William J. Luckas, Jr. and Robert E. Hall Department of Nuclear Energy Brookhaven National Laboratory Upton, New York 11973

HUMAN ERROR RATES -

QUANTIFICATION METHOD FROM NUCLEAR EXPERIENCE AND DATA*

re nlegte

REPORT

THIS

PORTIONS

BNL-NUREG--28061 TI85 004731

BNL-NUREG-28061

WASTER CONF-801107--79

This paper reports on a practical method of quantifying human errors made in conjunction with testing, maintaining, and operating select important components in reactor safety systems of licensed nuclear power plants. This quantification of human error is measured in terms of human error rate (HER) namely the ratio of the number of human errors (of a specified type) to the number of opportunities for those particular errors. The human error rates generated in this work provide a very useful broad basis of comparison for appropriate derived and/or best judgement human error rate estimates which have been used in WASH-1400, (1) and also can provide input to bounding type risk assessments.

The number of human errors have been extracted from a computer-based data file of one-line description summary interpretations of Licensee Event Reports (LER) for interfacing with manual and remotely operated valves and pumps over a three (3) year period ending in 1978. The systems evaluated are the reactor safety systems for the 23 BWRs - the CoS, HPCI, and LPCI including Drywell and Suppression Chamber Spray systems; and for the 41 PWRs - the AFW. CtS, HPSI including safety related charging pumps and LPSI systems. Table 1 provides the results of the one-line summary human error interpretation.

The uniqueness of this approach lies in the denominator. The number of opportunities for human errors while interfacing with manual and remotely operated valves and pumps in the reactor safety systems during the three (3)

^{*}This work was performed under the auspices of the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission. DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED &



year period for all 64 licensed plants considered has been estimated using assumptions made based on licensed senior operator experience with safety systems. A detailed in-depth evaluation of the reactor safety systems was conducted on five (5) PWRs - one B&W, one CE, and three Westinghouse plants and two (2) BWRs - both GE plants. Using the safety system Piping and Instrumentation Diagrams (or equivalent) for each of the seven (7) plants, the average number (#) of remotely operated valves (ROV), manual valves (XV), and pumps cycled per year per plant has been calculated and tabulated in Table 2. When the tetal number of plant years (based on initial criticality of each plant) for each reactor vendor was determined for the three (3) year period of interest, the total weighted human - selected reactor safety system component (ROV, XV, and pumps) interface estimates were established (see Table 2). This represents the number of opportunities for human error.

Table 3 summarizes the HERs obtained by dividing the appropriate errors in Table 1 by the corresponding opportunities in Table 2. These broad classes of HERs provide a comparison to indicate that WASH-1400(1) estimates appear to be reasonable. This paper has indicated a practical method for actually determining the opportunities for human errors with safety systems which is far more accurate than determining the actual number of human errors.

References

- "Reactor Safety Study," U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, WASH-1400 (NUREG-75/014), Appendix III, Section 6.1, Table III 6-1, "General Error Rate Estimates" (1975).
- Sullivan, W.H. and Poloski, J.P., "Data Summaries of Licensee Event Reports of <u>Pumps</u> at U.S. Commercial Nuclear Power Plants," NUREG/CR-1205 (1980).
- Hubble, W.H. and Miller, C.F., "Data Summaries of Licensee Event Reports of <u>Valves</u> at U.S. Commercial Nuclear Power Plants," NUREG/CR-1363, (1980).

TABLE 1

٠.,

....

Summary of Number of Reported Human Errors Associated with Selected Reactor Safety System Interfacing Components Over a Specific Three-Year Period*

Reactor Safety System Interfacing Component	Reactor <u>PWR</u>	• Type <u>BWR</u>
Remotely Operated Valves (ROV)	17	13
Manual Valves (XV)	16	8
Total Valves (ROV + XV)	33	21
Total Pumps	18	9

*January 1, 1976 through December 31, 1978 for valves. May 1, 1975 through April 30, 1978 for pumps.

TABLE 2

Human - Selected Reactor Safety System Component Total Interface Estimates Over a Specific Three-Year Period*

		Average	Total	Average	Total	Average	Total
	# Plant Years	# ROV Cycled	# ROV	# XV Cycled	# XV	# Pump Cycled	# Pump
Reactor	1976-1978	Per Year	Cycled	Per Year	Cycled	Per Year	Cycled
Vendor	(5/75-4/78)	Per Plant	1976-1978	Per Plant	1976-1 978	Per Plant	(5/75-4-78)
B&W	22.0 (20.0)	213	4,686	89	1,958	90	1,800
CE	19.7 (18.0)	357	7,033	23	453	100	1,800
WX	67.2 (62.7)	267	17,942	76	5,107	93	5,831
All PWR	108.9 (100.7)	274	29,661	68	7,518	94	9,431
GE BWR	65.0 (63.2)	221	14,365	22	1,430	80	5,056
A11	173.9 (163.9)	Totals	44,026		8,948		14,487

î

ROV - Remotely Operated Valve XV - Manual Valve

* January 1, 1976 through December 31, 1978 for valves. May 1, 1975 through April 30, 1978 for pumps.

TABLE 3

 $C^{(2)}$

Human Error Rate (HER) Calculation

Summary

Reactor Safety System Interfacing Component	PWR	Reactor Type <u>BWR</u>	Both
Remotely Operated Valves (ROV)	0.57 x 10 ⁻³	0.91×10^{-3}	0.68 x 10 ⁻³
Manual Valves (XV)	2.1 x 10 ⁻³	5.6 x 10 ⁻³	2.7 x 10 ⁻³
Pumps	1.9 x 10 ⁻³	1.8 x 10 ⁻³	1.9 x 10 ⁻³

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.