				Detec Valve Clo Min	ction + sure Time ^a , putes	Mavimi	ım Drain	Loss I Detect	During ion and	Total	Maximum
	Station.	Upstream	Downstream	Upstream	Downstream	Vol	ume	Shut	down ^b	Re	lease
Location	ft	Valve	Valve	Valve	Valve	bbl	gal	bbl	Gal	bbl	gal
Fonwood Elementary, Northwood Elementary, and Langstead Primary Schools	75600 to 76400	Remote- controlled block valve	Manual block valve	5	120 ^c	3,903	164,000	781	32,800	4,684	196,800
Buescher State Park	673338 to 679884	Manual block valve	Remote- controlled block valve	120 ^c	5	2,333	98,000	781	32,800	3,114	130,800
Colorado River Crossing	710033	Remote- controlled block valve MLV G-1	Check valve and manually- operated block valve	5	5	1,245	52,300	781	32,800	2,026	85,100
Onion Creek Crossing	865867	Remote- controlled block valve	Remote- controlled block valve	5	5	4,310	179,600	781	32,800	5,091	212,400
Hillcrest Elementary School	861050	Remote- controlled block valve	Remote- controlled block valve	5	5	488	20,500	781	32,800	1,269	53,300
Brown Schools	888000	Remote- controlled block valve	Remote- controlled block valve	5	5	3,996	167,800	781	32,800	4,777	200,600
Shiloh Oaks Subdivision	891264	Remote- controlled block valve	Remote- controlled block valve	5	5	2,667	112,014	781	32,800	3,448	144,814
Karst Preserve	901500	Remote- controlled block valve	Remote- controlled block valve	5	5	3,964	166,500	781	32,800	4,745	199,300
Edwards Aquifer – General	875615 to 914682	Remote- controlled block valve ^d	Remote- controlled block valve	5	5	5,240	220,080	781	32,800	6,021	252,880

Table 6-1. Estimated Maximum Product Release at Selected Locations

				Detection + Valve Closure Time ^a , <u>Minutes</u>		Detection + Valve Closure Time ^a , Minutes Maximum Drain		ım Drain	Loss I Detec Pipe	During tion & eline	Total N	Maximum
Leasting	Station,	Upstream	Downstream	Upstream	Downstream	Vol	ume	Shute	down	Ke kki	lease	
Location	Ft	valve	valve	valve	valve	DDI	gai	DDI	gai	DDI	gai	
Cedar Valley Pump Station	959033	Remote- controlled block valve	Manual block valve	5	120 ^c	5,470	229,740	781	32,800	6,251	262,540	
Cenozoic Pecos Alluvium - A	2358249 to 2685651	Manual Block Valve	Remote- controlled block valve	120 ^c	5	18,000	756,000	781	32,800	18,781	788,800	
Cenozoic Pecos Alluvium - B	2727629 to 2940056	Manual Block Valve	Manual block valve	120 ^c	120 ^c	35,500	1,490,000	781	32,800	36,200	1523000	

^a Detection and closure of remote-controlled valves assumed to be 5 minutes
^b Based on maximum flow of 225,000 barrels per day
^c Assumes that leak is detected and line (including remote-controlled valve) is shut down in 5 minutes, manual block valves are closed within 2 hours
^d Upstream remote-controlled valve is located at stationing 879965

Release Location	Topographical Maximum Spill Surface Area, ft ²	Worst-Case Release Quantity, bbls
Hillcrest Elementary	1,020,632	1,269
Brown Schools	764,601	4,777
Shiloh Oaks Subdivision	982,217	3,448
Cedar Valley Pump Station	1,245,944	6,251

Table 6-2. Pipeline Release Locations and Maximum Release Quantities for Cases Modeled

Version 9.1									
Title:	Austin average met: CVPump/WC/262540gal/instant								
Species:	Gasoline: LH								
Release type:	Pool/lagoon description								
Emergency response output:	Pool fire radiation								
X location:	0 ft								
Y location:	0 ft								
Isopleth conc. (ppm): .	4e+004,0,0								
Building height:	0 ft Width: 0 ft								
Source to building distance:	0 ft Direction: 0°								
Liquid pool surface									
height above ground:	0 ft								
Amount released:	2.625e+005 gallons								
Pool area:	4.45e+004 ft ²								
Pool depth (calculated):	9.464 in								
Pool temperature assumed to	be ambient or boiling point								
No pool mitigation time									
Solar radiation pool evaporat	ion efficiency: 1								
Wetted tank surface area (liq	uid pool fire): 0 ft ²								
Water fraction of spill surface	$e(0 \rightarrow 1): 0.15$								
Surface is assumed to be dirt									
Surface Specific Heat:	800 joules/kg K								
Surface Thermal Conducti	vity: 0.32 w/m K								
Surface Density:	1640 kg/m ³								
Relative Pore Volume of S	Surface (0 ->1): 0.34								
Darcy Constant of Surface	2.8e-007 m								

Table 6-3. Example CHARM^a Data Input Form

Complex Hazardous Air Release Model (CHARM^â)

Table 6-4. Meteorological Parameters Used in the Modeling Analysis

Met Data:	
Relative Humidity:	68.93%
Ambient Temperature:	67.8°F
Ambient Pressure:	1 atms
Cloud Cover (tenths)	10
Stability Class: D (User sup)	plied)
Solar Radiation:	0.3 kW/m ²
No inversion present	
Surface roughness:	30 cm
Wind measurement altitude:	10 m
Winds Time Direction	Speed
00:00 SSE	7.66 mph
	-

			Maximum Impact Distance (from Pool Centroid) ft							
		Spill	Fla	sh Fire		Pool Fire				
	Release	Surface			C	Oil		oline		
Release	Volume,	Area,			1	4	1			
Location	bbls	ft ²	Oil	Gasoline	kW/m ²	kW/m ²	kW/m ²	4 kW/m^2		
Hillcrest	50	4140	36	165	396	207	476	246		
Elementary	500	12800	60	482	685	353	819	415		
School	1269 ¹	20300	73	514	858	439	1019	511		
	50	4140	36	165	396	207	476	246		
Brown	500	12800	60	482	685	353	819	415		
Schools	1500	22100	76	491	894	458	1061	530		
	4777	39000	96	603	1178	598	1390	686		
Chilah	50	4140	36	165	396	207	476	246		
Shilon	500	12800	60	482	685	353	819	415		
Uaks Subdivision	1500	22100	76	491	894	458	1061	530		
Suburvision	3448	33200	90	613	1089	555	1282	633		
Cedar	50	4140	36	165	396	207	476	246		
Valley	500	12800	60	482	685	353	819	415		
Pump	1500	22100	76	491	894	458	1061	530		
Station	6,251	44,500	101	489	1255	636	1485	734		

Table 6-5. Summary of CHARM^{**D**} Modeling Results (maximum distances measured from pool centroid)

 1 The worst-case release quantity for the Hillcrest segment (1,269 bbls) is less than the 1,500 bbl case; therefore, the 1,500 bbl case was not modeled.

			Maximum Impact Distance (From Pipeline), ft							
			Flas	n Fire		Pool Fire				
	Release	Spill			Oil		Gasoline			
Release	Volume,	Surface				4	1			
Location	bbls	Area, ft ²	Oil	Gasoline	$1 \mathrm{kW/m^2}$	kW/m ²	kW/m ²	4 kW/m^2		
Hillcrest	50	4140	321	450	681	492	761	531		
Elementary School	500	12800	345	767	970	638	1104	700		
School	1269 ¹	20300	358	799	1143	724	1304	797		
Brown	50	4140	66	195	426	237	506	276		
Schools	500	12800	90	572	715	383	849	445		
	1500	22100	106	521	924	488	1091	560		
	4777	39000	126	633	1208	628	1420	716		
Shiloh Oaks	50	4140	249	378	609	420	689	459		
Subdivision	500	12800	273	695	898	566	1032	628		
	1500	22100	289	704	1107	671	1274	743		
	3448	33200	303	826	1302	768	1495	846		
Cedar	50	4140	965	1094	1325	1136	1405	1175		
Valley	500	12800	989	1411	1614	1282	1748	1344		
Pump	1500	22100	1005	1420	1823	1387	1990	1459		
Station	6251	44500	1030	1418	2184	1565	2414	1663		

Table 6-6. Summary of of CHARM^{**Ò**} Modeling Results(maximum distances measured from pipeline)

¹ The worst-case release quantity for the Hillcrest segment (1,269 bbls) is less than the 1,500 bbl case; therefore, the 1,500 bbl case was not modeled.

Table 6-7. EA Relative Risk Assessment ModelProbability of Failure Categories and Variables

Third-Party Damage
Depth of Cover
Activity Level
Patrol Frequency and Effectiveness
One-Call Effectiveness
Public Education Activities
Aboveground Exposures
Right-of-Way Condition
Corrosion
Atmospheric Corrosion
Internal Corrosion
Buried Pipe Corrosion
Cathodic Protection
Buried Coating
Interferences
Mechanical Corrosion
Line Inspection
Design
Pipe Strength
System Safety Factor
Fatigue Potential
Surge Potential
Integrity Tests
Earth Movements
Incorrect Operations
Construction/Design
Training
Procedures
Maps and Records
Overpressure Potential
Safety Systems
Maintenance
Communications
Mechanical Error Preventors
Risk Assessment

County	Beginning Station (ft)	End Station (ft)	Feet of Pipeline in County	Total Calls	Cleared Calls	Dispatched Calls	Percent Calls Dispatched	Calls per 10 Feet of Pipeline	Code (2)
Austin	337659	489702	161023	77	31	46	60	0.0048	Medium
Bastrop	632229	810379	180150	255	53	202	79	0.0142	High
Bell	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	(1)	None
Blanco	1010656	1148496	131740	4	0	4	100	0.0003	Low
Brazoria	0	0	0	1	0	1	100	(1)	None
Brazos	0	0	0	5	1	4	80	(1)	None
Crane	2395852	2542522	113980	54	4	50	93	0.0047	Medium
Crockett	1934341	2071221	136880	0	0	0	0	0.0000	Low
Culberson	2952749	3225275	272529	0	0	0	0	0.0000	Low
Ector	0	0	0	2	0	2	100	(1)	None
El Paso	3578518	3666496	88603	0	0	0	0	0.0000	Low
Fayette	489702	632229	123127	18	5	13	72	0.0015	Medium
Galveston	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	(1)	None
Gillespie	1148496	1272896	124400	13	2	11	85	0.0010	Medium
Harris	0	265235	265039	10690	3853	6837	64	0.4033	High
Hays	957388	1010656	59368	46	8	38	83	0.0077	Medium
Hockley	0	0	0	1	0	1	100	(1)	None
Houston	0	0	0	1	0	1	100	(1)	None
Howard	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	(1)	None
Hudspeth	3225275	3578518	352615	0	0	0	0	0.0000	Low
Hunt	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	(1)	None
Kimble	1448456	1631959	183503	8	0	8	100	0.0004	Low
Lee	0	0	10400	4	0	4	100	0.0038	Medium
Llano	0	0	3339	0	0	0	0	0.0000	Low
Mason	1272896	1448456	172221	2	0	2	100	0.0001	Low
Menard	1631959	1651727	19768	0	0	0	0	0.0000	Low
Nueces	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	(1)	None
Orange	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	(1)	None
Reagan	2071221	2219167	137946	0	0	0	0	0.0000	Low
Reeves	2774200	2952749	178831	0	0	0	0	0.0000	Low
Schleicher	1651727	1934341	282614	2	0	2	100	0.0001	Low
Travis	810379	957388	147009	3739	1286	2453	66	0.2543	High
Upton	2219167	2395852	176685	19	1	18	95	0.0011	Medium
Waller	265235	337659	72445	30	11	19	63	0.0041	Medium
Ward	2542522	2774200	264068	0	0	0	0	0.0000	Low
Total			3658282	14979	5263	9716	65		

Table 6-8. One-Call Data on the Longhorn Pipelinefrom August 1, 1998 to April 1, 1999

(1): Calls were received for counties where Longhorn Pipeline does not run.

(2): Code levels:

High – Calls per 10 feet (ft) of pipeline is greater than 0.01

Medium – Calls per 10 ft of pipeline is greater than 0.001

Low – Calls per 10 ft of pipeline is less than 0.001

None – Calls received in counties where there is no pipeline

Beginning	Ending Station	Beginning Milenest	Ending Milenest	Dopulation	Environmental Areas
				Fopulation	Crook
190+39	210+04	5.7	4.1	Flight	
350+34	364+43	6.6	6.9	High	Greens Bayou
517+40	531+35	9.8	10.1	High	Greens Bayou
901+48	915+18	17.1	17.3	High	Halls Bayou
1233+96	1247+66	23.4	23.6	High	Creek
1557+74	1571+44	29.5	29.8	High	H.C.F.C.D. Channel
1629+75	1644+95	30.9	31.2	High	Little White Oak Bayou
1801+38	1805 + 04	34.1	34.2	High	
1805+04	1988+71	34.2	37.7	High	
3362+42	3386+82	63.7	64.1	Low	Brazos River
6595+02	6726+91	124.9	127.4	High	Buescher State Park
6726+91	6805+44	127.4	128.9	Low	
6805+44	7089+91	128.9	134.3	Low	
7089+91	7111+88	134.3	134.7	Low	Colorado River
8407+37	8625+93	159.2	163.4	High	McKinney Falls State Park
8625+93	8665+27	163.4	164.1	High	Creek
8802+30	9152+68	166.7	173.3	High	Edwards Aquifer
9546+10	9559+30	180.8	181.0	Medium	Creek
10209+88	10485+21	193.4	198.6	High	Pedernales State Park

Table 6-9. Longhorn Partners Pipeline –WES Risk Ranking Assessment of Highest Risk Sections

Table 6-10. Comparison of Attributes of Three Relative Risk Assessments

Comparison	EPC	WES	EA	Notes
Number of geographic sections for analysis	7	138	10,100+	
Average segment length	65.7 miles	5.0 miles	400 ft	1
Number of risk variables	~54	~54	~82	
Approximate pieces of	~700	~13,800	~1,200,000	
information used to assess risks				
Basis of model	Muhlbauer, 1996	Muhlbauer, 1996	Muhlbauer,	
			1996	
			(modified)	
Highest risk segments	Eckert to Bastrop	125-127 (Buescher	Miles 11-17	
		State Park)	Miles 22-35	
		167-173 (Edwards	Miles 166-174	
		Aquifer)		
Highest failure-	Kemper to Ft	34-37	Miles 11-22	
probability segments	McKavet	64-67 (Brazos	Miles 172-176	
	Crane to Kemper	River)	Miles 357-453	
Highest consequence	Eckert to Bastrop	4-31 (various)	Miles 11 to 17	
segments		163	Miles 22 to 36	
		180	Miles 166 to	
			174	
Risk–range of scores,	16 to 58	30 to 125	Tier dependent	2, 5
highest segment risk to				
lowest				
Probability–range of	203 to 245	222 to 311	159 to 267	2
scores (worst to best)				
Consequence-range of	3.6 to 13.2	2.3 to 8.3	Tier 1 to Tier 3	3, 4,
scores (best to worst)				5

1. EPC model covers only Kemper to Baytown section.

2. Higher numbers indicate more safety—reduced risk—for the risk and probability scores. Range is function of the choice of scaling factors.

3. Higher numbers indicate increased risk for the consequence score.

4. These consequence numbers are heavily dependent upon product characteristics, nearby receptors, and choice of scales used for spill score.

5. The EA Risk Model combines probability of failure scores with tier categories to evaluate relative risk.

Issue	EPC	WES	Current (EA) Model
Surge	No difference	No difference	Higher weighting for surge; potential
potential	noted	noted	seen as "high" in some places
Fatigue	No fatigue issues	Differences, but	Higher weighting, potential seen
		unknown criteria	
ROW	Unknown	ROW = "good"	Some poor ROW sections identified
Pipe	Standard pipe	Standard pipe	Penalty for pre-1970 ERW and for
strength	pressure/wall	pressure/wall	older girth welds
	thickness	thickness	
	calculations	calculations	
Earth	No differences in	No differences in	More variations seen; seismic;
movements	"earth	"earth	landslide; soils databases; model for
	movements"	movements"	scour
	potential	potential	
Cathodic	Qualitative	Qualitative system	Actual test lead and CIS readings
protection	system scoring	scoring	used
Coating	Qualitative	Qualitative coating	Qualitative coating condition scoring
	coating condition	condition scoring	plus databases of repairs and visual
	scoring		inspections
ILI	Uncertain use of	Uncertain use of	Used previous ILI indications as
indications	data	data	direct evidence
Leak	Uncertain use of	Uncertain use of	Used previous leaks
history	data	data	
Repair	Uncertain use of	Uncertain use of	Used previous repairs
history	data	data	
Spread	Uncertain use of	Uncertain use of	More detailed overland and
range	data	data	subsurface spread model

Table 6-11. Comparison of EPC, WES, and EA Risk Model Features *

^{*}Where scores are constant across the entire length of the pipeline, it is assumed that the model does not detect differences in the issue and therefore does not assess the issue.

6-83

Volume 1: Chapter 6

					Overall	Risk	
Case	if	Average Leak Rate per Mile- Year	Predicted Leak Count for 700 Miles and 50 Years	Impact	Frequency of Impact over Life of Project	Annual Frequency (x1000) for Impact	Notes
				Drinking water contamination	0.27	5.35	
				Fatality	0.16	3.21	1
	Industry average			Injury	0.72	14.42	1
1	reportable leak rate	0.001	35	Recreational water contamination	2.80	55.96	
	applies			Prime agricultural contamination	1.06	21.14	
				Wetlands contamination	1.65	32.92	
				Drinking water contamination	0.20	4.10	~10 reportables (>50 bbl) over 450 miles in 29 years
				Fatality	0.12	2.46	1
	Pre-mitigation			Injury	0.553	11.05	1
2	reportable leak rate continues	0.00077	26.8	Recreational water contamination	2.14	42.88	
				Prime agricultural contamination	0.81	16.20	
				Wetlands contamination	1.26	25.22	
				Drinking water contamination	0.23	4.69	26 leaks (some less than 50 bbl) over 450 miles in 29 years
				Fatality	0.14	2.82	1
	Pre-mitigation leak			Injury	0.63	12.65	1
3	rate continues	0.00199	69.7	Recreational water contamination	2.45	49.06	
				Prime agricultural contamination	0.93	18.53	
				Wetlands contamination	1.44	28.86	

Table 6-12. Overall Impact Frequencies

Notes

1 Fatality and injury rates are based on DOT fatality and injury rates per reportable leak, applied to 700 miles.

				Segment-Specific Risk		
if	Average Leak Rate per Mile- Year	Predicted Leak Count for 700 Miles & 50 Years	Impact	Frequency (x 10^6) of Impact over Life of Project	Annual Frequency (x 10^6) for Impact	Notes
			Drinking water contamination	181	3.62	
			Fatality	109	2.17	1
stry average			Injury	488	9.76	1
rtable leak	0.001	35	Recreational water contamination	1893	37.85	
applies			Prime agricultural contamination	715	14.30	
			Watlanda contamination	1502	20.02	2272 6

Table 6-13. Segment-Specific Impact Frequencies

Final EA

Case

				Drinking water contamination	181	3.62	
				Fatality	109	2.17	1
	Industry average			Injury	488	9.76	1
1	reportable leak	0.001	35	Recreational water contamination	1893	37.85	
	rate applies			Prime agricultural contamination	715	14.30	
				Wetlands contamination	1502	30.03	3372 ft, special length for this receptor
	Pre-mitigation		26.8	Drinking water contamination	139	2.77	~10 reportables (>50 bbl) over 450 miles in 29 years
		0.00077		Fatality	83	1.66	1
r				Injury	374	7.48	1
2	rate continues			Recreational water contamination	1450	29.01	
	fute continues			Prime agricultural contamination	548	10.96	
			Wetlands contamination	1151	23.01	3372 ft, special length for this receptor	
			.00199 69.7	Drinking water contamination	159	3.17	26 leaks (some less than 50 bbl) over 450 miles in 29 years
				Fatality	95	1.90	1
3	Pre-mitigation	0.00100		Injury	428	8.55	1
continues	continues	ue 0.00199		Recreational water contamination	1659	33.18	
				Prime agricultural contamination	48.9	0.98	
			Wetlands contamination	1316	26.33	3372 ft. special length for this receptor	

Notes

1 Fatality and injury rates are based on DOT fatality and injury rates per reportable leak, applied to 700 miles.

Table 6-14. Overall Impact Probabilities for Case 3

Overall Impact Probability* Annual Estimated **Probability of** Average Leak Count **Probability of One** Probability Leak Rate Annual One or More per Milefor 700 Miles or More Impacts Chances in a Chances in a Impacts over If... Year and 50 Years over Life of Project Life of Project Case Impact Thousand Thousand Notes 0.00199¹ 20.9 percent 3 Pre-mitigation 69.7 Drinking water 0.47% 209 4.68 leak rate contamination estimate Fatality 2.81 13.1% 0.28% 131 2 46.9% 1.26% 469 12.6 2 Injury 91.4% 4.79% 914 47.9 Recreational water contamination Prime agricultural land 60.4% 1.8% 604 18.36 contamination Wetlands contamination 76.4% 2.84% 764 28.4

* Overall impact probability is probability of one or more events in 50 years over 700 miles

* Overall impact probability, annual, is probability of one or more events in 1 year over 700 miles Notes:

1 26 leaks (some less than 50 bbl) over 450 miles in 29 years

2 Fatality and injury rates are based on DOT fatality and injury rates per reportable leak, applied to 700 miles

Table 6-15. Segment-specific Impact Probabilities for Cases 3

		Average Leak Rate per	Estimated Leak Count for 700 Miles and 50	Impact Probability fo	r Specific Locations* Probability of One or More Impacts over	Annual probability of one or More Impacts over Life of	Probability Chances in a	Annual Chances in a	
Case	If	Mile-Year	Years	Impact	Life of Project	Project	Million	Million	Notes
3	Pre-mitigation leak rate estimate	0.00199 ¹	69.7	Drinking water contamination	0.0159%	0.000317%	159	3.17	
				Fatality	0.0095%	0.000190%	95	1.90	2
				Injury	0.0428%	0.000855%	428	8.55	2
				Recreational water contamination	0.166%	0.00332%	1658	33.2	
				Prime agricultural land contamination	0.0627%	0.001254%	627	12.54	
				Wetlands contamination	0.132%	0.00263%	1315	26.3	

6-87

* Impact probability for specific locations is probability of one or more events in 50 years per 2,500 ft

* Impact probability for specific locations, annual, is probability of one or more events in 1 year per 2,500 ft Notes:

1 26 leaks (some less than 50 bbl) over 450 miles in 29 years

2 Fatality and injury rates are based on DOT fatality and injury rates per reportable leak, applied to 700 miles

Spill Size	Historical EPC No. of	DOT/EPC Data Basis % of Spills in Size	Whole Line Frequency	Estimated Line Pro One or M (DOT/E	Avg. Whole bability of More Spills CPC Basis)
Range (bbl)	Spills	Range	(spills/year)	1 Year	50 Years
5,000 or	1	1.54	2.22E-02	2.19E-02	6.70E-01
greater					
1500 - 4999	2	5.46	7.86E-02	7.56E-02	9.80E-01
500 - 1499	4	10.12	1.46E-01	1.36E-01	9.99E-01
50 - 499	3	26.84	3.87E-01	3.21E-01	1.00E+00
Less than 50	16	56.00	8.07E-01	5.54E-01	1.00E+00

Table 6-16. Average Frequency and Probability of Pipeline Spills for Whole Line,
Pre-mitigation, by Spill Size Range

	Historical	Historical EPC Pump Station Spill	Whole Line Frequency,	Estimated Line Pro One or N	Avg. Whole bability of More Spills
Spill Size	EPC No. of	Distribution,	Spills/Year	(DOT/E	CPC Basis)
Range (bbl)	Spills	%	(18 stations)	1 Year	50 Years
5000 or	3	2.04	2.33E-01	2.08E-01	1.00E+00
greater					
1500 - 4999	4	2.72	3.10E-01	2.67E-01	1.00E+00
500 - 1499	7	4.76	5.43E-01	4.19E-01	1.00E+00
50 - 499	34	23.13	2.64E+00	9.28E-01	1.00E+00
Less than 50	99	67.35	7.68E+00	1.00E+00	1.00E+00
Total	147	100.00	1.14E+01	1.00E+00	1.00E+00

Table 6-17. Average Frequency and Probability of Pump Station Spills for Whole Line,Pre-mitigation, by Spill Size Range

	Chance for One Individual in a	
Event	50-Year Period *	Source/Basis of Estimate
Motor vehicle deaths	1 in 123	Accident Facts, 1997, p.78. Estimated based on
		reported death rate of 16.3 deaths/year per
Matan ashiala iningian	1 := 2	100,000 persons for 1996.
Motor venicle injuries	1 in 2	Accident Facts, 1997, p. 78. Estimated based on reported total injuries of 2,600,000 for 1006
		and a 1006 US population of 265 220 000
		nersons Assumes total population exposed
		each year and constant population.
Pedestrian deaths (by	1 in 870	Accident Facts, 1997, p.100, Estimated based
motor vehicle accident)	T III 070	on reported total deaths of 6.100 for 1996 and a
		1996 US population of 265,229,000 persons.
		Assumes the entire population has the potential
		to be a pedestrian.
Falling deaths (public	1 in 1,000	Accident Facts, 1997, p.100. Estimated based
places)		on 5,300 reported deaths for 1996 and a 1996
		US population of 265,229,000 persons.
		Excludes fall-related deaths at home and work.
Falling deaths (all	1 in 380	Accident Facts, 1997, p.8. Estimated based on
locations)		1996 death rate of 5.3 deaths/year per 100,000
		population. Includes unintentional fall related
		deaths in all locations (public, home and work).
Deaths from firearms in	1 in 10,600	Accident Facts, 1997, p.117. Estimated based
public places		on 500 reported deaths for 1996 and a 1996 US
		firearm related deaths at home and work
		Internitional deaths only homicides/ suicides
		excluded
Recreational boating	1 in 1 840	Based on report from National Association of
deaths	1 11 1,010	State Boating Law Administrators (NASBLA).
		Factors Related to Recreational Boating
		Participation in the United States : A Review of
		the Literature. August 17, 2000. Pp. 5 and 62.
		815 total deaths in 1998. Recreational boating
		participants of 74,847,000 in 1998 (approx. 29
		percent of the total US population).
Tornado deaths (1999,	1 in 16,600	National Climatic Data Center web site. Based
states with reported		on tornado data from 1999. 94 tornado deaths
tornado deaths)		in 13 states. Total population of these 13 states
		of 78,000,000 (29 percent of the US
		population) was taken from the US Census
Tomada daatha (1000	1 in 52 000	Dureau web site for 1999.
10mado deaths (1999, entire US)	1 in 38,000	Tornado data from 1990 - 04 tornado dastha in
chule (15)		13 states Total US nonulation of 272 600 813
		was taken from the US Census Rureau web site
		for 1999.
Tornado deaths (1999, entire US)	1 in 58,000	Bureau web site for 1999.National Climatic Data Center web site.Tornado data from 1999.94 tornado deaths in13 states.Total US population of 272,690,813was taken from the US Census Bureau web sitefor 1999.

Table 6-18. Summary of Common Individual Risks

	Chance for One Individual in a	
Event	50-Year Period *	Source/Basis of Estimate
Lightning deaths	1 in 119,000	National Climatic Data Center web site. Based on 46 lightning deaths in 1999. 1999 US population taken from Census Bureau (272,690,813).
Cancer deaths	1 in 10	American Cancer Society. Statistics taken from web site. Expected cancer deaths rate in 1999 of 563,100. Risk based on total 1999 US population.
Cancer deaths in males	1 in 9	American Cancer Society. Cancer Facts and Figures – 1997 from the ACS web site. Male: 219 deaths/year per 100,000 population.
Cancer deaths in females	1 in 14	American Cancer Society. Cancer Facts and Figures – 1997 from the ACS web site. Female: 142 deaths/year per 100,000 population.

Table 6-18. Summary of Common Individual Risks (Continued)

^{*} Chance for one individual in a 50-year period was calculated by multiplying the risk in one year by 50. For example, if the risk is one death/year per 100,000 population, then the risk for 50 years is 50 times the one-year risk or 50 deaths per 100,000 population (i.e., 1 in 2000 chance over a 50-year period).