# Mitman, Jeffrey

. . 1

From:	Mitman, Jeffrey : NUU
Sent:	Monday, March 15, 2010 5:55 PM
To:	James, Lois
Cc:	Ferrante, Fernando; Vail, James; Laur, Steven
Subject:	Generic Failure Rate Evaluation for Jocassee
Attachments:	GENERIC FAILURE RATE EVALUATION FOR JOCASSEE DAM.doc; Memo OFI Dam
	Failure Rate R1.doc

Importance:

High

.

Lois, attached is the final version of the subject document. It has been reviewed by Steve, all of his comments and concerns have been addressed. I've also drafted a transmittal memo to Mark (through Melanie) from you. It also is attached. If these meet with you concurrence we will enter the documents formally into Adams and transmit them to Mark.

Jeff

- -



# **Generic Failure Rate Evaluation for Jocassee Dam**

March 15, 2010

Fird

Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) Analyst:

Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) Analyst:

Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) Analyst:

James Vail, Reliability and Risk Analyst, NRR/DRA/APOB Fernando Ferrante, Reliability and Risk

Analyst, NRR/DRA/APOB Jeff Mitman, Senior Reliability and Risk Analyst, NRR/DRA/APOB

Peer Reviewer:

Steven A. Laur, Senior Technical Advisor NRR/DRA

## GENERIC FAILURE RATE EVALUATION FOR JOCASSEE DAM BY DIVISION OF RISK ASSESSMENT'S PRA OPERATIONAL SUPPORT BRANCH

The following documents a generic dam failure rate analysis applicable to the Jocassee Dam performed by the PRA Operational Support Branch (APOB) of the Division of Risk Assessment (DRA) in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR). The analysis, technical justifications, and databases used in support of the calculations for the derived value are briefly discussed. Portions of this evaluation were initially performed in 2007 but not formally documented at that time.

## Approach

The approach used in deriving a generic failure rate value applicable to the Jocassee Dam included: (i) an evaluation of the physical characteristics and description of the dam, (ii) an assessment of the overall U.S. dam population for those with similar features to the Jocassee Dam, (iii) a study of U.S. dam performance information for failure events that may be applicable to this subset of the overall population, and (iv) a calculation of a point estimate, as well as consideration of the uncertainty involved, for the failure rate given the observed failure events and the observed time period (in dam-years).

## Jocassee Dam Description

The Jocassee Dam is located in northwest South Carolina, forming a reservoir (Lake Jocassee) with a 7565-acre surface area, a water volume of 1,160,298 acre-feet, and a total drainage area of 147 sq-miles at full pond (1,110 feet elevation above mean sea level). The reservoir was created in 1973 with the construction of the dam. The Jocassee Dam is an embankment dam with an earthen core and rockfilled and random rockfilled zones (see Figure 1).

(b)(7)(F)

The dam is 385 feet in height (1,125 crest elevation above mean sea level) and 1,825 feet in length and, along with two homogeneous earthfill dikes and a reinforced concrete spillway, is part of a hydroelectric station and pumped storage project. The underground powerhouse generating units receive water from two cylindrical intake towers through eight openings. The water is channeled from the intake towers to four hydro turbines by two bifurcated power tunnels which are constructed through the bedrock of the east abutment. Two gates 33 feet in height and 38 feet in width control the outflow of the spillway.

### Databases

The staff used two databases to obtain information about the population of dams in the US: the National Inventory of Dams (NID), maintained by the US Army Corps of Engineers, and the National Performance of Dams Program (NPDP), developed by the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Stanford University. The NID database contains data describing multiple attributes such as dimensions, type, impoundment characteristics, etc. The NPDP database contains a collection of dam incident reports searchable by various parameters including dam type, incident type, and consequences.

#### Failure Events

Table 1 lists the applicable dam failures initially derived from the NPDP database. To choose these 13 failures, the analysts used criteria based on the previously discussed dam characteristics (i.e., dam type and height). However, due to the ambiguity in the classification of the dam type (i.e., based on material composition) between and within the NID and NPDP databases, as well as the lack of information to establish an exact link with the Jocassee Dam characteristics for every data point, the staff considered both rockfill dams and mixed-rockfill dams (i.e., those classified exclusively as rockfill dams as well as mixed dam types that include rockfill in their categorization). It should be noted that the NPDP database does not list any failures post-2006 and at least two well-known large dam failures in the U.S. are not included: the Big Bay Dam in Mississippi (March 2004) and the Taum Sauk Reservoir (December 2005) in Missouri. While the Big Bay Dam was an earthen dam (i.e., excluded based on dam type), the Taum Sauk Reservoir consisted of a concrete-faced rockfill dam approximately 100 feet in height and was, therefore, included in the current analysis.

Additionally, the list was screened to take into consideration (i) failure events observed between 1900 and 2005, and (ii) failure events observed between 1940 and 2005; under the assumption that events prior to these construction periods could produce different results representative of distinct design practices. In part, this choice was due to the lack of information on the exact construction date of several dams in the database. The staff expended an extensive effort to determine the construction completion date for several dams for which the information was missing in the NPDP database (this information is included in Table 1).

Several failures listed in Table 1 have (or are assumed to have) occurred within a few years of either the start or completion of construction (e.g., the Lower Hell Hole Dam and the Frenchman Dam failures). Based on the information available and the estimated completion dates, the staff screened out such failures since the occurrence of the events was assumed to be related to the construction phase and, therefore, not applicable to a mature dam such as Jocassee.

Finally, the analysts chose to include the Dresser No. 4 Dam failure, because they deemed this dam to be similar to the Jocassee Dam in composition (i.e., a large mixed earthfill-rockfill dam),

despite the fact that it is listed as a tailings dam (i.e., a dam theoretically built under lower standards of quality and maintenance).

Therefore, the final list of failures of dams similar to, and therefore applicable to, the Jocassee Dam includes 6 failures occurring between 1900 and 2005. These six failures are highlighted in Table 1. The staff included these failures based on the following criteria: (i) rockfill or mixed-rockfill dam type, (ii) dam height above 50 feet, (iii) failure occurring after 1900, and (iv) no failures during or within a few years of completion of construction. Note that if failures occurring prior to 1940 are screened, then only 4 events remain: (1) Taum Sauk, (2) Dresser No.4 Dam, (3) Skagway, and (4) Kern Brothers Reservoir. It should be noted that there are 1 to 3 failures of dams built between 1940 and 2005 depending on whether the entries with unknown construction dates are excluded or not, respectively (in similar fashion, there are 3 to 5 failures for dams constructed between 1900-2005 excluding or not entries with unknown construction dates, respectively).

#### **Total Dam-years Calculation**

To calculate the dam failure rate, the staff needed to obtain the total number of dam-years of both failed and non-failed dams. The analysts extracted a subset of dams from the NID database based on a set of parameters to narrow the US population of dams to those reflecting the characteristics of the Jocassee Dam discussed above, i.e., large rockfill dams. They assumed that dams above 50 feet in height appropriately reflect design practices and structural characteristics of larger dams such as Jocassee. This height criterion was consistent with the large dam definition (WCD, 2000) established by the International Commission on Large Dams (ICOLD) which "defines a large dam as a dam with a height of 15m or more from the foundation." If dams are between 5-15 meters high and have a reservoir volume of more than 3 million cubic meters, ICOLD also classified such dams as large. Hence, the staff used this definition as a screening criterion. The dams considered for calculation of the total dam-years were those in the NID database that were categorized exclusively as 'Rockfill' dams (i.e., those listed under the 'ER' abbreviation, intended to correspond to rockfill dams for NID cataloguing purposes).

The staff included the dam-year contributions from Skagway and the replacement for the failed Frenchman Dam, while those from Kern Brothers Reservoir, Dresser No. 4 Dam, Penn Forest, and the failed Frenchman Dam were not included. This was because the staff judges that including the dam-year contribution from these specific dams would not significantly impact the resulting dam-year total. The staff calculated the final result using the difference between the last year in the available data (2005) and either 1900 or 1940. For the 1900-2005 period, the staff obtained a total of 21,490 dam-years; while for 1940-2005 the result was 13,889 dam-years. See Appendix A for a tabulation of the dams and the associated dam-years.

Diam Manasa 🦂	e <b>I</b> ncipente Year	Completion Year(ESP)	Inconstruction of the	Drinstyp		Description From NPDR Delanesce (Except a norm Sept.)
Taum Sauk	2005	1963	Overtopping	Rockfill	94	Overtopped due to over-pumping of reservoir. Independent analysis indicated several root causes (e.g., lack of monitoring, spillway).
Dresser No.4 Dam	1975	Unknown	Piping	Earth Rockfill /Tailings	105	Catastrophic failure that created a breach 300 feet wide in the levee.
Skagway	1965	1925	Inflow Flood - Hydrologic Event	Rockfill	79	The dam failed during a flood in 1965.
Hell Hole	1964	1964	Not Known	Rockfill	410	Dam failed during construction. Overtopped by 100 feet - washing out most of the fill.
Penn Forest	1960	1960	Piping	Concrete Earth Rockfill	151	Partial failure. Sinkhole occurred in upstream slope of dam.
Frenchman Dam	1952	1951	Inflow Flood - Hydrologic Event	Rockfill	63	Runoff from melling snow. A dike section was overtopped early morning April 15, 1952. Later that day, dam breached.
Kern Brothers Reservoir	1949	Unknown	Settlement	Earth Rockfill	54	Failure due to excessive settlement of fill.
Lake Francis	1899	1899	Piping	Earth Rockfill	79	Blowout failure under concrete spillway weir structure during period of heavy spillway flow. Spillway failure thought to be due to piping in soft saturated foundation.
Lafayette	1928	1928	Embankment Slide	Earth Rockfill	132	Foundation slide during construction (at 120 feet). Height raised to 170 feet in 1932. Not sure if this is considered a failure.
Manitou	1924	1917	Seepage	Earth Rockfill	123	Partial failure was disintegrating and converted into gravel fill.
Lyman	1915	1912	Piping	Earth Rockfill	76.4	Failure by piping through abutment; undermined by passage of water under cap of lava rock which flanked dam and extended beneath spillway. Main part of dam uninjured.
Lower Otay	1916	1897	Spillway	Earth Rockfill	154	Foundation slide during construction (at 120 feel). Height raised to 170 feet in 1932. Not sure if this is considered a failure.
Black Rock	1909	1908	Piping	Earth Rockfill	70	Failure by piping through abutment; undermined by passage of water under cap of lava rock which flanked dam and extended beneath spillway. Portion of spillway dropped 7 feet; some fill at south end washed out. Main part of dam uninjured.

# Table 1: Initial List of dam failure events applicable to the Jocassee Dam

. .

.

•

#### Generic Point Estimate of the Dam Failure Rate

The staff calculated the point estimate by dividing the number of applicable dam failures (see Table 1 above) by the total applicable dam-years (derived as described previously). Assuming a 1900-2005 range for the year of occurrence of the failure events and the dam-year estimation (based on completion year), the analysts obtained a failure rate of 2.8E-4 per dam-year. When considering a 1940-2005 range, the staff obtained a result of 2.9E-4 per dam-year.

Because the NID database does not give information regarding the quality of design, construction and/or maintenance, and the NPDP database does not consistently supply information on the dam health (i.e., is it well maintained?) at time of failure, the staff could not derive failure rates for above or below average built and maintained dams. This lack of information precluded the staff from making any judgment as to whether Jocassee is or is not an above average designed, constructed and maintained dam deserving of a failure frequency different than an average failure frequency.

Additionally, the staff recognizes that ambiguity and lack of complete information with respect to dam type, construction completion data, and dam incident reporting, may result in variations in the failure rate estimation. Therefore, the staff performed a simple sensitivity study in order to evaluate the changes due to screening failure events and cut-off year criteria. The results are shown in Table 2 for an assumed number of failures and clearly indicated that the results exhibit small variations for the period cut-off selected (1900-2005 and 1940-2005) and the number of failures considered (6 and 4, respectively). Additionally, the extent of the variation in the point estimate is shown for other number of failures and cut-off years based on the subset of dams selected. The table illustrates that the order-of-magnitude failure frequency estimate does not change significantly if the number of failures is increased or decreased slightly.

			ASSUMED NUMBER OF FAILURES							
CUT- OFF	DAM- YEARS	# DAMS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
ALL	25137	484	4.0E-05	8.0E-05	1.2E-04	1.6E-04	2.0E-04	2.4E-04	2.8E-04	
1900	21490	466	4.7E-05	9.3E-05	1.4E-04	1.9E-04	2.3E-04	2.8E-04	3.3E-04	
1910	19778	449	5.1E-05	1.0E-04	1.5E-04	2.0E-04	2.5E-04	3.0E-04	3.5E-04	
1920	18389	434	5.4E-05	1.1E-04	1.6E-04	2.2E-04	2.7E-04	3.3E-04	3.8E-04	
1930	16475	410	6.1E-05	1.2E-04	1.8E-04	2.4E-04	3.0E-04	3.6E-04	4.2E-04	
1940	13889	373	7.2E-05	1.4E-04	2.2E-04	2.9E-04	3.6E-04	4.3E-04	5.0E-04	
1950	12269	346	8.2E-05	1.6E-04	2.4E-04	3.3E-04	4.1E-04	4.9E-04	5.7E-04	
1960	8453	270	1.2E-04	2.4E-04	3.5E-04	4.7E-04	5.9E-04	7,1E-04	8.3E-04	
1970	3242	143	3.1E-04	6.2E-04	9.3E-04					
1980	1339	82	7.5E-04							
1990	381	36					_			
			FAILURE RATE GIVEN # NUMBER OF FAILURES AND CUTOFE YEAR							

#### Table 2: Failure Rate Sensitivity Analysis

#### **Bayesian Estimate of the Dam Failure Rate**

To evaluate the dam failure rate uncertainty, the staff conducted a Bayesian analysis of the failure rate for the 1900-2005 period via a Bayesian analysis approach (Atwood et al, 2003). In this approach, a prior distribution was assumed from the number of failures and dam-years for all large dams (according to the ICOLD definition) identified in the NID and NPDP databases. Failures identified as 'infantile failures' in NPDP were excluded and only dams built since 1900 according to NID were used for total dam-year calculation. Under these assumptions, the total number of failures for all large dams for 1900-2005 was 84 with a total of 260,960 dam-years. This corresponds to a point estimate of the failure rate equivalent to 3.2E-4/dam-vear. A distribution was fitted around this mean. The number of dam failure events was modeled as a Poisson distribution for which its conjugate prior was assumed to follow a Gamma distribution (i.e., the conjugate prior in a Gamma-Poisson model). The staff, based on judgment, chose a Gamma distribution with the point estimate obtained from the large dam failure rate above and a  $5^{th}$  percentile corresponding to 1E-5/dam-year. With these assumptions, the staff obtained a prior Gamma distribution with parameters  $\alpha = 0.8333$  and  $\beta = 2589$ , which has a 5<sup>th</sup> percentile equivalent to 1E-5/dam-year and a 95<sup>th</sup> percentile corresponding to 1E-3/dam-year. The staff updated this prior distribution with the data used to obtain the large rockfill dam point estimate (e.g., 6 failures in 21,490 dam-years) to calculate the posterior distribution. The resulting posterior has a mean of 2.8E-4/dam-year, a 5th percentile of 1.3E-4/dam-years, and a 95th percentile of 4.8E-4/dam-years (with parameters  $\alpha$  = 6.8333 and  $\beta$  = 24,079). Figure 2 shows both the generic large dam prior and the posterior specific to rockfill dams.

#### Conclusions

The staff estimated generic dam failure rates for large rockfill dams, which it considers applicable to the Jocassee Dam, as 2.8E-4/dam-year. Given the nature of the data and the assumptions involved in narrowing the applicable failure events and subset of the U.S. dam population comparable to this specific dam, the staff performed a Bayesian analysis. Using available data on the domestic inventory of dams and dam failures, the range obtained varies between 1.3E-4/dam-year and 4.8E-4/dam-year (5<sup>th</sup> – 95<sup>th</sup> percentile) around a mean of 2.8E-4/dam-year.

A literature review performed by the authors for statistical studies of dam failures appears to corroborate this conclusion. Such studies were found in Baecher et al (1980), Martz and Bryson (1982), Donnelly (1994), ICOLD (1995), Foster (2000a), and Foster et al (2000b).



Figure 2: Failure Rate Probability Distributions Used in Bayesian Updating

#### References

Baecher, G. B., M. E. Paté, and R. De Neufville (1980), "Risk of Dam Failure in Benefit-Cost Analysis," *Water Resource Research*, 16(3), 449–456.

Martz, H.F., and M.C. Bryson (1982), "Predicting Low-Probability/High-Consequence Events," Proceedings of the Workshop on Low-Probability/High-Consequence Risk Analysis, June 15-17, 1982, Arlington, Virginia.

Donnely, R. (1994), "Issues in Dam Safety, ACRES International Innovations Autumn Edition": http://www.hatch.com.cn/Hatchenergy/Innovations/autumn2004/feature.html

ICOLD (1995), "Dam Failures Statistical Analysis," Bulletin 99, International Commission on Large Dams.

WCD (2000), "Dams and Development: A New Framework for Decision-Making - overview," The Report of the World Commission on Dams.

Foster M, Fell R, Spannagle M (2000a), "The statistics of embankment dam failures and accidents," *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, 37, 1000-1024.

Foster M, Fell R, Spannagle M (2000b) "A method for assessing the relative likelihood of failure of embankment dams by piping," *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, 37, 1025-1061

C.L. Atwood, J.L. LaChance, H.F. Martz, D.J. Anderson, M. Englehardt, D. Whitehead, and T. Wheeler (2003), "Handbook of Parameter Estimation for Probabilistic Risk Assessment," NUREG/CR-6823, US NRC.

• '

...

. .

	1.000			S. Same	and and a second second	Sec. Sec. 3
	ی اور بید بر سیومان : ایر اس سرومان : ایر اس سرومان : ایر			Constant and a second sec	ور بر بوده در از از از مربوعه در از از	
	CARDING C					and the second second
DIAMOND VALLEY LAKE	CA00866	2000	284	800,000	5	10
HANSEN RECREATIONAL LAKE	CA01448	1999	50	85	6	16
LOLONIS VINEYARDS	CA01423 CA10324	1999	6/ 550	145.600	6	22 28
MELROSE AVENUE	CA01400	1998	57	52	7	35
	CA01406	1998	65	1,187	7	42
DENNIS NO 2	CA01414 CA01398	1997	60	148	8	50
RMG WEST TAILINGS DAM	NV10508	1997	94	9,567	8	66
	CA01396	1997	197	100,000	8	74
SEA RANCH	CA01411	1996	61	300		92
ILLINOIS CREEK HEAP LEACH DAM	AK00261	1996	83	103	9	101
CHASE GULCH	CO02766	1996	100	1,250		110
Gold Guich 1A	AZ00224	1995	106	110	10	130
HUCKLEBERRY CREEK DAM	AR01522	1995	110	23,342	10	140
BEE CANYON RB	CA01360	1994	62	243	11	151
ROUND CANYON RB	CA01378	1994	98	286	11	173
JAMESTOWN MINES T	CA01245	1984	200	12,100	11	184
MACKS CREEK	AK00201	1993	52.5	24 757	12	196
LANGTRY	CA01350	1992	50	525	13	221
SANDS HILL SLURRY IMPOUNDMENT DAM	OH02839	1992	131	1,200	13	234
BRADLEY LAKE SPILLWAY DAM	AK83023	1991	115	2/2 284.150	14	248 262
BRADLEY LAKE DAM	AK83016	1991	125	284,150	14	276
L PETERS CAN RB	CA01207	1990	52	206	15	291
CENTENNIAL	CA01248	1990	62	635	15	321
MOLYCORP TAILING DAM 5A	NM00531	1990	73	3,630	15	336
PAD 6 OVERFLOW POND DAM	SC02578	1990	80	55	15	351
HOMESTAKE TAILINGS	CA01205	1990	169	0	15	381
PLYMOUTH EFFL	CA01189	1989	59	187	16	397
HARVEY PLACE	CA01222	1989	72	3,700	16	413
DOVE CANYON	CA01248	1989	88	415	16	445
NEW SPICER MEADOW	CA01224	1989	262	189,000	16	461
CSP MULE CREEK	CA01195	1988	51	535	17	478
FOOTHILL PARK	CA00268	1988		67	17	512
DAY CREEK DB	CA01232	1988	90	140	17	529
Schoens	AZ00207	1988	143.6	82,000	17	548
RAMONA	CA01215	1968	228	12,200	17	580
Mt St Helens Sediment Retention Structure	WA00558	1988	240	126,000	17	597
ANTELOPE	CA01213	1987	57	764	18	615
BALSAM MEADOW	CA01283	1986	127	2,040	19	652
BRADFORD	CA01263	1985	58	440	20	672
JAYNE SLAKE	CA01262	1985	70	1,225	20	692
DAVIS CREEK	CA01223	1985	105	6,079	20	732
RED MOUNTAIN RES	CA00225	1985	120	1,350	20	752
	CA01240 CA01241	1985	120	596	20	772
TERROR LAKE	AK83008	1984	193	108,000	21	814
GARNETT, CITY OF, CEDAR CREEK RESERVOIR	KS07006	1983	70	24,000	22	836
	WA00208	1983	262	153 260	22	858
CALERO	CA01209	1982	55	2,832	23	903
FLAT ROCK CREEK SITE 1	AR01442	1982	57	509	23	926
COEN C-3	CA01313	1982	97	480	23	972
Gold Guich #2	AZ00194	1982	118.3	590	23	995
SOLOMON GULCH SPILLWAY	AK83021	1981	55	31,500	24	1,019
STANLEY & MAHR RES	CA01280	1981	79	166	24	1.067
LAS LLAJAS	CA01217	1981	96	1,250	24	1,091
SOLOMON GULCH	AK00027	1981	206	31,500	24	1,115
	CA01230	1980	51	650	25	1,164
PORTOLA	CA01183	1980	53	586	25	1,189
SAND CREEK	CA01180 CA01277	1980	60	1,050	25 25	1,214
DEER CANYON DB	CA01231	1980	78	24	25	1,264
PEA RIDGE TAILINGS DAM	MO30473	1980	150	4,100	25	1,289
	0R00824	1980	160	73,500	25	1,314
	CA01184	1979	55	330	26	1,365
	AL01519	1979	75	35	26	1,391
BESSIE MINES-#3 IMPOUNDMENT	CA01083	19/9	100	10,700	26	1,41/
UPPER OSO	CA01145	1979	142	3,700	26	1,469
WASTEWATER STORAGE	CA01137	1978	75	212	27	1,496
	CA01134 CA01148	1978	102	79	27	1,523
SAFE SHUTDOWN IMPOUNDMENT DAM	TX04912	1977	70	900	28	1,578
LOS ANGELES RES	CA01081	1977	130	10,000	28	1,606
DEQUEEN	AR01201	1 18//	160	370,600	28	1,634

# Appendix A: Dam-Year Tabulation

•

·

.

,

-SENSITIVE INFORMATION - OFFICIAL USE ONEY

						Sector Sector
		. Conserver of		Ser out	and the second s	
		and the second sec	the second	AND AND AND		
	CA01082 PA00917	1977	182	42,000	28	1,662
SUNFLOWER	CA01116	1976	50	420	29	1,719
HOLMAN	CA01108 CA01128	1976	101	250	29	1,777
MISSION VIEJO, LAKE	CA01122	1976	123	4,300	29	1,806
WILLIAM L JESS	OR00612	1976	345	1,970	29	1.835
POND 2B	CA01092	1975	55	89	30	1,894
LIVE OAK RES	CA01120 CA01084	1975	60 105	2,500	30	1,924
TRAMPAS CANYON	CA01123	1975	183	5,700	30	1,984
	CA01101 NC01524	1974	55 112	300	31	2,015
ELDERBERRY FB	CA01080	1974	_179	28,400	31	2,077
BOYD ND 2	CA01111 CA01054	1973	52	52 870	32	2,109
J C JACOBSEN	CA00587	1973	56	1,820	32	2,173
JOCASSEE SPILLWAY	SC02757	1973	64	1,287,788	32	2,205
NOCKAMIXON	PA00734	1973	102	71,000	32	2,269
	CA00223	1973	109	43,800	32	2,301
PERRIS	CA00054	1973	130	131,452	32	2,365
	KY03046	1973	282	435,600	32	2,397
JOCASSEE	SC00529	1973	385	1,287,788	32	2,451
RANCHO SECO	CA00825	1972	58	2,950	33	2,494
Lower Rimrock Dam	WA00036	1972	67	550	33	2,580
	CA00995	1972	79	1,250	33	2,593
LAUREL CREEK	PA00578	1972	135	4,080	33	2,620
	CA00904	1972	158	9,200	33	2,692
CANADA ROAD	CA00055	1972	570	7,200	33 - 34	2,725
STRAZA	CA01064	1971	62	185	34	2,793
ALISAL CREEK	CA00913 CA00731	19/1	93	2,342	34	2,827
TURNER	CA00905	1971	111	2,000	34	2,895
	CA00909	19/1	124	3,300	34	2,929
DON PEDRO	CA00281	1971	568	2,030,000	34	2,997
	CA01081 CA00789	1970	55 67	730	35	3,032
ANTHONY HOUSE	CA00964	1970	75	3,840	35	3,102
L VAN NORMAN BYPASS Willow Springs	CA00101 AZ00088	1970	78 87.7	4,230	35	3,137
DIXON	CA00878	1970	116	2,500	35	3,207
TERMINAL	AZ00022 ČA00888	1970	160 53	5,000 844	35	3,242
Clear Branch Creek Dam	OR00451	1969	111	4,000	36	3,314
BIG CREEK	CA00652 KY00088	1969	120	7,650	38	3,350
LOPEZ	CA00887	1969	166	52,500	36	3,422
COYOTE CREEK	CA00803 CA00572	1968	92	1,490	37	3,459
SUMMIT RES	CA00146	1968	124	220	37	3,533
SANTA YNEZ CANYON	CA00100	1968	12/ 157	356	37	3,570
WALNUT CANYON	CA00869	1968	187	2,570	37	3,644
DEL VALLE MINERAL HOT SPRINGS LAKE	CA00043 CA01028	1968	<u>222</u> 54	77,100	37	3,681
SWAN	CA00965	1987	59	550	38	3,757
HILLSIDE RANCH MAGNOLIA	CA01067 CA00966	1967	60 68	210	38 38	3,795
	CA00894	1967	71	3,160	38	3,871
MSD TREATMENT PLANT DAM	NC00320 CA00175	1967	102	385	38	3,909
EL TORO RES	CA00875	1967	106	877	38	3,985
FOSTER	CAU1394 OR00012	1967	116	309 61,000	38	4,023
Cabin Creek Upper	CO01239	1967	215	1,800	38	4,099
Faucherie Lake Main	COU0673 CA00256	1967	205	45,870	38	4,137
HAWKEYE	CA01052	1966	66	140	39	4,215
McSwain	CA00725 CA00242	1966	83 97	10,000	<u>39</u>	4,293
Chevelon Canyon	AZ00046	1966	100	8,542	39	4,332
N. FORK OF POUND DAM	VA19501	1966	115	11,293	39	4,3/1
SAN JOAQUIN RES	CA00853	1966	224	3,036	39	4,449
HARTZELL	CA00857 CÁ00727	1965	410 50	<u>∠08,400</u> 300	39 40	4,488
Yards Creek Upper - West Dike	NJ83004	1965	52	4,900	40	4,568
HAYNES RES	CA01030 CA00642	1965	<u>67</u> 70	5,870	40	4,608
UPPER BLUE	CO00871	1965	75	2,635	40	4,688
DUTCH FLAT 2 FB	CA00258 OR03632	1965	77 81	185	40	4,728
GRASSHOPPER HOLLOW TAILINGS DAM	WV06523	1965	129	1,260	40	4,808
WOOD RANCH	CA00850	1965	146	11,000	40	4,848
	CA00867	1965	193	22,000	40	4,928
JACKSON MEADOWS	CA00254	1965	195	52,500	40	4,968

• •

•

	C. C. Mader Maria				100	
			100 Carlos (199	Sector Sector	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Second and a second
		- torreses		2.2.2.2		
SAN ANTONIO	CA00813	1965	202	350,000	40	5,008
FALL CREEK	OR00007	1965	205	125,000	40	5,048
	CA00417 CA00856	1965	214	24,300	40	5,088
MCCLOUD	CA00418	1965	240	35,300	40	5,168
SUMMERSVILLE DAM	WV06702	1965	390	413,400	40	5,208
GRIZZLY CREEK	CA00553	1964	50	76	41	5,249
BERNARDO RES	CA00118	1964	54	30	41	5.331
Clinch River Flyash Dam #1	VA16703	1964	55	1,240	41	5,372
BRENTWOOD PARK	CA00651	1964	58	80	41	5,413
Camp Kwoneesum Dam	WA00131	1964	60	120	41	5,454
Clinch River Flyash Dam #2	VA16702	1964	85	157	41	5,538
SAN LORENZO CR	CA00841	1964	65	380	41	5,577
HARBOR VIEW	CA00830	1964	65	28	41	5,618
	KY00042	1964	105	1156	41	5,659
ANTELOPE	CA00037	1964	113	22,566	41	5,741
JAMES H TURNER	CA00132	1964	193	50,500	41	5,782
BRIONES ROUND BUTTE	CA00172	1984	273	67,520	41	5.823
COUGAR	OR00015	1964	519	219,000	41	5,905
FOOTHILL REG PARK	CA01057	1963	51	109	42	5,947
LARSON	CA00712	1963	54	325	42	5.989
	CA00840	1963	55	<u>310</u> 6 280	42	6,031
Canyon Creek Meadows Reservoir	OR00385	1963	58	400	42	6,115
MARSH CREEK	CA00809	1963	59	4,425	42	6,157
WARD CREEK	CA00839	1963	71	130	42	6,199
MAST	CA00972	1963	/3	4,994	42	6,241
LOWER SUNSET DB	CA01161	1963	86	37	42	6,325
TAUM SAUK PS UPPER	MO30040	1963	94	4,350	42	6,367
MATANZAS CREEK	CA00794	1963	95	1,500	42	6,409
	CA83099	1963	102	76,500	42	6,451
VILLA PARK	CA00829	1963	118	15,600	42	8,535
PALISADES RES	CA00843	1963	148	147	42	6,577
VIRGINIA RANCH	CA00842	1963	152	57,000	42	6,619
CAMANCHE	CA00173	1963	171	417,120	42	6,061
CAMP FAR WEST	CA00227	1963	185	104,500	42	6,745
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM	VA05101	1963	250	145,700	42	6,787
	CA00816	1963	453	230,000	42	6,829
MAYHEW RESERVOIR	CA00897	1962	53	18	43	6,915
MINERS RANCH	CA00275	1982	55	912	43	6,958
BOSCH NO 2	CA01044	1962	55	37	43	7,001
	AZ00049	1962	89.2	2,764	43	7,044
PATTERSON	CA00895	1962	100	46	43	7,130
HERNANDEZ	CA00848	1962	124	18,000	43	7,173
OLIVE HILLS RES	CA00870	1962	140	185	43	7,216
ROBERT W MATTHEWS	CA00833	1962	150	51,800	43	7.302
PONDEROSA DIV	CA00274	1962	160	4,750	43	7,345
MARK EDSON	CA00607	1982	162	20,000	43	7,388
CHET HARRITT	CA00238	1962	200	9,790 84	43	7,431
DANVILLE	CA00184	1961	75	45		7,519
NORTH	CA00183	1961	62	244	44	7,563
BETHANY FOREBAY	CA00033	1981	95	5,250	4	7,607
ROSEMONT	CO00471	1961	120	3,155	- 4	7,695
FRENCHMAN	CA00032	1961	129	55,477	44	7,739
	ID00057	1981	175	58,200	44	7,783
URNWALL I AIUNGS	CA00289	1981	210	93.010	44	7.871
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM	PA00008	1961	239	160,290	44	7,915
SLY CREEK	CA00272	1981	271	65,050	44	7,959
LEWIS SMITH	AL01420	1981	300	1.670,700	44	8,003
BIG DALTON DB	CA01156	1960	59	193	45	8,093
WILLIAM, LAKE	CA00586	1960	68	340	45	8,138
LITTLE DALTON DB	CA01154	1960	71	234	45	8,183
	CA00885	1960	107	68	45	8,273
ASH CREEK	UT00010	1960	138	12,250	45	8,318
NEWELL	CA00156	1960	182	8,991	45	8,363
WHALE ROCK	CA00029	1960	193	40,662	45	5,408 8,453
BIG CANYON	CA00891	1959	65	600	46	8,499
RATTLESNAKE CAN	CA00855	1959	79	1,480	46	8,545
BELL CANYON	CA00149	1959	95	2,530	46	8,591
ICE HOUSE	CA00814	1959	150	37,120	46	8,637
	MT00882	1959	200	59,500	46	8,729
J W WISDA	CA00053	1958	50	45	47	8,776
SIERRA MADRE VIL	CA01158	1958	50	109	47	8,823
EARL THOMAS RES	CA00119	1958	58	107	47	8,870
DEER LAKE	CA00579	1958	72	260	47	8.964
SAN MARCOS	CA00785	1958	85	320	47	9,011
MIDDLEFIELD RES	CA00896	1958	147	22	47	9,058

•

- SENSITIVE INFORMATION - OFFICIAL USE ONLY

#### GENERIC FAILURE RATE EVALUATION FOR JOCASSEE DAM (2).doc

.

		24 (1980) 24 (1980)	1000 C 42	Watern 25		
	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	100000	1942 19 198	ئا ہیں – نمجمنیہ کا ا		Sector Sector
		1. A.	1. A. S.	19	Sugar Sec.	
Wishon Main	CA00411 CA00412	1958	265	129,000	47	9,105
MCMAHON	CA00701	1957	52	520	48	9,200
	CA01013	1957	54	715	48	9,248
A L CHAFFIN	CA00552	1957	65	450	48	9,344
ARROYO SECO	CA00613	1957	67	2,433	48	9,392
PLEASANT VALLEY	CA00314 CA00098	1957	87	20	48	9,440
UVAS	CA00807	1957	118	10,000	48	9,538
PARADISE	CA00297	1957	210	11,500	48	9,584
LA VERNE, LAKE	CA00983	1956	50	54	49	9,681
COIT	CA01011	1956	54	275	49	9,730
SYCAMORE	CA00800	1956	- 50 - 83	860	49	9,828
ALESSANDRO	CA00798	1956	66	370	49	9,877
ANNADEL NO 1	CA00729 CA00056	1956	67	395	49	9,926
Fool Hollow	AZ00051	1956	78	5,617	49	10,024
	CA00808	1956	87	225	49	10,073
CHERRY VALLEY	CA00125	1956	315	273,500	49	10,171
MOSKOWITE	CA005B3	1955	50	472	50	10,221
PORTAL PH FOREBAY	CA00562 CA00442	1955	65	<u>∡15</u> 325	50	10,271
DICK WEEK	CA00585	1955	70	3,140	50	10,371
SAWPIT DB	CA01157 CA00806	1955	82 95	152	50	10,421
Steer Branch Dam	VA19503	1955	210	40	50	10,521
	ID00288	1955	340	307,000	50	10,571
NULL	CA00933	1954	54	188	51	10,673
	CA00994	1954	65	520	51	10,724
UPPER STONE CANYON	CA00097	1954	111	425	51	10,775
GARVEY RES	CA00217	1954	160	1,610	51	10,877
VERMILION VALLEY	CA00441 CA00208	1954	167 230	125,000	51	10,928
FRENCHMAN DAM	MT00003	1953	63	21,000	52	11,031
EAGLE ROCK	CA00094	1953	113	254	52	11,083
JAMES J LENIHAN	CA00293	1953	208	21,430	52	11,187
CRYSTAL	CA00573	1952	<u>51</u>	105	53	11,240
SUTRO RESERVOIR	CA00565	1952	55	120	53	11,293
SCHUBIN	CA01045	1952	55	225	53	11,399
POMPONIO RANCH	CA01008	1952	63 245	258	53	11,452
MALLACOMES	CA00591	1951	57	200	54	11,559
NIEGEL	CA01047	1951	81	145	54	11,613
Little Hell s Canyon	AZ00215	1951	69.5	1,545	54	11,721
NOVATO CREEK	CA00321	1951	71	4,430	54	11,775
BELLETT	CA00542	1951	54	10,230	<u>54</u> 55	11,829
GLEN MARTIN	CA00754	1950	55	33	55	11,939
	CA00064 CA00685	1950	<u>60</u> 83	174 88	55	11,994
MARLOWE HEIRS REFUSE DAM-WHITE OAK BRANCH	KY00665	1950	80	316	55	12,104
STOCKTON CREEK	CA00699	1950	95	365	55	12,159
LEROY ANDERSON	CA00294	1950	235	91,280	55	12,269
SYPHON CANYON	CA00749	1949	59	500	58	12,325
QUEENS CREEK	NC00333	1949	78	718	56	12,437
BON TEMPE	CA00207	1949	98	4,300	56	12,493
BIG DRY CREEK	CA01075	1945	50	30,200	50 57	12,608
JACOBS CREEK	CA00232	1948	53	587	57	12,663
LA HEROCADUKA	CA00582 CA00247	1948	100	13,800	57	12,720
SCOTTS FLAT	CA00253	1948	175	49,000	57	12,834
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM	WA00300 CA00683	1948 1947	425 67	106,000	57 58	12,891
DOS PUEBLOS	CA00730	1946	78	300	59	13,008
	CA00104	1946	125	31,000	59	13,067
RUBIO DB	CA00202	1944	64	44	61	13,187
	CA00403	1943	61	1,147	62	13,249
LLTSIAN NANTAHALA	NC00371	1943	250	126,000	63	13,311 13,374
CHORRO CREEK	CA01076	1941	77	90	64	13,438
ORANGE COUNTY RESERVOIR	CA00218 CA00090	1941 1941	103	217	64	13,502
THORPE	NC00378	1941	150	67,100	64	13,630
THORPE LAKE DAM #1 (NP&L FERC)	NC00338	1941	150	600	64	13,694
GRANT LAKE	CA00089	1940	87	47,525	65 65	13,824
CHEVY CHASE 1290	CA01078	1940	90	17	65	13,889
MUNICIPAL KIMBALL CREEK	CA00155 CA00310	1939	56 80	344	06 66	14,021
PALOS VERDES RES	CA00215	1939	82	1,100	66	14,087
	CA00299 MT00012	1939	100 55	6,150 8,100	66	14,153 14,220
		1000	~~	4,100		

• •

•

SENSITIVE INFORMATION - OFFICIAL USE ONLY

#### GENERIC FAILURE RATE EVALUATION FOR JOCASSEE DAM (2).doc

		1007			$\{ a_{i}, \ldots, a_{i} \}$	Service marries
		1. Start	5-400	S		and the second second
		Sector S	all of the second			
	CA00719	1938	65	165	67	14,287
SUTTENFIELD	CA00010	1938	76	600	67	14,421
C L TILDEN PARK	CA00161	1938	88	268	67	14,488
GREGORY, LAKE	CA00224 CA00212	1938	90	2,100	67	14,555
SAN GABRIEL NO 1	CA00200	1938	320	44,183	67	14,689
GLACIER LAKE NORTH DAM	MT00068	1937	57	4,980	68	14,757
CHERRY FLAT	CA00133 CA00158	1937	60	250	68	14,825
EATON WASH DB	CA00201	1938	63	721	69	14,963
	CA00300	1936	65	23,000	69	15,032
COYOTE	CA00289	1936	140	23,666	69	15,10
BIG CANYON CR	CA00611	1935	63	395	70	15,240
LAKE QUIVIRA, CITY OF, LAKE QUIVIRA DAM	KS02974	1935	80	2,996	70	15,310
STEVENS CREEK	CA00292	1935	130	3,800	70	15,450
GUADALUPE	CA00290	1935	142	3,460	70	15,520
BOUQUET CANYON	CA00190	1935	190	36,505	70	15,590
UPPER HOLLYWOOD	CA00087	1933	87	198	72	15,733
SANTIAGO CREEK	CA00298	1933	136	25,000	72	15,805
WHITTIER RES NO 4	CA00153	1931	55	32	74	15,952
SWANZY LAKE	CA00144	1931	86	107	74	18,026
SALT SPRINGS	CA00382	1931	332	141,900	74	16,100
GRIZZLY	CO01545	1930	65	987	75	16,250
FELTLAKE	CA00670	1930	67	900	75	16,325
BRAND PARK	CA00061	1930	99	32	75	16,400
LAFAYETTE	CA00163	1929	132	4,250	76	16,551
GEUNOC LAKE	CA00564	1928	50	3,237	77	16,628
COYOTE FLAT	CA00780 CA00513	1928	50	5,250	77	16,705
THOMPSON CREEK	CA00198	1928	66	543	77	16,859
BUCKS STORAGE	CA00332	1928	122	103,000	77	18,936
BIG TOOTH	CO00445	1925	147	205	78	17,013
BOWMAN	CA00245	1927	175	64,000	78	17,169
PHILBROOK	CA00345	1926	85	5,180	79	17,248
BLACK ROCK CR	CA00693	1925	57	30	80	17,407
SKAGWAY	CO00481	1925	79	3,570	BQ	17,487
	CA00445 KY00316	1925	287	230 500	80	17,567
BRIDGEPORT	CA00284	1924	63	44,100	81	17,728
ENCINO BTONE CANYON	CA00070	1924	168	9,789	81	17,809
HENDERSON	CA00083	1924	108	500	82	17,890
EL DORADO FOREBAY	CA00375	1923	P1	472	82	18,054
	CA00077	1923	105	92	82	18,136
Spruce Hollow	MD00349	1920	50	150	85	18,304
SAN PABLO	CA00166	1920	170	43,193	85	18,389
BOX ELDER CREEK (CHATFIELD)	UT00050	1919	50	511	86	18,475
MAIN STRAWBERRY	CA00388	1916	143	18,312	89	18,653
Drews Reservoir	OR00049	1914	63	65,000	91	18,744
SAND CANYON	CA00854	1912	58	960	93	18,929
Lyman	AZ00004	1912	76.4	44,500	93	19,022
MORENA	CA00110	1912	181	50,208	93	19,115
Wenas Dam	WA00002	1911	90	5,500	94	19,303
SAWMILL LAKE	CA00250	1910	50	3,040	95	19,398
	CA00162	1910	81	485	95	19,493
RELIEF	CA00390	1910	145	15,122	95	19,683
CRANE VAL STOR	CA00337	1910	145	45,410	95	19,778
MARIE, LAKE	CA00391	1908	60	170	97	19,875
SABRINA	CA00448	1908	70	8,376	97	20,069
MADIGAN, LAKE	CA00141 CA00344	1908		253	97	20,166
PHOENIX LAKE	CA00208	1907	90	612	98	20,362
HERMAN, LAKE	CA00851	1905	51	2,210	100	20,462
PIEDMONT	CA00168	1905	64	60	100	20,562
DESABLA FOREBAY	CA00343	1903	53	280	102	20,764
	CA00381	1903		5,160	102	20,866
TERMINAL	CO00895	1902	103	29,800	102	21,968
CHOLLAS	CA00107	1901	50	310	104	21,175
Hogan Dam	VA15504	1900	60	1,285	105	21,280
BEAR RIVER	CA00379	1900	83	6,818	105	21,490
TORESON	CA00483	1898	55	1,140	107	21,597
BEAR GULCH	CA00658	1896	61	672	109	21,706
FREY, LAKE	CA00142	1894	83	1,075	111	21,926
RED ROCK NO 1	CA00510	1893	63	10,000	112	22,038
	CA00690 CA00171	1892	60 61	427	113	22,151
		1021		747		

• •

. ,

#### GENERIC FAILURE RATE EVALUATION FOR JOCASSEE DAM (2).doc

•

			Service States			
		Percer				
COWELL RESERVIOR	CA00048	1890	50	175	115	22,380
SEQUOIA LAKE	CA00709	1888	51	1,370	117	22,497
YOSEMITE, LAKE	CA00241	1868	53	8,101	117	22,614
EMERALD LAKE 1 LOWER	CA00688	1885	57	45	120	22,734
PHOENIX	CA00389	1880	52	455	125	22,859
SPENSER LAKE	CA00673	1876	87	73	129	22,988
FORDYCE, LAKE	CA00357	1873	143	48,900	132	23,120
SAN ANDREAS	CA00129	1870	107	19,027	135	23,255
TEMESCAL, LAKE	CA00160	1869	116	200	136	23,391
PILARCITOS	CA00128	1866	103	3,100	139	23,530
EMERY	CA00618	1850	53	630	155	23,685
NOTRE DAME	CA00674		51	120		
LOWER STEHLY	CA01227		60	145		
AUXILIARY RESERVOIR C	CA01458		65	3,700		
LANG CREEK DETN BN	CA01368		67	263		
SLICKROCK CREEK	CA01444		155	220	1	
WESINER HOLLOW, SLUBBY DAM	PA01641		192	3 948		

• • `

r

1

.

- SENSITIVE INFORMATION - OFFICIAL USE ONLY