

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
Wildfire Mitigation Plans Discovery 2022
Data Response

PG&E Data Request No.:	CalAdvocates_008-Q03		
PG&E File Name:	WMP-Discovery2022_DR_CalAdvocates_008-Q03		
Request Date:	January 28, 2022	Requester DR No.:	CalAdvocates-PGE-2022WMP-08
Date Sent:	February 25, 2022	Requesting Party:	Public Advocates Office
PG&E Witness:		Requester:	Alan Wehrman

The following questions relate to the PG&E Independent Monitor Report of November 19, 2021, Kirkland & Ellis LLP, filed on November 23, 2021 (the Monitor's 2021 report),¹ and PG&E's responses to Data Request CalAdvocates-PGE-2022WMP-06, dated January 10 and 14, 2022.

QUESTION 03

PG&E's response to Data Request CalAdvocates-PGE-2022WMP-06 includes an inspection report from June 13, 2021 which lists no "damage or compelling abnormal conditions" in all categories except "Other Required Data."² Regarding this inspection:

- a) It is Cal Advocates' understanding that, as of June 13, 2021, the crossarm that failed on June 16 still had open electric corrective notifications because the maintenance issues previously flagged in 2019 and 2020 had not been remediated. Is this correct?
- b) Please explain why the inspector did not note any damage to the crossarm during this inspection.
- c) State what PG&E inspection protocol(s) the inspector used on June 13, 2021 for this inspection.
- d) List the regulations and internal standards against which the inspector was supposed to verify compliance in this inspection on June 13, 2021.
- e) Has PG&E's management identified any flaws or shortcomings in the performance of this particular inspection?
- f) If the answer to part (e) is yes, please describe what action(s) PG&E has taken to address the identified flaws or shortcomings in the performance of this particular inspection.

¹ Kirkland & Ellis LLP, PG&E Independent Monitor Report of November 19, 2021 (Case No. 14-CR-00175- WHA Doc. No. 1524-1), November 23, 2021.

² PG&E's response to Data Request CalAdvocates-PGE-2022WMP-06, Question 3, Attachment 4.

ANSWER 03

- a) Yes, this is correct.
- b) The inspector should have noted the condition of the cross arm on the inspection report. The open tag was included in the report.
- c) The inspector should have followed the guidance in TD-2305M-JA02, Job Aid: Overhead Inspection.
- d) The inspector should have been verifying compliance to the requirements of CPUC General Order (GO) 165.
- e) Yes, the inspector should have noted the damaged cross arm on the inspection report.
- f) No specific actions were taken to address the identified flaws or shortcomings in the performance of this particular inspection. The asset failed and was subsequently repaired shortly after this inspection. See our response to Question 4 for additional quality control and re-inspection activities.