

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

PG&E Data Request No.:	SPD_006-Q001
PG&E File Name:	WMP-Discovery2026-2028_DR_SPD_006-Q001
Request Date:	May 20, 2025
Requester DR No.:	SPD-PGE-WMP2026- 006
Requesting Party:	Safety Policy Division
Requester:	Edwin Schmitt
Date Sent:	May 22, 2025

SUBJECT: FOLLOW-UP 2026-2028 BASE WMP DATA REQUESTS (SPD-PGE-WMP2026-006)

QUESTION 001

The following questions are all related to PG&E's first response to SPD-PGE-WMP2026-SPD-004 Question 5.

- a. In the 2024 RAMP Tranche, PG&E has listed 630 circuit segments as “#NA”. Provide an Excel workbook that lists the WDRM v.4 Circuit Segment Name for each of the 630 circuit segments in the first column. The second column should explain why this circuit segment was listed as #NA, such as this circuit segment was split from a larger circuit segment in WDRM v.3 due to the addition of a recloser. The third column should list the name of the previous circuit segment as it was used in WDRM v.3 and presented in *PGE_2023_WMP_R0_Section_642_Atch01.xlsx*. If this is a newly constructed circuit segment, the response in the third column must be “New”.

2026-2028 Base WMP WDRM v.4 Circuit Segment Name	Explanation for #NA	2024 RAMP WDRM v.3 Circuit Segment Name
CAMP EVERS 2106737512		

- b. Explain why PG&E in its 2026-2028 Base WMP did not include a file similar to *PGE_2023_WMP_R0_Section_642_Atch01.xlsx* in its submission.
- i. For each mitigation listed below, explain why it is now impossible for PG&E to unitize the mitigation by circuit mile (as it was in *PGE_2023_WMP_R0_Section_642_Atch01.xlsx*):
- a) Expulsion Fuse Replacement
 - b) Surge Arrestor Replacement
 - c) Aerial Inspection
 - d) Ground Inspection
 - e) Non-Pole Backlog

- f) Tree Removal
 - g) Down Conductor Detection (DCD)
 - h) Line Sensors
 - i) Pole Backlog
 - j) Pole Clearing
- ii. For each mitigation listed above, explain why PG&E was able to complete the corresponding “% of Segment” field in the TopRisk_Table Worksheet of PGE_2023_WMP_R0_Section_642_Atch01.xlsx.¹
- c. For the years 2023-2025, PG&E states that it is unable to determine actual expenditure and present value cost of specific work done on a circuit segment for each of the mitigations listed in Question 1.b.i., but PG&E can provide the average cost to complete one unit of the mitigation program. For each of the mitigations listed in Question 1.b.i., provide an explanation for why PG&E is unable to determine the actual expenditure and present value cost of specific work done on a circuit segment.
- i. Since PG&E is unable to determine the actual expenditures, provide a step-by-step method PG&E used to estimate the average cost to complete one unit of each of the mitigations listed in Question 1.b.i. Be sure to include the unit cost and the range of the unit cost for each mitigation in your response.
 - ii. PG&E’s SAP system allows for the presentation of monthly detail of undergrounding projects by using the Analyses for Office (AO) report PROJ002-PS Monthly Detail function.² Explain how PG&E records cost-related data in SAP for orders related to each of the mitigations listed in Question 1.b.i.
 - a) Can PG&E use Analyses for Office (AO) report PROJ002-PS Monthly Detail function to generate a report similar to EUP_DR_SPD_013_Q001Atch02CONF.xlsx for each of the mitigations listed in Question 1.b.i.?
 - a. If so, provide a copy of the report for an order associated with the CORNING 110185152 circuit segment for each of the mitigations listed in Question 1.b.i.
 - b. If not, explain why not.
- d. Table 8-1 in PG&E’s 2026-2028 Base WMP states that PG&E intends to install 200 service breakaway connectors in 2026, 1,400 in 2027 and 1,400 in 2028. Explain why PG&E in response to SPD-PGE-WMP2026-SPD-004 Question 5 stated that it does not track any information related to breakaway connector installations.
- i. What is the MAT Code for this mitigation activity (GM-14) that PG&E used in its 2027 Test Year GRC Application?

¹ For instance, on the OAKHURST 110310140 circuit segment, PG&E stated that Tree Removal occurred on 42.3% of the circuit segment in 2023, on 24.5% of the circuit segment in 2024 and on 14.4% of the circuit segment in 2025.

² See SPD-PGE-SB884-013 (PG&E Ref. DRU14491-Case-EUP-SB 884), Question 1c. and EUP_DR_SPD_013_Q001Atch02CONF.xlsx.

- ii. How will PG&E calculate the risk reduced by service breakaway connectors if the location of service breakaway connectors and identify future locations for work if the location of the service breakaway connector is not tracked?
- e. Figure PG&E 5-2-5 in PG&E's 2026-2028 Base WMP presents the EORM Risk Model as contributing to the calculation of Wildfire Consequence (i.e., WFC v4). Pg. 71 of PG&E's 2026-2028 Base WMP states that "Ignition Risk (WDRM v4) for distribution is determined for equipment asset locations for each risk driver causal model LoRE, p(i), and CoRE, WFC." Table 5-4 states that Ignition/Wildfire Risk (WDRM/WTRM) provides a key output of "Circuit Segment Risk". In response to SPD-PGE-WMP2026-SPD-004 Question 5 PG&E states that it is impossible to provide circuit segment EORM Values because "PG&E's EORM values are not calculated to the circuit segment level, but at the "tranche" level." Explain how PG&E uses tranche level EORM values to develop the key output of "Circuit Segment Risk" from the WDRM.
 - i. Provide a step-by-step calculation of "circuit segment risk." At each stage PG&E must explain what is the scale of analysis (i.e., tranche, circuit segment, etc.) and must clearly note the units (i.e. dollars, number of deaths, CMI etc.).³ This step-by-step calculation must include a description of
 - a) what CalFire Fire Data is input into the EORM Risk Model
 - b) How the CalFire Fire Data is used within the EORM Risk Model to develop the MAVf intermediate results
 - c) How the MAVf intermediate results are used within the Wildfire Consequence Model to generate the output of Consequence Pixel Values
 - d) How the Consequence Pixel Values are used to calculate Ignition Risk
 - ii. Explain how the EORM and WDRM methods differ.
 - iii. SPD understands that PG&E scales the WDRM v4 risk values to the predicted risk dollar amount from the CBRs (see Table PG&E-6.2.1.2-2). What are the benefits/drawbacks from scaling a bottoms-up relative risk model to the top-down EORM model?
 - a) For instance, it appears that WDRM v4 predicts more risk outside of the HFTD than the EORM model does – is this type of discrepancy reconciled in the model?
 - b) How does the EORM predicted values in tranches (safety, reliability, financial, combined) compare to a risks from WDRM v4 when combined at the tranche level?
 - iv. Use the calculation of Ignition Risk on CORNING 110185152 circuit segment to create a concrete example of the step-by-step calculation of "circuit segment risk" provided in PG&E's response to Question 1.e.i
- f. Does PG&E intend to only present WDRM data in its Electrical Undergrounding Plan submission to Energy Safety?

³ 3 Please note, tables such as PG&E-6.2.1.2-4 are confusing because it is not clear what the scale of analysis is in the example, nor is it clear which units are used for each number in the example.

- i. If a party wished to know the EORM values for a circuit segment that PG&E includes in its Electrical Undergrounding Plan, is PG&E able to generate those values?
- g. In PG&E's response to SPD-PGE-WMP2026-SPD-001 Question 26, PG&E stated that in the 2026-2028 Base WMP Submission it used a preliminary version of the WBCA Tool to conduct mitigation effectiveness analysis. Since PG&E has stated that the post-mitigation values requested in SPD-PGE-WMP2026-SPD-004 Question 5 cannot be provided through the WDRM v.4 model, can PG&E provide these values through its use of the preliminary version of the WBCA tool?
 - i. If so, please complete the following variables that were included in Decision Tree Results by Circuit Segment.xlsx along with PG&E's response SPD-PGE-WMP2026-SPD-004 Question 5 on May 30th 2025:
 - a) Post-Mitigated LoRE
 - b) Unadjusted Post-Mitigated CoRE
 - c) Adjusted Post-Mitigated CoRE
 - d) Unadjusted Post-Mitigated Risk
 - e) Adjusted Post-Mitigated Risk
 - ii. If not, explain why not and in which dataset the five data points listed in Question 1.g.i is located. Provide SPD with that data along with PG&E's response to SPD- PGE-WMP2026-SPD-004 Question 5 on May 30th 2025.

ANSWER 001

- a. Pursuant to agreement with SPD, PG&E will provide this response on June 5, 2025.
- b. Pursuant to agreement with SPD, PG&E will provide this response on May 28, 2025.
- c. Pursuant to agreement with SPD, PG&E will provide this response on May 28, 2025.
- d. Pursuant to agreement with SPD, PG&E will provide this response on May 28, 2025.
- e. In Figure PG&E-5-2-5, the MAVf intermediate result as depicted in the procedural schematic is the delivery of the MAVf by EORM for the completing the development of the WFC v4 model.
 - i. Please see PG&E's responses to parts (a), (b), (c), and (d), below, as well as PG&E's WDRM documentation suite, which includes: "Wildfire Distribution Risk Model Version 4(WDRM v4) Documentation". "Distribution Event Probability Models Version 4 (DEPM v4) Documentation", "Wildfire Consequence Model Version 4 (WFC v4) Documentation", and "RaDA Modeling Algorithms and Methodologies Version 1 Documentation".
 - a) Cal Fire data are not used in developing the MAVF which feeds into the WFC v4 model.
 - b) Please see the answer to part a).
 - c) The MAVf used by the Enterprise Risk Models is used to determine consequence values for asset locations location as detailed in Sections 3 and 4 of the "Wildfire Consequence Model Version 4 (WFC v4)

Documentation”. A procedural overview of the consequence modeling process is provided in Figure PG&E-5.2.2.2-1 on page 68 of the “PG&E Wildfire Mitigation Plan R0 2026-2028 | volume 1 of 2”.

- d) The Wildfire (Ignition) Risk calculation using consequence pixels for distribution is explained in Sections 3.1 and 4 of the “Wildfire Distribution Risk Model v4 Documentation”.
- ii. Simply, the EORM risk model develops the MAVf function that transforms burned acreage, structure loss, and potential fatalities into a single consequence value, while the WFC v4 uses MAVf function to estimate seasonal consequence values for all distribution asset locations.
- iii. The benefits/drawbacks from scaling a bottoms-up relative risk model to the top-down EORM model (Wildfire Risk Bowtie Model) are as follows:
 - The grouping of circuit segments into tranches and the relative risk value among tranches in the top-down Wildfire Risk Bowtie Model model are informed by the bottoms-up circuit-segment level risk model, and hence more predictive than simply summarizing historical data.
 - The scaling is needed to enable the cost and benefit of wildfire risk mitigations with non-wildfire risk mitigations, e.g. reliability risk mitigation.
- a) Yes. Wildfire Risk Bowtie Model scales the non-HFTD/HFRA risk so that the percentage of risk from non-HFTD/HFRA is the same as that predicted by WDRM v4.
- b) The Wildfire Risk Bowtie Model’s risk values for combined attributes in tranches are the product of a scaling factor and those from WDRM v4 when combined at the tranche level. The scaling factor is calculated as the ratio of the Wildfire Risk Bowtie Model’s total distribution baseline risk over the total WDRM v4 risk, and the same scaling factor applies to every tranche.

The split of total risk by safety, reliability and financial can be different between two models. For example, the choice of groupings of fires and their associated modeled frequency and consequence per event, as well as the historical fires used in the modeling are different. Although there is a great overlap between historical fires used in both models, especially destructive fires, WFC v4 uses NASA Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite (VIIRS) data in addition to PG&E ignition data, Cal Fire data and CPUC Safety and Enforcement Division (SED) reports.
- iv. Pursuant to agreement with SPD, PG&E will provide this response on June 5, 2025.
- f. PG&E intends to use WDRM v4 as the basis for ignition data in the Electrical Undergrounding Plan.
 - i. PG&E’s EORM values are not calculated at the circuit segment level, but at the tranche level. If desired, as an alternative, PG&E can provide tranche-level values which will be identical for all circuit segments in the same tranche.

- g. PG&E believes we can provide the requested values through use of the preliminary version of the WBCA tool, dependent on completion of mapping of mitigation activities to the given list of circuit segments.