Kec 1 4/12/03-State's Exhibit 51 UCRL-ID-124837 LOJETOGE T and the state of t CO-KAP DATA DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT DOCUMENT FOR THE AIRCRAFT CRASH RISK ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY (ACRAM) \gg 51 V DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCHMENT IS LAW MATTED 72-22_15FS1- STATE FXh.b,T 0 Z OFFICE UP THE SECRETARY RULEMAKINGS AND ADJUDICATIONS STAFF Richard W. Mensing 2003 JAN 29 PM 2: 34 Timothy A. Haley Martin A. Stutzke Andrew B. Barto Chris Y. Kimura This is an informal report intended primarily for internal or limited external August 1, 1996 and may or may not be those of the Laboratory. Work performed under the auspices of the Department of Energy by the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract W-7405-Eng-48. STANDARD distribution. The opinions and conclusions stated are those of the author DOCKETED USNRC Tom Lin 800-Km Jenglet - x RAS STSIG ٩ .

4. MILITARY AVIATION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

For the ACRAM Standard [Ref. 4.1], military aviation is defined as the broad categorization of aviation activities performed by military personnel in fulfillment of their official duties. Such activities include passenger and cargo transport, in-flight retueling, flight training, etc. Activities associated with military operations areas (MOA) and training ranges, such as air combat training, low level navigation, personnel and stores drops, are not included. However, cruise phase of flight between an originating alfield and the MOAs, as well as training associated with takeoff and landing at an alfield, including touch and go's; simulated emergency landings, e.g., no flap, fiameout; and missed approach/go-arounds, are included.

To quantify the risk of a military aircraft crashing into a facility it is necessary to estimate the number of military flights in the vicinity of the facility, the frequency of military aircraft crashes and the probability that the aircraft crashes into the facility. The latter requires knowledge about the location of aircraft crashes, given an incident leading to a crash, as well as some crash kinematics, e.g., glide or impact angle, heading angle, and skid distance.

To estimate military aircraft crash frequencies, relevant crash and flight information was solicited from the U.S. Air Force, Army and Navy safety agencies. Useable information for fixed wing and rotary wing (helicopter) aircraft were received from the Air Force. The Army provided data on Army helicopters. Data received from the Navy was judged to be of limited value for this application, and is not included in the estimates presented here. Analysis of available crash data and the resulting estimates of military aircraft crash frequencies are presented in Section 4.2.

Crash kinematic and crash location data were derived by reviewing Air Force aircraft mishap reports from 1976 to 1993. A database of aircraft crash data was developed as part of the DNA supported W78/W87 Minuteman III Weapon System Safety Assessment (WSSA) [Ref. 4.2]. That formed the basis for developing crash kinematics and crash location probability distributions. Data analysis and distributions are summarized in Section 4.3.

Section 4.4 includes a summary of some of the appropriate characteristics of military alrcraft which are necessary for the structural analyses.

4. MILITARY AVIATION

4.2 MILITARY AVIATION CRASH FREQUENCIES

Development of estimates of aircraft crash frequencies is based on an analysis of aircraft crash and flight data supplied by Air Force and Army safety agencies [Ref. 4.3-4.6] and the database of Air Force mishaps developed for the DNA supported Minuteman III WSSA [Ref. 4.2].

For the ACRAM Standard, the flight phases of interest for military aviation are

Takeofis at airlields in the vicinity of the facility of interest

Landings at airfields in the vicinity of the facility of interest Overflights, during the cruise phase of flight, in the vicinity of the facility of interest

Analysis of the military crash data required the identification of the phase of flight in which the crash occurred as well as screening of crashes to delete those not applicable to crashes into structures, e.g., crashes involving taxling and/or parked aircraft. This required a review of the individual accident reports/summaries to assign each accident to the proper phase and, occasionally, involved judgments in the applicability of an accident. Thus, there is some uncertainty in the estimates of crash frequencies in addition to inherent "statistical" variation due to the limited amount of historical data. Although recognized, this uncertainty is neither quantitied nor included in the provided estimates of crash frequencies. Rather, the estimates provided are considered plausible point estimates of the appropriate frequencies.

Two analyses were considered in developing estimates for crash frequencies. One analysis is based on a review of the brief summaries of mishaps as provided by the Air Force/Army safety agencies. This approach is discussed and the resulting estimates of crash frequencies are presented in Section 4.2.2. The second analysis is based on the Air Force mishap database developed for the Minuteman III WSSA. This analysis and the resulting estimates are discussed in Section 4.2.3.

This Standard is expected to be applicable to facilities off an airfield and not in the immediate vicinity of a runway. Therefore, military takeoff and landing crashes were identified as "on runway" (i.e., crashes in which the initial impact occurred on the runway and the rolling/skidding aircraft departed the runway or remained on the runway) or "off runway" (i.e., the initial impact occurred off the runway). Although the off runway crashes include some that occurred on an airfield, the off runway crash frequency estimated from the historical data is considered a reasonable conservative estimate applicable for this Standard.

For military aviation the cruise phase of flight involved a number of different types of operations in addition to "normal" flight from one base to another. A significant part of the cruise portion of flight, particularly for military attack, fighter and trainer alroratt, involved maneuvers. Since this type of activity is not expected to attect facilities covered by this Standard, accidents occurring during maneuvers, air shows, and other special operations were not included in developing the estimated inflight crash frequencies. Deleting those accidents from consideration required that the mileage flown, which is the denominator of crash frequencies, be adjusted. Since the available military flight information is in flight hours, considerable judgment was involved in developing the provided estimates of crash frequencies.

Ideally, estimates of crash frequencies can be developed for each type of military aircraft. This was the goal in the second analysis (Section 4.2.3). Due to limited data and the reasonable expectation that actual frequencies are comparable for some subsets of aircraft, estimated crash frequencies are provided per aircraft type or group of types. The philosophy of this Standard is to use three subcategories of military aircraft:

Large aircraft: bomber and cargo aircraft such as the B-1, B-2, B-52, C-5, C-9, KC-10, C-21, C-130, KC-135 and C-141

Small aircraft: attack, fighter and trainer aircraft such as the A-7, A-10, A-97, F-4, F-5, F-15, F-16, F-106, F-111, F-117, T-93, T-37, T-98, T-99 and T-41

Helicopters: H-1, H-3, H-53 and H-60

4. MILITARY AVIATION

4-2

Estimates of crash frequencies are provided for each subcategory as well as for all military aircraft. These combined estimates are based on a weighted average of the individual frequencies, weighted by the respective normalized number of takeofis/landings and number of miles flown during "normal" flight. Application of the combined frequencies is appropriate only when (1) the distribution, among the different types of aircraft (e.g., T-38, F-16, B-52, ...), of the number of takeofis/landings at the airlield of interest and (2) the distribution, among aircraft types, of the encode overflights in the vicinity of the tacility of interest are comparable to the distributions in the historical data. If operations at a given location are much different than the overall distribution in the historical data, atternative estimates of crash frequencies, based on the appropriate mix of aircraft at the location, should be considered.

4.2.1 ESTIMATES OF CRASH FREQUENCIES BASED ON AN ANALYSIS OF IMPACT ACCIDENTS

Air Force mishap data solicited from the Air Force Safety Agency [Ref. 4.3-4.5] provides one basis for estimating crash frequencies for military aviation. Air Force classification of mishaps is based on the economic costs of damage to the aircraft and personnel costs and are defined as follows:

Flight Mishap - A mishap involving an Air Force aircraft when intent for flight exists.

- Class A A mishap in which the resulting total cost of property damage, injury and liness is \$1,000,000 or greater; or an Air Force aircraft is destroyed; or a fatally occurs.
- Class B A mishap in which the resulting total cost of property damage, injury and lliness is \$200,000 or more, but less than \$1,000,000.
- Class C A mishap in which the resulting total cost of property damage is \$10,000 or more, but less than \$200,000 or injury or occupational liness resulted in a lost workday case involving days away from work.
- Destroyed Destroyed means uneconomical to repair, defined by the number of man-hours estimated as needed to repair the aircraft. Repair time varies depending on the type of aircraft.
- Mishap Rates Rates are computed on basis of the number of mishaps per 100,000 flying hours.
- Flight Related When there is a mishap with little or no damage to the aircraft, the incident does not affect the mishap rate.

One set of data provided by the AFSA is based on the lifetime mishap history, up to the early 1994 time trame, of a large number of Air Force aircraft. A total of 5171 Class A, 2450 Class B, and 3598 Destroyed mishaps are included in this data set. A summary of these mishaps, by aircraft type, is given in Table 4.1. Related flight information included in the table is the total flight hours for each type of aircraft. Also included in the table of mishap rates, given as rates per 100,000 flight hours.

The various aircraft types were grouped by the three subcategories of military aviation, small aircraft, large aircraft, and helicopter. The mishap data for the three subcategories are summarized in Tables 4.2 to 4.4. Again, estimates of mishap rates are per 100,000 flight hours. Since T-33 aircraft have been out of the Air Force inventory for some time, mishap rates for small aircraft are estimated excluding the T-33 data as well.

The mishaps recorded in Tables 4.1 to 4.4 include a large number of mishaps not applicable to crashes into off airfield facilities, e.g., nonimpact mishaps, on airfield crashes, etc. Therefore, the mishap rates provided in these tables may be over estimates of crash rates into off airfield structures. In addition, takeoff and landing incidents are likely to be significant contributors to crashes into structures; thus, it is appropriate to develop crash rates per takeoff and landing. To do this it is necessary to have a more detailed description of the mishap.

A second set of data provided by the AFSA included summary information for mishaps in the 1979-1993 time period. Useable information was derived from 1426 mishaps. To develop crash frequency estimates, the 1426 mishaps were classified either as impact or non-impact mishaps. Impact mishaps included accidents involving ground, runway, water, midair, terrain, vehicle, and building impact. Non-impact mishaps included incidents involving foreign objects, birds, etc., and parked aircraft fires and other such incidents. Non-impact mishaps are considered not applicable. There were 1093 impact mishaps. Those mishaps included all classes of damage to the crashing aircraft. The mishaps were partitioned by aircraft "size" (large, small and helicopter) and by flight phase (takeoff, landing and inflight). Takeoff and landing were further partitioned into "on runway" and "off runway" mishaps. In-flight mishaps were partitioned into "normal" and "special", i.e., low atitude and maneuvering operation mishaps. A graphical description of the classification of the mishaps is shown in Figure 4.1. For this analysis, takeoff includes takeoff roll, abort/discontinue, and inflight portions of a flight; landing includes the pattern, final approach, flare

4. MILITARY AVIATION

4-4

and rollout portions; normal in-flight includes climb to cruise, cruise between an originating airfield and an operations area, it applicable, and cruise descent portions; and special in-flight includes low level and maneuvering operations in restricted airspace.

The number of impacting mishaps for each subcategory of aircraft and flight phase, appropriate flight information and the resulting estimates of crash frequencies are summarized in Table 4.5.

Crash frequencies for takeoffs and landings are per takeoff/landing. Crash frequencies for "normal" intlight operation, are "per mile." The estimated mileage derived to estimate inflight rates is based on an analysis of the expected number of miles flown during "normal" tlight. This analysis attempted to account for the time in the takeoff and landing phases of flight as well as the time in maneuvers and other special operations. This required a considerable amount of judgment by the analyst.

For some facilities, particularly hardened structures, a more appropriate estimate of a crash frequency may be one based on only considering impact mishaps in which the crashing aircraft was destroyed. Of the 1093 impact mishaps, a crashing aircraft was classified as "destroyed" in 819 mishaps. These impact destroyed mishaps were partitioned in the same way as impact mishaps as shown in Figure 4.1. A summary of this data and the resulting estimates of crash frequencies are given in Table 4.6.

Basic mishap data, flight information and partitioning of mishaps by aircraft subcategory and flight phase were developed by T. Lin at Sandia National Laboratory [Ref. 4.6]. Development of estimated miles flown during "normal" inflight operations is based on an analysis of aircraft operations by Logicon RDA [Ref. 4.7].

4.2.2 ESTIMATES OF CRASH FREQUENCIES BASED ON AN ANALYSIS OF THE MISHAP DATABASE DEVELOPED FOR THE MINUTEMAN III WSSA

Another source of mishap information is the mishap database developed for the DNA-supported Minuteman III WSSA [Ref. 4.2]. This database was developed from data extracted from individual mishap reports, also available from the AFSA. Its primary use was as a resource for crash location and crash kinematic information, but it is also useful as a basis for estimating crash frequencies. Development of crash frequency estimates using this database is based on identifying mishaps involving a "crash" which is defined as "An alrorati mishap associated with flight that prevents the alrorati from coming to a full stop landing on its pear." In addition, for this analysis, flight phases are defined as:

Takeoff: The phase of flight from the application of takeoff power on the runway to the point where the aircraft altitude is not affected by its proximity from the departure runway.

Landing: The phase of flight from the point where the aircraft atitude is affected by its proximity from the approach runway to its departure from the runway under a controlled taxi.

In-flight: The phase of flight where the aircraft attitude is not affected by its proximity to the runway.

A summary of the crash data, estimated crash frequencies and applicable flight information for individual alreadt types and groups of alreadt types, as well as for the three subcategories of alreadt, is presented in Tables 4.7 and 4.8.

The basic crash data and flight information were developed by M. Fuentes at Sandia National Laboratories [Ref. 4.6]. The estimated miles used for estimating crash frequencies during the inflight phase of flight is based on analysis of military aircraft operations by Logicon RDA.

4. MILITARY AVIATION

4-6

Table 4.8 Creek Dete and Estimates of Cresh Frequencies Based on the Minutemen III Mishep Detabase

]								
						en N	mnal Figt	Ŧ	Opod	Doolling	E
				Menhor	Hold	Estmeted	No. of	and Rate	Estimated	No. of	Crash Rate
				of Series	Hours	Mine	Crestma	-	Inne	Creates	Mile
				We we	2 177 mm	5.00E+06	R	4.00E-09	5.00E+08	8	1.20E-09
<u>1 11</u>	Somberts (Bill)		10 D24 D21			1 50E+09	•	2.67E-09	1.50E+09	10	6.67E-09
		-	UISU Unite	1121	4.728.000	1.10E+09	-	9.09E-10	1.106+09	0	<0.09E-10
				000 000 0	7.738.000	1.BOE+09	2	1.11E-09	1.805+09	-	6.56E-10
	ပန္စာကိုဝ (ပဒေ)			821.000	1.535.000	3.50E+08	ł	2.855-09	3.50E+08	-	2.86E-09
<u></u>	•		Al Cam	6.946.000	20,344,000	4.75E+09	8	1.685-09	4,75E+09	5	2.53E-09
-			Al arts (Ba. Ca)	7.289.000	22,521,000	5,25E+09	10	1.90E-09	5.25E+09	13	3.435-09
			La	000,278	1.387.000	2.40E+08	6	3.75E-06	2.60E+08	54	1.65E-07
				2675.000	3,730,000	B.30E+08	32	3.86E-06	9.30E+08	101	1.126-07
			Al Shubantha	3.600.000	5,117,000	1.07E+09	41	3.895-06	1.19E+09	147	1.246-07
				1.740.000	2.962.000	5, 10E+08	81	3.14E-08	5.60E+08	47	8.39E-08
				3.882.000	5,162,000	1.206409	20	1.87E-08	1.30E+09	139	1.075-07
				000 280 2	2,864,000	6.40E408		6.25E-09	7,10E+08	8	B.45E-00
	Figmens (HS)			000	1.648.000	3.70E+08	0	2.43E-09	4.10E+09	P	9.78E-00
		בנומונים	Al the former the	8.362.000	12,606,000	2.72E+09	64	1.80E-08	2.985+09	266	9.60E-05
			Other As. Fa	1,530,000	2,079,000	4.50E+08	12	2.676-08	5.D0E+09	2	1.46E-08
			MA, Fa	13,492,000	19,832,000	4,245+09	102	2.41E-08	9.17E+09	806	5.52E-08
			Sutnorts: 137	4,154,000	5,212,000	7,006+08		5.71E-09	7.B0E+06	=	1.41E-08
		-	Strender 75	5,109,000	6.036,000	1.205+08	11	9.175-09	1.406409	8	1.03E-08
	128114015 (2)		The Ta	1.347,000	2.254,000	3.90640	3	7.695-09	A.30E+00		1.675-06
	5		AT 7	10.010.000	13.504.000	2.296+0	18	7,865-09	2.61E+09	\$	1.72E-08
			NU CHARLES TO	24 102.000	33,336,00	0.535+0	120	1,84E-06	1.18E+10	1 521	4.685-08
					1.449.000	B.30E+0		2.05E-07	0+305-6	9	9.685-08
Helicopter					27 200	1001		1 245-00	1 1.71E+10	010	3.38E-08
AR MITTERY A	horait			0001811722	mone /c	1432319					

•

-

ICLE/	ar regulatory commestum
Domet No	PFS
Stafi Applicant Intervenor	
Other DATE Clerk	_/o 2 Witness

•