PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
10 Year Electrical Undergrounding Plan (EUP)
Data Response

PG&E Data Request No.:	OEIS_003-Q004
PG&E File Name:	EUP-PhI_DR_OEIS_003-Q004
Request Date:	October 23, 2026
Requester DR No.:	Energy Safety-DR-EUP-26-08
Requesting Party:	Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety
Requester:	David Rey
Date Sent:	October 28, 2026
Responsible Person(s):	Justin Sadler

SUBJECT: ALTERNATIVE MITIGATIONS AND PORTFOLIO PROJECT SELECTION

Remote Grid Screening in Screen 3 and Additional Comparison 3

QUESTION 004

Does the Remote Grid feasibility review used for Screen 3 Alternative Mitigation (S3 AM) follow the same criteria/process as Additional Comparison 3 (AC3)? If not, describe each process and provide the Remote Grid feasibility result for each Portfolio O project.

a. Describe the screening sequence, technical feasibility criteria, and decision points for Remote Grid under each process. State whether the same criteria are used; if not, explain the differences.
b. Explain how a Remote Grid option could be included in S3 AM rather than being considered only within AC2 or AC3.
c. For all Confirmed Projects for which Remote Grid was considered for S3 AM, please provide the BCR for the model design variation that was compared to the chosen S3 AM.

Choose one of the confirmed projects for which OH + Remote Grid was considered for use as S3 AM. Use this project as an example and explain how and where the Remote Grid location was identified, how the total BCR was calculated, and the likely reasons the BCR was less then 100% OH for that project.

ANSWER 004

The EUP describes the Remote Grid and LEIP feasibility criteria in the context of AC 3 (pp. 140–141): PG&E identifies portions of a Circuit Segment that are end of line, relatively long, and serve few customers, then completes a desktop screen for site-specific features that would make Remote Grid infeasible. Feasibility also depends on customer willingness, site availability, land rights, environmental, permitting and engineering factors (Table 3-9, note (b)). The EUP does not set separate feasibility

criteria for S3 AM. S3 AM and AC 3 differ in when Remote Grid is considered and why, not in the feasibility criteria.

a. Sequence and decision points:
    - S3 AM: During the Screen 3 Alternative Mitigation Review, PG&E determines the non-undergrounding alternative with the best BCR. Where a feasible Remote Grid opportunity is identified, it is included in S3 AM if it improves upon or exceeds the BCR of covered conductor (Table 3-9, note (b)). The S3 AM BCR is then compared to the 100% UG and AC 2 BCRs using the 70 percent rule (pp. 131–139).
    - AC 2: If the AC 2 scope equals 100% UG or S3 AM, the most viable Remote Grid location is added (Figure 3-6).
    - AC 3: After the preferred alternative is selected, every Screen 3 segment is reviewed for Remote Grid and LEIP candidates and screened for infeasibility, and an expected cost is developed. AC 3 becomes the Project as Scoped only if its BCR exceeds the Project as Scoped BCR. If Remote Grid is found infeasible, the selected scope is kept (Figure 3-8; pp. 140–141).
b. Where feasible, S3 AM may consist entirely of covered conductor, entirely of Remote Grid, or a combination of the two (Table 3-9). A Remote Grid option may be included in S3 AM when it is identified during the Screen 3 Alternative Mitigation Review and scoping process, costed through the Feedback Loop (p. 133), and determined to have a BCR that improves upon or exceeds the covered conductor BCR. Otherwise, Remote Grid is considered through AC 2 or AC 3.
c. Below is a table of confirmed projects where OH + RG was considered for S3 AM.

project_id	CPZ	OH + RG1 BCR	OH + RG2 BCR	OH BCR	RG site	Reason why OH + RG < OH BCR
Proj00001	PUEBLO 21031970	2.1327	N/A	3.1209	RG site considered at end of line (EOL), initially to reduce UG scope by 0.38 miles. This mitigation type failed. Then re-evaluated RG site for S3 AM.	Only addresses 0.23 mile of OH bare conductor. Capital cost for the RG site is $1.65M.

Proj00003	FORESTHILL 1101CB	2.5604	2.8375	3.9227	Two RG sites are considered in this zone, both at EOL. RG1 site considered at EOL, initially to reduce UG scope by 0.36 miles. This mitigation type failed. RG2 site considered at EOL, initially to reduce UG scope by 0.37 miles. This mitigation type failed. Both RG sites re-evaluated RG site for S3 AM.	RG1 addresses 0.14 mile of OH bare conductor. Capital cost for RG1 site is $1.77M. RG2 addresses 0.43 mile of OH bare conductor. Capital cost for RG2 site is $1.85M.
Proj00004	DUNBAR 1103799422	0.3651	N/A	4.5058	RG site considered at EOL as part of S3 AM.	Only addresses 0.05 mile of OH bare conductor. Capital cost for the RG site is $2.21M.
Proj00005	FORESTHILL 11011820	0.3947	N/A	0.5417	RG site considered at EOL, initially to reduce UG scope by 0.22 miles. This mitigation type failed. Then re-evaluated RG site for S3 AM.	Only addresses 0.13 mile of OH bare conductor. Capital cost for the RG site is $1.71M.
Proj00008	GEYSERVILLE 1102904170	2.2303	N/A	2.5764	RG site considered at EOL, initially to reduce UG scope by 1.627 miles. This mitigation type failed. Then re-evaluated RG site for S3 AM.	Only addresses 0.71 mile of OH bare conductor. Capital cost for the RG site is $3.25M.
Proj00011	EL DORADO PH 2101668674	3.5476	N/A	5.6122	RG site considered at EOL, initially to reduce UG scope by 0.11 miles. This mitigation type failed. Then re-evaluated RG site for S3 AM.	Only addresses 0.11 mile of OH bare conductor. Capital cost for the RG site is $1.98M.
Proj00020	CAMP EVERS 210510294	0.736	N/A	1.1098	RG site considered at EOL, initially to reduce UG scope by 0.18 miles. This mitigation type failed. Then re-evaluated RG site for S3 AM.	Only addresses 0.05 mile of OH bare conductor. Capital cost for the RG site is $1.04M.
Proj00026	CAMP EVERS 2105534190	0.5659	N/A	0.7902	RG site considered at EOL, initially to reduce UG scope by 0.11 miles. This mitigation type failed.	Only addresses 0.11 mile of OH bare conductor. Capital

					Then re-evaluated RG site for S3 AM.	cost for the RG site is $1.05M.