

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
Wildfire Mitigations Plans Discovery 2026-2028
Data Response

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| PG&E Data Request No.: | GPI_001-Q002 |
| PG&E File Name: | WMP-Discovery2026-2028_DR_GPI_001-Q002 |
| Request Date: | May 9, 2025 |
| Requester DR No.: | GPI-PGE-2026-2028WMP-01 |
| Requesting Party: | Green Power Institute |
| Requester: | Zoe Harrold, Ph.D |
| Date Sent: | May 14, 2025 |

The following questions relate to your 2026-2028 WMP submission.

WFC model questions:

QUESTION 002

- a. In OEIS_001_Q24, OEIS asked (a.iii) “How many “worst weather days” are included within the set used for WFC?” PG&E responded: “PG&E includes 571 worst weather days from March 2003 to Dec 2020.”
 - i. Of the total 571 worst weather days modeled with 24-h Technosylva fire spread simulations, how many simulations are included in the quantification of each CoRE pixel?
 - ii. If a subset of the 571 worst weather day simulations are applied in the WFC for each CoRE pixel, what is the basis for selecting whether a Technosylva worst weather day 24-h simulation is used as a WFC input to calculate CoRE for a given pixel?
- b. Confirm that the only outputs from 24-h Technosylva fire spread simulations input into the WFC to determine granular CoRE values are Flame Length and Rate of Spread. If other fire spread simulation outputs (e.g., acreage, buildings destroyed, etc.) are included in any aspect of the WFC and final CoRE valuation, please list them and describe the methods used.
- c. It is our understanding that PG&E previously calibrated Technosylva simulation Flame Length and Rate of Spread “Destructive Fire” thresholds based on 8-h simulations (PG&E 2023- 2025 WMP R5, p. 173).
 - i. Did PG&E analyze the relationship between 24-h Technosylva simulation Flame Length and Rate of Spread and its revised “Predicted Destructive Potential” binned fire classifications? If so, provide the calibration results.
- d. PG&E validates its use of 24-h versus 8-h Technosylva simulations based on the correlation between simulated historical fires versus actual acres burned (wildfire-consequence-model-documentation-v4.pdf, p. 13).
 - i. Did PG&E complete a similar assessment for simulated historical fires versus actual buildings destroyed? If so, please provide the results.

- ii. Does PG&E apply the simulated acres burned from 24-h Technosylva simulations in any of its risk quantification models?
- e. FPI outputs are an input to the WFC Model. FPI fuel data is sourced from Technosylva and is reported as being updated annually (PGE 2026-2028 MWP vol. 1, p. 470).
 - i. Please clarify if a 2030 fuels layer was used as an input to generate the backcast FPI R values that are input into the WFC for the “11 fire seasons covering 2012 through 2022 (wildfire-consequence-model-documentation-v4.pdf, p. 30).” If not, please provide the fuel data vintage(s) used in the FPI backcast for the WFC model.

ANSWER 002

- e. Pre-fire fuels layers were used as input to generate the backcast of the FPI climatology. Specifically, a pre-fire fuels snapshot was created for years 2012-2020. A spring 2021 snapshot was used for 2021, and a spring 2022 snapshot for 2022. Pre-fire fuels layers represent the state of the fuels before being changed by wildfire.