



Utility Safety Culture Working Group 2026 Q1 Meeting

Safety Policy Division

Friday, January 30, 2026, 9:00am-12:00pm

WELCOME AND UPDATES



California Public
Utilities Commission

Detailed Agenda

Time	Friday, January 30: Safety Culture Working Group Q1 Meeting. Topic 2: Mechanisms supportive of Open Information Sharing
9:00 AM	Intro and Welcome - <i>SPD (5min)</i>
9:05 AM	Working Group Updates and recap of last meeting- <i>SPD (10 mins)</i>
9:15 AM	Advancing Safety Culture: The Canadian Pipeline Industry Experience - <i>Dr. Claudine Bradley, Canadian Energy Regulator (40 mins)</i>
9:55 AM	Q&A <i>(30 mins)</i>
10:15 AM	Application of Lessons to Advance Utility Safety Culture - <i>Joint IOUs (20 mins)</i>
10:35 AM	<i>Break</i>
10:45 AM	Survey Results - <i>SPD (10 mins)</i>
10:55 AM	Group Discussion on incorporating lessons learned - <i>All (35 mins)</i>
11:30 AM	FAA and the CAST Experience, Q&A - <i>Christopher Hart (30 min)</i>
12:00 PM	Next Steps - <i>SPD (5 min)</i>

Working Group Updates

- Facilitator.
- Website and reference material.
- Upcoming dates.

Objectives



California Public
Utilities Commission

D.25-01-031: Open Information Flow and Non-Punitive Engagement

- “Safety Policy Division, in collaboration with the Utility Safety Culture Working Group, discussed later in this decision, should explore mechanisms supportive of open-information flow within the IOUs, across the industry, and between the IOUs and the Commission, including, but not limited to, those applied by INPO for confidentiality and non-punitive information sharing, which the Commission may consider at a future time.”
- **Goals:** “Develop means for collaborative information-sharing and coordination among all interested entities to recognize risk.”
- **Guiding Principles:** “Non-punitive engagement and collaboration supports developing and maintaining healthy safety cultures that improve outcomes.”

2026 Q1 Session: Topic 3

G. Priorities and Preliminary Multi-Year Work Plan

Based on the items included in D.25-01-031.

Priorities Key

Near-term – within 1 year of USCWG formation	Mid-term – within 2 years of USCWG formation	Long-term – starting 3 rd year of USCWG formation
---	---	---

Key Responsibilities	Actions	Priority	Lead	Timeline
2. Annual Public Workshop	a) Plan and conduct an annual public workshop	Mid-Term	SPD/IOUs	2 nd Quarter, 2026; annually thereafter.
3. Mechanisms supportive of open-information flow within the IOUs, across the industry, and between the IOUs	a) Confidentiality and non-punitive mechanisms used by INPO, and other mechanisms.	Near-Term	IOUs	3 rd Quarter, 2025
	b) Nonpunitive reporting	Mid-Term	CalPA	1 st Quarter, 2027



Focus on Topic 3a) this session



3. b) share results of Survey for next steps

Recap from Last Session

- Core concepts presented by the Joint IOUs
 - **Non-Punitive Information Sharing,**
 - Human and Organizational Principles (**HOP**)
 - Accountability-Oriented Enabling Regulation (**AER**)
- Case Examples from:
 - Nuclear/INPO
 - Aviation/FAA
 - **Canadian Energy Regulator**
- Key Points from Joint IOUs:
 - Punitive systems can discourage transparency.
 - HOP principles -> people make mistakes, blame fixes nothing.
 - Trust and transparency are prerequisites for learning.
- Key highlights from Discussion
 - Voluntary vs Mandatory
 - Tension between transparency and judgment: learning requires prioritizing understanding over judgment.
 - Trust is foundational.
 - Safety culture is about people and human behavior not engineering.
 - Non-punitive collaboration requires evolution in mindset, modeling, and clear boundaries of confidentiality

Advancing Safety Culture: The Canadian Pipeline Industry Experience

Dr. Claudine Bradley, Canadian Energy Regulator



California Public
Utilities Commission

Application of Lessons to Advance Utility Safety Culture

Joint Utilities: SoCalGas, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E



California Public
Utilities Commission

BREAK – 10 MINS

Survey Results

Safety Policy Division



California Public
Utilities Commission

Survey

- Objective
- Format
- Participation
- Representation
- Observations

The survey responses provide early insight into some participant perceptions and are intended to guide dialogue and learning—**not to diagnose issues or prescribe solutions.**

Survey – what we observed (cont.)

- **Suitability of Core concepts: HOP, AER, and non-punitive information sharing**

- 100% respondents rated concepts as at least *somewhat suitable*; over half as *very* or *highly suitable*.
- **Observation:** General support. Apparent conceptual alignment; implementation details and trust safeguards appear as limiting factors, not philosophical disagreements. Perceived need to continually build shared understanding.

- **Framework Components: What may work best**

- Confidential reporting between utilities and regulators (91%)
- Public sharing of aggregated lessons learned (82%)
- Industry-led efforts and joint regulator–industry partnerships (73%)
- Clear de-identification of shared information (64%)
- Others (at different levels of application):
 - SMS/SMS Standards, Joint Statement (Utilities and CPUC) on safety culture, engagement (site visits/joint training), root cause evaluations, peer reviews, learning teams, amongst others.

Survey – what we observed

- **Understanding vs. Confidence in Non-Punitive Safety Reporting Systems**

- Most respondents report moderate understanding, with requests for more clarity (examples, case studies etc.), not more theory.
- **Observation:** Gap is not knowledge – but rather confidence in outcomes and intent. Moderate understanding coupled with lower perceptions of trust and readiness (from later questions in survey).
- Process of building a shared understanding of outcomes and intent will identify unrecognized gaps in understanding.

- **Current regulatory environment/systems: Judgement vs Transparency**

- 70% say the system favors judgment/accountability
- No one responded it favors learning/openness.
- **Observations:**
 - skew towards “judgment” is not opposition to accountability, but possibly a signal that learning is perceived as secondary or risky in current practice.
 - Accountability and learning are not opposite. Misleading to lump judgment with accountability.

Survey – what we observed (cont.)

Trust and psychological safety

- 100% say open discussion of near misses occurs rarely or sometimes.
- **Observations:** Low trust seems to reflect structural and systemic conditions, not unwillingness to share. Responses on experiential examples indicate that where protections and relationships exist, sharing has increased.

Non-Punitive Reporting: Concerns and Preconditions

- Top confidence builders: leadership modeling non-punitive behaviors and clear boundaries for enforcement vs learning.
- Trust repeatedly identified as the single point of failure.
- **Observations:** Respondents are not asking for secrecy; they are asking for predictability, clarity, and consistency in how information is treated,

Survey – what we heard and observed

Confidentiality protections for other collaborative activities, such as safety culture assessments, working group discussions, etc.

- No respondent considered confidentiality protections as unimportant.
- Confidentiality protections rated as somewhat important to essential
- **Observation:** support for confidentiality as an enabler of candor, but also a clear warning to avoid “blanket secrecy.” That tension will need explicit design choices (what is protected, what is public, and why).

Cultural Readiness and Trust-Building

- Trust rated **low to moderate**
- Cultural readiness clustered around *beginning awareness* and *moderately ready*
- **Observation:** Quantitative readiness scores align with qualitative descriptions of a system mid-transition—aware of the need to change, but lacking shared execution pathways.

Cross-cutting themes

Across nearly all open-ended responses:

- **Trust is foundational**, not supplemental.
- **Clarity beats abstraction**, (definitions, boundaries, use cases).
- **Leadership behavior matters more than policy language.**
- **Culture – not just tools – may be the limiting factor.**
- **Participants are willing – but cautious.**

Group Discussion

Facilitated by Safety Policy Division



California Public
Utilities Commission

Next Steps

Safety Policy Division



California Public
Utilities Commission

Next Steps

- Meeting Platform
- Q2 Meeting and facilitator onboarding
- Topic 3b) Non-punitive Reporting System
 - Task Force
 - Collaborative platform