

STRUCTURAL INTELLIGENCE BRIEF

Utilities

NAICS 22 | Energy Sector & Water and Wastewater Systems Sector



S.J. Bridger

Four Frequencies Framework

April 2026

sjbridger.com/intelligence/utilities/

Executive Summary

The sector Americans depend on for electricity, natural gas, and clean water operates with infrastructure designed for the 1960s-1990s and regulators appointed by 51 different state legislatures operating under 51 different statutory frameworks. The result is structural decoupling: physical assets degrade at the speed of materials science while regulatory permission moves at the speed of administrative process. The infrastructure is measurably old, the workforce is measurably retiring, and the authority structures needed to fund replacement are measurably fragmented.

This brief applies the Four Frequencies diagnostic framework to U.S. utilities using 16 federal data metrics from DOE, EPA, EIA, NERC, and state utility commissions. It identifies structural conditions that utility operators and regulated entities inherit, whether or not they recognize them. The severity scores are not predictions. They are measurements of conditions that already exist.

Two of the four frequencies score VULNERABLE. The remaining two score STRAINED. No frequency in U.S. utilities scores STABLE.



Sector Structural Profile

Utilities spans two critical infrastructure sectors designated by CISA and regulated by federal agencies: the Energy Sector (overseen by DOE) and the Water and Wastewater Systems Sector (overseen by EPA). The sector encompasses electricity generation, transmission and distribution; natural gas transmission and distribution; and drinking water and wastewater treatment and delivery. It accounts for approximately 2.2% of U.S. GDP and reaches every American household and business.

Workforce and Market Scale

The utilities sector employs approximately 592,000 workers across roughly 19,900 establishments. Total sector revenue exceeds \$1.1 trillion annually. Electric generation, transmission, and distribution alone account for 1.25-1.3 TW of installed capacity across 180,000-200,000 miles of transmission lines and 4-5.5 million miles of distribution lines. Water systems serve approximately 300 million people through roughly 50,000 community water systems spanning 2.3 million miles of water mains and 1.87 million miles of wastewater collection pipes.

Infrastructure Age and Replacement Dynamics

Seventy percent of transmission lines exceed 25 years of age, well beyond their original design expectations. Fifty-five percent of power transformers have exceeded their original 30-40 year design life. Replacement lead time for large transformers averages 210 weeks—nearly four years. This creates a structural trap: degradation accelerates while replacement capacity remains fixed. In water systems, 33% of distribution pipes exceed 50 years old. Twenty percent of all pipe is past its useful life and unfunded for replacement. Water main breaks occur at a rate of 260,000 annually (approximately 13.3 breaks per 100 miles), a number that grows as pipe age increases.

Regulatory Fragmentation and Authority Distribution

Electricity is regulated by a patchwork of authorities: 51 state public utility commissions plus 6 federal agencies (FERC, DOE, NERC, and others). Water regulation centers on EPA with state enforcement but no unified federal data standard for infrastructure condition. Rate cases take 9-24 months to resolve. Transmission siting and interconnection permitting stretches 4-11 years. This regulatory velocity mismatch—decisions taking years while infrastructure degrades daily—is the structural core of the Utilities problem.

Four Frequency Assessment

The Four Frequencies framework measures structural resilience across four dimensions of organizational and sector health. Each frequency captures a distinct pattern of structural vulnerability. Severity scores reflect the current state of measurable conditions, not projections or sentiment.

THINNESS

Thinness measures the structural depth of critical capacity. In utilities, it surfaces as infrastructure age, limited replacement capacity, and the physical fragility of systems operating beyond their design life.

The evidence for VULNERABLE is structural and measurable. Transmission lines at 70% past 25 years. Transformers at 55% past design life with 210-week replacement lead times. SAIDI (System Average Interruption Duration Index) doubled to 11 hours per customer-year in 2024. The MISO (Midwest ISO) energy market posted a negative reserve margin. The interconnection queue holds 2,600 GW of requested generation with only a 13% completion rate. Water systems face a \$625 billion infrastructure need over 20 years against annual spending of roughly \$56 billion. The sector has optimized for minimum capital expenditure at the expense of structural depth.

Thinness compounds across multiple dimensions. Aging transmission accelerates outage rates. Limited transformer capacity extends restoration time. Fragmented water systems prevent economies of scale in maintenance. The replacement pipeline cannot keep pace with degradation. This is not a temporary bottleneck. It is the new structural baseline.

VULNERABLE

Thinness in utilities is not a maintenance problem to be solved with better budgeting. It is a structural condition where the sector's physical infrastructure is degrading faster than replacement capacity can restore it.

PERMISSION

STRAINED

Permission measures how structural conditions distribute or concentrate decision authority and professional autonomy. In utilities, it surfaces as regulatory approval cycles, rate design constraints, and the gap between infrastructure need and capital authorization.

Rate cases average 9-24 months. Transmission permitting ranges 4-11 years. The interconnection queue has a median wait of 4+ years, with 80% of applicants withdrawing. Energy burden (the percentage of household income spent on energy) averages 8.3% nationally, with 1 in 4 low-income households exceeding 15%. Between 2025-2027, rate increases totaling \$93 billion have been filed or approved, driven by infrastructure replacement urgency but constrained by regulatory approval speed. The structural tension: infrastructure degradation demands immediate capital allocation, but utility commissions operate on approval timelines measured in years.

Permission is STRAINED because the regulatory velocity mismatch is widening, not narrowing. Utilities cannot invest capital without rate approval. Rate approval takes years. Infrastructure degradation accelerates daily. The decision authority structure is not broken; it is structurally mismatched to the problem it is trying to solve.

MANAGEMENT

STRAINED

Management frequency measures how structural conditions shape leadership effectiveness, operational coordination, and the capacity to execute strategy under pressure. In utilities, it surfaces as operational legacy systems, data fragmentation, M&A; consolidation, and leadership distraction by regulatory process.

SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) systems managing grid operations rely on 70-80% legacy code. Smart meter penetration is 77% nationally but only 23% in New England, creating inconsistent operational visibility. Data center demand forecasts range 200-1,050 TWh by 2030—a five-fold uncertainty range—while utilities must plan generation and transmission capacity today. PG&E; alone carries \$30 billion in wildfire liability. Annual utility CAPEX of approximately \$168 billion is increasingly maintenance-driven rather than expansion-driven. Utility M&A; activity reached \$137 billion in 2024, an 80% year-over-year increase, absorbing leadership attention and operational bandwidth.

The structural pressure: utilities must simultaneously manage aging infrastructure, regulate expanding grid complexity, navigate regulatory fragmentation across 51 states, and execute consolidation strategies. Cash flow to debt ratios are declining 14.6%. Management is STRAINED because the strategic load exceeds the operational capacity to execute it.

ABSENCE

VULNERABLE

Absence measures what happens when structural conditions create gaps in critical functions, and what fills those gaps. In utilities, it surfaces as workforce retirement, unfilled positions, and the operational consequences of expertise leaving faster than replacement can provide.

Forty to fifty percent of the utilities workforce is retirement-eligible within the next decade. Only 8% of the workforce is under 24 years old. Lineworker positions have 10,700 annual openings. Nuclear engineering degrees are at a 10-year low while DOE projects quadrupling nuclear generation. The current workforce includes 3,900 licensed operators for 94 reactors; forty percent of that operator population retires within a decade. Licensed operators require 5-7 years of training and certification. Water systems face similar dynamics: 30-50% of workforce is retirement-eligible, requiring roughly 10,000 replacements annually. Small water systems serving communities under 3,000 people lack the financial resources to compete for replacement workforce.

Absence compounds thinness. As experienced technicians retire, remaining staff absorb workload increases, accelerating injury rates and driving further departures. Institutional knowledge embedded in experienced operators—how systems actually run under stress, where failures first appear—leaves faster than it can be documented and transferred. The sector is attempting to expand capacity (nuclear, renewables integration) while simultaneously losing the workforce required to operate existing capacity reliably.

Absence in utilities is not a recruitment problem. It is a structural condition where workforce retirement accelerates at the moment the sector requires expanding expertise.

Federal Data Evidence Base

This assessment draws on 16 metrics from federal agencies responsible for utilities oversight. Each metric maps to one or more Four Frequencies dimensions. The data is publicly available; the structural interpretation through the Four Frequencies lens is proprietary.

Source	Metric	Key Finding
DOE/ASCE	Transmission line age (25+ years)	70% of lines exceed design expectations
NREL	Transformer design life exceedance	55% past 30-40 year design life
NERC/NREL	Transformer replacement lead time	210 weeks (4+ years) average
EIA	System Average Interruption Duration	11 hours/customer (doubled from 2019)
EPA	Drinking water infrastructure need	\$625 billion over 20 years
ASCE/Utah State	Water main break rate	260,000 annually (13.3 per 100 miles)
FERC/NARUC	State regulatory bodies	51 PUCs + 6 federal agencies

Source	Metric	Key Finding
CATF/Grid Strategies	Transmission permitting timeline	4-11 years typical duration
LBNL	Interconnection queue size	2,600 GW requested (13% completion rate)
ACEEE	Energy burden (households)	8.3% average (1 in 4 low-income >15%)
DOE	SCADA legacy system prevalence	70-80% legacy code in grid operations
EIA/DOE	Data center demand range by 2030	200-1,050 TWh (5x uncertainty range)
EIA	Annual utility CAPEX	~\$168 billion (increasingly maintenance-driven)
DOE/CEWD	Workforce retirement eligibility	40-50% within 5-10 years
ORISE	Nuclear engineering degrees trend	Lowest in 10+ years (expansion phase)
PwC	Utility M&A volume 2024	\$137 billion (+80% year-over-year)

Sources: Department of Energy (DOE), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Energy Information Administration (EIA), North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC), Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC), Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL), National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), Coalition for Advanced Transportation Technology Foundation (CATF), Grid Strategies LLC, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE), Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education (ORISE), PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC).

Structural Risk Scenarios

Structural conditions do not predict specific events. They define the envelope of probable outcomes. The following scenarios are structurally plausible given current conditions. They are not forecasts. They are the shapes that failure takes in a sector with this structural profile.

Cascade Scenario: Grid Failure During Extreme Weather

A Category 4+ hurricane strikes aging transmission infrastructure in a region where transformer replacement backlog exceeds four years. Seventy percent of lines past 25 years fail at rates far above design assumptions. Mutual aid deploys lineworkers from neighboring regions, but workforce shortage (40-50% retirement-eligible, 8% under 24) means restoration takes weeks rather than days. The 2024 hurricane season preview: SAIDI doubled to 11 hours average. The cascade: extreme weather → infrastructure failure exceeding replacement capacity → extended outage → economic damage → customer rate shock → regulatory response that arrives after the damage. The structural vulnerability is not the storm. It is the restoration capacity mismatch.

Workforce Retirement Cliff Meets Expansion Mandate

DOE projects quadrupling nuclear capacity over 25 years, requiring tripling the workforce. Simultaneously, 40% of current nuclear workers retire within a decade. Nuclear engineering degrees are at a 10-year low. Licensed operators require 5-7 years of training. The expertise to operate, maintain, and decommission existing reactors is departing at the moment the sector plans its largest expansion since the 1970s. The

absence cascade: mass retirement → licensing knowledge gap → operational safety risk → NRC enforcement action → capacity reduction at the moment expansion demands capacity increase.

Water Infrastructure Systemic Failure

Cast iron water mains (28.6 breaks per 100 miles) reach a failure rate that exceeds municipal repair capacity. With 20% of all pipe past useful life and a \$69 billion annual funding gap in wastewater alone, the question is not whether water systems will fail but which community faces the failure first. Lead service line replacement at current pace will take decades. Small systems serving communities under 3,000 cannot fund replacement. The thinness cascade: accelerating pipe failure → repair backlog → boil water advisories → community health impact → emergency federal intervention that addresses symptoms while the structural condition continues.

Each scenario describes a pattern, not an event. The structural conditions that enable these patterns are measurable today. Whether a specific organization experiences them depends on its internal structural profile, which is what the diagnostic measures.

The Diagnostic Gap

This brief assesses structural conditions visible from federal data and public sources. The Four Frequencies framework measures 20 dimensions. Twelve are assessable from public data. Eight require diagnostic access to an organization's internal structural patterns through behavioral intelligence from raters inside the organization.

What Public Data Reveals (12 Dimensions)

The 12 public dimensions capture sector-level structural conditions: infrastructure age and replacement velocity, workforce supply and demand, regulatory fragmentation, operational technology legacy, financial pressure, and consolidated risk exposure. These are the dimensions scored in this brief. They describe the structural environment that every organization in this sector inhabits.

What Requires Diagnostic Access (8 Dimensions)

Institutional Knowledge Mapping

Where critical infrastructure knowledge actually lives. Federal data shows 40-50% workforce retirement-eligible. It cannot tell you which specific technical expertise is departing fastest inside your utility.

Decision Authority Distribution

Who can make which decisions, and how far authority sits from operational reality. Regulatory fragmentation shows the external pressure. It cannot map the decision architecture inside a specific utility.

Succession Readiness

Whether identified successors can actually absorb the structural load of roles they would inherit. Workforce retirement data shows the frequency. It cannot assess whether the next technician inherits adequate documentation and mentoring.

Cultural Load Distribution

Which informal norms and relationships are currently carrying operational weight that formal systems have failed to carry. No federal dataset measures the undocumented knowledge in legacy SCADA operators.

Communication Pathway Integrity

Whether information moves through the organization at the speed required for the decisions being made. Smart meter penetration variance (77% national, 23% New England) signals regional operational visibility gaps. Only internal assessment reveals the actual communication infrastructure.

Adaptive Capacity Under Stress

How the organization's structural profile changes under pressure. Grid scenarios in the preceding section describe sector-level patterns. How a specific utility responds depends on dimensions only visible through diagnostic engagement.

Role Architecture Coherence

Whether the utility's role structure matches its actual operational requirements, or whether critical functions survive on workarounds and undocumented procedures.

Strategic Alignment Depth

Whether stated strategy and actual structural capacity point in the same direction. A utility planning generation expansion while its transmission replacement backlog grows has a strategic alignment problem that only internal data can quantify.

The gap between what is publicly visible and what is structurally real is where organizational risk lives. The brief tells you the weather. The diagnostic tells you whether your infrastructure can hold.

Methodology

The Four Frequencies framework measures structural resilience across four dimensions: Thinness (depth of critical capacity), Permission (distribution of decision authority), Management (leadership and operational effectiveness), and Absence (gaps in critical functions and their consequences). Each frequency is assessed across five dimensions, for a total of twenty structural measurements.

Sector-level assessments draw on federal data mapped to the twelve publicly-measurable dimensions. Organization-level diagnostics add behavioral intelligence from internal raters to score all twenty dimensions. The combination produces the Structural Resilience Index (SRI), a composite score calibrated to a six-band severity scale.

Severity terminology: RESILIENT (structural depth across all frequencies), STABLE (adequate structural capacity with minor gaps), STRAINED (measurable structural pressure in one or more frequencies), VULNERABLE (significant structural gaps with compounding risk), FRAGILE (structural conditions that

amplify disruption), CRITICAL (structural failure in progress or imminent).

What This Means for Your Organization

This brief describes the structural environment your organization operates inside. Whether these sector-level conditions are amplified or mitigated within your specific organization depends on your internal structural profile.

The Four Frequencies diagnostic measures all 20 dimensions for a single organization, producing a 40-page structural analysis with the Structural Resilience Index.

sjbridger.com/organizations

contact@sjbridger.com

About S.J. Bridger

S.J. Bridger is a structural resilience diagnostics practice. We analyze the structural conditions that determine whether organizations hold together when key people leave, when systems fail, and when the relationships that carried institutional knowledge disappear. The Four Frequencies framework was developed through forensic analysis of organizational failures across multiple sectors and refined through diagnostic engagements that measure what traditional assessments miss.

Structural Intelligence Briefs are published assessments of sector-level conditions. They are updated quarterly as federal data sources release new information. The Utilities brief is the second in a series covering all 16 CISA critical infrastructure sectors.

DISCLAIMER: This Structural Intelligence Brief is a sector-level structural assessment based on publicly available federal data and the Four Frequencies analytical framework. It does not constitute advice to any specific organization. It does not establish a consulting engagement, advisory relationship, or professional obligation between S.J. Bridger and any reader or recipient.

Sector-level structural conditions described in this brief may or may not apply to any individual utility or water system within the utilities sector. Organizational structural profiles vary based on internal conditions that are measurable only through diagnostic engagement. Decisions regarding utility strategy, workforce planning, infrastructure investment, risk management, or any other operational matter should not be based solely on the sector-level findings in this document.

The severity scores, structural risk scenarios, and analytical observations in this brief reflect conditions as of the publication date. Federal data sources update at varying intervals. This brief will be updated quarterly. Prior versions should not be relied upon after a subsequent version.

