



## Workshop #3 for A.15-05-002, et al.



***Steven Haine, P.E.***  
**Senior Engineer, Risk Assessment Section (SED)**  
**California Public Utilities Commission**

October 6, 2015



# Safety and Emergency Information

- In the event of an emergency, please proceed calmly out the exits.
- The Temporary Evacuation Location has been relocated to the Civic Center Plaza.
- It is located on the other side of City Hall. Exit the building at Van Ness and McAlister streets and walk past City Hall.





## Practical Information

### WiFi Access:

*login: guest*

*password: password*

### Restrooms:

out the Hearing Room doors  
and down the far end of the  
hallway.

- Call in information:
- Phone line: 1-866-859-2737  
Participant code: 1682922
- WebEx:  
<https://van.webex.com/mw0401lsp13/mywebex/default.do?service=1&siteurl=van&nomenu=true&>
- Meeting Number: 747 072 712  
Meeting Password: Smap2015!





## Workshop #3 Objectives

- Should factors besides safety be used in risk scoring? (Already addressed in previous workshops). Any final thoughts?
- Sufficient level of granularity in risk assessment models and implications on data availability.
- Guidance on RAMP.
- Roadmap and future SMAP plans.
- Reaching agreement on what decisions Commission has to make in this SMAP.





## Sufficient level of granularity in models

- Gas example: Corrosion on pipelines is high level, internal corrosion is more specific, even more specific is internal corrosion caused by microbial action. Specific identification would result in more specific action to target the microbes.
- Electric example: pole failure is high level. Pole failure due to rotten poles is more specific. Pole failure due to overloading is also more specific. Overload caused by communication cables is even more specific. Finer granularity would result in more targeted mitigation.





# Sufficient level of granularity in models

Benefits of higher granularity:

- Sharper focus of what could adversely affect the assets and operations
- More targeted and more effective mitigations strategies at possibly lower cost.

Drawbacks of higher granularity:

- Fewer data points for each kind of threat leading to more uncertainty in the predictive power of the models.
- Granularity may be so high that it becomes disorienting and makes things hard to handle. It may make it easy to overlook a threat.





# Sufficient level of granularity in models

- One possible solution to the data availability problem is to have parallel models, one that is high level and another that is very granular. They each provide a picture that is useful and can supplement each other.
- Another solution to data availability is to go back to the earlier theme of sharing data to build a bigger pool of credible data.







## Roadmap for SMAPs

- At a minimum, the first SMAP proceeding should establish a limited set of common elements that utilities can use or are already using: structured framework similar to PG&E's RIBA, common risk score formula, measure of relative risk reduction per dollar spent (SCE's RSE), 7x7 matrix format.
- In the next SMAP, the models should show increasing maturity and migration towards use of probability models. Relative risk ranking models will still be important to highlight the relative significance of different risks.
- In the next SMAP, there should be some adopted metric to measure the cost effectiveness of the mitigations.







# Next Steps

- SED releases Workshop 2 preliminary report (October 13)
- Comments due on Workshop 2 preliminary report (October 27)
- SED releases ALARP whitepaper (October)
- Workshop 4 (December 4)
- SED releases draft report (January/2016)





**Thank You**

**For Additional Information:**

[www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/safety/Risk\\_Assessment.htm](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/safety/Risk_Assessment.htm)

