a Critical Safety Barrier:** Avoiding loss of containment from pipework systems is crucial. This requires rigorous inspection, maintenance, correct design for support and vibration, and minimizing potential leak points like flanges and dead-legs. [11]
- **Accurate and Relevant Process Safety Performance Indicators:** Conventional safety metrics (e.g., Lost Time Injury Rate) are not adequate indicators of process safety performance for major hazard control. Specific Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for major hazards should be developed, monitored, and reported. [11]
- **Reliability of Utility Supply Systems:** Disruptions to essential utility supplies (steam, electricity, cooling water) on a major hazard site can cause significant operational problems and have the potential to initiate or escalate major accidents. [11]
- **Meticulousness in Maintenance and Recommissioning:** Ensuring that equipment is correctly restored to its safe operational state after any maintenance or inspection activity (e.g., re-opening valves like steam traps, ensuring all protection systems are active and correctly set) is vital. [37]
- **Thorough Investigation and Resolution of Operational Problems:** Serious or recurring operational problems (such as those experienced on the FCCU after its modifications) must be thoroughly investigated to identify root causes, and effective corrective actions must be implemented and verified. [40]
- **Organizational Culture and Learning:** A strong safety culture that supports robust implementation of policies, learning from incidents (internal and external), and effective communication across all levels is essential for preventing major accidents. The gap between BP's stated policies and site practices was a key finding. [9]

The series of incidents at Grangemouth in 2000 vividly illustrates how multiple, seemingly distinct failures across different plant systems can be indicative of deeper, systemic weaknesses in an organization's process safety management. The interconnectedness of the events is notable: the power failure necessitated the FCCU shutdown, and activities related to the power failure (investigating flooding) led to the human error causing the steam line rupture. [11] This demonstrates that initial upsets, even in utility systems, can create conditions or prompt actions that trigger further failures if not managed with extreme diligence, especially during subsequent recovery and restart phases which are inherently higher risk.

The deliberate disabling of a critical electrical protection relay using cable ties is a particularly alarming finding, pointing to a profound misunderstanding of, or disregard for, fundamental safety principles at some level within the organization or its contractors. [39] Such an act represents a willful bypassing of a safety barrier. Similarly, the unreported damage to a high-voltage cable during excavation and the failure to reopen a steam trap after maintenance highlight lapses in basic work discipline and adherence to procedures. [37] These individual acts or omissions, which might have been perceived as minor or isolated at the time, collectively contributed to creating latent conditions ripe for failure. This underscores the danger of any "normalization of deviance" where small shortcuts or uncorrected deficiencies are tolerated, as they can accumulate and align to cause a major incident.

The HSE's broader conclusion about BP's policies being well-intentioned but not consistently achieved due to organizational and cultural reasons is a critical takeaway that resonates with findings from other major BP incidents, such as Texas City. [9] It emphasizes that having good written policies and procedures is insufficient; effective process safety requires a relentless focus on implementation, verification, continuous improvement, and a safety culture that is genuinely lived at all levels of the organization, from senior management to frontline workers and contractors. The failure to act decisively on previous operational problems and HSE recommendations regarding the FCCU further highlights weaknesses in organizational learning and accountability. [40]

F. Recommendations from Investigation Report (HSE)

While the specific, detailed list of recommendations from the HSE's "Major incident investigation report - BP Grangemouth, Scotland, May - June 2000" is not fully enumerated in the provided snippets, the key issues and lessons learned point directly to the areas the HSE would have targeted. These would include:

- Strengthening Management of Change procedures for both technical and organizational changes.
- Improving risk assessment processes, particularly for excavation work, transient operations, and modifications.

- Enhancing the integrity management programs for critical pipework, including design, inspection, and maintenance.
- Revising and ensuring consistent application of Permit-to-Work systems.
- Improving procedures and training for the operation and maintenance of utility systems (electrical, steam).
- Developing and tracking meaningful process safety performance indicators.
- Strengthening organizational learning processes and ensuring effective communication and implementation of safety review findings.
- Addressing the cultural factors that allowed deviations from established policies and good practice. The HSE noted that BP was already taking steps to address some historical organizational structure issues at the time the incidents occurred and had been previously advised by HSE to review the FCCU process following an earlier (1999) torch oil explosion. [40]

Table 7: Key Focus Areas for HSE Recommendations for Grangemouth Incidents (Inferred)

Focus Area	Implied Corrective Action (Based on Findings)
Management of Change (MOC)	Implement robust MOC procedures for all technical and organizational changes, with thorough hazard evaluation. [11]
Risk Assessment & Permit-to-Work (PTW)	Enhance risk assessment for all activities; ensure rigorous and consistent application of PTW systems, especially for high-risk work like excavation. [11]
Pipework Integrity Management	Subject pipework to more rigorous inspection, maintenance, and design scrutiny (support, vibration, material choice) to prevent loss of containment. [11]
Electrical Safety & Protection System Integrity	Improve procedures for work near buried cables; ensure integrity and proper functioning of all electrical protection systems; prohibit unauthorized modifications. [39]

Utility System Operation & Maintenance	Develop and enforce strict procedures for operation and maintenance of utility systems (e.g., steam traps) to prevent hazardous conditions. [37]
Process Safety Performance Indicators	Develop and use KPIs specific to major accident hazards to accurately track process safety performance, rather than relying on conventional safety metrics. [11]
Organizational Learning & Safety Culture	Strengthen mechanisms for learning from incidents and near-misses; ensure effective communication and implementation of safety policies and review findings. [9]

Source: Inferred from [9]

The Grangemouth incidents served as a stark warning about the importance of maintaining vigilance across all aspects of a complex industrial site, as failures in seemingly disparate areas can interconnect and lead to significant safety events.

IX. Case Study 8: Buncefield Oil Storage Depot Explosion and Fire, 2005

A. Incident Overview

- **Date & Location:** December 11, 2005, Buncefield Oil Storage Depot, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire, UK. This was a large fuel storage terminal, not a refinery, but its lessons are highly relevant to refinery tank farm operations. [41]
- **Event Description:** In the early hours of a Sunday morning, a series of massive explosions occurred, followed by a very large fire that engulfed a significant portion of the site, involving 20 large storage tanks containing various fuels (primarily gasoline). The incident was initiated by the overfilling of Tank 912, a large above-ground storage tank receiving unleaded motor gasoline via a pipeline. An estimated 300 tonnes of gasoline overflowed from vents at the top of the tank, forming a very large, dense, low-lying vapor cloud approximately 2 meters deep and covering a wide area. This flammable vapor cloud subsequently found an ignition source and exploded with devastating force, leading to the ensuing fires. [41]

B. Investigation Process

- **Investigating Body:** A Major Incident Investigation Board (MIIB), independently chaired by the Rt Hon Lord Newton of Braintree, was established. The UK Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and the Environment Agency (EA) were key parts of the Competent Authority investigating and responding. [41]
- **Key Methodologies:** The MIIB conducted an extensive investigation, publishing eight reports. Key reports focused on the design and operation of fuel storage sites, emergency preparedness and response, the explosion mechanism, and land use planning. The investigation analyzed the sequence of events leading to the overfill, the failure of safety systems, the nature of the vapor cloud and explosion, and the subsequent emergency response and recovery efforts. [41]

C. Root Causes and Contributing Factors

- **1. Technical Deficiencies:**
    - **Failure of Tank Gauging System:** The primary automatic tank gauging (ATG) system on Tank 912, which should have monitored the gasoline level, became stuck and provided a constant, incorrect reading, leading operators to believe the tank was not filling.
    - **Failure of Independent High-Level Alarm/Trip:** A separate, independent high-level switch, designed to provide an alarm and potentially initiate a shutdown if the ATG failed and the tank overfilled, also failed to operate. This switch was reportedly of a type prone to sticking.
    - **Lack of Ultimate High-Level Protection / Bund Overfill:** The design lacked a final, robust, and independently verified system to prevent catastrophic overfill or to safely contain such a massive overflow within the bund. While bunds were present, the sheer volume and nature of the release overwhelmed them, allowing the vapor cloud to spread.
    - **Tank Inlet Design:** The design of the tank inlet and the filling process contributed to the conditions for a massive release once overfilling occurred.
    - **Vapor Cloud Formation and Ignition:** The specific properties of the released gasoline and atmospheric conditions allowed for the formation of an unusually large and persistent flammable vapor cloud. The exact ignition source was not definitively identified but was likely an electrical spark or static discharge within the cloud.
- **2. Human Factors:**
    - **Over-reliance on Automated Systems:** Control room operators may have overly relied on the automated tank gauging system, and when it failed to show the level rising, they did not identify the developing hazardous situation through other means (e.g., cross-checking pumping rates and expected fill times).

    - **Inadequate Operator Response to Abnormal Conditions:** Procedures or training may have been insufficient for operators to recognize and respond effectively to the failure of the level gauging and alarm systems.
    - **Shift Handover Issues:** Potential deficiencies in information transfer during shift handovers regarding the status of Tank 912's filling operation.
- **3. Organizational and Management System Failures:**
    - **Deficient Safety Management Systems:** Fundamental weaknesses in the safety management systems of the site operators responsible for ensuring the safe containment of fuel.
    - **Inadequate Maintenance and Testing of Safety Critical Equipment:** The failure of both the primary level gauge and the independent high-level alarm points to deficiencies in their maintenance, inspection, and testing regimes to ensure they were fully operational and reliable. [43]
    - **Insufficient Layers of Protection / Defense in Depth:** The incident demonstrated a failure of multiple layers of protection that should have prevented the overfill or mitigated its consequences. The concept of 'defense in depth' was not effectively implemented or maintained for this scenario. [43]
    - **Poor Process Safety Leadership and Culture:** Underlying issues with process safety leadership and culture that allowed critical safety systems to be unreliable or inoperative. [41]
    - **Inadequate Understanding of Major Accident Hazards:** Potentially an underestimation of the scale and consequences of a major tank overfill and subsequent vapor cloud explosion at such a large terminal.
    - **Emergency Preparedness and Response:** While not a root cause of the initiation, the MIIB reports also highlighted areas for improvement in emergency preparedness, response, and recovery for such large-scale incidents. [41]

D. Detailed Consequences

- **Personnel:** Over 40 people were injured; fortunately, there were no fatalities, which was considered miraculous given the scale of the explosions. [41]
- **Asset Damage:** Most of the site was destroyed by the explosions and subsequent fires, which burned for several days. Significant damage occurred to both commercial and residential properties in the vicinity. It was the largest peacetime fire in Europe. [41]
- **Economic Loss:** Significant economic losses due to destruction of the fuel depot, damage to surrounding businesses (estimated at £100m for nearby companies shortly after), and disruption to fuel supplies. Five companies were ordered to pay almost £10 million in combined fines and costs. [41]

- **Environmental Impact:** Large clouds of black smoke were emitted into the atmosphere for several days. Contamination of soil and groundwater occurred. [41]
- **Community Impact:** A large area around the site was evacuated on emergency service advice. The incident had serious social impacts, both immediate and long-term, on people's lives and livelihoods, including loss of earnings and psychological impacts. [41]

E. Key Lessons Learned

- **Criticality of Reliable Tank Overfill Protection Systems:** Multiple, independent, and robust layers of protection are essential to prevent tank overfills. This includes reliable level gauging, independent high-level alarms, and automatic shutdown systems. These systems must be rigorously maintained, inspected, and tested. [43]
- **Understanding and Managing Vapor Cloud Explosion (VCE) Hazards:** The incident highlighted the potential for very large and destructive VCEs from spills of volatile flammable liquids like gasoline, even in open areas. A better understanding of vapor cloud behavior, dispersion, and ignition mechanisms was needed. [41]
- **Importance of Secondary and Tertiary Containment:** While primary containment (the tank) failed, the design and capacity of secondary containment (bunds) and tertiary containment measures are critical in limiting the spread of spills and the formation of large vapor clouds. [43]
- **Process Safety Leadership and Culture:** Strong process safety leadership and a positive safety culture are paramount in ensuring that safety management systems are effective and that known risks are properly managed. [41]
- **Robust Maintenance and Testing of Safety-Critical Equipment:** Safety-critical devices like level sensors and alarms must be subject to rigorous proof testing and maintenance regimes to ensure their continued functionality and reliability.
- **Emergency Preparedness for Large-Scale Events:** Emergency plans must consider worst-case credible scenarios, including large VCEs and multi-tank fires, and ensure adequate resources and coordination for response and recovery. [43]
- **Land Use Planning around Major Hazard Sites:** The incident prompted reviews of land use planning policies around major hazard sites to better manage societal risk. [41]

The Buncefield disaster was a watershed moment for process safety in the fuel storage industry and beyond. The catastrophic failure of multiple layers of protection designed to prevent a tank overfill was a central finding. [43] The primary level gauge sticking, followed by the failure of an independent high-level alarm, meant that operators were unaware that Tank 912 was continuing to fill beyond its safe capacity. This highlights a critical vulnerability: if safety systems are not truly independent and are subject to common failure modes (e.g., poor maintenance, similar design flaws), then the intended redundancy is lost. The incident underscored the need for safety instrumented systems (SIS) to be designed, installed, operated, and maintained to high integrity levels (e.g., meeting standards like IEC 61511/BS EN 61511), with regular proof testing to verify their functionality. [43]

The sheer scale of the vapor cloud explosion was also a major learning point. [41] It challenged previous assumptions about the likely consequences of large gasoline spills and led to extensive research into vapor cloud formation, dispersion, and explosion mechanisms. This research informed subsequent guidance on site layout, bund design, and emergency response for fuel storage terminals. The failure was not just of primary containment but also, effectively, of secondary containment to prevent such a widespread hazardous atmosphere.

Organizational factors were also deeply implicated. The MIIB reports and subsequent actions by the Process Safety Leadership Group (PSLG) emphasized the critical role of strong process safety leadership, a competent workforce, and a culture that prioritizes safety. [41] The incident suggested that there may have been an underestimation of the risks associated with what might be perceived as a relatively simple operation (filling a tank) at such a large scale, or a drift in standards over time. The development of PSLG principles and guidance on safety and environmental standards for fuel storage sites aimed to address these systemic organizational and cultural weaknesses across the industry. [41]

F. Recommendations from Investigation Report (MIIB)

The MIIB published 25 key recommendations in its report on the "Design and operation of fuel storage sites," and further recommendations in its report on "Emergency preparedness for, response to and recovery from incidents." [41] These were wide-ranging and aimed at significantly raising safety standards. Key areas from the Design and Operation report included:

- **Protecting against loss of primary containment using high-integrity systems (Recs 1-10):**
    - Ensuring proper tank headspace margins.
    - Effective oversight of pipeline transfers, with receiving site control to terminate.
    - Effective gauging, monitoring, and fire-safe shut-off valves.
    - Upgrading overfill control equipment to higher standards (e.g., SIL 1 minimum

  for new/modified sites against BS EN 61511).
  - Automated emergency shutdown systems for pipeline-fed sites.
  - Good practice guidance on proof testing of overfill prevention systems and MOC.
  - Maintenance of records and use of leading/lagging performance indicators. [43]
- **Engineering against escalation of loss of primary containment (Rececs 11-16):**
  - Reviewing explosive atmospheres and protecting emergency response facilities.
  - Detecting flammable vapor in secondary containment.
  - Improving tank top design and safe re-routing of overflows to prevent vapor cloud formation. [43]
- **Engineering against escalation of loss of secondary and tertiary containment (Recs 17-18):**
  - Improving secondary and tertiary containment, including firewater management. [43]
- **Operating with high-reliability organisations (Recs 19-22):**
  - Emphasizing high standards of leadership, roles, responsibilities, competence, staffing, shift handover, MOC, contractor management, and performance evaluation. [43]
- **Delivering high performance through culture and leadership (Recs 23-25):**
  - Promoting process safety leadership and sharing incident data. [43]

Recommendations from the Emergency Preparedness report (32 recommendations) covered: assessing potential for major incidents, managing incidents on-site (emergency plans, training, facility siting, communications), preparing for and responding off-site (multi-agency coordination, national resources, public health), and recovering from incidents. [43]

Table 8: Key MIIB Recommendation Areas for Buncefield Incident (Design & Operation)

Recommendation Grouping (MIIB Report)	Key Focus Areas
Protecting against loss of primary containment (Recs 1-10)	High-integrity overfill prevention (gauging, alarms, trips to SIL standards), automated shutdown, proof testing, MOC, performance indicators. [43]

Engineering against escalation (Primary) (Recs 11-16)	Review of explosive atmospheres, protection of emergency facilities, vapor detection in bunds, tank top design to prevent vapor cloud formation from overflows. [43]
Engineering against escalation (Secondary/Tertiary) (Recs 17-18)	Improvement of secondary and tertiary containment design and capacity, firewater management. [43]
Operating with high-reliability organisations (Recs 19-22)	Strong leadership, clear roles/responsibilities, workforce competence, adequate staffing, robust shift handover, effective MOC, contractor management, performance evaluation. [43]
Delivering high performance (Culture/Leadership) (Recs 23-25)	Promotion of process safety leadership across industry, sharing of incident data and lessons learned. [43]

Source: [41]

The Buncefield investigation and subsequent recommendations led to a significant overhaul of safety standards and regulatory expectations for fuel storage sites in the UK and influenced international practice. The emphasis on high-integrity instrumented systems, robust management systems, and strong safety leadership became central to the post-Buncefield safety landscape.

X. Conclusion: Common Themes and Overarching Lessons from Refinery Process Safety Incidents

The detailed examination of these eight catastrophic process safety incidents across various refineries and a major fuel storage terminal reveals several recurring themes and overarching lessons critical for the prevention of future disasters. Despite differences in specific initiating events and geographical locations, common underlying failures in technical systems, human factors, and organizational safety management consistently emerge as significant contributors.

1. Failure of Mechanical Integrity and Aging Infrastructure:
A predominant theme is the failure of physical assets due to known degradation mechanisms that were inadequately managed.
* Corrosion: Sulfidation corrosion (Chevron Richmond 20), HTHA (Tesoro Anacortes 14), and general corrosion of an old pipe elbow (PES Philadelphia 26) were direct causes of

catastrophic ruptures. This highlights the critical need for robust mechanical integrity programs that accurately identify susceptible equipment, employ appropriate inspection techniques (including 100% component inspection where warranted), and ensure timely repair or replacement, especially for aging infrastructure.
* Material Selection: Incorrect or outdated material selection played a role in several incidents (e.g., low-silicon carbon steel at Chevron Richmond 22, carbon steel in HTHA service at Tesoro 14, brittle fracture of older steel vessels at Husky Superior 32). Proactive upgrading to inherently safer materials is a key preventative measure.
* Fatigue and Design: Pipework fatigue (Grangemouth FCCU 40) and inadequate design of relief systems for credible overpressure or liquid carry-over scenarios (BP Texas City 5, Texaco Milford Haven 34) were also significant.
2. Deficiencies in Process Safety Management (PSM) Systems:
Nearly all incidents demonstrated failures in multiple elements of established PSM frameworks.
* Process Hazard Analysis (PHA): PHAs frequently failed to adequately identify or assess major hazards (e.g., overfilling at BP Texas City 5, HTHA at Tesoro 14, sulfidation at Chevron Richmond 20), or to ensure safeguards were effective.
* Operating Procedures: Procedures were often incomplete, outdated, not followed, or inadequate for abnormal/transient operations (BP Texas City 5, Husky Superior 32).
* Management of Change (MOC): Failures in MOC were evident in unassessed plant modifications (Texaco Milford Haven 34), improper trailer siting (BP Texas City 2), and the inability to effectively implement expert recommendations for safety upgrades (Chevron Richmond 22). The need for MOC to cover organizational changes impacting safety (e.g., budget cuts, staffing) was also highlighted (BP Texas City - open OSHA rec 8).
* Training and Competency: Inadequate operator training, particularly for non-routine or emergency situations, and insufficient competency assurance were common factors (BP Texas City 3, Husky Superior 32).
* Pre-Startup Safety Reviews (PSSR): Failure to conduct or effectively complete PSSRs before restarting units contributed to incidents (BP Texas City 3).
3. Inadequate Management of Transient Operations:
A significant number of incidents occurred during non-steady-state operations, such as startups (BP Texas City 6, Tesoro Anacortes 14, Grangemouth FCCU 40) or shutdowns (Husky Superior 32). These periods are often higher risk due to changing conditions and increased potential for human error, yet they frequently receive less procedural and analytical rigor than normal operations.
4. Human Factors and Safety Culture Deficiencies:
* Normalization of Deviance: Acceptance of recurring abnormal conditions, such as frequent leaks (Tesoro Anacortes 14) or repeated problematic startups (BP Texas City 3), eroded safety margins.
* Communication Failures: Poor shift handovers (BP Texas City 3) and ineffective communication of risks or review findings (Grangemouth FCCU 40, Chevron Richmond 22) were common.
* Safety Culture: Deficient safety culture, characterized by a lack of leadership commitment,

pressure to maintain production over safety, fear of reporting, failure to empower workers, and inadequate resource allocation for safety, was a root cause in several major incidents (BP Texas City 2, Chevron Richmond 21, Tesoro Anacortes 14). The reliance on lagging indicators (personal injury rates) often masked underlying process safety weaknesses (BP Texas City 3, Grangemouth 11).
* Fatigue: Operator fatigue due to excessive overtime was a factor (BP Texas City 6).
5. Failure of Safety Critical Equipment and Instrumentation:
The unreliability or failure of safety-critical instruments (level gauges, alarms, pressure transmitters) and protective systems (relief valves, emergency shutdown systems, water cannons) was a direct contributor in many cases (BP Texas City 3, Texaco Milford Haven 34, Buncefield 43, PES Philadelphia 26). This points to deficiencies in design, maintenance, inspection, and testing of these vital safeguards. The Buncefield incident, with the concurrent failure of a level gauge and an independent high-level alarm, starkly illustrated the dangers of non-functional layers of protection.
6. Organizational Learning Failures:
A striking theme is the repeated failure of organizations to learn from past internal incidents, near-misses, or relevant external industry events (BP Texas City 3, Husky Superior 30, Grangemouth 40). Recommendations from previous audits or investigations were often not effectively implemented or tracked to completion (Chevron Richmond 22).
7. Limitations of Industry Standards and Regulatory Oversight:
Some incidents exposed limitations or non-conservatism in existing industry standards (e.g., Nelson Curves for HTHA at Tesoro Anacortes 14) or highlighted gaps where more prescriptive guidance was needed (e.g., FCCU safety at Husky Superior 30). Regulatory oversight was also found to be lacking in some cases, with insufficient resources, technical expertise, or regulatory frameworks that did not adequately drive proactive risk reduction (Chevron Richmond 20, Tesoro Anacortes 17).
Moving Forward:
Preventing future catastrophic incidents in the refining industry requires a holistic and sustained commitment to process safety excellence. This involves:

- **Vigilant Asset Integrity Management:** Prioritizing the maintenance and timely replacement of aging infrastructure, using appropriate materials, and employing robust inspection techniques.
- **Rigorous Implementation of all PSM Elements:** Ensuring that PHAs are thorough, procedures are accurate and followed, MOC is strictly applied, training is effective, and PSSRs are comprehensive.
- **Enhanced Focus on Transient Operations:** Developing detailed procedures, providing specialized training, and ensuring adequate supervision for startups, shutdowns, and other non-routine activities.
- **Cultivating a Strong Proactive Safety Culture:** Fostering leadership commitment to safety, empowering workers, encouraging reporting, learning from all deviations, and using meaningful leading and lagging process safety

indicators.
- **Ensuring Reliability of Safety Critical Devices:** Implementing high-integrity design, rigorous testing, and preventative maintenance for all safety-critical instrumentation and protective systems.
- **Strengthening Organizational Learning:** Establishing robust systems for investigating all incidents and near-misses, disseminating lessons learned effectively, and tracking corrective actions to completion.
- **Continuous Improvement and Industry Collaboration:** Actively participating in industry forums to share knowledge, update standards based on new learnings, and advocate for regulatory frameworks that drive continuous improvement in process safety performance.

The case studies demonstrate that major accidents are rarely the result of a single failure but rather a complex interplay of technical vulnerabilities, human errors, and deep-seated organizational and cultural deficiencies. Acknowledging this complexity and addressing these systemic issues with unwavering commitment is essential for achieving a safer future for the refining industry and the communities in which it operates.

Works cited

1. Incident Reports - ioMosaic, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.iomosaic.com/resources/incident-reports
2. BP America (Texas City) Refinery Explosion | CSB, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.csb.gov/bp-america-texas-city-refinery-explosion/
3. Human factors: Case study: petroleum refinery explosion: Information sheet - WorkSafe WA, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.worksafe.wa.gov.au/system/files/migrated/sites/default/files/atoms/files/231254_br_petroleumrefineryexplosion.pdf
4. Accident Prevention & Learnings from Major Accidents in Petroleum Sector - PNGRB, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.pngrb.gov.in/pdf/press-note/20250110_IOCL.pdf
5. Refinery Ablaze - 15 Dead - Office of Safety and Mission Assurance, accessed June 10, 2025, https://sma.nasa.gov/docs/default-source/safety-messages/safetymessage-2006-01-01-bptexascityrefineryfire.pdf?sfvrsn=13a91ef8_4
6. OE Summary 2006-05: Preliminary Findings on Fatal Explosion at Texas Refinery, accessed June 10, 2025, https://ehss.energy.gov/oesummary/oesummary2006/OES2006-05.pdf
7. NEAL R. GROSS 1 U.S. CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD BP AMERICAN REFINERY EXPLOSION PUBLIC MEETING Wings of Herit, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.csb.gov/assets/1/20/bp_transcript_1.pdf?13847
8. CSB Releases New Report on BP Texas City Refinery Disaster - Inspectioneering,

accessed June 10, 2025, https://inspectioneering.com/news/2025-03-24/11507/csb-releases-new-report-to-mark-the-20th-anniversary-of-the-fatal-bp-texas-city-
9. U.S. CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD Urgent Recommendation, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.csb.gov/assets/1/20/bp_recs.pdf?13851
10. Texaco Refinery, Milford Haven Chemical Processing 1994: Timeline of The Accident | PDF | Gases | Energy And Resource - Scribd, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.scribd.com/document/464938124/Texaco-refinery
11. Grangemouth Refinery, UK - FABIG, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.fabig.com/industrial-accidents/grangemouth-refinery-uk/
12. Major oil refinement process safety incidents - Frontline Data Solutions, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.fldata.com/oil-refinement-process-safety-incidents
13. BP Texas City 20 Years Later: Lessons Learned - ISSSource, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.isssource.com/bp-texas-city-20-years-later-lessons-learned/
14. CSB Investigation Finds 2010 Tesoro Refinery Fatal Explosion Resulted from High Temperature Hydrogen Attack Damage to Heat Exchanger - General News - Chemical Safety Board, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.csb.gov/csb-investigation-finds-2010-tesoro-refinery-fatal-explosion-resulted-from-high-temperature-hydrogen-attack-damage-to-heat-exchanger/
15. 2010 Tesoro Anacortes Refinery disaster - Wikipedia, accessed June 10, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2010_Tesoro_Anacortes_Refinery_disaster
16. accessed January 1, 1970, https.www.csb.gov/csb-investigation-finds-2010-tesoro-refinery-fatal-explosion-resulted-from-high-temperature-hydrogen-attack-damage-to-heat-exchanger/
17. 0205csb - Vol. I - Chemical Safety Board, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.csb.gov/assets/1/20/0205csb-tesoro_(2)1.pdf?15169
18. Tesoro Releases TOP Report on 2010 Incident at Anacortes Refinery - Inspectioneering, accessed June 10, 2025, https://inspectioneering.com/journal/2011-07-01/2/tesoro-releases-top-report-on-
19. Tesoro Anacortes Refinery Fatal Explosion and Fire | CSB, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.csb.gov/tesoro-refinery-fatal-explosion-and-fire/
20. CSB Draft Interim Report on 2012 Chevron Fire Notes Company ..., accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.csb.gov/csb-draft-interim-report-on-2012-chevron-fire-notes-company-failed-to-apply-inherently-safer-design/
21. Final report on 2012 Chevron refinery fire calls for reform in corporate safety culture Bay City News Service, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/Archive.aspx?ADID=3255
22. (PDF) CSB investigation of Chevron Richmond refinery pipe rupture ..., accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281897531_CSB_investigation_of_Chevron_Richmond_refinery_pipe_rupture_and_fire

23. Chevron Investigation Identifies Causes of Richmond Refinery Fire, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/26803/Investigation_Report_0412_pressrelease
24. pes factual update.pdf, accessed June 10, 2025, https://scanlon.house.gov/sites/scanlon.house.gov/files/pes%20factual%20update.pdf
25. Chevron Richmond Refinery Fire | CSB, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.csb.gov/chevron-richmond-refinery-fire/
26. 2019 Philadelphia refinery explosion - Wikipedia, accessed June 10, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2019_Philadelphia_refinery_explosion
27. Philadelphia Energy Solutions (PES) Refinery Fire and Explosions ..., accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.csb.gov/philadelphia-energy-solutions-pes-refinery-fire-and-explosions-/
28. An Unrefined Ending - Union of Concerned Scientists, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/2023-03/unrefined-ending-pa-energy-solutions-refinery.pdf
29. 2018 Husky Energy Refinery explosion - Wikipedia, accessed June 10, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2018_Husky_Energy_Refinery_explosion
30. CSB identifies six key safety issues that led to 2018 Superior refinery ..., accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.thechemicalengineer.com/news/csb-identifies-six-key-safety-issues-that-led-to-2018-superior-refinery-explosion/
31. Report: Husky Superior oil refinery explosion 'could have been avoided', accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.lrl.mn.gov/archive/minutes/senate/2023/labor/20230112/labor_20230112_Star-Tribune-Report-Husky-Superior-oil-refinery-explosion.pdf
32. Final Report into 2018 Husky Superior Refinery Explosion and ..., accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.csb.gov/-final-report-into-2018-husky-superior-refinery-explosion-and-asphalt-fire-in-wisconsin/
33. Incidents - HSE, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.hse.gov.uk/eci/incidents.htm
34. The explosion and fires at the Texaco Refinery, Milford Haven. 24th July 1994 - HSE, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.hse.gov.uk/comah/sragtech/casetexaco94.htm
35. (PDF) Refinery Explosion Analysis - Chevron Pembroke Amine ..., accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341622185_Refinery_Explosion_Analysis_-_Chevron_Pembroke_Amine_regeneration_unit_explosion
36. The Explosion and Fires at the Texaco Refinery, Milford Haven, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.jesip.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Texaco-Refinery-Explosion.pdf

37. BP Grangemouth - Human Factors 101, accessed June 10, 2025, https://humanfactors101.com/incidents/bp-grangemouth-2000/
38. Control of major accident hazards (COMAH): Investigation Reports - HSE, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.hse.gov.uk/comah/investigation-reports.htm
39. BP (Grangemouth) Power Distribution Failure 2000 - Process Safety Integrity, accessed June 10, 2025, https://processsafetyintegrity.com/events/2000-05-29_bp-grangemouth/
40. BP (Grangemouth) FCCU Fire 2000 - Process Safety Integrity, accessed June 10, 2025, https://processsafetyintegrity.com/events/2000-06-10_bp-grangemouth/
41. Buncefield response - HSE, accessed June 10, 2025, https://www.hse.gov.uk/comah/buncefield/
42. Buncefield Social Impact Assessment - Final Report - GOV.UK, accessed June 10, 2025, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a748984e5274a7f99028fc9/Buncefield-Social-Impact-Assessment-Final_20Report_0.pdf
43. The Buncefield Investigation Cm. 7491 - GOV.UK, accessed June 10, 2025, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a759a11ed915d6faf2b441b/7491.pdf