

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
Wildfire Mitigation Plans Discovery 2023
Data Response

PG&E Data Request No.:	CalAdvocates_011-Q001		
PG&E File Name:	WMP-Discovery2023_DR_CalAdvocates_011-Q001		
Request Date:	April 5, 2023	Requester DR No.:	CalAdvocates-PGE-2023WMP-11
Date Sent:	April 10, 2023	Requesting Party:	Public Advocates Office
DRU Index #:		Requester:	Pui-Wa LI

The following questions relate to your 2023-2025 WMP submission and also the following documents:

- PG&E's 2022 WMP, Section 7.1.E, Attachment 1 (Attch_Q3.pdf),
- PG&E's presentation during the 2021 EPIC Symposium (Attch_Q6_EPIC_Presentation.pdf),
- PG&E's Electric Preliminary Statement Part FY (Tariff Sheet No. 52259-E), and
- PG&E's Test Year 2023 GRC, Application 21-06-021, Exhibit PG&E-04 and Exhibit PG&E-17.

TOPIC: RAPID EARTH FAULT CURRENT LIMITER (REFCL)

QUESTION 001

PG&E's Test Year 2023 GRC rebuttal testimony (Ex. PG&E-17 on July 11, 2022) states the following:

Q 123 Does PG&E have experience with REFCL?

A 123 Yes. PG&E initiated a REFCL pilot project in 2018 at the Calistoga substation. After initial positive tests, the Calistoga REFCL pilot demonstration was stalled due to the failure of the substation REFCL equipment. In addition, PG&E had difficulty obtaining replacement equipment from various overseas suppliers due to supply chain issues and the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Thus, the REFCL technology could not be fully evaluated beyond the initial testing because of the equipment failure and supply chain issues. More recently, PG&E has made progress on its REFCL pilot project including completing the changes to the substation equipment after encountering equipment failures. PG&E has performed successful staged fault tests of the REFCL system and is in the process of reviewing the test data to evaluate REFCL's wildfire risk reduction for ground faults on distribution circuits. PG&E is looking at opportunities for REFCL deployments in its distribution substations to mitigate wildfire risk and evaluating combinations of REFCL with EPSS and other mitigations.¹

¹ Exhibit PG&E-17, Chapter 4.3, pp. 53 to 54.

Regarding the Calistoga REFCL pilot demonstration,

- a) Please break down PG&E's annual spending **on the Calistoga REFCL pilot demonstration** since the project initiation in 2018:

Year	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Recorded Capital Expenditure (\$)					
Recorded O&M Expenses (\$)					

- b) Please break down PG&E's annual spending on **Major Work Category (MWC) 49R** since the project initiation in 2018:

Year	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Recorded Capital Expenditure (\$)					
Recorded O&M Expenses (\$)					
Authorized Capital Expenditure (\$)					
Authorized O&M Expenses (\$)					

- c) Where are the costs in subpart (c) of this question recorded? Please provide the specific name(s) of the accounts and subaccounts, if applicable.
- d) What is the recovery mechanism for the costs in subpart (c) of this question?
- e) In the above quote, PG&E states that “[m]ore recently, PG&E has made progress on its REFCL pilot project including completing the changes to the substation equipment after encountering equipment failures.” Since 2018, how much has PG&E spent on “changes to the substation equipment” and any other equipment changes in order to test or deploy REFCL at the Calistoga substation?

ANSWER 001

PG&E objects to parts (a) through (e) of this request as beyond the scope of this proceeding. This question relates to PG&E's 2023 General Rate Case (GRC) proceeding and has no enunciated connection to PG&E's WMP proceeding. Furthermore, Cal Advocates concurrently served an identical data request on PG&E in the GRC proceeding and PG&E will provide a response to this request in that proceeding as it is the more appropriate venue.