

# DRAFT Assessment of Aircraft Crashes DRAFT

The generic data provided in DOE-STD-3014-96, "Accident Analysis for Aircraft Crash Into Hazardous Facilities," U.S. Department of Energy, October 1996, was used to assess the likelihood of an aircraft crash into or near a decommissioned spent fuel pool. Aircraft damage can affect the structural integrity of the spent fuel pool or affect the availability of nearby support systems, such as power supplies, heat exchangers and water makeup sources, and may also affect recovery actions.

The frequency of an aircraft crashing into a site,  $F$ , is obtained from the four-factor formula,

$$F = \sum_{i,j,k} N_{ijk} \cdot P_{ijk} \cdot f_{ijk}(x,y) \cdot A_{ij} \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

where:

$N_{ijk}$	=	estimated annual number of site-specific aircraft operations (no./yr)
$P_{ijk}$	=	aircraft crash rate (per takeoff and landing for near-airport phases) and per flight for in-flight (nonairport) phase of operation
$f_{ijk}(x,y)$	=	aircraft crash location probability (per square mile)
$A_{ij}$	=	site-specific effective area for the facility of interest including skid and fly-in effective areas (square miles)
$i$	=	(index for flight phase): $i=1,2$ , and 3 (takeoff, in-flight, landing)
$j$	=	(index for aircraft category, or subcategory)
$k$	=	(index for flight source): there could be multiple runways and nonairport operations

$$A_{\text{eff}} = A_f + A_s$$

where:

$$A_f = (WS + R) \cdot (H \cdot \cot \theta) + \frac{2 \cdot L \cdot W \cdot WS}{R} + L \cdot W$$

$$A_s = (WS + R) \cdot S$$

A model for the effective aircraft target area, was taken from DOE-STD-3014-96, Appendix B:

where:

$A_{\text{eff}}$	=	total effective target area	$H$	=	height of facility
------------------	---	-----------------------------	-----	---	--------------------

$A_f$	= effective fly-in area	$L$	= length of facility
$A_s$	= effective skid area	$W$	= width of facility
$WS$	= wing span	$S$	= aircraft skid distance
$\cot\theta$	= mean of cotangent of aircraft impact angle	$R$	= length of facility diagonal

Alternatively, a point target can be defined as just the area (length times width) of the facility in question.

Generic aircraft data and crash frequency values from Tables B-14 through B-18 of DOE-STD-3014-96 are summarized in Table 1 for five aircraft types.

Table 1 - Generic aircraft data

Aircraft	Wingspan (ft)	Skid distance (ft)	$\cot\theta$	Crashes per $\text{mi}^2\text{-yr}$			Notes:
				Min	Ave	Max	
General aviation	50	1440	10.2	$1 \times 10^{-7}$	$2 \times 10^{-4}$	$3 \times 10^{-3}$	
Air carrier	98	60	8.2	$7 \times 10^{-8}$	$4 \times 10^{-7}$	$2 \times 10^{-6}$	
Air taxi	58	60	8.2	$4 \times 10^{-7}$	$1 \times 10^{-6}$	$8 \times 10^{-6}$	
Large military	223	780	7.4	$6 \times 10^{-8}$	$2 \times 10^{-7}$	$7 \times 10^{-7}$	takeoff
Small military	100	447	10.4	$4 \times 10^{-8}$	$4 \times 10^{-6}$	$6 \times 10^{-8}$	landing

The data presented in Table 1 was used to determine the frequency of aircrafts hits per year for various building sizes (length, width and height) for the average and maximum crash rates, and the resulting frequencies are presented in Table 2. The product  $N_{ijk} * P_{ijk} * f_{ijk}(x,y)$ , for Equation 1, is taken from the crashes per  $\text{mi}^2\text{-yr}$  and  $A_{ij}$  is obtained from Equation 2 based on the aircraft characteristics. Two sets of data were generated, one including the wing and skid effective area and a second case which considered only the area (length times width) of the site. General aviation crashes dominate the results.

The building, or facility, characteristics were chosen to cover a range typical of a spent fuel pool to that of the PWR auxiliary building or the BWR secondary containment structure.

Table 2 - Aircraft hits per year

Building (L x W x H) (ft)	Effective Area (mi <sup>2</sup> )	Average Hits/year	Maximum Hits/year
With wing/skid model			
100 x 50 x 30	1.0x10 <sup>-2</sup>	2.1x10 <sup>-6</sup>	3.1x10 <sup>-5</sup>
200 x 100 x 30	1.8x10 <sup>-2</sup>	3.7x10 <sup>-6</sup>	5.5x10 <sup>-5</sup>
400 x 200 x 30	3.5x10 <sup>-2</sup>	7.0x10 <sup>-5</sup>	1.0x10 <sup>-4</sup>
200 x 100 x 100	2.5x10 <sup>-2</sup>	5.0x10 <sup>-6</sup>	7.6x10 <sup>-5</sup>
400 x 200 x 100	4.7x10 <sup>-2</sup>	9.5x10 <sup>-6</sup>	1.4x10 <sup>-4</sup>
80 x 40 x 30	9.0x10 <sup>-3</sup>	1.8x10 <sup>-6</sup>	2.7x10 <sup>-5</sup>
Point target			
100 x 50 x 0	1.8x10 <sup>-4</sup>	3.7x10 <sup>-8</sup>	5.4x10 <sup>-7</sup>
200 x 100 x 0	7.2x10 <sup>-4</sup>	1.5x10 <sup>-7</sup>	2.2x10 <sup>-6</sup>
400 x 200 x 0	2.9x10 <sup>-3</sup>	5.9x10 <sup>-7</sup>	8.6x10 <sup>-6</sup>
80 x 40 x 0	1.1x10 <sup>-4</sup>	2.4x10 <sup>-8</sup>	3.5x10 <sup>-7</sup>

The DOE model, using the generic data in Table 1, was compared to the results of other evaluations from "Probabilistic Safety Assessment and Management," A. Mosleh and R.A. Bari (Eds), PSAM 4, Volume 3, Proceedings of the 4-th International Conference on Probabilistic Safety Assessment and Management, 13-18 September 1998, New York City, USA.

An evaluation of aircraft crash hits was summarized by C.T. Kimura, et al., in "Aircraft Crash Hit Analysis of the Decontamination and Waste Treatment Facility (DWTF) at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL)." DWTF Building 696 was assessed. It is a 254 feet long by 80 feet wide, 1 story, 39 feet high structure. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 - DWTF Aircraft Crash Hit Frequency (per year)

Period	Air Carriers	Air Taxes	General Aviation	Military Aviation	Total <sup>(1)</sup>
1995	1.72x10 <sup>-7</sup>	2.47x10 <sup>-6</sup>	2.45x10 <sup>-5</sup>	5.03x10 <sup>-7</sup>	2.76x10 <sup>-5</sup>
1993-1995	1.60x10 <sup>-7</sup>	2.64x10 <sup>-6</sup>	2.82x10 <sup>-5</sup>	6.47x10 <sup>-7</sup>	3.16x10 <sup>-5</sup>
1991-1995	1.57x10 <sup>-7</sup>	2.58x10 <sup>-6</sup>	2.89x10 <sup>-5</sup>	7.23x10 <sup>-7</sup>	3.23x10 <sup>-5</sup>
1986-1995	1.52x10 <sup>-7</sup>	2.41x10 <sup>-6</sup>	2.89x10 <sup>-5</sup>	8.96x10 <sup>-7</sup>	3.23x10 <sup>-5</sup>

Note (1): Various time periods were studied to variations in air field operations.

Applying the DOE generic data to the DWTF resulted in a frequency range of  $4.4 \times 10^{-6}$  hits per year to  $6.6 \times 10^{-5}$  hits per year. For the point target model, the range was  $1.5 \times 10^{-7}$  to  $2.2 \times 10^{-6}$  per year.

In a paper by K. Jamali, et al., "Application of Aircraft Crash Hazard Assessment Methods to Various Facilities in the Nuclear Industry," additional facility evaluations were summarized. For the Seabrook Nuclear Power Station, application of the DOE model to the FSAR data resulted in an impact frequency  $2.38 \times 10^{-5}$  per year. The Millstone 3 plant area was reported as  $9.5 \times 10^{-3}$  square miles and the FSAR aircraft crash frequency was reported to be  $1.6 \times 10^{-6}$  per year. Applying the DOE model to information found in the Millstone 3 FSAR results in an impact frequency of  $2.74 \times 10^{-6}$  using the effective areas published in the FSAR, and  $2.31 \times 10^{-5}$  using the calculated effective areas. The generic DOE data, Table 1, resulted in an impact frequency range of  $2 \times 10^{-6}$  to  $3 \times 10^{-5}$  per year for the point target model, and  $1.6 \times 10^{-5}$  to  $2.4 \times 10^{-4}$  per year for the effective area (wing and skid) model.

A site specific evaluation for Three-Mile Island Units 1 and 2 was documented in NUREG/CR-5042, "Evaluation of External Hazards to Nuclear Power Plants in the United States," Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, December 1987. The aircraft crash frequency was estimated to be  $2.3 \times 10^{-4}$  accidents per year, about the same value as would be predicted with the DOE data set for the maximum crash rate for a site area of 0.01 square miles.

In NUREG/CR-5042, a study of a power plant response to aviation accidents was also summarized. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 - Probability of penetration as a function of location and concrete thickness

		Probability of penetration			
		Thickness of reinforced concrete			
Plant location	Aircraft type	1 foot	1.5 feet	2 feet	6 feet
≤ 5 miles from airport	Small ≤ 12,000 lbs	0.003	0	0	0
	Large > 12,000 lbs	0.96	0.52	0.28	0
> 5 miles from airport	Small ≤ 12,000 lbs	0.28	0.06	0.01	0
	Large > 12,000 lbs	1.0	1.0	0.83	0.32

There is reasonable assurance that the DOE model and generic data provide a range of aircraft crash hit frequencies that would be consistent with plant specific evaluations. At this level of effort, the resulting damage from an aircraft crash cannot be fully evaluated on a plant specific bases.

A detailed structural evaluation is beyond the scope of this effort. In general, PWR spent fuel pools are located on, or below grade, and BWR spent fuel pools, while generally elevated about 100 feet above grade, are located inside a secondary containment structure. The vulnerability of support systems (power supplies, heat exchanges and makeup water supplies) requires a knowledge of the size and location of these systems, information not readily available.

***The recommended values presented below are open for discussion and provided as a starting point for these discussions.***

**Significant pool damage:**

- (1) The recommended value for significant PWR spent fuel pool damage resulting from a direct hit is based on the point target model for a (100 x 50) foot pool with a conditional probability of 0.1 that the crash results in significant damage. The recommended value range is  $3.7 \times 10^{-9}$  to  $5.4 \times 10^{-8}$  per year.
- (2) The recommended value for significant BWR spent fuel pool damage resulting from a direct hit is based on the wing and skid model for a (200 x 100 x 100) foot structure with a conditional probability of 0.01 that the crash results in significant damage. The recommended value range is  $5.0 \times 10^{-8}$  to  $7.6 \times 10^{-7}$  per year.

**Support system availability:**

- (1) The recommended value for loss of a support system (power supply, heat exchanger or makeup water supply) is based on the DOE model including wing and skid area for a (400 x 200 x 30) foot area with a conditional probability of 0.01 that one of these systems is hit. The recommended value range is  $7 \times 10^{-8}$  to  $1.0 \times 10^{-6}$  per year.
- (2) The recommended value for loss of a support system (power supply, heat exchanger or makeup water supply) is based on the DOE model including wing and skid area for a (10 x 10 x 10) foot structure results in a frequency range of  $7.3 \times 10^{-7}$  to  $1.1 \times 10^{-5}$  per year with the wing and skid area, and  $7.4 \times 10^{-10}$  to  $1.1 \times 10^{-8}$  per year for the point model.