

Enhanced Component Performance Study

Air-Operated Valves

1998–2011

1 INTRODUCTION

This report presents an enhanced performance evaluation of air-operated valves (AOVs) at U.S. commercial nuclear power plants. This report does not estimate values for use in probabilistic risk assessments (PRAs), but does evaluate component performance over time. The [2010 Component Reliability Update](#) [Reference 1], which is an update to Reference 2 ([NUREG/CR-6928](#)) reports the current AOV unreliability estimates using Equipment Performance and Information Exchange (EPIX) data from 1998–2010 for use in PRAs.

The trend evaluations in this study are based on the operating experience failure reports from fiscal year (FY) 1998 through FY 2011 for the component reliability as reported in EPIX. The AOV failure modes considered are failure-to-open/close (FTOC), (failure to operate or control) (FTOP), and spurious operation (SO).

Previously, the study relied on operating experience obtained from licensee event reports, Nuclear Plant Reliability Data System (NPRDS), and EPIX. The EPIX database (which includes as a subset the Mitigating Systems Performance Index (MSPI) designated devices) has matured to the point where component availability and reliability can be estimated with a higher degree of assurance of accuracy. In addition, the population of data is much larger than the population used in the previous study.

The objective of the effort for the updated component performance studies is to obtain annual performance trends of failure rates and probabilities. An overview of the trending methods, glossary of terms, and abbreviations can be found in the [Overview and Reference](#) document on the Reactor Operational Experience Results and Databases web page.

The objective of the enhanced component performance study is to present an analysis of factors that could influence the system and component trends in addition to annual performance trends of failure rates and probabilities. Engineering analyses were performed with respect to time period and failure mode (Section 4.1). The factors analyzed are: sub-component, failure cause, detection method, recovery.

2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The results of this study are summarized in this section. Of particular interest is the existence of any statistically significant¹ increasing trends. In this update, no statistically significant increasing trends were identified in the AOV results.

Statistically significant decreasing trends were identified in the AOV results for the following:

- Failure probability estimate trend for AOV FTOC, all systems, industry-wide trend of AOVs with > 20 demands per year. (see Figure 2)
- Frequency (demands per reactor year) of AOV operation demands, ≤ 20 demands per year. (see Figure 7)
- Frequency (failures per reactor year) of AOV FTOC events > 20 demands per year. (see Figure 10)

Considering the low-demand AOVs; Table 3 shows that 97% of the AOV FTOC failures occurred in eight systems. Table 4 shows that 100% of the AOV FTOP failures occurred in eight systems. Similarly, Table 5 shows that 94% of the AOV SO failures occurred in five systems. And considering the high-demand AOVs; Table 6 shows that 81% of the AOV FTOC failures occurred in four systems. Table 7 shows that 95% of the AOV FTOP failures occurred in five systems. Similarly, Table 8 shows that 100% of the AOV SO failures occurred in six systems.

3 FAILURE PROBABILITIES AND FAILURE RATES

3.1 Overview

Trends of industry-wide failure probabilities and failure rates of AOVs have been calculated from the operating experience for the FTOC, FTOP, and SO failure modes. The AOV data set obtained from EPIX was segregated to AOVs with ≤ 20 demands/year (d/yr) and AOVs with > 20 d/yr and includes AOVs in the systems listed in Table 1. Reference 1 lists the industry failure data for AOVs with ≤ 20 d/yr. Table 2 shows industry-wide failure probability and failure rate results for the AOV with ≤ 20 d/yr from Reference 1. No results are shown for >20d/yr AOVs because Reference 1 does not present results for >20 d/yr.

The AOVs are assumed to operate both when the reactor is critical and during shutdown periods. The number of valves in operation is assumed to be constant throughout the study period. All demand types are considered—testing, non-testing, and, as applicable, emergency safeguard feature (ESF) demands.

¹ Statistical significance is defined in terms of the ‘p-value.’ A p-value is a probability indicating whether to accept or reject the null hypothesis that there is no trend in the data. P-values of less than or equal to 0.05 indicate that we are 95% confident that there is a trend in the data (reject the null hypothesis of no trend.) By convention, we use the "Michelin Guide" scale: p-value < 0.05 (statistically significant), p-value < 0.01 (highly statistically significant); p-value < 0.001 (extremely statistically significant).

Table 1. AOV systems.

System	Description	AOV Component Count			System	Description	AOV Component Count		
		Total	≤20 d/yr	>20 d/yr			Total	≤20 d/yr	>20 d/yr
AFW	Auxiliary feedwater	360	192	168	HPI	High pressure injection	94	70	24
CCW	Component cooling water	436	295	141	ISO	Isolation condenser	10	6	4
CRD	Control rod drive	117	66	51	MSS	Main steam	118	99	19
CSR	Containment spray recirculation	30	28	2	RCI	Reactor core isolation	8	6	2
CVC	Chemical and volume control	489	341	148	RCS	Reactor coolant	110	53	57
EPS	Emergency power supply	49	19	30	RHR	Residual heat removal	259	126	133
HCI	High pressure coolant injection	14	7	7	SWN	Emergency service water (Standby)	511	296	215
					SWS	Standby service water	55	20	35
					Total		2660	1624	1036

Table 2. Industry-wide distributions of p (failure probability) and λ (hourly rate) for AOVs (≤ 20 d/yr).

Failure Mode	5%	Median	Mean	95%	Distribution		
					Type	α	β
FTOC	6.27E-05	6.86E-04	9.51E-04	2.74E-03	Beta	1.11	1.168E+03
FTOP	2.66E-08	1.93E-07	2.49E-07	6.59E-07	Gamma	1.42	5.719E+06
SO	2.04E-09	7.46E-08	1.31E-07	4.49E-07	Gamma	0.68	5.211E+06

3.2 AOV Failure Probability and Failure Rate Trends

Trends in failure probabilities and failure rates are shown in Figure 1, Figure 2, Figure 3, Figure 4, Figure 5, and Figure 6. The data for the trend plots are contained in Table 10, Table 11, Table 12, Table 13, Table 14, and Table 15, respectively.




Figure 1. Failure probability estimate trend for AOV FTOC, all systems, industry-wide trend of AOVs

with ≤ 20 demands per year.




Figure 2. Failure probability estimate trend for AOV FTOC, all systems, industry-wide trend of AOVs with > 20 demands per year.




Figure 3. Failure rate estimate trend for AOV FTOP, all systems, industry-wide trend of AOVs with ≤ 20 demands per year.




Figure 4. Failure rate estimate trend for AOV FTOP, all systems, industry-wide trend of AOVs with > 20 demands per year.




Figure 5. Failure rate estimate trend for AOV SO, all systems, industry-wide trend of AOVs with ≤ 20 demands per year.




Figure 6. Failure rate estimate trend for AOV SO, all systems, industry-wide trend of AOVs with > 20 demands per year.

In the plots, the means of the posterior distributions from the Bayesian update process were trended across the years. The posterior distributions were also used for the vertical bounds for each year. The 5th and 95th percentiles of these distributions give an indication of the relative variation from year to year in the data. When there are no failures, the interval is larger than the interval for years when there are one or more failures. The larger interval reflects the uncertainty that comes from having little information in that year's data. Such uncertainty intervals are determined by the prior distribution. In each plot, a relatively "flat" constrained noninformative prior distribution (CNID) is used, which has large bounds.

The horizontal curves plotted around the regression lines in the graphs form 90 percent simultaneous confidence bands for the fitted lines. The bounds are larger than ordinary confidence intervals for the trended values because they form a band that has a 90% probability of containing the entire line. In the lower left hand corner of the trend figures, the regression p-values are reported. They come from a statistical test on whether the slope of the regression line might be zero. Low p-values indicate that the slopes are not likely to be zero, and that trends exist. Further information on the trending methods is provided in Section 2 of the [Overview and Reference](#) document. A final feature of the trend graphs is that the baseline industry values from Table 2 are shown for comparison.

4 ENGINEERING TRENDS

This section presents frequency trends for AOV failures and demands. The data are normalized by reactor year for plants that have the equipment being trended. Figure 7 shows the trend for total AOV demands of ≤ 20 demands per reactor-year AOVs. Figure 9 shows the trend in failure events for FTOC mode for AOV ≤ 20 demands, and Figure 13 shows the trend for the SO failure events for AOV ≤ 20 demands.

Figure 8 shows the trend for total AOV >20 demands per reactor-year of >20 demands per reactor-year AOVs. Figure 10 shows the trend in failure events for FTOC mode for AOV >20 demands, and Figure 14 shows the trend for the SO failure events for AOV >20 demands.

Table 3 summarizes the failures by system, year, and the FTOC failure mode for AOV ≤20 demands. The top five contributing systems and ties for the FTOC failure mode are AFW, CCW, CVC, MSS, RHR, and SWN. Table 4 summarizes the failures by system, year, and the FTOP failure mode for AOV ≤20 demands. The top five contributing systems and ties for the FTOP failure mode are AFW, CCW, CVC, HPI, ISO, MSS, RCS, and SWN. Table 5 summarizes the failures by system, year, and the SO failure mode for AOV ≤20 demands. The top five contributing systems and ties for the SO failure mode are AFW, CCW, CRD, CVC, and MSS.

Table 6 summarizes the failures by system, year, and the FTOC failure mode for AOV >20 demands. The top five contributing systems and ties for the FTOC failure mode are AFW, CCW, CVC, RHR, and SWN. Table 7 summarizes the failures by system, year, and the FTOP failure mode for AOV >20 demands. The top five contributing systems and ties for the FTOP failure mode are AFW, CCW, CVC, RHR, and SWN. Table 8 summarizes the failures by system, year, and the SO failure mode for AOV >20 demands. The top five contributing systems and ties for the SO failure mode are AFW, CCW, CVC, RCI, RHR, and SWN.

Table 16, Table 17, Table 18, Table 19, Table 20, Table 21, Table 22, and Table 23 provide the plot data for frequency (per reactor year) of AOV demands, FTOC events, FTOP events, and SO events, respectively. The systems from Table 2 are trended together for each figure. The rate methods described in Section 2 of the [Overview and Reference](#) document are used.






Figure 7. Frequency (demands per reactor year) of AOV operation demands, ≤ 20 demands per year.



CNID, p-value=0.2879

All High Dem and AOV FTOC 2-1-2013

Figure 8. Frequency (demands per reactor year) of AOV operation demands, > 20 demands per year.



CNID, p-value=0.5513

All Low Dem and AOV FTOC 2-1-2013

Figure 9. Frequency (failures per reactor year) of AOV FTOC events ≤ 20 demands per year.




Figure 10. Frequency (failures per reactor year) of AOV FTOC events > 20 demands per year.




Figure 11. Frequency (failures per reactor year) of AOV FTOP events ≤ 20 demands per year.




Figure 12. Frequency (failures per reactor year) of AOV FTOP events > 20 demands per year.





Figure 13. Frequency (failures per reactor year) of AOV SO events ≤ 20 demands per year.



CNID, p-value=0.2653

All High Demand AOV SO 2-1-2013

Figure 14. Frequency (failures per reactor year) of AOV SO events > 20 demands per year.

Table 3. Summary of AOV failure counts for the FTOC failure mode over time by system ≤ 20 demands per year.

System Code	Valve Count	Valve Percent	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	Total	Percent of Failures
AFW	192	12.1%	5	1	3	3	2			2	2	1	1	1	3		24	20.5%
CCW	295	18.5%	1			2	3		1	1	2	2	7		1	3	23	19.7%
CRD	66	4.1%		1													1	0.9%
CSR	28	1.8%										1					1	0.9%
CVC	341	21.4%	2	2	1	1	2	1	1		1	1			1	1	14	12.0%
HPI	70	4.4%						2			1		1			2	6	5.1%
MSS	99	6.2%	1		5		2										8	6.8%
RCI	6	0.4%											1				1	0.9%
RCS	53	3.3%												1			1	0.9%
RHR	126	7.9%	1	1			1				2	1		1	1		8	6.8%
SWN	296	18.6%	4		2	3		1	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	4	24	20.5%
SWS	20	1.3%						4								2	6	5.1%
Total	1592	100.0%	14	5	11	9	10	8	5	4	9	7	12	4	7	12	117	100.0%

Table 4. Summary of AOV failure counts for the FTOP failure mode over time by system ≤ 20 demands per year.

System Code	Valve Count	Valve Percent	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	Total	Percent of Failures
AFW	192	14.1%													1		1	5.6%
CCW	295	21.7%		1						1			1	1			4	22.2%
CVC	341	25.1%		2		1											3	16.7%
HPI	70	5.2%				1											1	5.6%
ISO	6	0.4%					1										1	5.6%
MSS	99	7.3%		2			1						1				4	22.2%
RCI	6	0.4%																
RCS	53	3.9%													1		1	5.6%
SWN	296	21.8%		1		1							1				3	16.7%
Total	1358	100.0%		6		3	2			1			3	1	2		18	100.0%

Table 5. Summary of AOV failure counts for the SO failure mode over time by system ≤ 20 demands per year.

System Code	Valve Count	Valve Percent	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	Total	Percent of Failures
AFW	192	16.9%				1		1	1	1		1	1			1	7	20.0%
CCW	295	25.9%		1	1		6					1			1	1	11	31.4%
CRD	66	5.8%		4													4	11.4%
CVC	341	29.9%					5			1				2		1	9	25.7%
MSS	99	8.7%		2													2	5.7%
RHR	126	11.1%											1				1	2.9%
SWS	20	1.8%														1	1	2.9%
Total	1139	100.0%		7	1	1	11	1	1	2		2	2	2	1	4	35	100.0%

Table 6. Summary of AOV failure counts for the FTOC failure mode over time by system > 20 demands per year.

System Code	Valve Count	Valve Percent	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	Total	Percent of Failures
AFW	168	16.9%		1	1	3	1	2	5	3	3		2		1	1	23	21.7%
CCW	141	14.1%	2		4			1			1				1	1	10	9.4%
CRD	51	5.1%	2		1												3	2.8%
CVC	148	14.8%	1	1			1					2					5	4.7%
EPS	30	3.0%										1	1				2	1.9%
MSS	19	1.9%			2									1			3	2.8%
RCS	57	5.7%				1						1	1				3	2.8%
RHR	133	13.3%	1	6	1		1	1			1	1	1	2	2	2	19	17.9%
SWN	215	21.6%	4	2	2	4	3	1	1	2	2		4	4	2	3	34	32.1%
SWS	35	3.5%	4														4	3.8%
Total	997	100.0%	14	10	11	8	6	5	6	5	7	5	10	6	6	7	106	100.0%

Table 7. Summary of AOV failure counts for the FTOP failure mode over time by system > 20 demands per year.

System Code	Valve Count	Valve Percent	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	Total	Percent of Failures
AFW	168	19.1%									2	1				1	4	10.3%
CCW	141	16.0%	1											1			2	5.1%
CVC	148	16.8%		1			1										3	7.7%
MSS	19	2.2%			1												1	2.6%
RCS	57	6.5%													1		1	2.6%
RHR	133	15.1%	1	1										1			3	7.7%
SWN	215	24.4%		1	5	2	1	3	2	4			1	1	2	3	25	64.1%
Total	881	100.0%	2	3	6	2	2	3	2	4	2	2	4	2	4	1	39	100.0%

Table 8. Summary of AOV failure counts for the SO failure mode over time by system > 20 demands per year.

System Code	Valve Count	Valve Percent	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	Total	Percent of Failures
AFW	168	28.4%				1				1					1		3	16.7%
CCW	141	23.8%		1													1	5.6%
CVC	148	25.0%	1														1	5.6%
RCI	2	0.3%											1				1	5.6%
RHR	133	22.5%	2											1			3	16.7%
SWN	215	36.3%	1	2		2	1				1				2		9	50.0%
Total	592	100.0%	4	3		3	1			1	1		2	2	1		18	100.0%

4.1 AOV Engineering Analysis by Failure Modes

The engineering analysis of AOV failure sub-components, causes, detection methods, and recovery are presented in this section. Each analysis divides the events into two periods: before July 2003 and after July 2003 (the start of the data begins in FY 1998 and the last date is FY 2011). This breakdown was chosen for two reasons: first, July 2003 represents a point in which the MSPI data collection attains a “higher level” of scrutiny; second, this date represents a point about half way through the full data period.

The second division of the events is by the failure mode determined after EPIX data review by the staff. See Section 5 for more description of failure modes.

AOV sub-component contributions to the three failure modes are presented in Figure 15. The sub-component contributions are similar to those used in the CCF database. For all three failure modes, the actuator is the largest contributor to the failure rates/probabilities. In the FTOP failure mode, the valve was shown to have no contribution to the failure rates/probabilities.

AOV cause group contributions to the three failure modes are presented in Figure 16. The cause groups are similar to those used in the CCF database. Table 9 shows the breakdown of the cause groups with the specific causes that were coded during the data collection. The most likely cause for the FTOC and FTOP failure modes is grouped as Internal. Internal means that the cause was related to something within the AOV component such as a worn out part or the normal internal environment. The most likely cause for the SO failure mode is grouped as Human. Of particular interest is the Human cause group. The human cause group is primarily influenced by maintenance and operating procedures and practices.

AOV detection methods to the three failure modes are presented in Figure 17. The most likely detection method for FTOC is a testing demand. The most likely detection method for FTOP and SO is an actual demand.

AOV recovery to the three failure modes are presented in Figure 18. The overall non-recoverable to recoverable ratio is approximately 4:1.

Table 9. Component failure cause groups.

Group	Specific Cause	Description
Design	Construction/installation error or inadequacy	Used when a construction or installation error is made during the original or modification installation. This includes specification of incorrect component or material.
Design	Design error or inadequacy	Used when a design error is made.
Design	Manufacturing error or inadequacy	Used when a manufacturing error is made during component manufacture.
External	State of other component	Used when the cause of a failure is the result of a component state that is not associated with the component that failed. An example would be the diesel failed due to no fuel in the fuel storage tanks.
External	Ambient environmental stress	Used when the cause of a failure is the result of an environmental condition from the location of the component.
Human	Accidental action (unintentional or undesired human errors)	Used when a human error (during the performance of an activity) results in an unintentional or undesired action.
Human	Human action procedure	Used when the procedure is not followed or the procedure is incorrect. For example: when a missed step or incorrect step in a surveillance procedure results in a component failure.
Human	Inadequate maintenance	Used when a human error (during the performance of maintenance) results in an unintentional or undesired action.
Internal	Internal to component, piece-part	Used when the cause of a failure is a non-specific result of a failure internal to the component that failed other than aging or wear.

Group	Specific Cause	Description
Internal	Internal environment	The internal environment led to the failure. Debris/Foreign material as well as an operating medium chemistry issue.
Internal	Setpoint drift	Used when the cause of a failure is the result of setpoint drift or adjustment.
Internal	Age/Wear	Used when the cause of the failure is a non-specific aging or wear issue.
Other	Unknown	Used when the cause of the failure is not known.
Other	Other (stated cause does not fit other categories)	Used when the cause of a failure is provided but it does not meet any one of the descriptions.
Procedure	Inadequate procedure	Used when the cause of a failure is the result of an inadequate procedure operating or maintenance.




Figure 15. AOV failure breakdown by period, sub component, and failure mode.




Figure 16. AOV breakdown by time period, cause group, and failure mode.




Figure 17. AOV component failure distribution by period, failure mode, and method of detection.




Figure 18. AOV component failure distribution by period, failure mode, and recovery.

5 AOV ASSEMBLY DESCRIPTION

An AOV assembly consists of a valve body and pneumatic operator sub-components. The valve body is generally a globe or butterfly type. The pneumatic operator is generally a piston or diaphragm type actuator. Main steam isolation valves and power operated relief valves are excluded from the AOV study even though pneumatically operated, as these are valves with different design and operating features.

The piece-parts of the valve body are the stem, packing, and internals. The pneumatic operator piece-parts may include piston internals/seals or diaphragm, positioner, mechanical linkage, volume booster, pilot valve, bolting, air regulator, airline, and wiring/contacts. Failures associated with instrument air systems that are not integral to the AOV assembly (e.g., contamination from the instrument air system that failed the AOV) are excluded in the AOV analysis.

Failure modes for the AOV include Fail to Open/Close, which combines the Fail to Open and Fail to Close (FTOC) failure modes into a single category; Fail to Operate (FTOP), which is a rate-based failure mode that includes Fail to Control for a flow/temperature control device and any other rate-based failure modes not including spurious operation; and Spurious Operation (SO), which includes Spurious Opening and Spurious Closing.

6 DATA TABLES

Table 10. Plot data for industry-wide AOV FTOC trend with ≤ 20 demands per year. Figure 1

FY/ Source	Failures	Demands	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
Update 2010						6.27E-05	2.74E-03	9.51E-04
1998	14	10001	8.50E-04	5.27E-04	1.37E-03	8.35E-04	2.00E-03	1.37E-03
1999	5	10092	8.39E-04	5.48E-04	1.28E-03	2.14E-04	9.20E-04	5.15E-04
2000	11	9997	8.28E-04	5.68E-04	1.21E-03	6.17E-04	1.66E-03	1.09E-03
2001	9	10196	8.17E-04	5.86E-04	1.14E-03	4.68E-04	1.40E-03	8.80E-04
2002	10	10221	8.06E-04	6.00E-04	1.08E-03	5.35E-04	1.51E-03	9.71E-04
2003	8	10169	7.96E-04	6.07E-04	1.04E-03	4.03E-04	1.28E-03	7.90E-04
2004	5	10285	7.85E-04	6.07E-04	1.02E-03	2.10E-04	9.03E-04	5.05E-04
2005	4	10316	7.75E-04	5.97E-04	1.01E-03	1.52E-04	7.75E-04	4.12E-04
2006	9	9783	7.65E-04	5.78E-04	1.01E-03	4.87E-04	1.45E-03	9.15E-04
2007	7	9831	7.55E-04	5.53E-04	1.03E-03	3.48E-04	1.20E-03	7.19E-04
2008	12	9782	7.45E-04	5.25E-04	1.06E-03	7.03E-04	1.81E-03	1.20E-03
2009	4	9736	7.35E-04	4.95E-04	1.09E-03	1.61E-04	8.18E-04	4.35E-04
2010	7	9880	7.25E-04	4.64E-04	1.13E-03	3.46E-04	1.19E-03	7.16E-04
2011	12	9777	7.16E-04	4.34E-04	1.18E-03	7.04E-04	1.81E-03	1.21E-03

Table 11. Plot data for industry-wide AOV FTOC trend with > 20 demands per year. Figure 2

FY/ Source	Failures	Demands	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
Update 2010						6.27E-05	2.74E-03	9.51E-04
1998	14	46884	1.98E-04	1.44E-04	2.73E-04	1.77E-04	4.25E-04	2.90E-04
1999	10	49065	1.90E-04	1.43E-04	2.52E-04	1.11E-04	3.13E-04	2.01E-04
2000	11	48379	1.82E-04	1.41E-04	2.34E-04	1.27E-04	3.41E-04	2.23E-04
2001	8	47883	1.74E-04	1.39E-04	2.17E-04	8.49E-05	2.70E-04	1.67E-04
2002	6	48167	1.67E-04	1.37E-04	2.03E-04	5.74E-05	2.18E-04	1.27E-04
2003	5	48619	1.60E-04	1.33E-04	1.92E-04	4.42E-05	1.90E-04	1.06E-04
2004	6	49764	1.53E-04	1.28E-04	1.83E-04	5.57E-05	2.11E-04	1.23E-04
2005	5	48890	1.47E-04	1.22E-04	1.76E-04	4.39E-05	1.89E-04	1.06E-04
2006	7	47925	1.41E-04	1.15E-04	1.72E-04	7.11E-05	2.45E-04	1.47E-04
2007	5	48104	1.35E-04	1.08E-04	1.68E-04	4.46E-05	1.92E-04	1.07E-04
2008	10	47975	1.29E-04	1.00E-04	1.66E-04	1.13E-04	3.19E-04	2.05E-04
2009	6	47300	1.24E-04	9.28E-05	1.65E-04	5.84E-05	2.22E-04	1.29E-04
2010	6	47360	1.18E-04	8.57E-05	1.63E-04	5.83E-05	2.21E-04	1.29E-04
2011	7	47252	1.13E-04	7.91E-05	1.63E-04	7.20E-05	2.48E-04	1.49E-04

Table 12. Plot data for industry-wide AOV FTOP trend with ≤ 20 demands per year. Figure 3

FY/ Source	Failures	Demands	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
Update 2010						2.66E-08	6.59E-07	2.49E-07
1998	0	14086080	6.22E-08	1.92E-08	2.02E-07	1.04E-10	1.01E-07	2.64E-08
1999	7	14059800	6.29E-08	2.21E-08	1.79E-07	1.92E-07	6.61E-07	3.97E-07
2000	0	14112360	6.36E-08	2.51E-08	1.61E-07	1.04E-10	1.01E-07	2.64E-08
2001	3	14182440	6.44E-08	2.83E-08	1.46E-07	5.69E-08	3.70E-07	1.84E-07
2002	2	14182440	6.51E-08	3.14E-08	1.35E-07	3.01E-08	2.91E-07	1.31E-07
2003	0	14199960	6.58E-08	3.40E-08	1.27E-07	1.03E-10	1.01E-07	2.62E-08
2004	0	14243760	6.65E-08	3.58E-08	1.24E-07	1.03E-10	1.01E-07	2.62E-08
2005	1	14243760	6.73E-08	3.62E-08	1.25E-07	9.21E-09	2.05E-07	7.85E-08
2006	0	14305080	6.80E-08	3.54E-08	1.31E-07	1.03E-10	1.00E-07	2.61E-08
2007	0	14235000	6.88E-08	3.35E-08	1.41E-07	1.03E-10	1.01E-07	2.62E-08
2008	3	14252520	6.96E-08	3.10E-08	1.56E-07	5.67E-08	3.68E-07	1.83E-07
2009	1	14226240	7.03E-08	2.82E-08	1.76E-07	9.22E-09	2.05E-07	7.86E-08
2010	2	14226240	7.11E-08	2.53E-08	2.00E-07	3.00E-08	2.90E-07	1.31E-07
2011	1	14401440	7.19E-08	2.26E-08	2.29E-07	9.14E-09	2.03E-07	7.79E-08

Table 13. Plot data for industry-wide AOV FTOP trend with > 20 demands per year. Figure 4

FY/ Source	Failures	Demands	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
Update 2010						2.66E-08	6.59E-07	2.49E-07
1998	2	9233040	3.18E-07	2.04E-07	4.97E-07	5.27E-08	5.10E-07	2.30E-07
1999	3	9259320	3.13E-07	2.10E-07	4.65E-07	9.95E-08	6.46E-07	3.21E-07
2000	6	9276840	3.07E-07	2.16E-07	4.37E-07	2.70E-07	1.03E-06	5.96E-07
2001	2	9180480	3.02E-07	2.21E-07	4.12E-07	5.30E-08	5.12E-07	2.31E-07
2002	2	9259320	2.97E-07	2.25E-07	3.91E-07	5.26E-08	5.08E-07	2.30E-07
2003	3	9206760	2.92E-07	2.26E-07	3.75E-07	1.00E-07	6.49E-07	3.23E-07
2004	2	9198000	2.86E-07	2.25E-07	3.65E-07	5.29E-08	5.11E-07	2.31E-07
2005	4	9206760	2.81E-07	2.20E-07	3.59E-07	1.53E-07	7.81E-07	4.15E-07
2006	2	9171720	2.77E-07	2.13E-07	3.59E-07	5.30E-08	5.12E-07	2.31E-07
2007	2	9171720	2.72E-07	2.03E-07	3.63E-07	5.30E-08	5.12E-07	2.31E-07
2008	4	9198000	2.67E-07	1.93E-07	3.70E-07	1.54E-07	7.81E-07	4.16E-07
2009	2	9171720	2.62E-07	1.81E-07	3.80E-07	5.30E-08	5.12E-07	2.31E-07
2010	4	9075360	2.58E-07	1.70E-07	3.91E-07	1.55E-07	7.90E-07	4.20E-07
2011	1	9075360	2.53E-07	1.59E-07	4.04E-07	1.64E-08	3.65E-07	1.40E-07

Table 14. Plot data for industry-wide AOV SO trend with ≤ 20 demands per year. Figure 5

FY/ Source	Failures	Hours	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
Update 2010						2.04E-09	4.49E-07	1.31E-07
1998	0	14086080	1.09E-07	3.63E-08	3.25E-07	1.16E-10	1.14E-07	2.96E-08
1999	7	14059800	1.11E-07	4.16E-08	2.94E-07	2.15E-07	7.41E-07	4.45E-07
2000	1	14112360	1.13E-07	4.73E-08	2.68E-07	1.04E-08	2.31E-07	8.87E-08
2001	1	14182440	1.15E-07	5.33E-08	2.47E-07	1.04E-08	2.30E-07	8.83E-08
2002	11	14182440	1.17E-07	5.92E-08	2.31E-07	3.85E-07	1.04E-06	6.77E-07
2003	1	14199960	1.19E-07	6.45E-08	2.20E-07	1.03E-08	2.30E-07	8.82E-08
2004	1	14243760	1.21E-07	6.83E-08	2.15E-07	1.03E-08	2.29E-07	8.80E-08
2005	2	14243760	1.23E-07	7.00E-08	2.18E-07	3.36E-08	3.25E-07	1.47E-07
2006	0	14305080	1.26E-07	6.93E-08	2.28E-07	1.15E-10	1.12E-07	2.92E-08
2007	2	14235000	1.28E-07	6.67E-08	2.46E-07	3.36E-08	3.25E-07	1.47E-07
2008	2	14252520	1.30E-07	6.27E-08	2.72E-07	3.36E-08	3.25E-07	1.47E-07
2009	2	14226240	1.33E-07	5.79E-08	3.05E-07	3.36E-08	3.25E-07	1.47E-07
2010	1	14226240	1.35E-07	5.30E-08	3.46E-07	1.03E-08	2.29E-07	8.81E-08
2011	4	14401440	1.38E-07	4.81E-08	3.95E-07	9.66E-08	4.92E-07	2.62E-07

Table 15. Plot data for industry-wide AOV SO trend, >20 demands per year. Figure 6

FY/ Source	Failures	Hours	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
Update 2010						2.04E-09	4.49E-07	1.31E-07
1998	4	9233040	1.59E-07	6.07E-08	4.16E-07	1.31E-07	6.66E-07	3.54E-07
1999	3	9259320	1.49E-07	6.33E-08	3.51E-07	8.51E-08	5.52E-07	2.75E-07
2000	0	9276840	1.40E-07	6.56E-08	2.99E-07	1.54E-10	1.51E-07	3.92E-08
2001	3	9180480	1.31E-07	6.72E-08	2.57E-07	8.56E-08	5.56E-07	2.76E-07
2002	1	9259320	1.23E-07	6.77E-08	2.24E-07	1.38E-08	3.07E-07	1.18E-07
2003	0	9206760	1.16E-07	6.68E-08	2.01E-07	1.55E-10	1.51E-07	3.94E-08
2004	0	9198000	1.09E-07	6.40E-08	1.84E-07	1.55E-10	1.52E-07	3.94E-08
2005	1	9206760	1.02E-07	5.95E-08	1.75E-07	1.39E-08	3.08E-07	1.18E-07
2006	1	9171720	9.57E-08	5.36E-08	1.71E-07	1.39E-08	3.09E-07	1.19E-07
2007	0	9171720	8.98E-08	4.71E-08	1.71E-07	1.55E-10	1.52E-07	3.95E-08
2008	2	9198000	8.43E-08	4.07E-08	1.75E-07	4.52E-08	4.37E-07	1.97E-07
2009	2	9171720	7.91E-08	3.47E-08	1.80E-07	4.53E-08	4.38E-07	1.98E-07
2010	1	9075360	7.43E-08	2.94E-08	1.88E-07	1.40E-08	3.11E-07	1.19E-07
2011	0	9075360	6.97E-08	2.47E-08	1.97E-07	1.57E-10	1.53E-07	3.98E-08

Table 16. Plot data for frequency (events per reactor year) of AOV operation demands with ≤ 20 demands per year. Figure 7

FY	Demands	Reactor Years	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
1998	10001	99.0	1.03E+02	1.01E+02	1.05E+02	9.94E+01	1.03E+02	1.01E+02
1999	10092	99.0	1.03E+02	1.01E+02	1.05E+02	1.00E+02	1.04E+02	1.02E+02
2000	9997	99.3	1.02E+02	1.01E+02	1.04E+02	9.91E+01	1.02E+02	1.01E+02
2001	10196	99.0	1.02E+02	1.01E+02	1.04E+02	1.01E+02	1.05E+02	1.03E+02
2002	10221	99.0	1.02E+02	1.00E+02	1.03E+02	1.02E+02	1.05E+02	1.03E+02
2003	10169	99.0	1.01E+02	1.00E+02	1.03E+02	1.01E+02	1.04E+02	1.03E+02
2004	10285	99.3	1.01E+02	1.00E+02	1.02E+02	1.02E+02	1.05E+02	1.04E+02
2005	10316	99.0	1.01E+02	9.97E+01	1.02E+02	1.03E+02	1.06E+02	1.04E+02
2006	9783	99.0	1.01E+02	9.94E+01	1.02E+02	9.72E+01	1.00E+02	9.88E+01
2007	9831	99.0	1.00E+02	9.89E+01	1.02E+02	9.77E+01	1.01E+02	9.93E+01
2008	9782	99.3	9.99E+01	9.85E+01	1.01E+02	9.69E+01	1.00E+02	9.85E+01
2009	9736	99.0	9.96E+01	9.80E+01	1.01E+02	9.67E+01	1.00E+02	9.83E+01
2010	9880	99.0	9.93E+01	9.75E+01	1.01E+02	9.82E+01	1.01E+02	9.98E+01
2011	9777	99.0	9.91E+01	9.70E+01	1.01E+02	9.71E+01	1.00E+02	9.88E+01

Table 17. Plot data for frequency (events per reactor year) of AOV operation demands with > 20 demands per year. Figure 8

FY	Demands	Reactor Years	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
1998	46884	99.0	4.89E+02	4.80E+02	4.99E+02	4.70E+02	4.77E+02	4.74E+02
1999	49065	99.0	4.89E+02	4.81E+02	4.97E+02	4.92E+02	4.99E+02	4.96E+02
2000	48379	99.3	4.88E+02	4.81E+02	4.96E+02	4.84E+02	4.91E+02	4.87E+02
2001	47883	99.0	4.88E+02	4.81E+02	4.94E+02	4.80E+02	4.87E+02	4.84E+02
2002	48167	99.0	4.87E+02	4.81E+02	4.93E+02	4.83E+02	4.90E+02	4.87E+02
2003	48619	99.0	4.86E+02	4.81E+02	4.92E+02	4.87E+02	4.95E+02	4.91E+02
2004	49764	99.3	4.86E+02	4.81E+02	4.91E+02	4.98E+02	5.05E+02	5.01E+02
2005	48890	99.0	4.85E+02	4.80E+02	4.90E+02	4.90E+02	4.98E+02	4.94E+02
2006	47925	99.0	4.85E+02	4.80E+02	4.90E+02	4.80E+02	4.88E+02	4.84E+02
2007	48104	99.0	4.84E+02	4.79E+02	4.90E+02	4.82E+02	4.90E+02	4.86E+02
2008	47975	99.3	4.84E+02	4.77E+02	4.90E+02	4.80E+02	4.87E+02	4.83E+02
2009	47300	99.0	4.83E+02	4.76E+02	4.90E+02	4.74E+02	4.81E+02	4.78E+02
2010	47360	99.0	4.83E+02	4.74E+02	4.91E+02	4.75E+02	4.82E+02	4.78E+02
2011	47252	99.0	4.82E+02	4.73E+02	4.91E+02	4.74E+02	4.81E+02	4.77E+02

Table 18. Plot data for frequency (events per reactor year) of AOV FTOC events with ≤ 20 demands per year. Figure 9

FY	Failures	Reactor Years	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
1998	14	99.0	8.77E-02	5.51E-02	1.40E-01	8.44E-02	2.03E-01	1.38E-01
1999	5	99.0	8.63E-02	5.70E-02	1.31E-01	2.18E-02	9.38E-02	5.24E-02
2000	11	99.3	8.49E-02	5.89E-02	1.23E-01	6.22E-02	1.67E-01	1.09E-01
2001	9	99.0	8.36E-02	6.04E-02	1.16E-01	4.82E-02	1.44E-01	9.06E-02
2002	10	99.0	8.22E-02	6.16E-02	1.10E-01	5.53E-02	1.56E-01	1.00E-01
2003	8	99.0	8.09E-02	6.21E-02	1.05E-01	4.13E-02	1.31E-01	8.10E-02
2004	5	99.3	7.96E-02	6.19E-02	1.02E-01	2.17E-02	9.35E-02	5.23E-02
2005	4	99.0	7.83E-02	6.07E-02	1.01E-01	1.58E-02	8.06E-02	4.29E-02
2006	9	99.0	7.71E-02	5.86E-02	1.01E-01	4.82E-02	1.44E-01	9.06E-02
2007	7	99.0	7.58E-02	5.60E-02	1.03E-01	3.46E-02	1.19E-01	7.15E-02
2008	12	99.3	7.46E-02	5.30E-02	1.05E-01	6.95E-02	1.79E-01	1.19E-01
2009	4	99.0	7.34E-02	4.98E-02	1.08E-01	1.58E-02	8.06E-02	4.29E-02
2010	7	99.0	7.22E-02	4.66E-02	1.12E-01	3.46E-02	1.19E-01	7.15E-02
2011	12	99.0	7.11E-02	4.35E-02	1.16E-01	6.96E-02	1.79E-01	1.19E-01

Table 19. Plot data for frequency (events per reactor year) of AOV FTOC events with > 20 demands per year. Figure 10

FY	Failures	Reactor Years	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
1998	14	99.0	9.76E-02	7.19E-02	1.32E-01	8.39E-02	2.02E-01	1.37E-01
1999	10	99.0	9.33E-02	7.11E-02	1.22E-01	5.49E-02	1.55E-01	9.95E-02
2000	11	99.3	8.92E-02	7.02E-02	1.13E-01	6.19E-02	1.66E-01	1.09E-01
2001	8	99.0	8.53E-02	6.90E-02	1.05E-01	4.11E-02	1.31E-01	8.06E-02
2002	6	99.0	8.15E-02	6.74E-02	9.86E-02	2.79E-02	1.06E-01	6.16E-02
2003	5	99.0	7.80E-02	6.54E-02	9.30E-02	2.17E-02	9.32E-02	5.21E-02
2004	6	99.3	7.45E-02	6.28E-02	8.85E-02	2.78E-02	1.06E-01	6.14E-02
2005	5	99.0	7.13E-02	5.96E-02	8.52E-02	2.17E-02	9.32E-02	5.21E-02
2006	7	99.0	6.82E-02	5.61E-02	8.28E-02	3.44E-02	1.18E-01	7.11E-02
2007	5	99.0	6.52E-02	5.24E-02	8.11E-02	2.17E-02	9.32E-02	5.21E-02
2008	10	99.3	6.23E-02	4.87E-02	7.98E-02	5.48E-02	1.54E-01	9.93E-02
2009	6	99.0	5.96E-02	4.50E-02	7.88E-02	2.79E-02	1.06E-01	6.16E-02
2010	6	99.0	5.70E-02	4.16E-02	7.80E-02	2.79E-02	1.06E-01	6.16E-02
2011	7	99.0	5.45E-02	3.83E-02	7.74E-02	3.44E-02	1.18E-01	7.11E-02

Table 20. Plot data for frequency (events per reactor year) of AOV FTOP events with ≤ 20 demands per year. Figure 9

FY	Failures	Reactor Years	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
1998	0	99.0	8.88E-03	2.74E-03	2.87E-02	1.48E-05	1.45E-02	3.76E-03
1999	7	99.0	8.98E-03	3.15E-03	2.56E-02	2.73E-02	9.41E-02	5.65E-02
2000	0	99.3	9.09E-03	3.59E-03	2.30E-02	1.48E-05	1.44E-02	3.76E-03
2001	3	99.0	9.20E-03	4.05E-03	2.09E-02	8.16E-03	5.30E-02	2.64E-02
2002	2	99.0	9.32E-03	4.50E-03	1.93E-02	4.31E-03	4.17E-02	1.88E-02
2003	0	99.0	9.43E-03	4.88E-03	1.82E-02	1.48E-05	1.45E-02	3.76E-03
2004	0	99.3	9.54E-03	5.13E-03	1.78E-02	1.48E-05	1.44E-02	3.76E-03
2005	1	99.0	9.66E-03	5.21E-03	1.79E-02	1.32E-03	2.94E-02	1.13E-02
2006	0	99.0	9.78E-03	5.09E-03	1.88E-02	1.48E-05	1.45E-02	3.76E-03
2007	0	99.0	9.90E-03	4.82E-03	2.03E-02	1.48E-05	1.45E-02	3.76E-03
2008	3	99.3	1.00E-02	4.47E-03	2.25E-02	8.14E-03	5.28E-02	2.63E-02
2009	1	99.0	1.01E-02	4.06E-03	2.53E-02	1.32E-03	2.94E-02	1.13E-02
2010	2	99.0	1.03E-02	3.66E-03	2.88E-02	4.31E-03	4.17E-02	1.88E-02
2011	1	99.0	1.04E-02	3.26E-03	3.31E-02	1.32E-03	2.94E-02	1.13E-02

Table 21. Plot data for frequency (events per reactor year) of AOV FTOP events with > 20 demands per year. Figure 10

FY	Failures	Reactor Years	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
1998	2	99.0	2.97E-02	1.90E-02	4.65E-02	4.91E-03	4.75E-02	2.14E-02
1999	3	99.0	2.92E-02	1.96E-02	4.34E-02	9.30E-03	6.03E-02	3.00E-02
2000	6	99.3	2.86E-02	2.01E-02	4.07E-02	2.52E-02	9.57E-02	5.56E-02
2001	2	99.0	2.81E-02	2.06E-02	3.84E-02	4.91E-03	4.75E-02	2.14E-02
2002	2	99.0	2.76E-02	2.09E-02	3.64E-02	4.91E-03	4.75E-02	2.14E-02
2003	3	99.0	2.71E-02	2.10E-02	3.49E-02	9.30E-03	6.03E-02	3.00E-02
2004	2	99.3	2.66E-02	2.09E-02	3.39E-02	4.90E-03	4.74E-02	2.14E-02
2005	4	99.0	2.61E-02	2.04E-02	3.33E-02	1.43E-02	7.26E-02	3.86E-02
2006	2	99.0	2.56E-02	1.97E-02	3.33E-02	4.91E-03	4.75E-02	2.14E-02
2007	2	99.0	2.51E-02	1.88E-02	3.36E-02	4.91E-03	4.75E-02	2.14E-02
2008	4	99.3	2.47E-02	1.78E-02	3.42E-02	1.42E-02	7.24E-02	3.85E-02
2009	2	99.0	2.42E-02	1.67E-02	3.51E-02	4.91E-03	4.75E-02	2.14E-02
2010	4	99.0	2.38E-02	1.57E-02	3.61E-02	1.43E-02	7.26E-02	3.86E-02
2011	1	99.0	2.33E-02	1.46E-02	3.73E-02	1.51E-03	3.35E-02	1.29E-02

Table 22. Plot data for frequency (events per reactor year) of AOV SO events ≤ 20 demands per year.
Figure 13

FY	Failures	Reactor Years	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
1998	0	99.0	1.55E-02	5.19E-03	4.62E-02	1.66E-05	1.62E-02	4.22E-03
1999	7	99.0	1.58E-02	5.95E-03	4.19E-02	3.06E-02	1.05E-01	6.33E-02
2000	1	99.3	1.61E-02	6.77E-03	3.83E-02	1.48E-03	3.29E-02	1.26E-02
2001	1	99.0	1.64E-02	7.63E-03	3.53E-02	1.48E-03	3.30E-02	1.27E-02
2002	11	99.0	1.67E-02	8.49E-03	3.30E-02	5.52E-02	1.48E-01	9.70E-02
2003	1	99.0	1.71E-02	9.24E-03	3.15E-02	1.48E-03	3.30E-02	1.27E-02
2004	1	99.3	1.74E-02	9.80E-03	3.09E-02	1.48E-03	3.29E-02	1.26E-02
2005	2	99.0	1.77E-02	1.01E-02	3.13E-02	4.83E-03	4.67E-02	2.11E-02
2006	0	99.0	1.81E-02	9.96E-03	3.28E-02	1.66E-05	1.62E-02	4.22E-03
2007	2	99.0	1.84E-02	9.59E-03	3.54E-02	4.83E-03	4.67E-02	2.11E-02
2008	2	99.3	1.88E-02	9.02E-03	3.91E-02	4.82E-03	4.66E-02	2.10E-02
2009	2	99.0	1.91E-02	8.35E-03	4.39E-02	4.83E-03	4.67E-02	2.11E-02
2010	1	99.0	1.95E-02	7.65E-03	4.98E-02	1.48E-03	3.30E-02	1.27E-02
2011	4	99.0	1.99E-02	6.95E-03	5.70E-02	1.40E-02	7.14E-02	3.80E-02

Table 23. Plot data for frequency (events per reactor year) of AOV SO events > 20 demands per year.
Figure 14

FY	Failures	Reactor Years	Regression Curve Data Points			Plot Trend Error Bar Points		
			Mean	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Lower (5%)	Upper (95%)	Mean
1998	4	99.0	1.48E-02	5.67E-03	3.89E-02	1.22E-02	6.20E-02	3.30E-02
1999	3	99.0	1.39E-02	5.91E-03	3.28E-02	7.94E-03	5.15E-02	2.56E-02
2000	0	99.3	1.30E-02	6.11E-03	2.78E-02	1.44E-05	1.40E-02	3.66E-03
2001	3	99.0	1.22E-02	6.26E-03	2.39E-02	7.94E-03	5.15E-02	2.56E-02
2002	1	99.0	1.15E-02	6.30E-03	2.09E-02	1.29E-03	2.86E-02	1.10E-02
2003	0	99.0	1.08E-02	6.21E-03	1.86E-02	1.44E-05	1.41E-02	3.66E-03
2004	0	99.3	1.01E-02	5.95E-03	1.71E-02	1.44E-05	1.40E-02	3.66E-03
2005	1	99.0	9.46E-03	5.52E-03	1.62E-02	1.29E-03	2.86E-02	1.10E-02
2006	1	99.0	8.87E-03	4.97E-03	1.58E-02	1.29E-03	2.86E-02	1.10E-02
2007	0	99.0	8.31E-03	4.36E-03	1.58E-02	1.44E-05	1.41E-02	3.66E-03
2008	2	99.3	7.80E-03	3.77E-03	1.61E-02	4.19E-03	4.05E-02	1.83E-02
2009	2	99.0	7.31E-03	3.21E-03	1.66E-02	4.20E-03	4.06E-02	1.83E-02
2010	1	99.0	6.85E-03	2.71E-03	1.73E-02	1.29E-03	2.86E-02	1.10E-02
2011	0	99.0	6.43E-03	2.28E-03	1.81E-02	1.44E-05	1.41E-02	3.66E-03

7 REFERENCES

1. U.S. NRC, *Component Reliability Data Sheets Update 2010*, January 2012, <http://nrcoe.inl.gov/resultsdb/publicdocs/AvgPerf/ComponentReliabilityDataSheets2010.pdf>
2. S.A. Eide, et al, *Industry-Average Performance for Components and Initiating Events at U.S. Commercial Nuclear Power Plants*, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NUREG/CR-6928, February 2007.