MANAGING RISK EXPOSURE AND MUNICIPAL CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE

CERIU Infra2011 Session D1 - Managemen November 15, 2011

Pevelop

TEAL

wemodel

#### **Presentation Overview**

- Introductions
  - Tara Gudgeon, Region of Halton
  - Geoff Linschoten, AECOM
- Introduction to Risk, Criticality and Probability
- Criticality Model
   Development
  - Consequence of Failure
  - Probability of Failure
- Region of Halton Model
- Condition Assessment
- Discussion



#### About Halton Region....



#### Comprised of Four Area Municipalities

- The City of Burlington
- Town of Halton Hills (Georgetown & Acton)
- Town of Oakville
- Town of Milton

- 2001 Population of 400,000
- 2011 Projected to 450,000
- 2031 Projected to be 780,000

<u>www.halton.ca</u>



And there are the risks that we deal with in our daily work that could be dealt with through a proper understanding of the factors contributing to the risk WORK

ZONE

SPEED

#### **Risk Definitions**

#### Risk is a measure of the degree of exposure to the consequences that might result from event that might happen – Water Research Foundation, 2008

# Probability

# How likely is it for the asset to fail?



# Consequence

How severe are the long and short term consequences of asset failure?





#### **Sample Strategies for Reducing Risk**

Sample Risk Reduction Option	Reduces Probability	Reduces Consequences
CAPITAL INVESTMENTS		
Rehabilitation	$\checkmark$	
Replacement	<ul> <li>Image: A set of the set of the</li></ul>	
New redundant asset	Ø	Ø
O&M ACTIVITIES		
Development of operating SOPs	$\checkmark$	
Improved planned maintenance procedures	$\checkmark$	
Enhanced monitoring through SCADA	$\checkmark$	
LEVELS OF SERVICE CHANGES		
Demand management		V
Improved response and recovery		V
Reduce LoS with stakeholder involvement		V



## Model is based on international best practice

ADVANCING THE BELENCE OF WATER

**WWFRF** 



Global Water Research Coalition





SERVICES ASSOCIATIO

Risk Analysis and Management for Critical Asset Protection (RAMCAP®) Standard for

Risk and Resilience Management of Water and Wastewater Systems

Tool for Risk Management of Water Utility Assets



## Sample risk framework





#### **MS Excel Model Development**

	Consequences of	of Failure			
	Index	Index Weight	Variable	<b>GIS</b> Column	Variable Weight
	Economic	0.2	Pipe Size	6	0.2
			Material	7	0.2
<u>ъ</u>			Accessibility	14	0.3
pd			Water Crossing	14	0.3
Ĕ	Operational	0.2	Redundancy	11	0.5
ity			Retetention Time	25	0.25
Sali			Flow Rate	26	0.25
itic	Social	0.2	Land Use	16	0.25
С С			Road Type	18	0.25
			Flow Rate	26	0.5
	Environmental	0.4	Water Proximity	37	0.25
		••••	Sensitive Area	15	0.5
			Flow Rate	26	0.25
		<b>USER DEFINED</b>			<b>USER DEFINED</b>
		1			
ity	Probability of Failu	Ire			
bil	Index	Index Weight	Variable	<b>GIS</b> Column	Variable Weight
ba	Condition	1	Age vs ESL	8	0.25
2			Break History	38	0.5
<u>م</u>			Soil Corrosion	17	0.25
		1	I	1	
		USER DEFINED			USER DEFINED
		1			

#### **Typical Model Outputs**



Medium critical assets



Least critical assets

Informs O&M and Capital Planning decisionmaking

#### O&M and Capital Planning Decision-Making



# **Consequence of failure**

#### **Consequence of Failure – Factors that Influence Consequence in Pressure Pipes**

ECONOMIC	OPERATIONAL	SOCIAL	ENVIRONMENTAL
Pipe size	Pipe redundancy / alternative routes	Adjacent land use	Proximity to a fish bearing water course
Pipe material	Pipe retention time	Proximity to a critical customer	Proximity to a sensitive area
Pipe accessibility	Pipe flow rate	Volume of overflows	Impact of Repairs
Adjacent land use	Ease of Repair	Loss of Reputation	Volume of Overflows
Cost to Repair etc etc	Impact on the System	Public Disruption	Compliance and Regulatory Issues

#### What is the relative importance (weighting) of each factor?

## **Consequence of Failure - Economic**

Index	Economic								
Weight	20								
Category				Repair C	ost				
Weight				1					
Variable	PipeSiz	ze	Material		Accessibility		Water Cr	ossing	
Weight	0.2		0.2		0.3		0.3	}	
Table	Main.sl	пр	Main.shp		Halton List		geo sp	atial	
Attribute	e Diameter Material Need to build table analys					/sis			
	Value	Score	Value	Score	Value	Score	Value	Score	
	0 - 300	1	UNKN	0	Yes	1	No	1	
	300 - 600	50	VC	5	No	100	Yes	100	
	> 600	100	DI	10					
			HDPE						
Valid			PE						
Fntries			PVC						
Lincites			STL						
			AC						
			CI						
			CONC	100					
			CONC PRE						
			СРР						

#### **Consequence of Failure – Operational, Environmental Impact**

Index	Operational					
Weight			0.2			
Category			Operational Imp	act		
Weight			1			
Variable	Redunda	incy	Retention Ti	me	Flow	v rate
Weight	0.5 0.25				0.	25
Table	Main.sl			Firm Ca	apacity	
Attribute	GIS query		to be built in separate table		to be built in s	separate table
	Value	Score	Value	Score	Value	Score
Valid	Yes	1	> 120	1	0-25	1
Entries	No	100	>60 < 120	50	25 - 100	25
			< 60 Min	100	100 - 500	75
					> 500	100

Index	Environmental						
Weight	0.4						
Category			Environment Im	pact			
Weight			1				
Variable	Water Prox	imity	Sensitive Are	ea	Flow	rate	
Weight	0.25 0.5 0.25					25	
Table	Water Body/Streams EA Layer SanitaryPumpingSta				npingStation		
Attribute	Distance		EA Layer		Firm Capacity		
	Value	Score	Value	Score	Value	Score	
	> 200	1	No	1	0 - 25	1	
	101 - 200	5	Yes	100	25 - 100	25	
Valid	51 - 100	10			100 - 500	75	
Entries	1 - 50	25			> 500	100	
	0 100						

#### **Consequence of Failure – Social**

Index	Social						
Weight	0.2						
Category			Customer Impa	ict			
Weight			1				
Variable	Land Us	se	Road Type		Flow	rate	
Weight	0.25		0.25		0.	.5	
Table	MPAC_Pa	rcel	Street_IMS		SanitaryPum	pingStation	
Attribute	Prop_Code		Street_Desc		Firm Capacity		
	Value	Score	Value	Score	Value	Score	
	Vacant	1	Other	1	0-25	1	
	Agricultural	1	Local	Б	25 - 100	25	
	Special Purpose	5	Collector	C	100 - 500	75	
Valid	Commercial				> 500	100	
Entries	Industrial	50	Major Arterial	10			
	Institutional	30	Multi-Purpose Arte				
	Government		Provincial Highway				
	Residental	100	Provincial Freeway	100			
			Toll				

#### **Consequence of Failure Results**





### **Consequence of Failure Results**





# **Probability of failure**

ROAD

WORK

AHEAD

### **Probability of Failure**

Index	Probability of Failure					
Weight				1		
Category			Сс	ondition		
Weight				1		
Variable	Age ve	Age versus ESL Number of Breaks Under Influence of Corrosi				
Weight	0	0.25 0.5			0	.25
	Value	Score	Value	Score	Value	Score
	< 50%	1	0	0	Good	1
	50-80%	50	1	25	Poor	50
Valid Entries	> 80%	100	2	50	Very Poor	100
			>3	100		

Probability	Description
А	High Probability of Failure, Confirm Condition
В	Medium Probability, Consider long term condition
C	Low Probability, Consider condition assessment in future

#### **Probability of Failure Results**



#### **Probability of Failure Results**





#### **Summary of Overall Risk**

#### Risk = Consequences x Probability

#### Low Risk

Failure can be addressed through normal operations

R/R on

Failure

Monitor and

Forecast

#### Moderate Risk

Failure can be accommodated but strains operation

Failure Management

Structured assessment to Plan

Highest Risk

Failure cannot be handled in an effective manner

> Failure Avoidance

Continuous proactive maintenance & rehab

## **Condition Assessment Strategy**

#### For all levels of risk

- Consider staged approach to increase understanding of exposure environment and applied loads
  - Importance of doing this increases with increasing failure consequence
- Maximize the use of understanding the material degradation process
  - Learn from every project you and everyone you know has undertaken
  - Never throw out an observation you or anyone else makes





## **Condition Assessment Strategy**

- Balanced approach driven by risk exposure & cost to gain necessary information.
  - **Highest** Priority Assets
    - Requires **accurate** understanding of deterioration mechanism
    - Multi-modal assessment strategy to compensate for weaknesses of individual techniques
    - Focus on attaining a high degree of certainty
    - Ensure assessment can be repeated so that performance can be tracked over time





## **Condition Assessment Strategy**

- Balanced approach driven by risk exposure & cost to gain necessary information.
  - Medium Priority Assets
    - Increase frequency of assessment as condition deteriorates
    - Increase **certainty** of data as condition deteriorates
    - Establish baseline and track performance over time







#### **Condition Assessment "Toolbox"**

	Low Consequence	Moderate Consequence	High Consequence
Iron/Steel	Break - History Review, Soil Properties, Half - Cell Corrosion Potential	Corrosion Pit Measurement (Opportunistic & Direct Sampling)	Corrosion Pit Measurement (RFEC, Direct Sampling)
AC	Break-History Review, Soil Properties, Opportunistic Sampling (Calcium Hydroxide Leaching)	Opportunistic, Direct Sampling, & NDT	Direct Sampling, NDT
PVC/HDPE	Break History; Opportunistic Sampling	Opportunistic & Direct Sampling	Direct Sampling
РССР	Not Appli	Wire Break Detection (RFEC)	









#### **Contact:**



Geoff Linschoten, AECOM Hamilton, Central Region Asset Management Lead

Geoff.Linschoten@aecom.com

or



Tara Gudgeon, Region of Halton, Supervisor of Wastewater Capital Planning <u>Tara.Gudgeon@halton.ca</u>

