

Member Communication Experience

Quantitative Risk Assessments To Strengthen Resilience Across Infrastructure Systems

Written by: Dina Hunt, PE, Vice President and Chief Earthquake Hazard Engineer;
Kandace Jennings, Senior Analyst, Security and Safety; Maria Pena, Group Leader, Asset Management and Resilience;
Elizabeth Landowski, PE, Principal Geotechnical Engineer; and Eric Abrams, Senior Project Manager; all of GFT

INTERCONNECTED INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEMS

From dams and transportation to utilities and cybersecurity, infrastructure systems are increasingly interconnected. Explore how quantitative risk assessments can help agencies move beyond siloed analysis to prioritize investments, strengthen resilience, and support system-wide, data-driven decision-making and enterprise risk management.

MOVING BEYOND TRADITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING

Traditional design approaches rely on a specific set of standards, but today's challenges demand a wider view of assets and their operating environments. Aging infrastructure, climate impacts, and constrained funding require agencies to implement risk-based, data-driven decision-making – a more proactive approach to managing risk. By incorporating quantitative risk assessments into planning, organizations can focus resources on the highest-risk assets and improve overall system performance.

DEFINING RISK, VULNERABILITY, AND RESILIENCE

A strong infrastructure risk assessment framework starts with clear definitions:

- » **Risk:** The likelihood and consequence of an event.
- » **Vulnerability:** How susceptible an asset is to damage.



- » **Resilience:** How effectively a system responds and recovers.

Clarifying these terms allows agencies to align methodologies across sectors and supports better communication when evaluating infrastructure performance. This clarity also strengthens risk identification, helps define a consistent risk profile, and improves how agencies assess risks across infrastructure systems.

UNDERSTANDING INTERDEPENDENCIES ACROSS SYSTEMS

Infrastructure systems do not operate independently. Transportation, water, power, and communications networks

are deeply interconnected, meaning disruptions in one sector can cascade across others. Recognizing these dependencies is essential for accurate risk assessment.

A holistic, cross-sector approach enables agencies to evaluate these dependencies and develop risk management strategies that address system-wide vulnerabilities and reduce the potential impact of cascading failures across infrastructure systems and supply chains.

THE VALUE OF QUANTITATIVE RISK ANALYSIS

Qualitative risk analysis and semi-quantitative methods provide valuable insights, but they often lack consistency across agencies and sectors. Quantitative risk assessments introduce more specific probability-based metrics and financial consequences, allowing risks to be expressed in comparable terms such as annualized cost.

This creates a consistent framework that supports enterprise risk management, cross-sector prioritization, and cost-benefit analysis. With this level of specificity, agencies can better understand overall risk, compare managed risks, and support more defensible, risk-based investment decisions.

APPLYING RISK ACROSS INFRASTRUCTURE SECTORS

Quantitative risk assessment can be applied across multiple infrastructure networks:

- » **Dams and levees:** Evaluating potential failure modes, including hazard loading, system response, and consequences such as life loss or economic damage.
- » **Transportation systems:** Assessing risks from natural hazards / human-induced threats to estimate both capital and operational impacts to asset owners, users, and communities.
- » **Utilities and cybersecurity:** Identifying vulnerabilities across interconnected assets and modeling cascading impacts from events such as cyber intrusions.

Across each sector, the same foundational equation applies: risk equals the combination of likelihood, vulnerability, and consequence. These approaches help agencies evaluate risk across assets and develop targeted strategies to mitigate it.

FROM RISK ASSESSMENT TO ACTION

Quantifying risk is only the first step in addressing risk and developing effective response plans. The true value comes from integrating results into decision-making.

These insights help clients:

- » Prioritize capital investments and maintenance programs.
- » Support grant applications and funding strategies.
- » Strengthen asset management strategies and lifecycle planning.
- » Improve emergency preparedness and response.

Integrating risk into planning processes helps organizations shift from reactive responses to proactive, data-driven decision-making.

COMMUNICATING RISK TO DRIVE BETTER DECISIONS

Effective risk communication is critical to implementation. Different stakeholders require tailored messaging:

- » Leadership focuses on cost, exposure, and investment priorities.
- » Regulators emphasize compliance and public safety.
- » Communities need clear, accessible information about impacts and reliability.

Clear, consistent communication helps build trust and supports more consistent, informed decisions across all stakeholders.

BUILDING A RESILIENT, RISK-INFORMED CULTURE

Ultimately, risk assessment is not a one-time effort. It is an ongoing process that evolves with new data, changing conditions, and shifting priorities. By adopting a common, quantitative framework and integrating it across systems, agencies can:

- » Break down data silos and improve cross-sector collaboration.
- » Align stakeholders around shared priorities.
- » Continuously refine strategies to address emerging risks.

This supports a more integrated enterprise risk management approach across infrastructure systems. It also helps transform uncertainty into actionable insights and supports the development of infrastructure systems that are more resilient, adaptable, and prepared for the future. 

About the Authors

Dina Hunt, PE, is vice president and chief earthquake hazard engineer at GFT. As past president of USSD, Dina is a nationally recognized expert in dam safety and seismic resilience. She leads seismic hazard assessments and risk evaluations for critical infrastructure across the U.S. and internationally.

Kandace Jennings is senior analyst of security and safety at GFT. She leads risk and resilience assessments for critical infrastructure, helping organizations identify vulnerabilities, meet regulations, and strengthen operational performance.

Maria Pena is group leader of asset management and resilience at GFT, with experience in risk modeling, sustainability, and infrastructure resilience. She supports transportation and water agencies with climate risk assessments and investment strategies that improve system performance and long-term planning.

Elizabeth Landowski, PE, is principal geotechnical engineer at GFT. She is a risk management practice leader specializing in dam and levee safety projects. She has nearly 20 years of experience in geotechnical engineering and risk assessment and management, supporting clients in the delivery of safe water infrastructure.

Eric Abrams is senior project manager at GFT. He has over 35 years of experience helping departments of transportation and other government clients make the most of their data and geospatial technology. He specializes in geospatial strategic planning, architecture, and data best practices.

About the Article

This article was written for the [GFT Blog page](#). Founded in 1915, [GFT](#) has been a driving force in shaping infrastructure and improving communities in more than 65 countries, specializing in natural resources, transportation, water, power, and facility-related projects. The company embraces sustainability and innovation in projects and internal activities and achieves results while being responsible stewards of the environment. A results-driven firm, GFT is consistently ranked in the top one percent of engineering firms worldwide.

Any views and opinions expressed in this article may or may not reflect the views and opinions of the Construction Management Association of America (CMAA). By publishing this piece, CMAA is not expressing endorsement of the individual, the article, or their association, organization, or company.