



Liberty
933 Eloise Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
Tel: 800-782-2506
Fax: 530-544-4811

October 8, 2026

VIA OEIS E-FILING

Docket #WMPGuidelines

Tony Marino
Deputy Director
Electrical Infrastructure Directorate
Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety
715 P Street, 20th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Liberty Comments on Draft WMP Guidelines

Dear Deputy Director Marino:

Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric) LLC ("Liberty") hereby provides comments on the Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety's ("Energy Safety") Draft Wildfire Mitigation Plan ("WMP") Guidelines ("Draft Guidelines") issued on September 1, 2026.

- I. **Energy Safety should revise footnote 10 to indicate that Liberty may file a four-year General Rate Case ("GRC") for 2028-2031, per California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") determination in Liberty's next GRC filing.**

Liberty intends to propose a four-year GRC cycle for 2028-2031 in its next GRC filing to align its regulatory planning and wildfire mitigation activities. Alignment between the GRC and WMP cycles promotes regulatory consistency. The CPUC will determine whether Liberty's proposed four-year GRC period is adopted. If Liberty's four-year GRC proposal is adopted, Liberty will submit a 2028-2031 WMP to align GRC and WMP cycles. As such, Liberty requests that Energy Safety's Final WMP Guidelines acknowledge the potential that Liberty's next WMP will either cover 2028-2030 or 2028-2031, per CPUC decision in its GRC proceeding.

- II. **Energy Safety should allow utilities to propose whether a WMP Update is necessary in the years following a Base WMP submittal.**

The Draft Guidelines do not provide a mechanism for a utility to notify Energy Safety when the utility identifies a material development that may warrant consideration of a WMP update. For instance, new information may become available after WMP approval that would cause a utility to seek updates to its initiative activity targets. The inability to update targets may result in approved targets that no longer reflect anticipated risk reduction, changing circumstances, operational constraints, or external dependencies. Energy Safety's oversight is best served when approved targets reflect the most current information available, rather than assumptions or data based on outdated information. This issue becomes more challenging as WMP planning cycles extend longer and further into the future. Energy Safety should establish a process through which

utilities can request a WMP Update filing, including updating approved targets annually for mitigation activities. This process would be in addition to the Energy Safety driven mechanism to require a WMP Update filing.

III. Energy Safety should remove the proposed requirements related to risk tolerance in Section 8.2.3 and throughout the Draft WMP Guidelines.

The CPUC is actively considering the issue of risk tolerance and whether and how it should be incorporated into utility decision making. There are key policy questions under consideration, including whether a risk tolerance standard or framework should be adopted, what form such a framework should take, and how it should be incorporated into utility risk management and investment decision-making. Thus, it is premature to require utilities to demonstrate how risk tolerance informs wildfire mitigation strategy, mitigation selection, or other WMP planning elements before the CPUC completes its evaluation of this issue. Therefore, utilities should not be required to develop utility-specific risk tolerance methodologies in advance of CPUC direction on the subject.

IV. Energy Safety should revise Section 7.4 to state that it will approve or deny a WMP as soon as practicable, and in no event later than nine months after submission.

Liberty proposes revising Section 7.4 to clarify that nine months is the maximum allowable review period and that WMPs will be approved or denied as soon as practicable when the record supports an earlier decision, rather than the expected timeframe for every WMP decision. A decision as soon as practicable would provide utilities with greater certainty when making time-sensitive planning, budgeting, procurement, permitting, and implementation decisions. Earlier decisions are particularly important when a utility's WMP review overlaps with a GRC proceeding involving the same wildfire mitigation programs, costs, schedules, and risk-reduction assumptions. Timelier decisions would promote alignment between the WMP and GRC processes and reduce the need for duplicative testimony, workpapers, discovery, and subsequent revisions.

V. Energy Safety should provide necessary flexibility to revise an approved WMP subsequent to a GRC decision.

The Draft Guidelines require a utility to submit a revised WMP within 45 days of a GRC decision. While Liberty supports timely alignment of an approved WMP with the CPUC's revenue authorization in a GRC decision, there are scenarios in which completing all required implementation and risk analyses within 45 days may not be practicable. It is important to note that a GRC decision may not provide the same level of granularity required for WMP mitigation activity level allocations and thus, a reduction or modification in authorized revenue may not translate proportionally to a specific reduction in an individual WMP activity or target. Instead, the utility may need to evaluate a different portfolio of mitigations to maintain the optimal risk reduction within the overall authorized funding level. Requiring final activity-level allocations, targets, and risk-reduction calculations within 45 days may result in preliminary estimates that require later correction. Energy Safety should acknowledge that 45 days may not always be practicable for the utilities and permit utilities to request additional time to complete Revised

WMPs when additional analysis is necessary to support accurate and risk-informed revisions.

VI. Energy Safety should remove the Appendix C requirement to provide all supporting documentation referred to throughout the WMP.

The Draft Guidelines require a utility to provide all supporting documentation referred to throughout the WMP in Appendix C, including standards, procedures, policies, plans, and processes. This requirement is inconsistent with prior WMP submissions and would significantly increase the volume of materials required to be filed. Compiling, reviewing, redacting, and maintaining such a large volume of supporting materials would require substantial utility and regulatory resources while providing limited additional value beyond the information already contained in the WMP. This requirement may increase preparation time, review costs, and administrative burden for both utilities and Energy Safety, potentially diverting resources away from wildfire risk mitigation activities and substantive review of WMP content. Liberty understands the need for transparency in referring to its standards and procedures included in its WMP, however, Energy Safety should assess whether there are more efficient and navigationally optimal ways (e.g., index with each document's version and effective date, with full documents provided on request) to provide the supporting documentation.

VII. Energy Safety should clarify the requirement in Section 11.5 referencing “United States Forest Service, Order Number 91-1 Fire Restrictions Pacific Southwest Region, executed July 24, 1991.”

Energy Safety references “United States Forest Service, Order Number 91-1 Fire Restrictions Pacific Southwest Region, executed July 24, 1991” as a requirement for pole clearing work. Liberty has previously counted pole clearing work on federal lands as part of its discretionary pole clearing work beyond PRC 4292 requirements. Liberty recommends that Energy Safety provide clarity as to if this order mandates pole clearing work and thus should be captured as required pole clearing work. Energy Safety should also explain why this order is now being referenced as a requirement in addition to PRC 4292, when in prior years, this order was not referenced. Liberty also requests that Energy Safety provide a link to the referenced order in its WMP Guidelines.

VIII. Energy Safety should extend the WMP data request deadline from three days to five days.

The Draft Guidelines require a three-day turnaround for data requests during WMP review. This places a challenging burden on Liberty's small team of WMP subject matter experts. Liberty recommends that Energy Safety extend the requirement to a five-day turnaround for data requests during WMP review.

October 8, 2026

Page 4

Liberty respectfully requests that Energy Safety take these recommendations into consideration as the final WMP Guidelines developed. If there are any questions, please contact me.

Jordan Parrillo
Manager of Regulatory Affairs
Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric) LLC
701 National Ave,
Tahoe Vista, CA 96148
Telephone: 530-721-7818
jordan.parrillo@libertyutilities.com