

SAFETY ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT IN THE WATER SUPPLY SECTOR

B. Tchórzewska-Cieślak, J. R. Rak, K. Pietrucha

Rzeszow University of Technology, Rzeszow, Poland
e-mail: charbara@prz.edu.pl, rakjan@prz.edu.pl, kpiet@prz.edu.pl

ABSTRACT

The paper presents a framework for the analysis of performance risk in water supply system (WSS) that can be applied to the entire system or to individual subsystems. It provided a background for the rules of management formulation. The aim of such management is to prepare resources and society for the case of an undesirable event occurrence which causes threat to health, property, environment and infrastructure. The risk elements, which always accompany crisis, have been presented.

1 INTRODUCTION

Safety of the WSS means the ability of the system safely execute its functions in given environment. The measure of WSS safety is risk. The notion of risk was introduced to European law by virtue of the instruction 89/392/EWG from 1989 on the adaptation of the state members regulations concerning machines.

The important problem is the exploitation of existing water supply systems (WSS) which should take into account the minimization of water losses, operational and safety reliability. Water supply providers seek to provide their customer with high-quality drinking water at all times. However this can sometimes be challenging because of changing raw water quality or problems with treatment and distribution. Opinions on WSS safety change along with the progress of science and technology.

The WSS safety management is an operator managerial activity to establish the aims (counteraction against lack of water or its bad quality, threatening health of municipal water pipe users) and to supervise their accomplishment using processes, information resources in the given operating conditions, in compliance with the valid law and with economic justification (Tchórzewska-Cieślak 2009). The transition to an explicit risk management philosophy within the water utility sector is reflected in recent revisions to the World Health Organization's (WHO) Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality (WHO 2003).

Nowadays safety of the technical and environmental systems functioning becomes a worldwide scientific tendency. In Poland, a ministerial document of National Frame Program has been issued and one of its strategic research areas is "safety". The priority directions of scientific research are, among others, crisis management, early warning systems in crisis situations and so on. In Europe, the program called GMES (Global Monitoring for the Environmental and Security) works. Also the sixth frame European Union program introduces those subjects in the priority "Information Society Technologies: 2.5.12 IST for Environmental Risk Management".

If the undesirable events have violent character and lead to some negative consequences connected with a serious failure, tragedy, catastrophe or disaster (e.g., floods, earthquakes, hurricanes, fires, terrorist attacks), then the relevant risk is the so-called "hard risk" type. The other type of risk is the so-called "soft risk", which is accompanied by slow and often combined actions of undesirable events (e.g., bad condition of municipal water purity, air pollution, noise), that, after some time, lead to irreversible changes in human health.

For purpose of this paper failure is defined as the event in which the system fails to functions with respect to its desired objectives. Safety of the WSS means the ability of the system safely execute

its functions in given environment. The measure of WSS safety is risk (Rak 2009, Tchórzewska-Cieślak 2010).

The main objective of this paper is to present the issue of risk management in the water supply sector. The paper explores the basic concepts related to water supply safety and presents a new method for risk analysis.

2 SAFETY AND RISK MANAGEMENT

Under their current philosophy drinking water infrastructure decision-makers attempt to manage the risk of systems failure through deterministic trial and error approaches that provide inefficient solutions (Pollard et al. 2008). Decision-makers and engineers are increasingly using modeling software to determine the effect of human activities on water quality. There are many surface water quality modeling and algorithms software in the public and private domain.

A special case of the WSS safety management is system management in a crisis situation. The methodology to determine the crisis management time in the WSS, connected with a shortage of drinking water was shown in table 1 (Rak & Pietrucha 2008).

Table 1. Supplying of water in a crisis situation

Needs are fulfilled	Tolerable water shortage	Non-tolerable water shortage	Disaster
100% Q	$\sim 70\% \leq Q < 100\%$	$\sim 30\% \leq Q < 70\%$	$0\% \leq Q < 30\%$
Normal operating time	Response time	Crisis management time	

where Q is water system capacity.

A crisis situation is characterized by the occurrence of undesirable events and processes, as well as their accumulation, which finally lead to a threat that the system will not be able to work autonomously or are not favourable for the system development. The undesirable phenomena (events, processes) which are a cause for the crisis are divided into internal (a source is inside the system) and external (a source is in the system surroundings).

From decision-making point of view the features of a crisis situation are a relatively short decision time, a low degree of predictability since the undesirable events often occur in an unexpected way (surprise), a high risk level, and fear resulting from the extreme acting conditions (panic, fright).

From crisis management point of view the character of a crisis situation lies in a permanent disturbance in working, a real or colourable loss of control, threat to the execution of the basic purposes, threat of a serious failure or disaster.

Taking into account the anti-crisis strategies related to a phase of crisis situation we can distinguish active actions (anticipated and preventive) and reactive actions (repulsive and liquidation). Considering the crisis extent and intensity and the possibility of overcoming it, we can distinguish:

- a potential crisis – the first symptoms of crisis situation can be seen,
- a hidden crisis – problems in system operation can be seen, it is impossible to identify their reasons,
- a hot crisis – consequences of intensified difficulties in system operation are noticed, system safety is threatened, there is still a possibility of keeping control of crisis situation,
- a burning crisis – an accumulation of threats occurs and progress of destructive phenomena is out of control, loss of system reliability and safety, system environment is not under control any more, there is no possibility of getting crisis situation under control.

A division according to the crisis consequences extent is as follows: global consequences, affect the whole system, and local consequences, affect objects or subsystems.

The aim of water consumers threat identification is to show the type of substance existing in drinking water, however the evaluation of threat level should be based on showing its harmful impact on human health and classifying the substances on the basis of all the available data. The impact of the particular substances on human health is determined by appropriate experts (doctors, chemists, biochemists, and microbiologist) on the basis laboratory and clinical studies, as well as from their experience (Hrudey 2001, Johanson 2008). Decisions on managing risk, if they are to be effective, need to be active rather than reactive and well structured. Risk management frameworks set out the relationship between the processes of risk identification, evaluation and management. They can be regarded as ‘route maps’ for decision makers (Ansell 1994).

Among the most important components of sustainable management strategies for WSS is the ability to integrate risk analysis and asset management decision-support systems, as well as the ability to incorporate in the analysis financial and socio-political parameters that are associated with the networks in study (Demotier et al. 2002, Ezell et al. 2000, Mac Gillivray et al. 2007, Quimpo & Wu 1997, Pollard et al. 2008).

Risk management in waterworks responsible for right water-pipe network operating is a formal program containing internal procedures which main purpose is to protect water consumers, environment, as well as waterworks interests (financial and personal). The water industry is undergoing a significant shift in its approach to risk management to one that is increasingly explicit and better integrated with other business processes. Risk management strategies and techniques traditionally applied to occupational health and safety and public health protection are now seeing broader application for asset management, watershed protection and network operation (Garnderr 2008, Rogers et al. 2008, Sadig et al. 2006, Shinstine 2002, Tanyimboh 1999).

It is very important for waterworks to identify risk correctly and to divide it into consumer risk and water producer risk. It allows choosing the right method for calculating different types of risks. The correct WSS risk management process should contain suitable organizational procedures within the framework of regular waterworks activity, the WSS operation technical control and supervisory system, a system of automatic transfer and data processing about WSS elements operation. The key role in this process is played by a system operator, whose main purpose is:

- to implement the reliability and safety management system,
- to operate the WSS according to valid regulations and in a way which ensures its long and reliable operation,
- to execute a program of undesirable events prevention,
- to develop failure scenarios for water supply in crisis situations,
- to develop a complex system of information about the possible threats for water consumers.

Such type of WSS risk management optimises an operation of particular WSS devices (e.g. parameters of operation of water pipe pumping stations which cooperate with network tanks), and the work of the whole system.

3 RISK ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

3.1 Failures in the WSS

A failure in the WSS is a complex problem, every time it occurs, the primary reasons behind it must be analyzed carefully. Failure can be grouped into either structural failure or performance failure. The failures of the WSS which occur most often are the following (Craun & Calderon 2001, Franks 1999, Hastak & Baim 2001, Tchórzewska-Cieślak 2010):

- incidental contamination of water intakes, eg. chemical, biological contamination,

- failures in water treatment stations, eg. disturbances in the technological process of water treatment,
- failures in transit, main and distributional pipelines, which can result in the secondary water contamination in water-pipe network, as well as breaks or lack of water supply to the receivers, or the drop of water pressure in the network,
- deterioration in water quality in water-pipe network as a result of unfavourable hydraulic conditions (low speed of water flow, pipelines technical conditions),
- failures in power supply, which can cause a lack of the possibility to operate the particular subsystems and elements of the WSS and even the whole system.

The factors which form the probability that the negative consequences occur are, among others, the following:

- the probability that the undesirable event occurs,
- frequency and a degree of exposure,
- the possibility of avoidance or minimization of the negative consequences.

Risk assessment is a process consisting of a number of the systematic steps, in which the study of different kinds of threats connected with the WSS operating is carried out. The basic purpose of this kind of activities is to collect the information necessary to estimate the safety of the system. Risk assessment should contain:

- establishment of a ranking of the undesirable events,
- determination of the level (value) of risk,
- proposal of the activities aimed at risk minimisation,
- establishment of time after which the risk can obtain its critical value as a result of different processes, eg. materials ageing.

Risk assessment includes the so called risk analysis, which is the process aimed at the determination of the consequences of failures (undesirable events) in the WSS, their extend, sources of their occurrence and the assessment of the risk levels (Aven 2010, Kaplana & Garrick 1981, Zio 2009). Haimes (1998, 2009) suggests that risk assessment concerns its reasons, as well as its likelihood and consequences. Hastak and Baim (2001) define infrastructure risk as a product of the probability (likelihood) of system failure (p) and costs associated with its repair (economic-value) (C).

Drinking water infrastructure system uncertainty or risk is defined as the likelihood or probability that the drinking water service fails to provide water on-demand to its customers (Tchórzewska-Cieślak 2010).

The purpose of this paper is to present the risk analysis method for drinking water infrastructure.

Risk (r) is a function of three parameters (Rak 2009, Tchórzewska-Cieślak 2010): the probability P_{Si} that i representative emergency scenario S_i occurs, the magnitude of losses C_{Si} caused by i representative emergency scenario S_i and the consumers protection O_{Si} against i representative emergency scenario S_i , $r = f(P_{Si}, C_{Si}, O_{Si})$. In this way risk can be calculated from the equation (1):

$$r = \frac{P_{Si} \cdot C_{Si}}{O_{Si}}$$

(1)

where P_{Si} is the probability of S_i , C_{Si} is the degree, or point weight, of consequences connected with S_i for water consumers, O_{Si} is the level, or point weight, of protection of water consumers against S_i .

For every situation, a score is assigned to the parameters P_{Si} , C_{Si} and O_{Si} , according to the following point scale:

- low (L)=1,
- medium (M)=2,
- high (H)=3.

In this way, we obtain risk matrix and a point scale to measure risk: tolerable, controlled and unacceptable, in a numerical form, within the range $[0.33 \div 9]$, according equation 1.

Failures in the WSS can be a consequence of errors made during design:

- errors in water-pipe network layout (ground conditions wrongly examined, an incorrect route for the water pipeline, the economic activity of a third party was not taken into account), wrong conception of water-pipe network geometry and structure,
- errors in network hydraulic calculations (an incorrect water-pipe diameter, incorrect pressure in network, wrong layout of water-pipe tanks), errors in a conception of the whole WSS control.

Errors made during construction:

- deviations from the design and the rules of correct construction, according to valid regulations, as concerns the technology of pipe laying, connections of the individual pipe sections; covering pipes for the passages going under and through the obstacles are not installed, improper anticorrosion protection (passive and active), badly performed pressure test and other procedures,

Errors made during operation:

- incorrect operating procedures, a lack of water pipeline operation monitoring,
- the scenarios for the emergency water supply were not taken into account,
- incoherent protecting and warning system for water quality,
- lack of programme to classify the network segment requiring the repair, lack of programme to obtain, process and storing the data on failures, their causes and consequences and records of data about failures.

3.2 The risk of design

The two-parameter matrix for risk assessment was proposed. The risk of design (r_d) can be calculated from the modified equation (1), we obtain equation (2) (Tchórzewska-Cieślak et al. 2011):

$$r_d = P_d \cdot C_d \quad (2)$$

where P_d – point weight related to the probability of design error, C_d – point weight related to the size of possible losses.

Point weights associated with P_d are the following:

- L = 1 – a renowned design office with a quality certificate, having completed projects in the list of reference, a design is made by means of tested computer programs,
- M = 2 – a design office having the required license to design and the list of references,
- H = 3 – a person with experience in designing segments of water pipe network.

Point weights associated with C_d are the following:

- L = 1 – financial loss up to 10^4 EUR,
- M = 2 – financial loss from 10^4 EUR to 10^5 EUR,
- H = 3 – financial loss above 10^5 EUR.

In table 2 the two-parameter risk matrix was presented.

Table 2. The two-parameter risk matrix at the stage of water-pipe network design.

C_d	P_d		
	L = 1	M = 2	H = 3
L = 1	1	2	3
M = 2	2	4	6
H = 3	3	6	9

The individual risk categories are the following:

- tolerable [1 ÷ 2],
- controlled [3 ÷ 4],
- unacceptable [6 ÷ 9].

3.3 The risk of construction

The three-parameter matrix for risk assessment was proposed. The risk of construction (r_c) can be calculated from the modified equation (1), we obtain equation (3) (Tchórzewska-Cieślak et al. 2011):

$$r_c = \frac{P_c \cdot C_c}{O_c} \quad (3)$$

where P_c – a point weight related to the probability of error made at construction, O_c – a point weight related to the probability of the detection of error, C_c – a point weight related to the size of possible losses.

Point weights associated with P_c are the following:

- L = 1 – a building company is certified ISO 9000 and has completed investments in the list of reference, procedures associated with the receipt of investment are obeyed, laying pipes according to the best available technology,
- M = 2 – a building company has completed investments in the list of reference, verification of the specification of materials and procedures for the receipt are performed,
- H = 3 – a building company enters the market of water-pipe network construction, lack of experience in this field.

Point weights associated with O_c are the following:

- H = 3 – procedures for pressure tests are scrupulously obeyed with the use of modern equipment, there are no derogations in relation to implementing the project, execution is supervised by an investor,
- M = 2 – procedures for the receipt of investment are implemented,
- L = 1 – questionable quality of the trials connected with the receipt of investment, frequent derogations from the design assumptions.

Point weights associated with C_c are the following:

- L = 1 – a financial loss up to 104 EUR,
- M = 2 – a financial loss from 104 EUR to 105 EUR,
- H = 3 – a financial loss above 105 EUR.

In table 3 the three-parameter risk matrix was presented, according to equation 3. The weights of individual parameters presented above were established on the basis of works (Rak 2009, Rak & Tchórzewska 2006).

Table 3. The three-parameter risk matrix at the stage of construction

C_c	P_c								
	L =1			M=2			H=3		
	O_c								
	H 3	M 2	L 1	H 3	M 2	L 1	H 3	M 2	L 1
L = 1	0.33	0.5	1	0.67	1	2	1	1.5	3
M = 2	0.67	1	2	1.33	2	4	2	3	6
H = 3	1	1.5	3	2	3	6	3	4.5	9

The individual risk categories are the following:

- tolerable [0.33 ÷ 2],
- controlled [3 ÷ 4],
- unacceptable [4.5 ÷ 9].

3.4 The risk of operation

The four-parameter matrix for risk assessment was proposed. The risk of operation (r_o) can be calculated from the modified equation (1), we obtain equation (4):

$$r_o = \frac{S_o \cdot I_o \cdot U_o}{O_o} \quad (4)$$

where S_o – a point weight associated with a type of water-pipe network, I_o – a point weight associated with the failure rate λ [failure/km year], U_o – a point weight associated with the difficulty to repair damages, O_o – a point weight related to protection of water-pipe network operation.

Point weights associated with S_o are the following:

- L = 1 – household connections,
- M = 2 – distributional network,
- H = 3 – main network.

Point weights associated with I_o are the following:

- L = 1 – the failure rate $\lambda < 0.5$ failure./km year,
- M = 2 – $0.5 \text{ failure/ km year} \leq \lambda \leq 1.0 \text{ failure/ km year}$,
- H = 3 - $\lambda > 1.0 \text{ failure/ km year}$

Point weights associated with U_o are the following:

- L = 1 – failure in the pipeline in not urbanized area, repair brigades are organized and equipped appropriately and they are in full readiness for 24 hours,
- M = 2 – failure in the pipeline in the pedestrian lane, basic equipment to repair a failure, one shift work.
- H = 3 – failure in the pipeline in the vehicles lane (streets), lack of mechanized equipment to repair a failure.

Point weights associated with O_o are the following:

- H = 3 – special, above standard, full monitoring of water pipe network by measuring the water pressure and flow rate of water, possession of a specialized apparatus to detect water leaks by acoustic methods, unrestricted communication with the public through the phone line active 24 hours, monitoring of water quality in water network by means of protection and warning system. The network is fully inventoried, an exploiter has numerical maps of water-pipe network,
- M = 2 – standard, simplified monitoring of water- pipe network with the use of pressure measurement, inability to respond to small water leaks, water quality tests in water- pipe network are conducted,
- L = 3 – none, lack of monitoring of water-pipe network and water quality. There are no current inventory of water-pipe network.

In table 4 the four-parameter risk matrix was presented. The individual risk categories are the following:

- tolerable [$0.33 \div 3$],
- controlled [$4 \div 8$],
- unacceptable [$9 \div 27$].

Table 4. The four-parameter risk in matrix at the stage of water-pipe network operation

U _o	Type of water-pipe network – S _o = 1									
	Household connections – L _o = 1									
	Failure rate – I _o									
	L = 1			M = 2			H = 3			
	Protection – O _o									
	H = 3	M = 2	L = 1	H = 3	M = 2	L = 1	H = 3	M = 2	L = 1	
L=1	LLLH 0.33	LLLM 0.5	LLLL 1	LMLH 0.66	LMLM 1	LMLL 2	LHLH 1	LHLM 1.5	LHLL 3	
M=2	LLMH 0.66	LLMM 1	LLML 2	LMMH 1.33	LMMM 2	LMML 4	LHMH 2	LHMM 3	LHML 6	
H=3	LLHH 1.5	LLHM 1.5	LLHM 3	LMHH 2	LMHM 3	LMHL 6	LHHH 3	LHHM 4.5	LHHL 9	
U _o	Type of water-pipe network – S _o = 2									
	Distribution – M _o = 2									
	Failure rate – I _o									
	L = 1			M = 2			H = 3			
	Protection – O _o									
	H = 3	M = 2	L = 1	H = 3	M = 2	L = 1	H = 3	M = 2	L = 1	
L=1	MLLH 0.66	MLLM 1	MLLL 2	MMLH 1.33	MMLM 2	MMLL 4	MHLH 2	MHLM 3	MHLL 6	
M=2	MLMH 1.33	MLMM 2	MLML 4	MMMh 2.66	MMMM 4	MMML 8	MHMH 4	MHMM 6	MHML 12	
H=3	MLHH 2	MLHM 3	MLHL 6	MMHH 4	MMHM 6	MMHL 12	MHHH 6	MHHM 9	MHHL 18	
U _o	Type of water-pipe network – S _o = 3									
	Main – H _o = 3									
	Failure rate – I _o									
	L = 1			M = 2			H = 3			
	Protection – O _o									
	H = 3	M = 2	L = 1	H = 3	M = 2	L = 1	H = 3	M = 2	L = 1	
L=1	HLLH 1	HLLM 1.5	HLLL 3	HMLH 2	HMLM 3	HMLL 6	HHLH 3	HHLM 4.5	HHLL 9	
M=2	HLMH 2	HLMM 3	HLML 6	HMMH 4	HMMM 6	HMML 12	HMHM 6	HMMH 9	HMLM 18	
H=3	HLHH 3	HLHM 4.5	HLHL 9	HMHM 6	HMMH 9	HMLH 18	HHHH 9	HHHM 13.5	HHHL 27	

The integrated risk is a sum of the risks at the stages of design r_d , construction r_c and operation r_o . To get the individual risks compatible with each other we should multiply them by the weights W_i , whose values are shown in table 5.

The integrated risk is determined from the modified equation (5).

$$r = W_i \cdot r_d + W_j \cdot r_c + W_k \cdot r_o \tag{5}$$

It is included in the range [1.0 ÷ 81].

The individual categories of integrated risk are the following:

- tolerable [1.0 ÷ 9.0],

- controlled [12.0 ÷ 24],
- unacceptable [27 ÷ 81].

Table 5. Values of weights

Risk	r_d			r_c			r_o		
	W_i			W_j			W_k		
	low	high	medium	low	high	medium	low	high	medium
tolerable	0.33	1.5	0.9	1.0	1.5	1.25	1.0	1.0	1.0
controlled	1.33	2.0	1.67	1.33	2.0	1.67	1.0	1.0	1.0
unacceptable	1.5	3.0	2.25	2.0	3.0	2.5	1.0	1.0	1.0

4 DISCUSSIONS

The presented work is a result of the five-year cooperation with water authorities as part of research grants. At present authors are processing a development research project, a result of which will be a program of the risk management in the waterworks company. Suggested methods, will constitute the basis for so-called Water Safety Plans of (recommended by WHO) which will be compulsory in waterworks practice. The risk analysis in Water Safety Plans is the basis of ensuring water consumers safety.

Data received from water authorities are derived from exploiters of the water supply system. Criteria of the risk assessing suggested in the work were based on the mentioned above information. Water Safety Plans, and methods of the risk management in water supply system are included in works: (Craun & Calderon 2001, Demotier et al. 2002, Ezell et al. 2000, Hipel et al. 2003, Johanson 2008, Mac Gillivray 2007, Rak 2009, Tanyimboh 1999, WHO 2002, 2003).

An important challenge is to define the tolerable risk level, the so-called ALARP (As Low As is Reasonably Practicable), which means that risk level should be as low as it is reasonably practicable. The ALARP principle was first introduced in Great Britain, where the unacceptable (impermissible) value of risk of death for the individual worker was determined to be $r=0.001$ and the risk of death for the public was determined to be $r=0.0001$. Risk reducing process should take into account a cost benefit analysis. Such risk level should be determined at which costs of its further lowering are disproportional high. Health and Safety Executive, directives introduce a notion “the cost for preventing a fatality” which is estimated, according to the mentioned above directives, at about 1mln GBP (HSE book 2001).

Danger and hazard are the factors that determine the magnitude of the risk. Danger is considered a cause of loss. It is characterized by some kind of arranged time sequence of successive phases. In the first phase threat appears, which creates danger (e.g. an incidental water pollution in a source). In the second phase danger becomes real (e.g. polluted water appears in the distribution subsystem). In the third phase the effects of real danger are revealed (e.g. water consumers’ gastric problems). Hazard is identified as a set of conditions and factors that have a direct impact on the second phase of danger. The scales of parameters that describe risk on the different levels of its occurrence should be simple, which allows risk assessment and classification for every discussed case. The method has an expert character and is used to pre-estimate the risk associated with the WSS operation. In relation to specialist expertise made by experts, describing the identified water-pipe failures, which are superior, this method should be regarded as preliminary material. The detailed analysis of the risk associated with different stages of the WSS operation is important. Determination of the size of the risk associated with the design, construction and operation and its sum allows the appropriate reaction at each stage, and consequently contributes to reducing the risk of the WSS operation. A lot of experience gained from the analysis of risk associated with the WSS operation can be already generalized at the level of research and passed in the form of publication. The knowledge about risk does not have to be achieved by means of individual trial and error method. Risk management requires its identification, is directly associated with the control of quality and reliability of technical systems. The latter includes all actions which result is a product (article, object, subsystem, system) of

the required quality and reliability. We still deal with the mistaken stereotype that the technical control in execution phase will ensure the required quality and reliability. Modern and perspective becomes a trend that the quality control and reliability control from the design phase, through construction, to operation of technical systems lead to a reduction of risk associated with their operation (Hipel et al. 2003).

In table 6 the quantitative and qualitative categories of the consequences connected with the three level risk gradation are presented.

Table 6. The quantitative and qualitative limits of risk connected with poor drinking water quality in public supply systems, related to 1 year

Consequence category	Description of consequences	Tolerable risk	Controlled risk	Unacceptable risk
Insignificant	Incidental difficulties that are not a threat to health, lack of consumers complaints	$<10^{-3}$	$10^{-1} \div 10^{-3}$	$>10^{-1}$
Marginal	Perceptible organoleptic changes, individual consumer complaints	$<10^{-4}$	$10^{-2} \div 10^{-4}$	$>10^{-2}$
Significant	organoleptic changes are significant, numerous consumers complaints, reports in local media, water can be used after 10 minutes boiling	$<10^{-5}$	$10^{-3} \div 10^{-5}$	$>10^{-3}$
Serious	mass gastric problems, relevant sanitary inspector turns off water pipe, toxic effects in pollution indicators, large number of reports in local media, general information in national media	$<10^{-6}$	$10^{-4} \div 10^{-6}$	$>10^{-4}$
Catastrophic	mass hospitalisation as a result of health complications, deaths, front news in national media	$<10^{-7}$	$10^{-5} \div 10^{-7}$	$>10^{-5}$

In crisis situation drinking water supplied to water pipes should be taken, if possible, from the underground water intakes. The other intakes become the reserve intakes. Water pipe should have the possibility to cut off water intakes with the operational possibility and to use the whole system or its fragments, e.g. water pipe network, water intake, transit water pipes, activate alternative water treatment technology (e.g. periodical dosage of active carbon in a powdery form), increase dosage of disinfecting agent, supply water bypassing Water Treatment Plant. If water pipe is inactivated and in the areas without water pipe network, water is supplied from emergency wells. When a number of the emergency wells is too low or their layout is unfavorable one should predict water delivery by tanks or water-carts. Water pipes and emergency wells should be prepared to get energy from generators, they should be equipped with generators which can start pumps and water supply during the limited deliveries. Fuel reserve should be enough for 400 hrs, however for not less than 200 hrs of generating sets operating. Water requirement in crisis situation should be established for all the municipal water pipes and for villages without water pipe network. It should be assured from water pipes and emergency wells, and also from industrial intakes, if necessary.

One can distinguish two kinds of water requirements in crisis situation (Rak 2009):

- necessary water quantity (for a few weeks time): population - $15 \text{ dm}^3/\text{person, day}$,
- minimum water quantity (for a few days time): population - $7.5 \text{ dm}^3/\text{person, day}$.

5 CONCLUSIONS

- To ensure WSS safety operating it is required to use the newest theoretical solutions, the basic category of which, nowadays, becomes the term risk. It comprises the evaluation of the relation between the occurring threats and the safety and protective barriers.
- It can be seen that there is a trend in legislation to ensure system safety through the implementation of the standard risk analysis and evaluation for the technological systems operation.
- The directions for further studies are determined by Frame Program which includes project V - safety. The following directions for operations, among others, are named: crisis management, information systems safety. This program is an extension of the Sixth Frame Program (FP6), the main aim of which is to manage risk situations through early warning and threats monitoring.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Scientific work was financed from the measures of National Center of Research and Development as a development research project No N R14 0006 10: “Development of comprehensive methodology for the assessment of the reliability and safety of water supply to consumers” in the years 2010-2013.

REFERENCES

- Ansell, J. 1994. Assessing and Understanding Risk. *Proc VEEC Sym*: 51-66.
- Aven, T. 2010. Conceptual framework for risk assessment and risk management. *Summer Safety & Reliability Seminars (Journal of Polish Safety and Reliability Association)*, 1: 15–27.
- Craun, G, Calderon, R. 2001. Waterborne disease outbreaks caused by distribution system deficiencies. *JAWWA*, 9: 64–75.
- Demotier, S., Odeh, K., Schon, W., Charles, P., Fotoohi, F., Allieux, J.F. 2002. Risk Assessment for Drinking Water Production Process; software, available at www.hds.utc.fr/_tdenoeux/sime/publis/esrel2002.pdf
- Ezell, B., Farr, J., Wiese, I. 2000. Infrastructure risk analysis of municipal water distribution system. *J of Inf Sys, ASCE*. 6(3): 118–122.
- Franks, S. 1999. Desegregations of environment factors affecting sewer pipe failures. *J of Inf Sys, ASCE*. 3 (1): 150–158.
- Gardnerr, G. 2008. Implementing risk management for a water supplies, A catalyst and incentive for change. *The Rangeland Journal*. 30: 149–156.
- Haimes, Y.Y, Li, Y. 1998. *Risk Modeling, Assessment and Management*. Wiley: New York.
- Haimes, Y.Y. 2009. On the Complex definition of risk: a systems–based approach. *Risk Analysis*. 29(12): 1647–1654.
- HSE-book. 2001. Reducing Risk–decision making process Health and SafetyExecutive, software available at www.hse.gov.uk
- Hastak, M., Baim, E. 2001. Risk factors affecting management and maintenance cost of urban infrastructure. *J of Inf Sys, ASCE* 2: 67–75.
- Hipel, K. W., Kilgour, D. M., Zhao N. Z. 2003. Risk analysis of the walker ton drinking water crisis. *Canadian Water Resour J*. 3: 395–397.
- Hrudey, S.E. 2001. Drinking water quality–a risk management approach, *Water*. 26(1): 29–32.
- Johanson, B. 2008. Public Views on Drinking Water Standards as risk Indicators. *Risk Analysis*. 28(6): 1515–1530.
- Kaplan, B., Garrick, J. 1981. On the quantitative definition of risk. *Risk Analysis*. Vol 1, No 1: 11–27.

- MacGillivray, B.H., Sharp, J.V., Strutt, J.E., Hamilton, P.D., Pollard, S.J.T. 2007. Benchmarking risk management within the international water utility sector. Part I: design of a capability maturity methodology. *J of Risk Research* 10: 85–104.
- Quimpo, R., Wu, S. 1997. Condition assessment of water supply infrastructure. *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, ASCE. 3 (1): 15–20.
- Pollard, S. J. T., Strutt, J. E., Macgillivray, B. H., Hamilton, P. H., Hrudehy, S. E. 2008. Risk analysis and management in the water utility sector-a review of drivers, tools and techniques. *Process Safety and Environ Prot.* 82: 1–10.
- Rak, J. 2009. Selected problems of water supply safety. *Environmental Protection Engineering* 35: 29–35.
- Rak, J., Pietrucha, K. 2008. Some factors of crisis management in water supply system. *Environmental Protection Engineering* 34: 57–65.
- Rak J., Tchórzewska-Cieślak B. 2006. Five-parametric matrix to estimate the risk connected with water supply system operation. *Environment Protection Engineering* 2: 37-46.
- Rogers, J. W., Garrick, E., Louis, G. E. 2008. Risk and opportunity in upgrading the US drinking water infrastructure system, *J of Environ Man*, 87: 26–36.
- Sadig, R., Najjaran, H., Kleiner, Y. 2006. Investigating evidential reasoning for the interpretation of microbial water quality in a distribution network. *Stochas Environ Research and Risk Asses* 21: 63–73.
- Shinstine, D. S., Ahmed, I., Lansey, K. (2002). Reliability/availability analysis of municipal water distribution networks: Case Studies. *J of Water Resour Pla and Man*, ASCE, 128, 140–151.
- Tanyimboh, T. T., Burd, R., Burrows, R., Tabesh, M. 1999. Modelling and reliability analysis of water distribution systems. *Water Science Tech.* 39: 249–255.
- Tchórzewska-Cieślak, B. 2010. Failure risk analysis in the water distribution system. *Summer Safety & Reliability Seminars (Journal of Polish Safety and Reliability Association)*. 1: 247–255.
- Tchórzewska-Cieślak, B. 2009. Water supply system reliability management. *Environmental Protection Engineering.* 35: 29–35.
- Tchórzewska-Cieślak B., Rak R. J., Pietrucha K. 2011. Failure Risk Analysis in the Water Supply Sector Management. *Summer Safety & Reliability Seminars (Journal of Polish Safety and Reliability Association)*. 1: 185–195.
- WHO (2002). Water Safety Plans (Revised Draft), Report publication WHO/SDE/WSH/02.09 (World Health Organization: Geneva.
- WHO (2003). Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality, 3rd edn (draft) World Health Organization: Geneva.
- Zio, E. 2009. *Computational Methods for Reliability and Risk Analysis*. World Scientific Publishing Co.: London.