

WMP Workshop S-MAP Safety Metrics Presentation



Steven Haine, P.E.

Senior Engineer

Safety & Enforcement Division

Risk Assessment and Safety Advisory Section

September 18, 2019



Background of SMAP Proceeding

- R.13-11-006 Order Instituting Rulemaking to Develop a Risk-Based Decision-Making Framework to Evaluate Safety and Reliability Improvements and to incorporate a risk-based decision-making framework into the energy utilities' GRCs.
- D.14-12-025 adopted the risk-based decision-making framework, consisting of S-MAP and RAMP Phase proceedings. S-MAP deals with risk models and risk evaluation methodologies.
- The end-product of each S-MAP proceeding will be a common risk modeling and evaluation approach.
- Development of safety metrics is part of the SMAP proceeding.



Difference between SMAP and WMP Metrics

- S-MAP concentrates on both leading and lagging indicator metrics. Leading indicators are preferred.
- From S-MAP Phase 1 decision D18-08-018: "Leading indicators are more suited to the goals of the proceeding than lagging indicators, because the goal is to understand potential safety incidents in advance and avoid them. ... Future S-MAPs can seek to replace the remaining lagging indicators with leading indicators as new data becomes available."



Difference between SMAP and WMP Metrics

 WMP metrics, as required by SB901, focus on measuring performance (i.e. results). This implies WMP metrics focus on lagging indicators. This is key difference S-MAP metrics and WMP metrics.



Adopted S-MAP Metrics

- There are 26 adopted metrics in all, but only 4 are related to overhead conductors.
- 1. Transmission & Distribution (T&D) Overhead Wires Down
 events Number of instances where an electric transmission or
 primary distribution conductor is broken and falls from its intended
 position to rest on the ground or a foreign object; excludes downed
 secondary distribution wires and "Major Event Days" (typically
 due to severe storm events) as defined by the IEEE. Unit is in
 number of wire down events.
- 2. Transmission & Distribution (T&D) Overhead Wires Down events - Major Event Days - Same metric as in 1., except downed secondary wires and "Major Event Days" are included when calculating wire down events.



Adopted S-MAP Metrics

- 3. Electric Emergency Response The percent of time utility personnel respond (are on-site) within one hour after receiving a 911 (electric related) call, with on-site defined as arriving at the premises to which the 911 call relates.
- 4. **Fire Ignitions** The number of powerline-involved fire incidents annually reportable to the CPUC per Decision 14-02-015. A reportable fire incident includes all of the following: 1) Ignition is associated with a utility's powerlines and 2) something other than the utility's facilities burned and 3) the resulting fire traveled more than one meter from the ignition point. Unit in number of ignitions.

All adopted electric overhead conductor metrics up to this point are <u>lagging indicators</u>. Efforts underway to develop leading indicators.



 Forty-two new electric conductor metrics are under consideration by the S-MAP metrics Technical Working Group (TWG). Vast majority are leading indicators. Some samples, <u>not complete list</u>:

No.	Proposed Metrics from Augst 23 Comments	Proposed by
1	Percentage of copper conductor of size #6 <i>or smaller</i> used in primary distribution circuits.	OSA/SCE
2	Percentage of aluminum conductor steel reinforced of size #4 <i>or smaller</i> used in primary distribution circuits	OSA/SDG&
3	Percent of Primary Voltage OH Conductor Miles Configured as Ungrounded or Three-Wire	OSA



No.	Proposed Metrics from Augst 23 Comments	Proposed by
4	Circuit Miles Conforming to Current Design Standards as a Percent of Total Miles	OSA
5	Conductor Miles with High Risk Properties that Experienced Overloading Conditions in a Year	OSA
6	Percentage of Circuit Miles Overloaded by at Least 105%	Cal Advocates
7	Percentage of Circuits Overloaded by at least 105%	Cal Advocates



No.	Proposed Metrics from Augst 23	
NO.	Comments	Proposed by
	Percent of OH Conductor that does	
8	not meet	Cal
0	Current Minimum Wire Size	Advocates
	Standards in HFRA	
	Percent of OH Conductor that does	
	not meet	Cal Advocates
9	Current Minimum Wire Size	
	Standards in non-	Advocates
	HFRA	
	Number of Non-Wooden Poles and	Cal
10	the Total	Advocates
	Poles on the System	Auvocates
11	Average Age of the Oldest 5% of	Cal
	Wooden Poles in	Advocates
	the System	Auvocates



No.	Proposed Metrics from Augst 23 Comments	Proposed by
13	Percentage of wire down events with root cause analysis performed	OSA
14	Number of Inspections Completed on Time as a Percent of Total Number of Inspections	OSA
15	Number of Repeat Findings in Audits and/or Management Reviews Related to OH Conductors	OSA
16	Backlog of Repair Items Associated with OH Conductor by Transmission and Distribution	OSA



No.	Proposed Metrics from Augst 23 Comments	Dronged by
17	Number of OH Corrective Actions Completed on Time versus the Total Number OH Corrective Actions Identified in a Year	OSA
18	Distribution of time required to resolve corrective actions/deficiencies related to overhead conductor (i.e. the distribution of time to complete postinspection corrective actions)	OSA
19	Average Number of Days Between Inspections and Completion of Post-Inspection Corrective Actions	Cal Advocates



	Percentage Miles of System	PG&E/Cal
a	Hardened (in HFTD, in non-HFTD)	Advocates
	Percentage miles of circuits with	
	vegetation management work	
	completed (in compliant with GO 95	
	Rule 35 and Public Resources Code	
 h	4293) in HFTD, divided by the total	PG&E/Cal
b	miles of circuits of planned	Advocates
	vegetation management work in the	
	past calendar year. The total miles	
	of EVM work planned for the past	
	calendar year	
С	Age of Overhead Conductor (Plotted	OSA
	as histogram/bar graph)	OSA



	Proposed Metrics from Augst 23	
No.	Comments	Proposed by
d	Miles of System Removed in HFTD	PG&E
L	areas	r d&L
	Miles of System Undergrounded in	PG&E
е	HFTD area	FGQE
	Percent of #4 Aluminum Conductor	
f	Steel Reinforced (ACSR) conductor	PG&E
	miles used in corrosion zones or	FGQE
	other small conductor metric	
	Total corrective actions completed	
	·	
g	versus the total corrective actions	
	identified by inspections per GO 165.	



No.	Proposed Metrics from Augst 23 Comments	Proposed by
	Comments	Proposed by
h	Number of GO 165 inspections and patrols due during the measurement period and completed on time as a percent of the total number of inspections and patrols due in the measurement period.	PG&E
i	QA audit corrective actions completed related to overhead conductors.	PG&E
j	Percent of covered conductor out of total overhead conductor in Tier 3 HFTD	TURN



Thank You!

For Additional Information: Steven Haine, Senior Utilities Engineer 415-355-553

