

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY**  
**Wildfire Mitigation Plans**  
**Rulemaking 18-10-007**  
**Data Response**

PG&E Data Request No.:	CalAdvocates_040-Q08		
PG&E File Name:	WildfireMitigationPlans_DR_CalAdvocates_040-Q08		
Request Date:	February 19, 2021	Requester DR No.:	CalAdvocates-PGE-2021WMP-06
Date Sent:	February 24, 2021	Requesting Party:	Public Advocates Office
PG&E Witness:		Requester:	Alan Wehrman

The following questions relate to PG&E's 2021 Wildfire Mitigation Plan (WMP) Update.

**Subject: Mitigation program effectiveness and risk spend efficiency (RSE)**

**QUESTION 08**

In attachment 7.3.5\_RSE\_Input\_Template\_EO\_WLDFR.xlsm, on the worksheet "Summary of Programs," under "Justification for Effectiveness %" for program 7.3.5.15 "Remediation of at-risk species," PG&E states:

"Vegetation Management Subject Matter Experts reviewed the reported causes of distribution outages, tied to results from the vegetation outage investigation reports from 2015-2019. Based on the current scope of the EVM program, SMEs applied the following estimates of mitigation effectiveness for the EVM program to different types of vegetation-related outage causes\*. In the Wildfire risk bowtie these vegetation-related causes are listed as sub-drivers for vegetation driver. ...

\*See M1 | Assumptions tab for the full list of vegetation outage causes and effectiveness percentages, along with justifications."

- a. Provide a copy of the referenced "M1 | Assumptions tab."
- b. State the basis of this estimate: "Where a tree grew into conductor, PG&E estimates that EVM will be 50% effective in mitigating similar outages in the future."
- c. State the basis of this estimate: "Where the branch that caused the outage was overhanging, PGE estimates 90% effectiveness."
- d. State the basis of this estimate: "Where the branch that caused the outage was not overhanging, ... if branch distance to conductor was within 4 feet, PG&E estimates 90% effectiveness."
- e. State the basis of this estimate: "Where the branch that caused the outage was

Internal

not overhanging, ... if branch distance to conductor was 4-12 feet, PG&E estimates 50% effectiveness.”

- f. State the basis of this estimate: “Where the branch that caused the outage was not overhanging, ... if branch distance to conductor was greater than 12 feet, PG&E estimates 0% effectiveness.”
- g. State the basis of these estimates: “Where a tree fell into the line, PG&E estimates the effectiveness of EVM measures based on the health of the tree: Dead - 0% effectiveness, No defect - 0% effectiveness, Slight defect - 50% effectiveness; Moderate/severe defect - 95% effectiveness.”
- h. How do observed data on circuit-segments that have been treated with EVM (for example, data on faults, outages, or ignitions) inform PG&E’s estimates of the effectiveness of EVM?
- i. Does PG&E have plans to modify its estimations of EVM effectiveness?
- j. If the answer to part (h) is yes, please explain types of changes under consideration and the likely timeframe for implementation.

#### **ANSWER 08**

- a. Attached document ‘EO-WF-25\_Mitigation Effectiveness WP’ was submitted as part of the 2020 RAMP Report, ‘M1 | Assumptions’ can be found in its associated tab.
- b. Basis for the assumptions are stated in the ‘EO-WF-25\_Mitigation Effectiveness WP’.
- c. Basis for the assumptions are stated in the ‘EO-WF-25\_Mitigation Effectiveness WP’.
- d. Basis for the assumptions are stated in the ‘EO-WF-25\_Mitigation Effectiveness WP’.
- e. Basis for the assumptions are stated in the ‘EO-WF-25\_Mitigation Effectiveness WP’.
- f. Basis for the assumptions are stated in the ‘EO-WF-25\_Mitigation Effectiveness WP’.
- g. Basis for the assumptions are stated in the ‘EO-WF-25\_Mitigation Effectiveness WP’.
- h. Estimated effectiveness of EVM was calculated by analyzing historical outages (2015-2019) where vegetation was determined as the main cause regardless of whether EVM work had been completed in those circuit segments.

Internal

- i. Yes
- j. PG&E understands that this question is in reference to part (i), not part (h) as stated in the question. We are currently evaluating EVM effectiveness at a regional level. The specific criteria is still under development.