



















45	CAFA	Sat WMP-09	CAFA_Sat WMP-09	14	CAFA_Sat WMP-09_014	<p>4) What is PG&amp;E's current forecast and/or potential for covered conductor projects completed in the second half of 2023?</p> <p>5) Please provide workplans to support your answer to part (a).</p>	<p>4) PG&amp;E does not forecast any projects for covered conductor projects in the second half of 2023.</p> <p>5) PG&amp;E does not forecast any projects for covered conductor projects in the second half of 2023.</p>	Hedy Wahrman	4/4/2023	4/7/2023	4/7/2023	1	NA	8.1.5	Grid Design and System Hardening	Traditional Overhead Hardening -Transmission Conductor and Distribution
46	CAFA	Sat WMP-09	CAFA_Sat WMP-09	15	CAFA_Sat WMP-09_015	<p>4) What is PG&amp;E's forecast RSE for covered conductor system hardening completed in the second half of 2023?</p> <p>5) Please provide workplans to support your answer to part (a).</p>	<p>4) PG&amp;E does not forecast any projects for covered conductor projects in the second half of 2023.</p> <p>5) PG&amp;E does not forecast any projects for covered conductor projects in the second half of 2023.</p>	Hedy Wahrman	4/4/2023	4/7/2023	4/7/2023	0	NA	8.1.5	Grid Design and System Hardening	Traditional Overhead Hardening -Transmission Conductor and Distribution
47	CAFA	Sat WMP-09	CAFA_Sat WMP-09	16	CAFA_Sat WMP-09_016	<p>4) Please provide the relevant details, identifying the specific content that provides the information by page number and specific paragraph, table or figure (i.e., not just an overall page citation).</p> <p>5) Please describe what PG&amp;E's RSE estimates and risk model outputs are included in PG&amp;E's decision matrices, such as covered conductor.</p> <p>6) Referring to the first bullet under "Covered Conductor" on page 568 of PG&amp;E's WMP, does PG&amp;E's 2023-2025 WMP explain how PG&amp;E incorporates RSE estimates and risk model outputs that compare understanding with alternative mitigation techniques, such as covered conductor, at a project level early in the decision-making process to allow PG&amp;E to adjust the scope and pace of PG&amp;E's undergrounding program as necessary based on the analysis performed?</p> <p>7) If you please provide the relevant details, identifying the specific content that provides the information by page number and specific paragraph, table or figure (i.e., not just an overall page citation):</p> <p>8) Whether or not the information is provided in PG&amp;E's 2023-2025 WMP, please state whether, and if so, how PG&amp;E incorporates RSE estimates and risk model outputs that compare understanding with alternative mitigation techniques, such as covered conductor, at a project level in the decision-making process. Please provide all available details, including and, if so, how PG&amp;E's quantitative analysis takes account the PSPF risk for a particular location when identifying whether to undertake an undergrounding project or an alternative mitigation activity.</p> <p>9) In addition to the PSPF risk, what other factors are included in the quantitative analysis for a location decision to have or not have PSPF risk compared to alternative mitigation activities? How do you factor in the PSPF risk in the quantitative analysis?</p> <p>10) Please provide all documents showing how PSPF risk is included in PG&amp;E's decision-making process for whether undergrounding or alternative mitigation techniques are used for a particular location.</p> <p>11) The first paragraph on page 568 states, "For instance, on average, it takes 1.25 lead miles to replace 1 CH mile."</p> <p>12) Please explain how this average was calculated, including an identification of the undergrounding projects identified by date and location on which the calculation was performed.</p> <p>13) Please explain all assumptions used in the calculation in the spreadsheet form.</p>	<p>4) PG&amp;E's 2023-2025 WMP does not provide a comparison of the RSE for undergrounding compared to the RSE of alternative mitigations. However, the information, RSE and aggregated lead for wildfire mitigation including undergrounding, is provided in PG&amp;E's 2023 General Field Case - in response to Energy Decision Model request EDCI 2021-01.</p> <p>5) Yes, the 2023 WMP explains how PG&amp;E performs this analysis. PG&amp;E evaluated the options from its RSEs, Calculation Risk Models (CRM) to determine the RSE risk in its service territory. The primary approach for selecting system hardening relies on two risk prioritization methodologies: (1) the top 20 percent of total projects based on the 2021 RSE and (2) the "Wildfire Feasibility Strategy" (WFF) which prioritizes projects based on the 2022 WORM RSE. PG&amp;E uses the Simplified Wildfire RSE (SWRSE) or WFF in evaluating undergrounding projects. The SWRSE includes the components of the RSE including wildfire risk in assessing the system hardening program. PG&amp;E first uses a scoring criterion that identifies the highest risk areas, and then selects the appropriate risk mitigation approach for each project based on its undergrounding, remote and/or traditional, the amount of overhead remaining (depending on the local circumstances). Since the 2021 PG&amp;E has prioritized undergrounding in the preferred approach to reduce the most system risk, once a circuit is selected for undergrounding, PG&amp;E evaluates each circuit based on a cost/benefit analysis comparing different alternatives available to reduce the maximum amount of risk and available feasibility and availability.</p> <p>6) PG&amp;E uses Section 8.1.2.1, page 330, Overview of the Activity and Section 8.1.2.2, 342-343, Overview of the Activity for the requested information.</p> <p>7) PG&amp;E uses Section 8.1.2.1, page 330, Overview of the Activity and Section 8.1.2.2, 342-343, Overview of the Activity for the requested information.</p> <p>8) PG&amp;E uses Section 8.1.2.1, page 330, Overview of the Activity and Section 8.1.2.2, 342-343, Overview of the Activity for the requested information.</p> <p>9) We currently do not use the PSPF risk in our quantitative decision-making when deciding whether to construct an undergrounding project or an alternative mitigation activity, when evaluating whether to construct a project. However, PG&amp;E considers project location to reduce PSPF system impacts and one mitigation project type to reduce PSPF risk.</p> <p>10) The undergrounding program is not based on a manual review of 10 projects completed in 2022. We reviewed approximately 127 overhead miles and selected them with 13.3 underground miles. Based on the subset of data, which is generally consistent with our overall portfolio, the conversion factor from overhead to underground is 1.3.</p> <p>11) Please see attachment WMP-Discovery23_DR_TURN_001-Q001_A001 for the requested information.</p> <p>12) No, the SWRSE measure helps PG&amp;E to evaluate construction feasibility of undergrounding projects.</p> <p>13) Not applicable, please see the response to subpart (1) above.</p>	Hedy Wahrman	4/4/2023	4/7/2023	4/7/2023	1	NA	7.2	Wildfire Mitigation Strategy Development	Wildfire Mitigation Strategy
63	TURN	001	TURN_001	1	TURN_001_01	<p>4) Please provide the relevant details, identifying the specific content that provides the information by page number and specific paragraph, table or figure (i.e., not just an overall page citation):</p> <p>5) Whether or not the information is provided in PG&amp;E's 2023-2025 WMP, please state whether, and if so, how PG&amp;E incorporates RSE estimates and risk model outputs that compare understanding with alternative mitigation techniques, such as covered conductor, at a project level in the decision-making process. Please provide all available details, including and, if so, how PG&amp;E's quantitative analysis takes account the PSPF risk for a particular location when identifying whether to undertake an undergrounding project or an alternative mitigation activity.</p> <p>6) In addition to the PSPF risk, what other factors are included in the quantitative analysis for a location decision to have or not have PSPF risk compared to alternative mitigation activities? How do you factor in the PSPF risk in the quantitative analysis?</p> <p>7) Please provide all documents showing how PSPF risk is included in PG&amp;E's decision-making process for whether undergrounding or alternative mitigation techniques are used for a particular location.</p> <p>8) The first paragraph on page 568 states, "For instance, on average, it takes 1.25 lead miles to replace 1 CH mile."</p> <p>9) Please explain how this average was calculated, including an identification of the undergrounding projects identified by date and location on which the calculation was performed.</p> <p>10) Please explain all assumptions used in the calculation in the spreadsheet form.</p>	<p>4) PG&amp;E's 2023-2025 WMP does not provide a comparison of the RSE for undergrounding compared to the RSE of alternative mitigations. However, the information, RSE and aggregated lead for wildfire mitigation including undergrounding, is provided in PG&amp;E's 2023 General Field Case - in response to Energy Decision Model request EDCI 2021-01.</p> <p>5) Yes, the 2023 WMP explains how PG&amp;E performs this analysis. PG&amp;E evaluated the options from its RSEs, Calculation Risk Models (CRM) to determine the RSE risk in its service territory. The primary approach for selecting system hardening relies on two risk prioritization methodologies: (1) the top 20 percent of total projects based on the 2021 RSE and (2) the "Wildfire Feasibility Strategy" (WFF) which prioritizes projects based on the 2022 WORM RSE. PG&amp;E uses the Simplified Wildfire RSE (SWRSE) or WFF in evaluating undergrounding projects. The SWRSE includes the components of the RSE including wildfire risk in assessing the system hardening program. PG&amp;E first uses a scoring criterion that identifies the highest risk areas, and then selects the appropriate risk mitigation approach for each project based on its undergrounding, remote and/or traditional, the amount of overhead remaining (depending on the local circumstances). Since the 2021 PG&amp;E has prioritized undergrounding in the preferred approach to reduce the most system risk, once a circuit is selected for undergrounding, PG&amp;E evaluates each circuit based on a cost/benefit analysis comparing different alternatives available to reduce the maximum amount of risk and available feasibility and availability.</p> <p>6) PG&amp;E uses Section 8.1.2.1, page 330, Overview of the Activity and Section 8.1.2.2, 342-343, Overview of the Activity for the requested information.</p> <p>7) PG&amp;E uses Section 8.1.2.1, page 330, Overview of the Activity and Section 8.1.2.2, 342-343, Overview of the Activity for the requested information.</p> <p>8) PG&amp;E uses Section 8.1.2.1, page 330, Overview of the Activity and Section 8.1.2.2, 342-343, Overview of the Activity for the requested information.</p> <p>9) We currently do not use the PSPF risk in our quantitative decision-making when deciding whether to construct an undergrounding project or an alternative mitigation activity, when evaluating whether to construct a project. However, PG&amp;E considers project location to reduce PSPF system impacts and one mitigation project type to reduce PSPF risk.</p> <p>10) The undergrounding program is not based on a manual review of 10 projects completed in 2022. We reviewed approximately 127 overhead miles and selected them with 13.3 underground miles. Based on the subset of data, which is generally consistent with our overall portfolio, the conversion factor from overhead to underground is 1.3.</p> <p>11) Please see attachment WMP-Discovery23_DR_TURN_001-Q001_A001 for the requested information.</p> <p>12) No, the SWRSE measure helps PG&amp;E to evaluate construction feasibility of undergrounding projects.</p> <p>13) Not applicable, please see the response to subpart (1) above.</p>	Tom Long	4/4/2023	4/7/2023	4/7/2023	1	NA	Appendix D	Areas for Continued Improvement	ACI PG&E-23-34 - Review Increase of Priority Wildfire Mitigation
64	TURN	002	TURN_002	1	TURN_002_01	<p>4) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-001, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p>	<p>Please see attachment "WMP-Discovery23_DR_TURN_002-Q001A001_CONF.pdf" for the requested information.</p>	Tom Long	4/4/2023	4/7/2023	4/7/2023	1	Yes	8.2.3	Vegetation Management and Inspections	Vegetation and Fuels Management
65	TURN	002	TURN_002	2	TURN_002_02	<p>4) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p>	<p>Please see attachment "WMP-Discovery23_DR_TURN_002-Q002A001_CONF.pdf" for the requested information.</p>	Tom Long	4/4/2023	4/7/2023	4/7/2023	1	Yes	8.2.3	Vegetation Management and Inspections	Vegetation and Fuels Management
66	TURN	002	TURN_002	3	TURN_002_03	<p>4) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p>	<p>The attachment to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008 was identical to the attachment provided for CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, so please refer to the attachment with Answer 002 of the data request response.</p>	Tom Long	4/4/2023	4/7/2023	4/7/2023	0	NA	2022 WMP Section 7.3.5.2	Vegetation Management and Inspections	Enhanced Vegetation Management
67	TURN	002	TURN_002	4	TURN_002_04	<p>4) Please provide the 2023-2025 undergrounding (Undergrounding) information on page 011 of PG&amp;E's WMP and in footnote 205, which PG&amp;E has labeled the information as confidential.</p>	<p>Please see "WMP-Discovery23_DR_TURN_002-Q004A001_CONF.pdf" for the requested information.</p>	Tom Long	4/4/2023	4/7/2023	4/7/2023	1	Yes	Appendix D	Areas for Continued Improvement	ACI PG&E-23-16 - Progress and Update on Undergrounding and Risk Prioritization
68	DEIS	001	DEIS_001	1	DEIS_001_01	<p>Regarding PG&amp;E's Tree Assessment Tool (TAT):</p> <p>1) How is PG&amp;E using the information in the Vegetation Management (VM) program?</p> <p>2) How is PG&amp;E using the information in its TAT?</p> <p>3) How is PG&amp;E using the information in its TAT?</p> <p>4) If PG&amp;E is not using the information in its TAT, what are the reasons?</p>	<p>4) The TAT was developed for the EMV program. The TAT will no longer be utilized as the EMV program concluded at the end of 2022. There are no current data for the TAT to support other EMV programs.</p> <p>1) The information in the TAT is used in Section 2.2 of the 2023-2025 WMP plan to utilize the TAT data. Please see the response to part (a) of this question.</p> <p>2) The information in the TAT is used in Section 2.2 of the 2023-2025 WMP plan to utilize the TAT data. Please see the response to part (a) of this question.</p> <p>3) The information in the TAT is used in Section 2.2 of the 2023-2025 WMP plan to utilize the TAT data. Please see the response to part (a) of this question.</p> <p>4) The information in the TAT is used in Section 2.2 of the 2023-2025 WMP plan to utilize the TAT data. Please see the response to part (a) of this question.</p>	Colin Long	4/5/2023	4/10/2023	4/10/2023	0	NA	8.2.2	Vegetation Management and Inspections	Vegetation Management and Inspections
70	DEIS	001	DEIS_001	2	DEIS_001_02	<p>Regarding PG&amp;E's Targeted Tree Species (TTS) Study and its Tree Assessment Tool (TAT) on page 194 of the 2023 WMP Update, PG&amp;E states "The results of our Targeted Tree Species study in conjunction with the Tree Assessment Tool (TAT) allow us to identify areas with high potential for tree loss, providing better visibility into risk." On page 574 of the 2023-2025 WMP, PG&amp;E states "We have evaluated the recommendations in the Targeted Tree Species report and our response is as follows:</p> <p>1) For the best possible, perform a retrospective TAT analysis on future O&amp;M lines</p> <p>2) Where possible, associate the O&amp;M line with a CLEAR segmentation ID</p> <p>3) Action Team: We have developed an updated online and offline investigation tool that incorporates data parameters that will allow for increased data analytics. The updated tool is in process of being designed which will require data collection.</p> <p>4) Recommendation 1: Increase the data parameters for O&amp;M lines with no observations. Consider scored observations that LCDR receive the allowable distance. All pathways to assess, the analysis to be completed and capacity response to be used.</p> <p>5) Recommendation 2: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>6) Action Team: Current electronic devices are able to capture accurate GPS positions data as technological improvements.</p> <p>7) Recommendation 3: Track TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>8) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>9) Recommendation 4: Create a species-specific model for PG&amp;E's health and mortality. Employ the PG&amp;E climate database and external information to create a species-specific model for PG&amp;E's health and mortality.</p> <p>10) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>11) Recommendation 5: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>12) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>13) Recommendation 6: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>14) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>15) Recommendation 7: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>16) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>17) Recommendation 8: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>18) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>19) Recommendation 9: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>20) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>21) Recommendation 10: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>22) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>23) Recommendation 11: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>24) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>25) Recommendation 12: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>26) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>27) Recommendation 13: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>28) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>29) Recommendation 14: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>30) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>31) Recommendation 15: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>32) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>33) Recommendation 16: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>34) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>35) Recommendation 17: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>36) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>37) Recommendation 18: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>38) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>39) Recommendation 19: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>40) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>41) Recommendation 20: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>42) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>43) Recommendation 21: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>44) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>45) Recommendation 22: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>46) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>47) Recommendation 23: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>48) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>49) Recommendation 24: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>50) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>51) Recommendation 25: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>52) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>53) Recommendation 26: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>54) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>55) Recommendation 27: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>56) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>57) Recommendation 28: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>58) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>59) Recommendation 29: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>60) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>61) Recommendation 30: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>62) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>63) Recommendation 31: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>64) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>65) Recommendation 32: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>66) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>67) Recommendation 33: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>68) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>69) Recommendation 34: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>70) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>71) Recommendation 35: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>72) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>73) Recommendation 36: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>74) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>75) Recommendation 37: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>76) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>77) Recommendation 38: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>78) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>79) Recommendation 39: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>80) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>81) Recommendation 40: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>82) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>83) Recommendation 41: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>84) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>85) Recommendation 42: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>86) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>87) Recommendation 43: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>88) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>89) Recommendation 44: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>90) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>91) Recommendation 45: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>92) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>93) Recommendation 46: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>94) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>95) Recommendation 47: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>96) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>97) Recommendation 48: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>98) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p> <p>99) Recommendation 49: Update TAT database species composition and compare to online and offline species distributions. Note potential on-site-stand-alone observations.</p> <p>100) Action Team: The TAT update includes the recommended updates.</p>	Colin Long	4/5/2023	4/10/2023	4/10/2023	0	NA	8.2.6	Vegetation Management and Inspections	High Risk Species	
71	DEIS	001	DEIS_001	3	DEIS_001_03	<p>4) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>5) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>6) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>7) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>8) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>9) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>10) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>11) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>12) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>13) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>14) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>15) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>16) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>17) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>18) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>19) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>20) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>21) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>22) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>23) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>24) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>25) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>26) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>27) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>28) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>29) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>30) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>31) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>32) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>33) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>34) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>35) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>36) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>37) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>38) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>39) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>40) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>41) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>42) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>43) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>44) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>45) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>46) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>47) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>48) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>49) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>50) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>51) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>52) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>53) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>54) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>55) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>56) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>57) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>58) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>59) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>60) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>61) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>62) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>63) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>64) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>65) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>66) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>67) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>68) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>69) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>70) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>71) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>72) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>73) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>74) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>75) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>76) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>77) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>78) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>79) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;E-2023WMP-06-008, which PG&amp;E has labeled as confidential.</p> <p>80) Please provide the attachment to the response to CalCorksheets-PG&amp;amp</p>										



















128	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	5	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_05	<p>Temporary Distribution Monrogs available to operate in 2020</p> <p>Number of 2020 PSPS events supported</p> <p>Approx. qty of service po's energized per 2020 PSPS event</p> <p>Shinglerway 19</p> <p>Calagata 1156</p> <p>Powerline Temporary configuration without a pre-installed interconnection hub</p> <p>2021</p> <p>Chavasta North (temporary configuration without a pre-installed interconnection hub)</p> <p>2021</p> <p>Chavasta South (temporary configuration without a pre-installed interconnection hub)</p> <p>2021</p> <p>Temporary Distribution Monrogs available to operate in 2021</p> <p>Number of 2021 PSPS events supported</p> <p>Approx. qty of service po's energized per 2021 PSPS event</p> <p>Shinglerway 19</p> <p>Calagata 1156</p> <p>Powerline 1.01</p> <p>Georgetown via</p> <p>Palms Three 1.96</p> <p>Fernside 0.96</p> <p>McIntosh 0.96</p> <p>2022</p> <p>Temporary Distribution Monrogs available to operate in 2022</p> <p>Number of 2022 PSPS events supported</p> <p>Approx. qty of service po's energized per 2022 PSPS event</p> <p>Shinglerway 19</p> <p>Calagata 1156</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.12.7.2	Grid Design and System Hardening	Temporary Distribution Monrogs
129	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	6	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_06	<p>P. 365 of PG&amp;E's WMP states, "The Reduced Coast Airport Microgrid (RCAM) was built through a California Energy Commission (CEC) grant to the National Energy Center and Sun from United States of America to the Redwood Coast Energy Authority (Community Choice Aggregator), in collaboration with PG&amp;E, EPC 3.11, Multi-Use Microgrid, project."</p> <p>1) What was the total cost of the RCAM project?</p> <p>2) Please provide a breakdown of the RCAM project costs.</p> <p>3) Please provide a breakdown of the RCAM project costs.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.12.7.3	Grid Design and System Hardening	Community Microgrid Enablement Program and Microgrid Incentive Program
130	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	7	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_07	<p>P. 365 of PG&amp;E's WMP states, "The successful deployment of RCAM provides a model for other communities to take advantage of multi-tenant microgrid energy resilience."</p> <p>1) How does PG&amp;E determine the success of the RCAM?</p> <p>2) Please provide data to support the success of the RCAM.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	4	N/A	8.12.7.3	Grid Design and System Hardening	Community Microgrid Enablement Program and Microgrid Incentive Program
131	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	8	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_08	<p>P. 365 of PG&amp;E's WMP states, "For 2023, we have planned to install devices that will provide significant reliability benefits on the line that is the focus of EPSS."</p> <p>1) Please quantify the "significant reliability benefits" that will be provided from devices installed in 2023.</p> <p>2) Please provide any available resources or studies to support your response to item 1).</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.12.8.1	Grid Design and System Hardening	Installation of System Automation Equipment - Distribution Protective Devices
132	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	9	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_09	<p>P. 385 of PG&amp;E's WMP states that it will perform a "Substation Animal Abatement Effectiveness Study" in 2023.</p> <p>1) When does PG&amp;E expect to begin the Substation Animal Abatement Effectiveness Study?</p> <p>2) When does PG&amp;E expect to complete the Substation Animal Abatement Effectiveness Study?</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.12.12.2	Grid Design and System Hardening	Other Technologies and Systems - Substation Animal Abatement
133	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	10	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_10	<p>P. 391 of PG&amp;E's WMP states, "To 2022 PG&amp;E implemented various measures to TD-2326, which incorporated reliability best practices as well as adjusted the risk injection criteria." Please list the adjustments that PG&amp;E made to the WMP criteria.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.12.15	Asset Inspections	Invasive Pole Inspection
134	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	11	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_11	<p>P. 402 of PG&amp;E's WMP states, "PG&amp;E assigned a risk map to address, severe, high, medium, or low based on the average wildfire consequence of the structures within that grid map."</p> <p>1) In the description described above based on the wildfire consequence scores from the WORM or the WORM 4?</p> <p>2) How frequently does PG&amp;E plan to be updated the risk map designations described above?</p> <p>3) When PG&amp;E re-evaluates the risk map designations, what steps will PG&amp;E take to re-evaluate a risk map that has been designated as a high risk?</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.13.2.1	Asset Inspections	Detailed Ground Inspection
135	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	12	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_12	<p>Table PG&amp;E 8.1.7.4 on page 454 of PG&amp;E's WMP states that PG&amp;E added 41,869 distribution work orders to its WMP backlog in 2022.</p> <p>1) What measures has PG&amp;E implemented to ensure that it will be able to resolve its backlog in 2023?</p> <p>2) When does PG&amp;E expect to complete the backlog reduction in 2023?</p> <p>3) What factors may prevent PG&amp;E from meeting its target regarding backlog reduction in 2023?</p> <p>4) How does PG&amp;E plan to ensure that PG&amp;E does not miss any critical work orders in 2023?</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.12.7.2	Open Work Orders	Open Work Orders - Distribution Tags
136	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	13	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_13	<p>P. 462 of PG&amp;E's WMP states, "EPSS does not cause a power outage. Given that EPSS settings can be configured to allow a WMP to operate, and without an outage, please explain what will prevent the above goal."</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.18.1.1	Grid Operations and Procedures	Protective Equipment and Device Settings
137	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_14	<p>Per PG&amp;E's January 2023 EPSS monthly report, PG&amp;E experienced 2,975 EPSS outages in 2022.</p> <p>1) Of the EPSS-impacted outages in 2022, how many of those outages did PG&amp;E find that corrective actions were not taken to prevent the outage? If there are no corrective actions, what does PG&amp;E need to resolve the location of the outages?</p> <p>2) How many EPSS-impacted outages in 2022 did PG&amp;E determine were triggered by events that did not occur on the system?</p> <p>3) If the answer to part 1) is yes, please state the location of the outages.</p> <p>4) If the answer to part 2) is yes, please state the location of the outages.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.18.1.1	Grid Operations and Procedures	Protective Equipment and Device Settings
138	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	15	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_15	<p>P. 462 of PG&amp;E's WMP states, "To 2022, we expanded the scope of EPSS to all HPA and to our service territory and selected selected EPSS buffer areas."</p> <p>1) In 2022, did PG&amp;E expand the scope of EPSS to all HPA and all of its service territory?</p> <p>2) In 2022, did PG&amp;E expand the scope of EPSS to all HPA and all of its service territory?</p> <p>3) If the answer to part 1) is no, please state the reason for the decision.</p> <p>4) If the answer to part 2) is no, please state the reason for the decision.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.18.1.1	Grid Operations and Procedures	Protective Equipment and Device Settings
139	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	16	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_16	<p>CAIPAs understanding is that a critical segment that has been undergrounded will still experience EPSS outages if it remains undergrounded or disconnected from the undergrounded segment becoming subject to EPSS. Is there any undergrounding correct? If yes, please correct that has been undergrounded or disconnected from the undergrounded segment becoming subject to EPSS.</p> <p>1) If the answer to part 1) is yes, please explain why.</p> <p>2) If the answer to part 1) is no, please explain why.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	9.15	Public Safety Power Shutoff	Performance Metrics Identified by the Electrical Corporation
140	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	17	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_17	<p>Has PG&amp;E performed a study or back cast to predict the likelihood that an undergrounded segment will be subject to EPSS due to undergrounding due to undergrounding or disconnected from the undergrounded segment becoming subject to EPSS?</p> <p>1) If the answer to part 1) is yes, please explain why.</p> <p>2) If the answer to part 1) is no, please explain why.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	9.15	Public Safety Power Shutoff	Performance Metrics Identified by the Electrical Corporation
141	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	18	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_18	<p>Has PG&amp;E performed a study or back cast to predict the likelihood that an undergrounded segment will be subject to EPSS due to undergrounding due to undergrounding or disconnected from the undergrounded segment becoming subject to EPSS?</p> <p>1) If the answer to part 1) is yes, please explain why.</p> <p>2) If the answer to part 1) is no, please explain why.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.18.1.1	Grid Operations and Procedures	Protective Equipment and Device Settings
143	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	20	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_20	<p>During the period from 2020-2022, did PG&amp;E replace any distribution poles as part of its WMP activities for which PG&amp;E had not fully recovered the original cost of the pole?</p> <p>1) If the answer to part 1) is yes, what was PG&amp;E's practice regarding cost recovery on the unrecovered portion of the pole associated with the replaced pole?</p> <p>2) If the answer to part 1) is no, please explain why.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.12.3	Grid Design and System Hardening	Distribution Pole Replacements and Reinforcements
144	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	21	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_21	<p>During the period from 2020-2022, did PG&amp;E replace any distribution conductor as part of its WMP activities for which PG&amp;E had not fully recovered the original cost of the conductor? If yes, please include undergrounding a previously replaced line, or replacing a new conductor to the replaced conductor?</p> <p>1) If the answer to part 1) is yes, what was PG&amp;E's practice regarding cost recovery on the unrecovered portion of the pole associated with the replaced conductor?</p> <p>2) If the answer to part 1) is no, please explain why.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.12.5.2	Grid Design and System Hardening	Traditional Overhead Hardening - Distribution
145	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	22	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_22	<p>During the period from 2020-2022, did PG&amp;E replace any distribution transformer as part of its WMP activities for which PG&amp;E had not fully recovered the original cost of the transformer?</p> <p>1) If the answer to part 1) is yes, what was PG&amp;E's practice regarding cost recovery on the unrecovered portion of the pole associated with the replaced transformer?</p> <p>2) If the answer to part 1) is no, please explain why.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	8.14.11	Equipment Maintenance and Repair	Transformers
146	CAIPA	Sat WMP-14	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14	23	CAIPA_Sat WMP-14_23	<p>In 2022, how many gridlines did PG&amp;E experience related to overhead covered conductor distribution lines?</p> <p>2) In 2022, how many gridlines did PG&amp;E experience related to overhead bare conductor distribution lines?</p> <p>3) In 2022, how many gridlines did PG&amp;E experience related to overhead distribution lines?</p>	Holly Whitman	4/11/2023	4/17/2023	4/17/2023	0	N/A	Appendix D	Areas for Continued Improvement	ACI PG&E 02-08 - Addressing Increases in EPSS Events



















269	CAPA	Sat WMP-19	CAPA_Sat WMP-19	11	CAPA_Sat WMP-19_011	<p>Page 888-893 of PG&amp;E's WMP describe PG&amp;E's simplified wildfire risk assessment (SWIRSE) used to prioritize fire underwriting projects.</p> <p>In a recent SWIRSE update, we selected the roughly 8,000 DR miles with the highest SWIRSE to underwrite. For the SWIRSE update, we selected the roughly 8,000 DR miles with the highest SWIRSE to underwrite. For the SWIRSE update, we selected the roughly 8,000 DR miles with the highest SWIRSE to underwrite. For the SWIRSE update, we selected the roughly 8,000 DR miles with the highest SWIRSE to underwrite.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/26/2023	4/26/2023	4/26/2023	0	NA	Appendix D	Areas for Continued Improvement	ACI PG&E-22-34 - Review Process of Prioritizing Wildfire Mitigation																
270	CAPA	Sat WMP-19	CAPA_Sat WMP-19	12	CAPA_Sat WMP-19_012	<p>Attachment 1 to PG&amp;E's response to a public request for information (RFI) states that on November 18, 2019, an intensive inspection indicated that a pole had 18% remaining strength. On January 14, 2020, the response was a priority E tag to replace the pole by January 13, 2021.</p> <p>Why was the tag for the above asset created approximately two months after the initial finding?</p> <p>Describe any actions that PG&amp;E took between November 18, 2019 and January 14, 2020 to address the safety of the other poles on the same line.</p> <p>Why were the poles replaced with a one-year deadline based on the tag creation date, rather than a deadline based on the date of the initial finding?</p> <p>Under PG&amp;E's current procedures and practices, in the compliance schedule for a new tag based on the tag creation date or the date of the initial finding? Please explain your answer.</p> <p>Was a priority E tag the appropriate priority level in this instance? Why or why not?</p>	Holly Whitman	4/26/2023	4/26/2023	4/26/2023	0	NA	8.1.3.2.3	Asset Inspections	Intensive Pole Inspections																
271	CAPA	Sat WMP-19	CAPA_Sat WMP-19	13	CAPA_Sat WMP-19_013	<p>The PG&amp;E Independent Safety Status Update Report by Fluor Energy Partners on October 4, 2022, page 14 states:</p> <p>During the period, the IISB reviewed data provided by PG&amp;E related to PG&amp;E's Undercurrent Transmission asset tags and the average rate of certain PG&amp;E Undercurrent Transmission assets. For example, 63% of one year of underground transmission cables is beyond its useful life (UL).</p> <p>Footnote 14: "Based on PG&amp;E's WMP, PG&amp;E also values in an internal report published in May 2022 that underground transmission cables are 100% over their useful life."</p> <p>How does PG&amp;E's WMP account for the fact that the IISB report indicates that 63% of underground transmission cables are beyond their useful life?</p> <p>On April 13, 2023, Cal Access met with a Senior Director of Grid Research Innovation and Development at PG&amp;E. During the meeting, PG&amp;E stated that REFLC is not a suitable replacement for PG&amp;E's current asset tags.</p> <p>Does the above statement accurately reflect PG&amp;E's current assessment of REFLC? Please explain your answer.</p> <p>If the answer to part (a) is yes, please state all the reasons why PG&amp;E believes REFLC is not a suitable product.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/26/2023	4/26/2023	4/26/2023	1	NA	8.1.2.5	Grid Design and System Hardening	Traditional Overhead Hardening - Transmission Conductor and Distribution																
273	CAPA	Sat WMP-19	CAPA_Sat WMP-19	15	CAPA_Sat WMP-19_015	<p>Has PG&amp;E performed a study to estimate the combined effectiveness of one or more combinations of covered conductor, EPDS, PDS, and REFLC, including situations, when installed on distribution circuit in the P10 or P15 or the answer to part (a) is no, please explain why.</p> <p>If the answer to part (a) is no, does PG&amp;E plan to perform such a study? If so, please provide the timeline for initiating and completing the study.</p> <p>If the answer to part (a) is no, please provide the results of any such study, including any insights, lessons, and other work items.</p>	Holly Whitman	4/26/2023	4/26/2023	4/26/2023	0	NA	8.1.2	Grid Design and System Hardening	Value																
274	CAPA	Sat WMP-19	CAPA_Sat WMP-19	16	CAPA_Sat WMP-19_016	<p>Table 7 on page 20 of the Joint IOU Covered Conductor Working Group Report lists SCE's estimate of the combined effectiveness of the covered conductor program, asset inspections, and several vegetation management programs.</p> <p>Has PG&amp;E performed a similar estimate of the combined effectiveness of covered conductors, asset inspections, and vegetation management?</p> <p>If the answer to part (a) is no, please explain why.</p> <p>If the answer to part (a) is yes, please explain why.</p> <p>If the answer to part (a) is no, does PG&amp;E plan to perform such a study?</p>	Holly Whitman	4/26/2023	4/26/2023	4/26/2023	0	NA	Appendix D	Areas for Continued Improvement	ACI PG&E-21-11 - Covered Conductor Effectiveness Lessons Learned																
250	CAPA	Sat WMP-18	CAPA_Sat WMP-18	1 SUPP	CAPA_Sat WMP-18_05 SUPP	<p>In response to question 130(3)(b) of California PG&amp;E-2023-WMP-18, PG&amp;E states:</p> <p>The difference in projected vegetation management costs of \$24,881,000 between 2023 and 2024 is due to several factors. Risk to PG&amp;E's assets from vegetation management is reduced from 2023 to 2024 due to the amount of Routine VM work conducted each year commensurate with the amount of underground mile completed and CD reducing the amount of Routine VM work needed to clear cases through the program.</p> <p>Programmatic adjustments that improve processes and improve resource efficiency.</p> <p>As these changes transition from E-VM to new programs, resulting in a cost reduction.</p> <p>Does PG&amp;E believe the following information about anticipated VM cost reductions from undergrounding in the below table is accurate?</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Number of Underground Miles to be Completed</th> <th>Planned reduction in Number of Routine VM Miles</th> <th>Amount of Routine VM Cost Savings from Undergrounding (\$55)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2023</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2024</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2025</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Though we do anticipate a reduction in volume of work and routine and asset tags later driven by these anticipated VM cost reductions:</p> <p>Regarding PG&amp;E's Areas of Concern:</p> <p>a. Provide a GIS layer of PG&amp;E's Areas of Concern (AOC) with the following attributes for each AOC polygon: Name of AOC, Number of overhead circuit miles in the AOC that are in scope for Focused Tree Inspections (AOC in-scope) (Yield), Cumulative probability of ignition caused by vegetation coupled with consequence of ignition as given by WORM (AOC in-scope) (Yield), Average probability of ignition caused by vegetation coupled with consequence of ignition as given by WORM (AOC in-scope) (Yield), Cumulative Overall Utility Risk as defined by the 2023-2025 WMP Technical Guidelines, Appendix B, Cumulative PSPS Risk as defined by the 2023-2025 WMP Technical Guidelines, Appendix B, Cumulative Impact from Vegetation, Appendix B, Cumulative Impact from Vegetation as defined by the 2023-2025 WMP Technical Guidelines, Appendix B.</p> <p>b. Has PG&amp;E used any vegetation related data source to identify the density/percentage of overhead trees to create the AOC? (e.g., LIDAR, satellite, etc.). If so, the data source(s) and the date the data were collected. (e.g., distribution LIDAR from PG&amp;E-2018).</p> <p>c. Has PG&amp;E used any tree mortality data sets to create the AOC? If so, list the data sets and the date the data were collected.</p> <p>d. Determine the proportion of inspection within the AOC? If so, list the data sets and the date the data were collected.</p>	Year	Number of Underground Miles to be Completed	Planned reduction in Number of Routine VM Miles	Amount of Routine VM Cost Savings from Undergrounding (\$55)	2023				2024				2025				Holly Whitman	4/26/2023	4/26/2023	4/26/2023	0	NA	8.2.5.2	Vegetation Management and Inspections	Quality Control
Year	Number of Underground Miles to be Completed	Planned reduction in Number of Routine VM Miles	Amount of Routine VM Cost Savings from Undergrounding (\$55)																												
2023																															
2024																															
2025																															
222	CAPA	Sat WMP-17	CAPA_Sat WMP-17	1	CAPA_Sat WMP-17_021	<p>REIGN CONFIDENTIAL</p> <p>Table 1 - Projects not pursued for Undergrounding in First 2500 miles</p> <p>PG&amp;E WMP-19 to create circuit protection zones (CPZ) based on first measured areas 17 miles to create a "cumulative risk score" for each CPZ. A Table 1 below, select CPZs that PG&amp;E has decided not to pursue undergrounding in the first 2500 miles. The table below shows the cumulative risk score for each CPZ and the following table shows the cumulative risk score for each CPZ and the following table shows the cumulative risk score for each CPZ.</p> <p>Table 1 - Projects not pursued for Undergrounding in First 2500 miles</p> <p>CPZ ID</p> <p>CPZ Name</p> <p>CPZ Length (miles)</p> <p>CPZ Risk Score</p> <p>CPZ Status</p> <p>CPZ Reason</p> <p>CPZ Description</p> <p>CPZ Location</p> <p>CPZ Coordinates</p> <p>CPZ Area (sq miles)</p> <p>CPZ Perimeter (miles)</p> <p>CPZ Volume (cubic miles)</p> <p>CPZ Weight (pounds)</p> <p>CPZ Value (dollars)</p> <p>CPZ Color (hex code)</p> <p>CPZ Font (font name)</p> <p>CPZ Size (font size)</p> <p>CPZ Weight (font weight)</p> <p>CPZ Color (font color)</p> <p>CPZ Font (font name)</p> <p>CPZ Size (font size)</p> <p>CPZ Weight (font weight)</p> <p>CPZ Color (font color)</p>	Matthew Taul	4/21/2023	4/26/2023	4/26/2023	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Grid Design and System Hardening	Undergrounding of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution																













340	OEIS	004	OEIS_004	14	OEIS_004_014	<p>Regarding PG&amp;E's Use of Downed Conductor Detection (DCD) and Partial Voltage Detection (PVD)</p> <p>1. Provide any analysis completed on reliability impacts due to DCD, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The number of outages that occurred due to DCD in 2022 and 2023</li> <li>The number of outages broken down by cause based on ignition drivers listed in Table 6 of the GDR that occurred due to DCD in 2022 and 2023</li> <li>Criteria used for DCD treatment (if applicable)</li> <li>The number of total customer minutes interrupted from DCD outages</li> <li>Any mitigations PG&amp;E is using to reduce reliability impacts from DCD implementation, including lessons learned from testing</li> <li>Provide any analysis completed on reliability impacts due to PVD, including:</li> <li>The number of outages that occurred due to PVD in 2022 and 2023</li> <li>The number of outages broken down by cause based on ignition drivers listed in Table 6 of the GDR that occurred due to PVD in 2022 and 2023</li> <li>Criteria used for PVD treatment (if applicable)</li> <li>The number of total customer minutes interrupted from PVD outages</li> <li>Any mitigations PG&amp;E is using to reduce reliability impacts from PVD implementation, including lessons learned from testing</li> </ol> <p>2. When evaluating outages due to EPSS, are DCD and PVD outages included as part of that evaluation?</p> <p>3. If so, what is the number of additional outages caused by PVD and DCD re-energized in 2023?</p> <p>4. If not, how does PG&amp;E account for and track any additional reliability event safety impacts from DCD and PVD implementation, and how does that inform changes to the two programs?</p>	Colin Lang	5/4/2023	5/9/2023	5/9/2023	<p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-014-014.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-014-014.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-014-014.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-014-014.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-014-014.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-014-014.html</a></p>	0	NA	8.1.2.10.1	Grid Design and System Hardening	Downed Conductor Detection Devices
341	OEIS	004	OEIS_004	15	OEIS_004_015	<p>Regarding Feasibility Constraints</p> <p>PG&amp;E must provide an analysis of how, if at all, feasibility constraints impact the decision making of its Wildlife Governance Steering Committee in selecting a portfolio of mitigation measures to decrease from the risk driver identification. This should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A flowchart or explanation of decision-making as processed by the Wildlife Governance Steering Committee.</li> <li>The correlation between WFS and feasibility.</li> <li>The correlation between WFS and WFS.</li> <li>Any associated shifts in prioritization due to implementing feasibility constraints</li> <li>A list of any projects not included within WFS scope to be feasibility constraints</li> </ol>	Colin Lang	5/4/2023	5/9/2023	5/9/2023	<p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-015-015.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-015-015.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-015-015.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-015-015.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-015-015.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-015-015.html</a></p>	1	NA	Appendix D	Areas for Continued Improvement	ACI PG&E-23-34 - Review Process of Feasibility Mitigation
342	OEIS	004	OEIS_004	16	OEIS_004_016	<p>Regarding Effectiveness of EPSS</p> <p>1. Provide the formula and calculations used by PG&amp;E to determine the effectiveness of EPSS</p> <p>2. Provide any analysis demonstrating alternate mitigation between EPSS risk and wildfire risk versus PG&amp;E's mitigation as directly addressing wildfire risk opposed to reliability</p> <p>3. Provide PG&amp;E's rationale for selecting EPSS-related mitigation measures, including risks and work hours shifted around from wildfire risk mitigation. This should also include any associated related mitigations.</p>	Colin Lang	5/4/2023	5/9/2023	5/9/2023	<p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-016-016.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-016-016.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-016-016.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-016-016.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-016-016.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-016-016.html</a></p>	2	NA	8.1.8.1.1	Grid Design, Operations and Maintenance	Protective Equipment and Device Settings
343	OEIS	004	OEIS_004	17	OEIS_004_017	<p>Regarding PG&amp;E's Underlying Program</p> <p>1. Provide the correlation of V2 and V3 risk scores of the 2022 WMP vs. 2023 WMP underlying scope for 2023. This should not include nor account for feasibility</p> <p>2. Provide the analysis on the remaining risk of the risks no longer scoped for underlying, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal mitigations being put into place to scope for underlying in the future</li> <li>The number of risks scoped for the future (per 2023)</li> <li>Alternative mitigations being used if no longer scoped for underlying</li> </ol>	Colin Lang	5/4/2023	5/9/2023	5/9/2023	<p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-017-017.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-017-017.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-017-017.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-017-017.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-017-017.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/oeis/oeis-004-017-017.html</a></p>	2	NA	8.1.2.2	Grid Design and System Hardening	Undergrounding of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
309	TURN	011	TURN_011	1	TURN_011_01	<p>1. PG&amp;E's WMP (R1) page - reference WDRM v3</p> <p>2. Please explain and quantify the difference in risk scoring results between WDRM v2 and WDRM v3. Please provide all supporting data and analysis in Excel with working formulas</p> <p>3. Please provide all results of WDRM v3 in Excel at the circuit segment, circuit protection zone, or most granular level available. This should include, at minimum, the following information in separate columns for all overhead HFTD and self-identified HFRA risks that have been evaluated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location</li> <li>Circuit segment identifier that can be used to cross-reference with PG&amp;E's underlying program, provided in WMP-2023-04-06_PGE_2023_WMP_R1_Appendix D ACI PG&amp;E-23-34_A2611</li> <li>Please add the unique identifier to the worksheet if necessary and provide in Excel if not already available. The unique identifier should also be incorporated into the response to question 2.</li> </ol> <p>4. Total overall risk score (wildfire + PSPS)</p> <p>5. Total PSPS risk score</p> <p>6. Mean wildfire risk score (please explain in the response how this is calculated)</p> <p>7. Mean PSPS risk score (please explain in the response how this is calculated)</p> <p>8. Overall number of underground risks (please explain the criteria if applicable for currently scoped projects) and WDRM number of risks of the underground</p> <p>9. Please add 4 columns to the spreadsheet provided (per part) for the number of overhead risks expected to be underground in 2023, 2024, and 2025, respectively, corresponding to each circuit segment.</p>	Tom Long	5/1/2023	5/9/2023	5/9/2023	<p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/turn/turn-011-01-01.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/turn/turn-011-01-01.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/turn/turn-011-01-01.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/turn/turn-011-01-01.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/turn/turn-011-01-01.html">https://www.pge.com/legal_global/overseer/turn/turn-011-01-01.html</a></p>	2	NA	6.2	Risk Methodology and Assessment	Risk Analysis Framework



224	DEIS	003	DEIS_003	10	DEIS_003_010	<p>Regarding PG&amp;E's Asset Inventory</p> <p>1. Provide a list of all fields that PG&amp;E's asset inventory captures (e.g., equipment, equipment type, age, installation date).</p> <p>2. Provide a list of all types of equipment captured within PG&amp;E's asset inventory.</p> <p>3. Provide a percentage to indicate PG&amp;E's missing data for each data field based on (a) within its asset inventory.</p> <p>4. Provide an estimated percentage for the amount of assets missing from PG&amp;E's asset inventory.</p>	Colin Lang	4/01/2023	6/01/2023	5/01/2023	2	N/A	8.1.5	Asset Management and Inspection (Systems)	N/A
344	TURN	012	TURN_012	1	TURN_012_01	<p>1. Please confirm that the Simplified Wildfire Risk Spreads Efficiency (SWRSE) and Wildfire Feasibility Expenditure (WFE) measures discussed on page 968 of PG&amp;E's WMP.</p> <p>2. Please describe any differences in wildfire mitigation programs proposed in relation of wildfire mitigation and approved within the WMP and GRC for the years 2023-2025, and.</p> <p>3. Can you lead to complete the cost-effectiveness of undergoing projects with any other projects.</p> <p>4. If PG&amp;E does not necessarily agree with "a" and "b" above, please explain why it does not.</p>	Tom Long	5/6/2023	5/11/2023	5/11/2023	0	N/A	Appendix D	Areas for Continued Improvement	ACI PG&E-22-34 - Review Process of Prioritizing Wildfire Mitigations
352	CaPA	Set WMP-24	CaPA_Set WMP-24	1	CaPA_Set WMP-24_01	<p>In reference to your response in Question 11 of GRC CallComments-PGE-2023WMP-16, in the email attachment WMP-Discovery 2023_DR_018-Q01146601, it is only indicated by PG&amp;E for underground projects and not for above ground projects.</p> <p>On Table (a) through (c), please identify the adjacent circuits that tie to the circuits with OH to US conversion projects in Table (a) through (c).</p>	Holly Whitman	5/6/2023	5/12/2023	5/11/2023	2	N/A	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Understanding of Electric Lines and/or Equipment
345	TURN	012	TURN_012	2	TURN_012_02	<p>2. Comparing the wildfire mitigation plan proposed in PG&amp;E's WMP with the wildfire mitigation plan proposed in PG&amp;E's latest 2023 GRC (21-24-021).</p> <p>3. Please describe any differences in wildfire mitigation programs proposed in relation of wildfire mitigation and approved within the WMP and GRC for the years 2023-2025, and.</p> <p>4. For any differences as described in (2) and (3), please provide a table that shows, on a program by program basis, the WMP program, the GRC program, and a description of the differences between the two, including without limitation differences in relation to or within each. The table should include any wildfire mitigation programs that are proposed in one of the proceedings but not in the other.</p>	Tom Long	5/6/2023	5/12/2023	5/12/2023	0	N/A	7.2.1	Wildfire Mitigation Strategy Development	Overview of Mitigation Initiatives and Activities
322	CaPA	Set WMP-22	CaPA_Set WMP-22	10	CaPA_Set WMP-22_010	<p>In response to data request CallComments-PGE-2023WMP-02, question 1, PG&amp;E provided its 2022 Quality Verification Distribution Audit report (WMP-Discovery2022_DR_CallComments_022-00104601CONF.pdf).</p> <p>1. For each of the 15 "zero tolerance &amp; high-risk findings," identified on page 4 of the above report, what action has PG&amp;E taken to mitigate these non-conformances in the future?</p> <p>2. For each of the 15 "zero tolerance &amp; high-risk findings," identified on page 4 of the above report, describe when and how PG&amp;E addressed the non-conformances to mitigate wildfire risk.</p> <p>3. For each category of the "Top Three Critical attribute findings" identified on page 4 of the above report, what action has PG&amp;E taken to mitigate these non-conformances in the future?</p> <p>4. For each category of the "Top Three Critical attribute findings" identified on page 4 of the above report, describe how PG&amp;E addressed the non-conformances to mitigate wildfire risk.</p> <p>5. Please describe all actions PG&amp;E has taken to reduce the rate of critical attribute non-conformances in future distribution system inspections.</p> <p>6. What is PG&amp;E's target Quality Pass Rate for 2023?</p> <p>7. Please compare and contrast the 2022 Quality Verification Distribution Audit mentioned above and the QA program for system inspections that PG&amp;E plans to implement (section 8.1.1 in PG&amp;E's WMP).</p>	Holly Whitman	5/02/2023	5/12/2023	5/12/2023	2	N/A	8.1.6.1	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Quality Assurance and Quality Control
353	MGRA	Data Request No. 5	MGRA_Data Request No. 5	1	MGRA_Data Request No. 5_01	<p>Is the sole source of this POI data the machine learning algorithm described in WDRM documentation? If not, what other inputs go into the POI?</p>	Joseph Michael	5/10/2023	5/15/2023	5/15/2023	0	N/A	Appendix C (8.4.1.1, 8.4.1.2)	Risk Methodology and Assessment	Geospatial Maps of Top Risk Areas Within the HPFA
354	MGRA	Data Request No. 5	MGRA_Data Request No. 5	2	MGRA_Data Request No. 5_02	<p>Is the Fine-grained POI distribution a result of the localization of specific historical outages, characteristics of assets, or environment, or both?</p>	Joseph Michael	5/10/2023	6/15/2023	5/15/2023	0	N/A	Appendix C (8.4.1.1, 8.4.1.2)	Risk Methodology and Assessment	Geospatial Maps of Top Risk Areas Within the HPFA
355	MGRA	Data Request No. 5	MGRA_Data Request No. 5	3	MGRA_Data Request No. 5_03	<p>Which of the following characteristics is known or suspected to contribute to the fine-grained localization of POI above shown, and to what degree:</p> <p>1. Topography and height</p> <p>2. Assets</p> <p>3. Assets health</p> <p>4. Assets type</p> <p>5. Distribution patterns</p>	Joseph Michael	5/10/2023	5/15/2023	5/15/2023	0	N/A	Appendix C (8.4.1.1, 8.4.1.2)	Risk Methodology and Assessment	Geospatial Maps of Top Risk Areas Within the HPFA
356	MGRA	Data Request No. 5	MGRA_Data Request No. 5	4	MGRA_Data Request No. 5_04	<p>Can you provide details regarding the WDRM POI model or any other model that is described in WDRM-02 discussion, or other aggregated party variables such as annual treatment or annual days over peak, are used as explanatory variables?</p>	Joseph Michael	5/10/2023	5/15/2023	5/15/2023	0	N/A	Appendix C (8.4.1.1, 8.4.1.2)	Risk Methodology and Assessment	Geospatial Maps of Top Risk Areas Within the HPFA
357	MGRA	Data Request No. 5	MGRA_Data Request No. 5	5	MGRA_Data Request No. 5_05	<p>Yes, in WDRM-02, we did not send and we did not include any significant variables in the probability of lightning ground outage model, which is trained on the data at the locations and on the ground surface usage. Wind and other contributors to the "weather" conditions are also provided in the consequence calculations in WDRM-02.</p>	Joseph Michael	5/10/2023	5/15/2023	5/15/2023	0	N/A	Appendix C (8.4.1.1, 8.4.1.2)	Risk Methodology and Assessment	Geospatial Maps of Top Risk Areas Within the HPFA

332	OEIS	004	OEIS_004	REV	OEIS_004_REV	<p>Regarding Enhanced Vegetation Management</p> <p>a. Provide the following table with discussion regarding EVM:</p> <p>Year</p> <p>HFTD Miles Completed</p> <p>Inspected</p> <p>Stake</p> <p>Powerline</p> <p>Tree Types Worked</p> <p>Percentage</p> <p>Task Per</p> <p>% of Miles in</p> <p>2019</p> <p>2020</p> <p>2021</p> <p>2022</p> <p>Total</p> <p>b. Provide a GIS layer of the features showing where EVM work was completed.</p>	Colin Lang	5/4/2023	5/15/2023	5/15/2023	0	N/A	8.2.2.8	Vegetation Management and Inspections	Discontinued Programs
329	OEIS	005	OEIS_005	1	OEIS_005_01	<p>Regarding Maturity Survey responses to Section 6.1.2 Question 4B, PG&amp;E answered "yes". What section of the Company Emergency Response Plan (CERP) does PG&amp;E provide a discussion of gaps, limitations, and improvement areas with remedial or corrective action plans in 4 weeks to address and CERP? If a discussion is contained in other documents, provide those and clarify what sections the discussion is contained in.</p>	Colin Lang	5/11/2023	5/16/2023	5/16/2023	3	N/A	Maturity Survey	Maturity Survey	Maturity Survey
360	OEIS	005	OEIS_005	2	OEIS_005_02	<p>Regarding Maturity Survey responses to Section 6.1.4 Question #2, PG&amp;E answered "yes" that an external third-party evaluation is conducted every five years.</p> <p>Please provide a copy of the most recent third-party evaluation.</p>	Colin Lang	5/11/2023	5/16/2023	5/16/2023	0	N/A	Maturity Survey	Maturity Survey	Maturity Survey
361	OEIS	005	OEIS_005	3	OEIS_005_03	<p>Regarding Maturity Survey responses to Section 6.1.4 Question #7, PG&amp;E answered "yes" that Subject Matter Expert (SME) reviews are completed annually.</p> <p>Please provide a copy of the most recent SME evaluation(s).</p>	Colin Lang	5/11/2023	5/16/2023	5/16/2023	1	N/A	Maturity Survey	Maturity Survey	Maturity Survey
362	TURN	013	TURN_013	1	TURN_013_01	<p>1. Following up on TURN DR 10-23) and PG&amp;E's response to:</p> <p>a. Please explain how PG&amp;E determined that a risk per the HV risk model above 720 constitutes the top 20% of risk-related segments? Why does 720 represent the 20% threshold? Please explain. Please provide a copy of the model used in the analysis. The top 20 percent of risk-related circuit segments in this response is 717 which PG&amp;E reported to WMP-2023_DR_TURN10-23Q04A001. How is the 5-83 circuit segments in each WORM model. Update WORM #3 that included both HFTD and HFRA (and non-HFTD line segments as well). WORM #2 only included HFTD circuit segments which totaled 3,635 circuit segments - see WMP-2023_DR_TURN10-23Q04A001. See connector_id_summary_WMP_23_06). The top 20 percent of the WORM #3 circuit segments is 721.</p> <p>b. Provide:</p> <p>Record Patent</p> <p>2019</p> <p>87,303</p> <p>45,600</p> <p>176,401</p> <p>2020</p> <p>193,729</p> <p>65,402</p> <p>128,976</p> <p>2021</p> <p>179,808</p> <p>22,416</p> <p>2022</p> <p>93,338</p> <p>41,100</p> <p>348,535</p> <p>c. As of February 2022, we forecast for Distribution program tree removals is approximately 332,000 trees in 2023, 331,000 trees in 2024, and 329,000 trees in 2025. In our Tree Removal Inventory Program, we are planning to remove 15,000 trees in 2023, 20,000 trees in 2024, and 25,000 trees in 2025. Please see below for the count of trees in PG&amp;E tree inventory that are listed for removal:</p> <p>Record Patent</p> <p>2019</p> <p>87,303</p> <p>45,600</p> <p>176,401</p> <p>2020</p> <p>193,729</p> <p>65,402</p> <p>128,976</p> <p>2021</p> <p>179,808</p> <p>22,416</p> <p>2022</p> <p>93,338</p> <p>41,100</p> <p>348,535</p>	Tom Long	5/11/2023	5/16/2023	5/16/2023	0	N/A	8.1.2.2	Grid Design, Operations, and Maintenance	Underwriting of Electric Lines and Equipment
363	Green Power Institute (GPI)	002	Green Power Institute (GPI)_002	1	Green Power Institute (GPI)_002_01	<p>Please provide:</p> <p>The number of trees removed in each year from 2019-2022 and the program under which the removals will occur.</p> <p>The number of planned tree removals for 2023, 2024, and 2025, and the program under which the removals will occur.</p> <p>The number of remaining trees in PG&amp;E's tree inventory that are listed for removal.</p>	Zoe Harwood	5/11/2023	5/16/2023	5/16/2023	0	N/A	8.2.2.4	Vegetation Management and Inspections	Tree Removal Inventory
364	Green Power Institute (GPI)	002	Green Power Institute (GPI)_002	2	Green Power Institute (GPI)_002_02	<p>Please provide the number of distribution line miles PG&amp;E will perform trimming on to achieve enhanced clearances (&gt; 12').</p>	Zoe Harwood	5/11/2023	5/16/2023	5/16/2023	0	N/A	8.2.3.3	Vegetation Management and Inspections	Clearance
365	Green Power Institute (GPI)	002	Green Power Institute (GPI)_002	3	Green Power Institute (GPI)_002_03	<p>Please provide any existing qualitative metrics (e.g., bushhacks, etc.) on the total amount of vegetation management "wins" (or reductions) produced each year from 2020 - 2022, and the annual amounts that are expected of existing facilities, suitable biomass facilities, or other facilities.</p> <p>2021: 161,033 tons</p> <p>2022: 39,867 tons</p> <p>2023: 26,860 tons</p>	Zoe Harwood	5/11/2023	5/16/2023	5/16/2023	0	N/A	8.2.3.2	Vegetation Management and Inspections	Wood and Slash Management
366	Green Power Institute (GPI)	002	Green Power Institute (GPI)_002	4	Green Power Institute (GPI)_002_04	<p>Please provide the number of customer requests to retain woody biomass resulting from vegetation management activities on private property, state property, and federal property.</p>	Zoe Harwood	5/11/2023	5/16/2023	5/16/2023	0	N/A	8.2.3.2	Vegetation Management and Inspections	Wood and Slash Management
367	Green Power Institute (GPI)	002	Green Power Institute (GPI)_002	5	Green Power Institute (GPI)_002_05	<p>Please describe current agreements and any recent (2021-Present) contractual terms with state and federal agencies regarding fuels and slash management (e.g. state and federal lands, respectively).</p>	Zoe Harwood	5/11/2023	5/16/2023	5/16/2023	0	N/A	8.2.3.2	Vegetation Management and Inspections	Wood and Slash Management
338	OEIS	004	OEIS_004	12	OEIS_004_12	<p>Regarding the PG&amp;E memo for PPSB on:</p> <p>The sections that relate to metrics PPSB-C, PPSB-D, PPSB-E and PPSB-F do not sufficiently describe the methodologies that ultimately result in a PPSB Risk Score. The Guidelines for section 8.2 Risk Analysis Framework require detailed discussion of likelihood, consequence, exposure potential and vulnerability for Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS) Risk:</p> <p>6.1.1 Overview: The electrical corporation must provide a brief narrative describing its methodology for quantifying the overall utility risk of wildfire and Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS).</p> <p>6.2.2.1 Likelihood: The electrical corporation must discuss how it calculates the likelihood that its equipment through normal operation or failure will result in a catastrophic wildfire and the resulting likelihood of losing a PPSB.</p> <p>6.2.2.2 Consequence: The electrical corporation must discuss how it calculates the consequences of a fire originating from the equipment and the consequence of implementing a PPSB event.</p> <p>In order to understand PG&amp;E's appropriate calculations that ultimately result in the PPSB Risk Score, please provide the following, including via Excel file as applicable:</p> <p>a. Regarding PPSB Likelihood:</p> <p>1. Provide details on the inputs to the PPSB model, and calculation.</p> <p>2. In the LARF spreadsheet (attached at Page 6-2.1) used to calculate likelihood of a PPSB event?</p> <p>3. The PPSB Likelihood section fully discusses applying current PPSB protocols against historical climatological data to inform the PPSB model, and refers to the WTRM data flow on Page 6-2.2.3.</p> <p>4. Explain the input data sources, PPI and PPIW models, and the WTRM data flow as required to produce the likelihood of a PPSB event.</p> <p>5. Explain the historical weather data used to provide the likelihood of a PPSB event.</p> <p>b. Regarding PPSB Consequence:</p> <p>1. Provide details on the inputs to the PPSB-C model.</p> <p>2. Provide explanation of the PPSB Consequence schemata, Figure 6-2.1.3.</p> <p>3. Provide an adequate PPSB Consequence Risk Score calculation.</p> <p>4. Describe the output of the PPSB likelihood (provide an example of 12-year customer distribution).</p> <p>5. How does Customer Classification &amp; Weighting affect the result?</p> <p>6. Provide more detailed schemata similar to the CARE Process Sheet (Figure 6-2.2.5) to illustrate model flow.</p> <p>7. Please provide a PPSB Consequence section with a similar level of detail as the Wildlife Consequence section. Highlighting figures and tables for transparency (using common keys).</p>	Colin Lang	5/4/2023	5/16/2023	5/16/2023	0	N/A	6.2	Risk Methodology and Assessment	Risk Analysis Framework
368	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	007	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_007	1	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_007_01	<p>1) What types of covered conductor (list of conductor material, conductor, voltage rating of conductor - if PSC&amp;N can't provide data from a manufacturer, then provide the conductor) does PSC&amp;N use and does PG&amp;E choose different types of covered conductor types over another?</p>	Henry Bernal	5/17/2023	5/18/2023	5/18/2023	3	N/A	8.1.2.1	Grid Design and System Hardware	Conductor Installation - Distribution
369	MGRA	Date Request No. 5	MGRA_Data Request No. 5	1	MGRA_Data Request No. 5_01	<p>These were delivered with an Excel spreadsheet containing outage IDs.</p> <p>These were delivered with an Outlook file containing the DOA tags that it is to change data process result of DR1. Please provide the file sent in response to DR-06 as soon as possible.</p>	Joseph Michael	5/15/2023	5/18/2023	5/18/2023	1	N/A	8.1.1.1	Grid Operations and Procedures	Protective Equipment and Device Settings
369	MGRA	Date Request No. 6	MGRA_Data Request No. 6	2	MGRA_Data Request No. 6_02	<p>Please add (or re-add) a sample "cascades" attribute to the outage file.</p>	Joseph Michael	5/18/2023	5/18/2023	5/18/2023	0	N/A	8.1.1.1	Grid Operations and Procedures	Protective Equipment and Device Settings
370	MGRA	Date Request No. 6	MGRA_Data Request No. 6	3	MGRA_Data Request No. 6_03	<p>Lowering, please add a "cascades" attribute to the outage data in the GIS file issued in response to MGRA DR1. Alternatively, provide an Excel file in which "cascades" is cross-referenced to OutageID(s).</p>	Joseph Michael	5/18/2023	5/18/2023	5/18/2023	0	N/A	8.1.1.1	Grid Operations and Procedures	Protective Equipment and Device Settings







305	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	009	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_009_02	2	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_009_02	<p>a. Was the statement classified broadly PPS?</p> <p>b. The CPUC operates independently of PPS and is based on different criteria and benchmarks designed to mitigate hazards and threats that can lead to loss of life and loss under non-PPS conditions. See PG&amp;E's 2023 WMP, Section 8.1.6 PPS indicators of operational maturity, flexibility, and system resilience is based on risk limited to:</p> <p>Operational Maturity</p> <p>Developed procedures in the PPS decision making process by reviewing information provided by our SMEs and determining when there is an imminent or significant risk of adverse events impacting PG&amp;E assets and a significant risk of harm. Resilience activities should trigger upon section 7.2.3 of PG&amp;E's 2023 WMP.</p> <p>1. Making extensive use of weather forecasts and scoring capabilities by utilizing Caltrans' Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) model which employs granular scoring processes to supplement the public safety risk analysis by segmenting smaller segments of the grid within the close confines of the fire critical weather footprint, rather than re-estimating larger amounts of water.</p> <p>2. Making extensive use of Advanced Notifications and outreach tools to notify impacted customers. Through Caltrans' Foundation for Independent Living Centers (FILC) and Community Based Organizations (CBO) response.</p> <p>3. Using an extensive camera, weather station, and satellite weather monitoring network and on the ground personnel to collect real-time observations to inform and speed the identification of weather "At-Risk" times in more precise, smaller areas, to get customers back in service faster (see section 7.3.2.1 of PG&amp;E's 2023 WMP).</p> <p>4. Reassigning and increasing resources for restoration efforts, including use of helicopters and fleet wing arrivals to conduct low safety paths after the weather "At-Risk" restoring service to safe lines as quickly as possible subject to operational safety and ability to access equipment for public and any needed repairs (see section 7.3.5 of PG&amp;E's 2023 WMP).</p> <p>5. Supporting vulnerable customers through Caltrans' Foundation for Independent Living Centers (FILC) and Community Based Organizations (CBO) response.</p>	Kevin Miller	6/20/2023	6/8/2023	6/7/2023	<a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-01">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-01</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-02">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-02</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-03">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-03</a>	0	NA	8.1.2	Public Safety Power Shutoff	Identification of Frequently De-Energized Circuits
306	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	009	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_009_03	3	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_009_03	<p>SP&amp;E has less than the required number of personnel with required training for several categories in Table B-30. PG&amp;E's Personnel Training Programs for Electric and PPSD Events. Other roles related to staffing include for example, all staffing will complete training on time and seasons for all being completed in the timing of a required position. Why are there less than required values of personnel not completing the training?</p>	Kevin Miller	6/20/2023	6/8/2023	6/7/2023	<a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-04">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-04</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-05">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-05</a>	0	NA	8.1.3	Grid Operations and Procedures	Personnel Work Procedures and Training in Conditions of Elevated Fire Risk
307	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	009	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_009_04	4	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_009_04	<p>SP&amp;E provides means to verify message receipt in Table B-49. PG&amp;E's Protocols for Emergency Communication to Stakeholder Groups. How accurate is the receipt information with regard to sending messages are reaching intended recipients/aware to act in intended early actions (e.g., including, but not limited to, those who are not on the list)?</p>	Kevin Miller	6/20/2023	6/8/2023	6/7/2023	<a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-06">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-06</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-07">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-07</a>	0	NA	8.4.1	Emergency Preparedness	Protocols for Emergency Communications
308	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	009	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_009_05	5	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_009_05	<p>SP&amp;E issues notifications to AFNMB members. How does PG&amp;E know that these notifications are received and that contact information is up to date?</p> <p>Does PG&amp;E have a way to continuously verify that the contact information on file is current to help ensure such important notices are being received by the intended recipients?</p>	Kevin Miller	6/20/2023	6/8/2023	6/7/2023	<a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-08">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-08</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-09">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-09</a>	0	NA	8.5.3	Community Outreach and Engagement	Engagement With Access and Functional Needs Populations
309	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	009	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_009_06	6	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_009_06	<p>SP&amp;E mentions pre-pandemic in-person engagement. Does PG&amp;E have data comparing pre-pandemic engagement to pandemic limitations engagement efforts and among other things, attendance? For instance, are there metrics regarding non-APNMB and APNMB?</p>	Kevin Miller	6/20/2023	6/8/2023	6/7/2023	<a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-10">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-10</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-11">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-11</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-12">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-12</a>	0	NA	8.5.3	Community Outreach and Engagement	Engagement With Access and Functional Needs Populations
400	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	009	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_009_07	7	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_009_07	<p>SP&amp;E states that if an AFN customer does not answer the door, the notification is considered successful if a door hanger is left. What return policy/practice is PG&amp;E following that classifies a door hanger as a successful notification?</p>	Kevin Miller	6/20/2023	6/8/2023	6/7/2023	<a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-13">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-13</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-14">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-14</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-15">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/06/20/23-06-20-15</a>	0	NA	8.5.3	Community Outreach and Engagement	Engagement With Access and Functional Needs Populations
372	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	005	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_01	1	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_01	<p>Regarding cost in PG&amp;E's undergrounding grid hardening mitigation initiative projects, used in calculating cost-efficiency and project feasibility as described in the 2022-2023 WMP (p. 340 and p. 358), is data and backlog needed?</p> <p>What was the average cost per circuit mile for undergrounding in 2022, 2021, and 2020, in the HFTD, non-HFTD, and battery-aided?</p> <p>What was the average cost per circuit mile expected in 2023, 2024, and 2025, in the HFTD, non-HFTD, and battery-aided?</p> <p>For non-battery-aided, explain expected average year-over-year cost changes.</p>	Kevin Miller	5/15/2023	6/12/2023	6/12/2023	<a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-01">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-01</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-02">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-02</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-03">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-03</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Grid Design and System Hardening	Undergrounding of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
373	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	005	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_02	2	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_02	<p>How does the utility's cost estimate breakdown for undergrounding per mile. Provide the cost estimate in a commonly used cost-estimating format (e.g., Uniform). If the utility uses a different format, provide internal documentation on that format so SPD can understand the cost estimate.</p>	Kevin Miller	5/15/2023	6/12/2023	6/12/2023	<a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-04">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-04</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-05">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-05</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-06">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-06</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Grid Design and System Hardening	Undergrounding of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
374	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	005	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_03	3	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_03	<p>How is PG&amp;E recognizing subsurface variability (e.g., encountering hard rock, slope, or other conditions) providing significant, physical obstacles into undergrounding cost calculations? Provide an example.</p>	Kevin Miller	5/15/2023	6/12/2023	6/12/2023	<a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-07">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-07</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-08">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-08</a> <a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-09">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/info/about/communications/press-releases/2023/05/15/23-05-15-09</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Grid Design and System Hardening	Undergrounding of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution



375	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	005	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_4	4	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_4	RCSC has stated that CalTrans bench depth requirements exceeded PG&E bench depth requirements. How has impacted costs and planning? For planning purposes, what percentages of additional underground cost will be impacted by the CalTrans bench depth requirements for 2023-2025?	PG&E has refined changes to our per mile cost forecasts related to CalTrans bench depth requirements. Planning for CalTrans bench requirements is incorporated into individual project design packages. Of the approximately 2,700 circuit miles planned in the 2023-2026 Underground Planning (UGP) with the 2023-2025 WMP, 204 circuit miles are on projects where PG&E has determined that the CalTrans bench depth requirements will likely apply. Currently, this makes up less than 8% of the underground circuit miles planned in our WMP. Engineers incorporate CalTrans bench depth requirements into the individual projects during the project design phase. The cost and planning impacts of the CalTrans requirements is based on these individual project design packages.	Kevin Miller	5/15/2023	6/12/2023	6/12/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_4">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_4</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Underground of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
376	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	005	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_5	5	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_5	How does service the impact cost calculation?	PG&E's underground forecasts represent the capital costs to construct projects. Service is not considered in these calculations, but is expected to be longer than normal lines. PG&E also expects that by undergrounding distribution lines, there will be long-term costs for operation and maintenance, vegetation management, and other activities associated with the lines.	Kevin Miller	5/15/2023	6/12/2023	6/12/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_5">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_5</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Underground of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
377	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	005	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_6	6	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_6	What is the estimated multiplier for conversion from overhead (OHL) to underground (UG) line (e.g., 1.25 Miles converts to 1.25 Miles UG)? How was the conversion factor derived? How was it established as the accelerating average for project planning purposes?	a. The original accelerated conversion of overhead to underground mileage (1.25) was based on the original response to the 2022 PG&E Request for Information. b. 19 projects completed in 2022 to validate this estimate. In these 19 projects, we converted approximately 12.7 miles of overhead and replaced them with 10.3 underground miles based on this subset of data, which is generally consistent with the estimated multiplier of 1.25 for our cost model. c. Please also see response to 2023 WMP Division TURM 01-001, subpart 4f.	Kevin Miller	5/15/2023	6/12/2023	6/12/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_6">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_6</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Underground of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
378	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	005	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_07	7	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_07	7. On pilot projects completed to date: a. What is the total all-in cost per mile? b. What is the breakdown of project costs per mile? SPD expects to see the following components inside of the cost, although SPD understands they may not be broken down in the exact format: (Specify in %; primary line, secondary line, and/or other) c. Design Estimate (e.g., labor, materials, other costs) d. Distribution (e.g., permits, construction, long-term maintenance) e. Contingency (e.g., design, construction, electric construction) f. Other (e.g., direct payments to homeowners or homeowners may complete work such as landscaping or road repair)	a. In 2019, PG&E completed two pilot projects to convert overhead primary conductor to underground primary conductor. The total all-in cost per mile for each pilot project is noted in the below table. Project Order # 20220718-3056880 Total Link Cost Per Mile (in \$M): \$2,114.19 b. PG&E breaks down actual costs slightly differently than the format suggested by SPD in this question. For undergrounding at the project level PG&E uses a format agreed on in partnership with other O&A. The following components contribute to the total: 1. Labor (internal) 2. Materials 3. Contingency (contract, corporate, etc.) 4. Other 5. Financing Costs The costs for each of the two pilot projects by cost component are shown in the below table. Project Order # 20220718-3056880 Cost Component Labor (internal) \$24,336.70 \$32,187.82 Materials \$M \$38,938 \$41,554.17 Contractor \$508,081.67 \$461,087.68 Design \$20,011.17 \$23,703.10 Other \$44,967.19 \$27,663.32 Financing \$16,123.62 Total Cost \$924,843.05 \$1,076,174.70 Total Link Cost Per Mile (in \$M): \$2,114.19	Kevin Miller	5/15/2023	6/12/2023	6/12/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_07">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_07</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Underground of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
379	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	005	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_08	8	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_08	8. Please provide WMP/Division/2023_DR_TURM_007-001/44541/CONF.xlsx, used to address TURM Data Request 7, Question 1, discussing TSC calculation for system hardening.	Please see "WMP/Division/2023_DR_TURM_007-001/44541/CONF.xlsx."	Kevin Miller	5/15/2023	6/12/2023	6/12/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_08">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_08</a>	1	NA	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Underground of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
380	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)	005	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_09	9	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Division)_005_09	9. On page 15 of the 2023-2025 WMP, PG&E states that the WDOM of ignition sources is "PG&E's historical ignition data, 2015-2021 (approximately 1,200 CPUC-reportable ignitions and approximately 1,000 non-reportable ignitions)." a. Describe how PG&E is using the ~1,900 non-CPUC-reportable ignitions in its risk modeling. b. Provide the ~1,900 non-CPUC-reportable ignition data as an spreadsheet in format similar to the existing CPUC-reportable ignition data (see CPUC SPD, PG&E, 2023, UG& and 44541/44541 and Wildlife Safety Ignition, under the Ignition Data).	a. The PG&E historical ignitions data described on page 15 of PG&E's WMP is used as the starting data for the probability of ignition model portion of the WDOM v. For applicable data not included in the report, please contact a local engineer. b. The approximately 1,900 non-CPUC-reportable ignitions used in the development of the WDOM v. is a "WMP/Division/2023_DR_TURM_007-001/44541/CONF.xlsx" file. This information has been aligned with the format used for the CPUC-reportable ignitions. In some cases, not all data is available for these additional non-reportable ignitions. c. Additional information: WMP/Division/2023_DR_TURM_007-001/44541/CONF.xlsx for a description of the Distribution Planning Process. This document was submitted as part of the 2023 GRC Phase 1 Call of Service Testimony as Chapter 6, Distribution Expansion Planning Process and Proposed Costs. Part 2 of the document includes a continuation regarding load forecasting. In the WMP, PG&E has a written process for producing annual distribution load forecasts. d. Please see WMP/Division/2023_DR_TURM_007-001/44541/CONF.xlsx for a copy of the Distribution Planning Process, 005084 - Guide for Planning Area Distribution Facilities - Section 7. e. Please see WMP/Division/2023_DR_TURM_007-001/44541/CONF.xlsx for a copy of the Distribution Planning Process, 005084 - Guide for Planning Area Distribution Facilities - Section 7. f. The choice of which system hardening measure is deployed for additive mitigation purposes is not influenced by the load forecast or load growth projects in an area.	Kevin Miller	5/15/2023	6/12/2023	6/12/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_09">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_09</a>	0	NA	6.2.1	Risk Methodology and Assessment	Risk and Risk Component Identification
405	CaPA	Sat WMP-26	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_01	1	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_01	a) Do you have a written process or procedure for developing load forecasts? b) If the answer to (a) is "yes," provide a copy. c) If the answer to (a) is "no," explain why not.	a) Please see our written process or strategy for developing load forecasts. b) Do you have a written process or procedure for developing load forecasts? c) If the answer to (a) is "yes," provide a copy. d) If the answer to (a) is "no," explain why not.	Holly Whitman	7/27/2023	8/10/2023	8/10/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_01">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_01</a>	2	NA	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Underground of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
406	CaPA	Sat WMP-26	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_02	2	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_02	a) Do you consider load growth projections when you determine which system hardening measures to deploy for additive mitigation purposes? b) If the answer to (a) is "yes," explain why not. c) If the answer to (a) is "no," explain why not.	a) Not applicable. b) System hardening measures are selected based on wildfire risk and ignition risk growth projections, not loading. However, any loading scenario, including load growth projections, are addressed during the system hardening project scoping and design process, and the application of our mitigation controls, including additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated into the design. c) Please see our plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes. The scope and design of the project may be influenced by forecasted load growth. d) The design team is aware of 15-year additive transformer and distribution circuit breaker forecast and a three-year distribution line-section forecast. e) Our main scenario is based for load forecasting. This scenario uses known load applications for service as well as the most recently adopted California Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report forecast for load and Distributed Energy Resource growth. Our Electric Distribution Planning team provides input and feedback to the Grid Design team throughout the scoping process ensuring that additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated with the system hardening measures. There is an additional loadpoint later in the scoping process where the Electric Distribution Planning and Grid Design engineering teams review the Circuit Breaker Change Event (CBCE) and approve the final design. At that point, if any changes are required due to new forecasted load growth, the design team is notified to respond to that.	Holly Whitman	7/27/2023	8/10/2023	8/10/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_02">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_02</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Underground of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
407	CaPA	Sat WMP-26	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_03	3	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_03	a) When you plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes, do you design projects to accommodate forecasted load growth? b) If yes, what degree of load growth do you design for? c) Describe your process for incorporating forecasted load growth into the design of system hardening projects (for instance, which scenarios of possible load growth are considered).	a) Please see our plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes. The scope and design of the project may be influenced by forecasted load growth. b) Our main scenario is based for load forecasting. This scenario uses known load applications for service as well as the most recently adopted California Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report forecast for load and Distributed Energy Resource growth. Our Electric Distribution Planning team provides input and feedback to the Grid Design team throughout the scoping process ensuring that additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated with the system hardening measures. There is an additional loadpoint later in the scoping process where the Electric Distribution Planning and Grid Design engineering teams review the Circuit Breaker Change Event (CBCE) and approve the final design. At that point, if any changes are required due to new forecasted load growth, the design team is notified to respond to that. c) The attention behind covering base conductor to covered conductor is to lower the risk of additional wildfire. When operating from base conductor to covered conductor, we ensure that the maximum load capacity of each, at a minimum, they also work with the Distribution Planning team to scale the design for forecasted load growth needs required. d) Designing the system to maintain current capacity and voltage systems allow for capacity not only for the load profile and customer service expectations, but also weathering capabilities we have established to handle regular operation and system hardening. e) PG&E designs for two base systems in primary electric distribution: tap-line and mainline. Tap-lines are typically served by fuses and interrupters and are generally serving less than 100 acres. Our mainline lines serve up to 100+ acre conductor base reinforced (ACSR) XLPE lines with joint composite R2 copper (Cu) XLPE lines with composite and 10 aluminum (AL) EPDM for G5. Each of these conductive choices can serve more than 400 acres and are typically based on their forecasted load capacity needs, weather power flow, and operational capacity requirements in the area. f) Additional measures include in weathering system-wide capabilities, voltage control for reactive power management, making protection and SCADA, as well as communications for real-time and weather to manage individual circuit and mainline forecasted improvements. In addition, where the load forecast may exceed our maximum line size or capacity of the circuit, we may choose to install additional conductors to increase capacity and/or operational capacity. g) Please see our plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes. The scope and design of the project may be influenced by forecasted load growth. h) Our main scenario is based for load forecasting. This scenario uses known load applications for service as well as the most recently adopted California Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report forecast for load and Distributed Energy Resource growth. Our Electric Distribution Planning team provides input and feedback to the Grid Design team throughout the scoping process ensuring that additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated with the system hardening measures. There is an additional loadpoint later in the scoping process where the Electric Distribution Planning and Grid Design engineering teams review the Circuit Breaker Change Event (CBCE) and approve the final design. At that point, if any changes are required due to new forecasted load growth, the design team is notified to respond to that.	Holly Whitman	7/27/2023	8/10/2023	8/10/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_03">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_03</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Underground of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
408	CaPA	Sat WMP-26	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_04	4	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_04	a) In a typical base conductor to covered conductor conversion project, is the intention to maintain, increase, or decrease the load capacity at peak operating temperatures? b) Explain the reasoning for your response to (a).	a) Please see our plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes. The scope and design of the project may be influenced by forecasted load growth. b) Our main scenario is based for load forecasting. This scenario uses known load applications for service as well as the most recently adopted California Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report forecast for load and Distributed Energy Resource growth. Our Electric Distribution Planning team provides input and feedback to the Grid Design team throughout the scoping process ensuring that additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated with the system hardening measures. There is an additional loadpoint later in the scoping process where the Electric Distribution Planning and Grid Design engineering teams review the Circuit Breaker Change Event (CBCE) and approve the final design. At that point, if any changes are required due to new forecasted load growth, the design team is notified to respond to that. c) The attention behind covering base conductor to covered conductor is to lower the risk of additional wildfire. When operating from base conductor to covered conductor, we ensure that the maximum load capacity of each, at a minimum, they also work with the Distribution Planning team to scale the design for forecasted load growth needs required. d) Designing the system to maintain current capacity and voltage systems allow for capacity not only for the load profile and customer service expectations, but also weathering capabilities we have established to handle regular operation and system hardening. e) PG&E designs for two base systems in primary electric distribution: tap-line and mainline. Tap-lines are typically served by fuses and interrupters and are generally serving less than 100 acres. Our mainline lines serve up to 100+ acre conductor base reinforced (ACSR) XLPE lines with joint composite R2 copper (Cu) XLPE lines with composite and 10 aluminum (AL) EPDM for G5. Each of these conductive choices can serve more than 400 acres and are typically based on their forecasted load capacity needs, weather power flow, and operational capacity requirements in the area. f) Additional measures include in weathering system-wide capabilities, voltage control for reactive power management, making protection and SCADA, as well as communications for real-time and weather to manage individual circuit and mainline forecasted improvements. In addition, where the load forecast may exceed our maximum line size or capacity of the circuit, we may choose to install additional conductors to increase capacity and/or operational capacity. g) Please see our plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes. The scope and design of the project may be influenced by forecasted load growth. h) Our main scenario is based for load forecasting. This scenario uses known load applications for service as well as the most recently adopted California Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report forecast for load and Distributed Energy Resource growth. Our Electric Distribution Planning team provides input and feedback to the Grid Design team throughout the scoping process ensuring that additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated with the system hardening measures. There is an additional loadpoint later in the scoping process where the Electric Distribution Planning and Grid Design engineering teams review the Circuit Breaker Change Event (CBCE) and approve the final design. At that point, if any changes are required due to new forecasted load growth, the design team is notified to respond to that.	Holly Whitman	7/27/2023	8/10/2023	8/10/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_04">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_04</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Underground of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
409	CaPA	Sat WMP-26	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_05	5	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_05	a) Are all new covered conductor installation projects designed to accommodate loads greater than current covered capacity for the same span? b) If the answer to (a) is "yes," explain how. c) If the answer to (a) is "no," explain why not.	a) Please see our plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes. The scope and design of the project may be influenced by forecasted load growth. b) Our main scenario is based for load forecasting. This scenario uses known load applications for service as well as the most recently adopted California Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report forecast for load and Distributed Energy Resource growth. Our Electric Distribution Planning team provides input and feedback to the Grid Design team throughout the scoping process ensuring that additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated with the system hardening measures. There is an additional loadpoint later in the scoping process where the Electric Distribution Planning and Grid Design engineering teams review the Circuit Breaker Change Event (CBCE) and approve the final design. At that point, if any changes are required due to new forecasted load growth, the design team is notified to respond to that. c) The attention behind covering base conductor to covered conductor is to lower the risk of additional wildfire. When operating from base conductor to covered conductor, we ensure that the maximum load capacity of each, at a minimum, they also work with the Distribution Planning team to scale the design for forecasted load growth needs required. d) Designing the system to maintain current capacity and voltage systems allow for capacity not only for the load profile and customer service expectations, but also weathering capabilities we have established to handle regular operation and system hardening. e) PG&E designs for two base systems in primary electric distribution: tap-line and mainline. Tap-lines are typically served by fuses and interrupters and are generally serving less than 100 acres. Our mainline lines serve up to 100+ acre conductor base reinforced (ACSR) XLPE lines with joint composite R2 copper (Cu) XLPE lines with composite and 10 aluminum (AL) EPDM for G5. Each of these conductive choices can serve more than 400 acres and are typically based on their forecasted load capacity needs, weather power flow, and operational capacity requirements in the area. f) Additional measures include in weathering system-wide capabilities, voltage control for reactive power management, making protection and SCADA, as well as communications for real-time and weather to manage individual circuit and mainline forecasted improvements. In addition, where the load forecast may exceed our maximum line size or capacity of the circuit, we may choose to install additional conductors to increase capacity and/or operational capacity. g) Please see our plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes. The scope and design of the project may be influenced by forecasted load growth. h) Our main scenario is based for load forecasting. This scenario uses known load applications for service as well as the most recently adopted California Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report forecast for load and Distributed Energy Resource growth. Our Electric Distribution Planning team provides input and feedback to the Grid Design team throughout the scoping process ensuring that additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated with the system hardening measures. There is an additional loadpoint later in the scoping process where the Electric Distribution Planning and Grid Design engineering teams review the Circuit Breaker Change Event (CBCE) and approve the final design. At that point, if any changes are required due to new forecasted load growth, the design team is notified to respond to that.	Holly Whitman	7/27/2023	8/10/2023	8/10/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_05">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_05</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Underground of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
410	CaPA	Sat WMP-26	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_06	6	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_06	a) Are all overhead to underground conductor conversion projects designed to accommodate loads greater than current capacity for the same span? b) If the answer to (a) is "yes," explain how. c) If the answer to (a) is "no," explain why not.	a) Please see our plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes. The scope and design of the project may be influenced by forecasted load growth. b) Our main scenario is based for load forecasting. This scenario uses known load applications for service as well as the most recently adopted California Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report forecast for load and Distributed Energy Resource growth. Our Electric Distribution Planning team provides input and feedback to the Grid Design team throughout the scoping process ensuring that additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated with the system hardening measures. There is an additional loadpoint later in the scoping process where the Electric Distribution Planning and Grid Design engineering teams review the Circuit Breaker Change Event (CBCE) and approve the final design. At that point, if any changes are required due to new forecasted load growth, the design team is notified to respond to that. c) The attention behind covering base conductor to covered conductor is to lower the risk of additional wildfire. When operating from base conductor to covered conductor, we ensure that the maximum load capacity of each, at a minimum, they also work with the Distribution Planning team to scale the design for forecasted load growth needs required. d) Designing the system to maintain current capacity and voltage systems allow for capacity not only for the load profile and customer service expectations, but also weathering capabilities we have established to handle regular operation and system hardening. e) PG&E designs for two base systems in primary electric distribution: tap-line and mainline. Tap-lines are typically served by fuses and interrupters and are generally serving less than 100 acres. Our mainline lines serve up to 100+ acre conductor base reinforced (ACSR) XLPE lines with joint composite R2 copper (Cu) XLPE lines with composite and 10 aluminum (AL) EPDM for G5. Each of these conductive choices can serve more than 400 acres and are typically based on their forecasted load capacity needs, weather power flow, and operational capacity requirements in the area. f) Additional measures include in weathering system-wide capabilities, voltage control for reactive power management, making protection and SCADA, as well as communications for real-time and weather to manage individual circuit and mainline forecasted improvements. In addition, where the load forecast may exceed our maximum line size or capacity of the circuit, we may choose to install additional conductors to increase capacity and/or operational capacity. g) Please see our plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes. The scope and design of the project may be influenced by forecasted load growth. h) Our main scenario is based for load forecasting. This scenario uses known load applications for service as well as the most recently adopted California Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report forecast for load and Distributed Energy Resource growth. Our Electric Distribution Planning team provides input and feedback to the Grid Design team throughout the scoping process ensuring that additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated with the system hardening measures. There is an additional loadpoint later in the scoping process where the Electric Distribution Planning and Grid Design engineering teams review the Circuit Breaker Change Event (CBCE) and approve the final design. At that point, if any changes are required due to new forecasted load growth, the design team is notified to respond to that.	Holly Whitman	7/27/2023	8/10/2023	8/10/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_06">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_06</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Underground of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
411	CaPA	Sat WMP-26	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_07	7	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_07	Describe the challenges or advantages entailed in increasing load capacity on a circuit that has previously been hardened with covered conductor.	a) Please see our plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes. The scope and design of the project may be influenced by forecasted load growth. b) Our main scenario is based for load forecasting. This scenario uses known load applications for service as well as the most recently adopted California Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report forecast for load and Distributed Energy Resource growth. Our Electric Distribution Planning team provides input and feedback to the Grid Design team throughout the scoping process ensuring that additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated with the system hardening measures. There is an additional loadpoint later in the scoping process where the Electric Distribution Planning and Grid Design engineering teams review the Circuit Breaker Change Event (CBCE) and approve the final design. At that point, if any changes are required due to new forecasted load growth, the design team is notified to respond to that. c) The attention behind covering base conductor to covered conductor is to lower the risk of additional wildfire. When operating from base conductor to covered conductor, we ensure that the maximum load capacity of each, at a minimum, they also work with the Distribution Planning team to scale the design for forecasted load growth needs required. d) Designing the system to maintain current capacity and voltage systems allow for capacity not only for the load profile and customer service expectations, but also weathering capabilities we have established to handle regular operation and system hardening. e) PG&E designs for two base systems in primary electric distribution: tap-line and mainline. Tap-lines are typically served by fuses and interrupters and are generally serving less than 100 acres. Our mainline lines serve up to 100+ acre conductor base reinforced (ACSR) XLPE lines with joint composite R2 copper (Cu) XLPE lines with composite and 10 aluminum (AL) EPDM for G5. Each of these conductive choices can serve more than 400 acres and are typically based on their forecasted load capacity needs, weather power flow, and operational capacity requirements in the area. f) Additional measures include in weathering system-wide capabilities, voltage control for reactive power management, making protection and SCADA, as well as communications for real-time and weather to manage individual circuit and mainline forecasted improvements. In addition, where the load forecast may exceed our maximum line size or capacity of the circuit, we may choose to install additional conductors to increase capacity and/or operational capacity. g) Please see our plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes. The scope and design of the project may be influenced by forecasted load growth. h) Our main scenario is based for load forecasting. This scenario uses known load applications for service as well as the most recently adopted California Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report forecast for load and Distributed Energy Resource growth. Our Electric Distribution Planning team provides input and feedback to the Grid Design team throughout the scoping process ensuring that additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated with the system hardening measures. There is an additional loadpoint later in the scoping process where the Electric Distribution Planning and Grid Design engineering teams review the Circuit Breaker Change Event (CBCE) and approve the final design. At that point, if any changes are required due to new forecasted load growth, the design team is notified to respond to that.	Holly Whitman	7/27/2023	8/10/2023	8/10/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_07">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_07</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Underground of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
412	CaPA	Sat WMP-26	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_08	8	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_08	Describe the challenges or advantages entailed in increasing load capacity on a circuit that has previously been hardened with underground conductor.	a) Please see our plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes. The scope and design of the project may be influenced by forecasted load growth. b) Our main scenario is based for load forecasting. This scenario uses known load applications for service as well as the most recently adopted California Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report forecast for load and Distributed Energy Resource growth. Our Electric Distribution Planning team provides input and feedback to the Grid Design team throughout the scoping process ensuring that additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated with the system hardening measures. There is an additional loadpoint later in the scoping process where the Electric Distribution Planning and Grid Design engineering teams review the Circuit Breaker Change Event (CBCE) and approve the final design. At that point, if any changes are required due to new forecasted load growth, the design team is notified to respond to that. c) The attention behind covering base conductor to covered conductor is to lower the risk of additional wildfire. When operating from base conductor to covered conductor, we ensure that the maximum load capacity of each, at a minimum, they also work with the Distribution Planning team to scale the design for forecasted load growth needs required. d) Designing the system to maintain current capacity and voltage systems allow for capacity not only for the load profile and customer service expectations, but also weathering capabilities we have established to handle regular operation and system hardening. e) PG&E designs for two base systems in primary electric distribution: tap-line and mainline. Tap-lines are typically served by fuses and interrupters and are generally serving less than 100 acres. Our mainline lines serve up to 100+ acre conductor base reinforced (ACSR) XLPE lines with joint composite R2 copper (Cu) XLPE lines with composite and 10 aluminum (AL) EPDM for G5. Each of these conductive choices can serve more than 400 acres and are typically based on their forecasted load capacity needs, weather power flow, and operational capacity requirements in the area. f) Additional measures include in weathering system-wide capabilities, voltage control for reactive power management, making protection and SCADA, as well as communications for real-time and weather to manage individual circuit and mainline forecasted improvements. In addition, where the load forecast may exceed our maximum line size or capacity of the circuit, we may choose to install additional conductors to increase capacity and/or operational capacity. g) Please see our plan system hardening projects for additive mitigation purposes. The scope and design of the project may be influenced by forecasted load growth. h) Our main scenario is based for load forecasting. This scenario uses known load applications for service as well as the most recently adopted California Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report forecast for load and Distributed Energy Resource growth. Our Electric Distribution Planning team provides input and feedback to the Grid Design team throughout the scoping process ensuring that additional capacity, voltage control, and protection is incorporated with the system hardening measures. There is an additional loadpoint later in the scoping process where the Electric Distribution Planning and Grid Design engineering teams review the Circuit Breaker Change Event (CBCE) and approve the final design. At that point, if any changes are required due to new forecasted load growth, the design team is notified to respond to that.	Holly Whitman	7/27/2023	8/10/2023	8/10/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_08">https://www.pge.com/page_global/common/pdf/ugp/underground-planning-2023-2025-wmp-005_08</a>	0	NA	8.1.2.2	Circuit Design and System Hardening	Underground of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution

422	CAFA	Sat WMP-28	CaPA_Sat WMP-28	1	<p>4) OC in integrating QC with execution processes by completing QC on a shorter timeline than has been historically executed, allowing for greater opportunities for on-scene inspectors, sharing findings, and making corrections, as necessary. By leveraging another timeline to review and identify issues, PG&amp;E can work with stakeholders who have been recently completed, enabling both more timely corrective actions and additional operational efficiencies (i.e., bringing the prior inspector back to a fuller location before the inspector has departed the area).</p> <p>5) Review the process that OC and CA follow in 2022.</p> <p>6) System Inspector (SI) execution complete the scheduled distribution inspection.</p> <p>7) Completed inspection locations after the onset of OC-light locations.</p> <p>8) OC complete the review of the OC-light locations through desktop and/or interviews.</p> <p>9) OC review the OC failures with the SI execution team.</p> <p>10) OC complete the review of the OC-light locations through desktop and/or interviews.</p> <p>11) OC complete the review of the OC-light locations through desktop and/or interviews.</p> <p>12) OC complete the review of the OC-light locations through desktop and/or interviews.</p> <p>13) OC complete the review of the OC-light locations through desktop and/or interviews.</p> <p>14) OC complete the review of the OC-light locations through desktop and/or interviews.</p> <p>15) OC complete the review of the OC-light locations through desktop and/or interviews.</p> <p>16) OC complete the review of the OC-light locations through desktop and/or interviews.</p> <p>17) OC complete the review of the OC-light locations through desktop and/or interviews.</p> <p>18) OC complete the review of the OC-light locations through desktop and/or interviews.</p> <p>19) OC complete the review of the OC-light locations through desktop and/or interviews.</p> <p>20) OC complete the review of the OC-light locations through desktop and/or interviews.</p>	0	NA	8.1.8	Quality Assurance and Quality Control	NA
423	CAFA	Sat WMP-28	CaPA_Sat WMP-28	2	<p>1) The quality of asset inspection work is being tracked by using data on OC failures to inform field and asset pass with high visibility opportunities for improvement in initial work execution, citing quality at the source. Where applicable, PG&amp;E will also continue to track OC pass rates as we have done previously.</p> <p>2) PG&amp;E utilizes parallel charts, among other tools, to track top finding types which are reviewed with stakeholders to formulate data-driven plans of action. Where applicable, PG&amp;E will also continue to review OC pass rates.</p>	0	NA	8.1.8	Quality Assurance and Quality Control	NA
424	CAFA	Sat WMP-28	CaPA_Sat WMP-28	3	<p>1) All CA audit locations are audited from operational OC prior to asset work locations. Both ground and desktop QA audits are equal but desktop QA audits are given higher priority. Due to the nature of the sampling, it is not possible to determine in advance the quantities of each condition which may appear in the QA sample.</p> <p>2) PG&amp;E uses the response to subject (a) for an explanation of how distribution locations are assessed. The process is the same for distribution locations as it is for transmission locations.</p>	0	NA	8.1.8	Quality Assurance and Quality Control	NA
425	CAFA	Sat WMP-28	CaPA_Sat WMP-28	4	<p>1) All CA audit locations are audited from operational OC prior to asset work locations. Both ground and desktop QA audits are equal but desktop QA audits are given higher priority. Due to the nature of the sampling, it is not possible to determine in advance the quantities of each condition which may appear in the QA sample.</p> <p>2) PG&amp;E uses the response to subject (a) for an explanation of how distribution locations are assessed. The process is the same for distribution locations as it is for transmission locations.</p>	0	NA	8.1.8	Quality Assurance and Quality Control	NA
426	CAFA	Sat WMP-28	CaPA_Sat WMP-28	5	<p>1) PG&amp;E will continue to track the quality of asset inspection work by using data on OC failures to inform field and asset pass with high visibility opportunities for improvement in initial work execution, citing quality at the source. Where applicable, PG&amp;E will also continue to track OC pass rates as we have done previously.</p> <p>2) PG&amp;E utilizes parallel charts, among other tools, to track top finding types which are reviewed with stakeholders to formulate data-driven plans of action. Where applicable, PG&amp;E will also continue to review OC pass rates.</p>	0	NA	8.1.8	Quality Assurance and Quality Control	NA
427	CAFA	Sat WMP-28	CaPA_Sat WMP-28	6	<p>1) The findings that underpin QVGA audits in 2022 were not solely focused on HF-TD in addition, the ability to discern between HF-TD and non-HF-TD in the video VM reports that were reviewed on distribution line inspections, second round, etc. was limited in 2022. This means that the identified number of 2022 QVGA audits in VM does not represent the full number of 2022 QVGA audits.</p> <p>2) PG&amp;E will continue to track the quality of asset inspection work by using data on OC failures to inform field and asset pass with high visibility opportunities for improvement in initial work execution, citing quality at the source. Where applicable, PG&amp;E will also continue to track OC pass rates as we have done previously.</p>	0	NA	8.1.8	Quality Assurance and Quality Control	NA
428	CAFA	Sat WMP-28	CaPA_Sat WMP-28	7	<p>1) PG&amp;E will continue to track the quality of asset inspection work by using data on OC failures to inform field and asset pass with high visibility opportunities for improvement in initial work execution, citing quality at the source. Where applicable, PG&amp;E will also continue to track OC pass rates as we have done previously.</p> <p>2) PG&amp;E utilizes parallel charts, among other tools, to track top finding types which are reviewed with stakeholders to formulate data-driven plans of action. Where applicable, PG&amp;E will also continue to review OC pass rates.</p>	0	NA	8.1.8	GHG Operations and Procedures	NA
429	CAFA	Sat WMP-28	CaPA_Sat WMP-28	8	<p>1) The findings that underpin QVGA audits in 2022 were not solely focused on HF-TD in addition, the ability to discern between HF-TD and non-HF-TD in the video VM reports that were reviewed on distribution line inspections, second round, etc. was limited in 2022. This means that the identified number of 2022 QVGA audits in VM does not represent the full number of 2022 QVGA audits.</p> <p>2) PG&amp;E will continue to track the quality of asset inspection work by using data on OC failures to inform field and asset pass with high visibility opportunities for improvement in initial work execution, citing quality at the source. Where applicable, PG&amp;E will also continue to track OC pass rates as we have done previously.</p>	1	NA	8.1.8	GHG Operations and Procedures	NA
430	CAFA	Sat WMP-28	CaPA_Sat WMP-28	9	<p>1) The findings that underpin QVGA audits in 2022 were not solely focused on HF-TD in addition, the ability to discern between HF-TD and non-HF-TD in the video VM reports that were reviewed on distribution line inspections, second round, etc. was limited in 2022. This means that the identified number of 2022 QVGA audits in VM does not represent the full number of 2022 QVGA audits.</p> <p>2) PG&amp;E will continue to track the quality of asset inspection work by using data on OC failures to inform field and asset pass with high visibility opportunities for improvement in initial work execution, citing quality at the source. Where applicable, PG&amp;E will also continue to track OC pass rates as we have done previously.</p>	0	NA	8.1.8	GHG Operations and Procedures	NA
431	CAFA	Sat WMP-28	CaPA_Sat WMP-28	10	<p>1) The findings that underpin QVGA audits in 2022 were not solely focused on HF-TD in addition, the ability to discern between HF-TD and non-HF-TD in the video VM reports that were reviewed on distribution line inspections, second round, etc. was limited in 2022. This means that the identified number of 2022 QVGA audits in VM does not represent the full number of 2022 QVGA audits.</p> <p>2) PG&amp;E will continue to track the quality of asset inspection work by using data on OC failures to inform field and asset pass with high visibility opportunities for improvement in initial work execution, citing quality at the source. Where applicable, PG&amp;E will also continue to track OC pass rates as we have done previously.</p>	0	NA	8.1.8	GHG Operations and Procedures	NA
432	CAFA	Sat WMP-28	CaPA_Sat WMP-28	11	<p>1) The findings that underpin QVGA audits in 2022 were not solely focused on HF-TD in addition, the ability to discern between HF-TD and non-HF-TD in the video VM reports that were reviewed on distribution line inspections, second round, etc. was limited in 2022. This means that the identified number of 2022 QVGA audits in VM does not represent the full number of 2022 QVGA audits.</p> <p>2) PG&amp;E will continue to track the quality of asset inspection work by using data on OC failures to inform field and asset pass with high visibility opportunities for improvement in initial work execution, citing quality at the source. Where applicable, PG&amp;E will also continue to track OC pass rates as we have done previously.</p>	0	NA	8.1.8	GHG Operations and Procedures	NA





413	CaPA	Sat WMP-26	CaPA_Sat WMP-26	RSRFP	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_OSSUPP	Provide a list of circuits in your system. For each circuit, provide: a) Circuit ID Number b) Peak load in Amperes observed since January 1, 2014. c) Circuit Capacity in Amperes	Holly Whitman	7/27/2023	8/4/2023	8/4/2023	1	NA	8.1.2.2	Grid Design and System Hardening	Undergrounding of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
414	CaPA	Sat WMP-26	CaPA_Sat WMP-26	10SRFP	CaPA_Sat WMP-26_O10SRFP	Provide updated GIS layers of primary distribution, secondary distribution, and transmission lines, with the following: a) Circuit ID Number b) Peak load in Amperes obtained since January 1, 2014. c) Circuit Capacity in Amperes	Holly Whitman	7/27/2023	8/4/2023	8/4/2023	1	NA	8.1.2.2	Grid Design and System Hardening	Undergrounding of Electric Lines and/or Equipment - Distribution
445	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Decision)	010	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Decision)_010	1	CPUC - SPD (Safety Policy Decision)_010_01	Provide the attached spreadsheet with information summarized from Table 11 of PG&E's most recently submitted QAR 01 (2023 submitted Aug 1).	Kevin Miller	8/4/2023	9/1/2023	8/31/2023	1	NA	QDR	NA	NA
446	OESB	012	OESB_012	1	OESB_012_01	001 - Regarding PG&E's Response to RN/PG&E-23-07 a. Considering that there are no facts in O&M or coded Level 2 inspection data, the TRAQ form will not be digitized and the Focus+ Tree Inspection procedure does not require inspectors to take a photo of completed TRAQ forms, where data and information in PG&E plan to use to perform field-based quality control and Level 2 inspections performed under Focus+ Tree Inspections? b. Describe the quality control procedure for Focus+ Tree Inspections. c. How are any paper TRAQ forms generated through Focus+ Tree Inspections collected and stored by PG&E? d. Do you record Focus+ Tree Inspections, Results, and Incident Reports? e. How and where does the Inspector document relevant factors that contributed to an inspector's designation of a tree as a risk or not a risk, and any associated information? f. If PG&E does not record this information, justify why it does not record this information. g. In PG&E's response to Data Request PRMPM_2022-PG&E-001, Question 2, PG&E describes updates made to its Tree Assessment Tool (TAT) in 2022. h. Was this updated TAT ever operational? i. If it is, when was it operational? (i.e., used by all inspectors in the field to perform tree risk assessment under O&M). j. If not, why was it not operational? k. Provide the most recent version of the updated TAT, want that version was not operational. l. In response to item k, provide any reports regarding the 2022 update of the TAT, including, but not limited, documentation of methodology, application, internal review, and external review. m. In response to item l, provide any reports regarding the current version of the TAT. (Internal Inventory lists a 7% of vegetation in the HFTD does PG&E's analysis regarding the "percent of vegetation in the HFTD" assume that 100% of the vegetation in the HFTD will be mitigated?) n. If so, justify the assumption. o. If not, what percentage of vegetation risk does PG&E estimate it can mitigate in the HFTD? p. In response to item p, provide any reports regarding the 2022 update of the TAT, including, but not limited, documentation of methodology, application, internal review, and external review. q. In response to item q, provide any reports regarding the current version of the TAT. (Internal Inventory lists a 7% of vegetation in the HFTD does PG&E's analysis regarding the "percent of vegetation in the HFTD" assume that 100% of the vegetation in the HFTD will be mitigated?) r. If so, justify the assumption. s. If not, what percentage of vegetation risk does PG&E estimate it can mitigate in the HFTD? t. In response to item t, provide any reports regarding the 2022 update of the TAT, including, but not limited, documentation of methodology, application, internal review, and external review. u. In response to item u, provide any reports regarding the current version of the TAT. (Internal Inventory lists a 7% of vegetation in the HFTD does PG&E's analysis regarding the "percent of vegetation in the HFTD" assume that 100% of the vegetation in the HFTD will be mitigated?) v. If so, justify the assumption. w. If not, what percentage of vegetation risk does PG&E estimate it can mitigate in the HFTD?	Delecia Smith	8/30/2023	9/27/2023	9/27/2023	4	NA	8.2.2.5	Vegetation Management and Inspections	Focused Tree Inspections
447	OESB	012	OESB_012	2	OESB_012_02	002 - Regarding PG&E's Response to RN/PG&E-23-03 a. In its response relating to EPSS, PG&E states that it "does not have detailed mitigation effectiveness analysis at this time. These analyses are being developed based on subject matter expertise while empirical data is being collected." b. Explain what is meant by this statement, particularly given PG&E has provided effectiveness estimates for EPSS elsewhere. c. In PG&E's 2022-2025 WMP, PG&E states an estimated effectiveness of 68% for EPSS in 2022. To what will this effectiveness estimate be applied? Justify why. d. When does PG&E plan on calculating a more updated effectiveness estimate? What factors is PG&E including in the calculation?	Delecia Smith	8/30/2023	9/27/2023	9/27/2023	0	NA	8.1.1.10	Grid Design and System Hardening	Downed Conductors Detection Devices
448	OESB	012	OESB_012	3	OESB_012_03	003 - Regarding PG&E's Response to RN/PG&E-23-04 a. Table RN/PG&E-23-04-1 uses "Applied Backing Units Excavated" and "Applied Backing Units Remaining." Provide these same numbers for each year, broken down by priority (e.g., high, medium, and non-priority risk, respectively). b. Since PG&E's relation of FDRs, provide the following data broken down annually: 1. The number of instances in which PG&E cancelled a work order in response to an FDR. 2. The number of instances in which PG&E created a new work order in place of an existing work order in response to an FDR. 3. The number of instances in which PG&E combined work orders in response to an FDR. 4. Details on how PG&E tracks the above (through) within its databases. If PG&E does not currently track such instances, explain why. c. WBE PG&E continue to conduct annual FDRs on all Priority 1 tags? d. Provide all of PG&E's work orders for work orders and associated tracking to handling this backlog. This should include, but not be limited to: 1. Resource tracking, including obtaining work orders and personnel 2. Resource limitations, such as obtaining needed equipment and supply chain issues, and how PG&E intends on handling them. 3. Tagging of additional work orders including including details on how to identify, prioritize, and respond to require 4. How is PG&E tracking and prioritizing open risk tags that are Priority E or F? e. FDR notifications are entered in SAP for tracking, work planning, and execution. There is no distinct report or data base dedicated to notifications that are subject to FDR. But PG&E can use a user defined to identify which notifications require an FDR and use a task to see which notifications have an FDR implemented. Please provide the best available data for the number of instances in which PG&E cancelled a work order in response to an FDR. f. FDR Year Notification # 2021 104K 2022 147K 2023 146K g. PG&E typically updates existing notifications and does not create new notifications as part of the FDR process. The exception to this is when the FDR escalates the lower priority tag to an emergency tag. When this occurs, a new Priority A notification is created and the other notifications are closed. The table below provides the best available data for the number of instances in which PG&E created a new work order in response to an FDR. FDR Year Notification # 2021 21 2022 43 2023 26 h. PG&E typically only combines notifications as part of an FDR process when the notifications are duplicate notifications. The table below provides the best available data for the number of instances where an inspector recommended a cancellation to a duplicate. FDR Year Notification # 2021 107 2022 110 2023 99 i. FDR notifications are entered in SAP for tracking, work planning, and execution. There is no distinct report or data base dedicated to notifications that are subject to FDR. But PG&E can use a user defined to identify which notifications require an FDR and use a task to see which notifications have an FDR implemented. Please provide the best available data for the number of instances in which PG&E cancelled a work order in response to an FDR. j. FDR Year Notification # 2021 104K 2022 147K 2023 146K k. PG&E typically updates existing notifications and does not create new notifications as part of the FDR process. The exception to this is when the FDR escalates the lower priority tag to an emergency tag. When this occurs, a new Priority A notification is created and the other notifications are closed. The table below provides the best available data for the number of instances in which PG&E created a new work order in response to an FDR. FDR Year Notification # 2021 21 2022 43 2023 26 l. PG&E typically only combines notifications as part of an FDR process when the notifications are duplicate notifications. The table below provides the best available data for the number of instances where an inspector recommended a cancellation to a duplicate. FDR Year Notification # 2021 107 2022 110 2023 99	Delecia Smith	8/30/2023	9/27/2023	9/27/2023	0	NA	8.1.7.2	Open Work Orders	Open Work Orders - Distribution Tags
449	OESB	012	OESB_012	4	OESB_012_04	004 - Regarding PG&E's Response to RN/PG&E-23-05 a. For the 79 circuit segments not included in an undergrounding plan and that have not been hardened, provide the following information via spreadsheet: 1. Circuit Name 2. Circuit segment/CRZ Name 3. Length of circuit segment 4. VZ Risk Score 5. VZ Risk Ranking 6. VZ Risk Score (if available) 7. VZ Risk Ranking (if available) 8. WFE Rating 9. WFE Rating 10. Feasibility Score 11. Reason for why the circuit segment is not included in undergrounding plan 12. Other mitigation options being used for the circuit segment currently 13. Other mitigation options being considered for the circuit segment in the future, (if such differs from 12)	Delecia Smith	8/30/2023	9/27/2023	9/27/2023	1	NA	7.2.1	Wildfire Mitigation Strategy Development	Overview of Mitigation Initiatives and Activities
450	CaPA	Sat WMP-29	CaPA_Sat WMP-29	1	CaPA_Sat WMP-29_01	Page 35 of PG&E's response states, "PG&E is currently working to integrate QC with our execution processes to drive quality during critical work execution." a) Provide the approximate date when PG&E plans to implement Integrated QC process, described above. b) Please provide any internal protocols, presentations, reports, or other documentation that describes PG&E's proposed Integrated QC process. c) How does PG&E plan to ensure that all personnel, fieldworkers, checklists, or job aids that personnel will use when implementing PG&E's proposed Integrated QC process.	Holly Whitman	9/1/2023	9/27/2023	9/27/2023	0	NA	8.1.6	Quality Assurance and Quality Control	NA





465	CaPA	Sat WMP-30	CaPA_Sat WMP-30	1	CaPA_Sat WMP-30_01	<p>This data request relates to PG&amp;E's Wildlife Distribution Risk Model version 4 (hereinafter referred to as "WDRM v4"). If any of the requested documents or information is not yet complete and available, please state in your response when you expect the documents or information to be complete and available.</p> <p>4) Please list all distinct risk scores generated by PG&amp;E's WDRM v4. For example, WDRM v3 generated 17 different risk scores 4</p> <p>For each risk score in part (a), please provide a category or brief description of the type of risk the score represents.</p> <p>5) For each risk score in part (a), please provide a brief explanation of how PG&amp;E intends to use that risk score.</p> <p>6) For each risk score in part (a), please list all PG&amp;E wildfire mitigation initiatives that are informed by that risk score.</p> <p>7) For each risk score in part (a), please state the most granular level available for that risk score. For example, in WDRM v3, the most granular level available would be the risk scores associated with individual 100m x 100m plots.</p> <p>8) For each risk score in part (a), please state the granularity of which the risk score is used to inform wildfire mitigation initiatives (e.g., circuit segment, circuit, individual asset, etc.).</p>	4) - 1) The Wildlife Distribution Risk Model (WDRM v4) is not currently available. PG&E plans to make the model information available with the 2025 Wildfire Mitigation Plan Update.	Holly Whitman	10/1/2023	10/25/2023	10/23/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf">https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf</a>	0	N/A	2022 WMP Section 4.5	Model Metrics and Calculation Methodologies	NA
466	CaPA	Sat WMP-30	CaPA_Sat WMP-30	2	CaPA_Sat WMP-30_02	<p>This data request relates to PG&amp;E's Wildlife Distribution Risk Model version 4 (hereinafter referred to as "WDRM v4"). If any of the requested documents or information is not yet complete and available, please state in your response when you expect the documents or information to be complete and available.</p> <p>4) Please list all composite (or aggregate) risk scores generated by PG&amp;E's WDRM v4. For example, WDRM v3 generated five composite risk scores.</p> <p>5) For each risk score in part (a), please provide a category or brief description of the type of risk the score represents.</p> <p>6) For each risk score in part (a), please provide a brief explanation of how PG&amp;E intends to use that risk score.</p> <p>7) For each risk score in part (a), please list all PG&amp;E wildfire mitigation initiatives that are informed by that risk score.</p> <p>8) For each risk score in part (a), please state the most granular level available for that risk score.</p> <p>9) For each risk score in part (a), please state the granularity of which the risk score is used to inform wildfire mitigation initiatives (e.g., circuit segment, circuit, individual asset, etc.).</p>	4) - 1) As stated in the response to Question 001, the WDRM v4 is not currently available. PG&E plans to make the model information available with the 2025 WMP Update.	Holly Whitman	10/1/2023	10/25/2023	10/23/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf">https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf</a>	0	N/A	2022 WMP Section 4.5	Model Metrics and Calculation Methodologies	NA
467	CaPA	Sat WMP-30	CaPA_Sat WMP-30	3	CaPA_Sat WMP-30_03	<p>The following questions refer to the risk scores generated from WDRM v4. This should be understood to refer to PG&amp;E's responses to questions 1 and 2 above.</p> <p>4) Please provide a GIS file that details the most granular level (as discussed in questions 1a) and 2a)) available for each risk score identified in questions 1a) and 2a). This file should contain the following:</p> <p>a) Geographic features detailing the most granular level available for each risk score. This may be polygons that depict "points," lines that depict circuit segments, points that depict assets, or other geometry that best suits the relevant risk scores. If multiple risk scores share geometry (e.g., multiple risk scores that are calculated at the "tower" level), there is no need to include multiple layers that depict the same physical geometry.</p> <p>b) Each geographic feature, please include all relevant risk scores from questions 1a) and 2a) as attributes.</p>	4) - 3) As stated in the response to Questions 001 - 002, the WDRM v4 is not currently available. PG&E plans to make the model information available with the 2025 WMP Update.	Holly Whitman	10/1/2023	10/25/2023	10/23/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf">https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf</a>	0	N/A	2022 WMP Section 4.5	Model Metrics and Calculation Methodologies	NA
468	CaPA	Sat WMP-30	CaPA_Sat WMP-30	4	CaPA_Sat WMP-30_04	<p>The following questions refer to the risk scores generated from WDRM v4. This should be understood to refer to PG&amp;E's responses to questions 1 and 2 above.</p> <p>4) Please provide a GIS file that details the risk scores at the same granularity that is currently used to inform wildfire mitigation measures (as discussed in questions 1f) and 2f). This file should contain the following:</p> <p>a) Geographic features detailing the relevant geometry for each risk score. This may be polygons that depict "points," lines that depict circuit segments, points that depict assets, or other geometry that best suits the relevant risk scores. If multiple risk scores share geometry (e.g., multiple risk scores that are used to inform mitigation measures at the circuit segment level), there is no need to include multiple layers that depict the same physical geometry.</p> <p>b) For each geographic feature, please include all relevant risk scores from questions 1a) and 2a) as attributes.</p> <p>c) For each geographic feature, include the circuit identification number as an attribute.</p> <p>d) For each geographic feature, include the circuit name as an attribute.</p> <p>e) For each geographic feature, include the circuit segment name as an attribute.</p> <p>f) If needed, include unique classification for each geographic feature (e.g., asset ID, substation name, etc.).</p>	4) - 1) As stated in the response to Questions 001 - 003, the WDRM v4 is not currently available. PG&E plans to make the model information available with the 2025 WMP Update.	Holly Whitman	10/1/2023	10/25/2023	10/23/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf">https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf</a>	0	N/A	2022 WMP Section 4.5	Model Metrics and Calculation Methodologies	NA
469	CaPA	Sat WMP-30	CaPA_Sat WMP-30	5	CaPA_Sat WMP-30_05	<p>The following questions refer to the risk scores generated from WDRM v4. This should be understood to refer to PG&amp;E's responses to questions 1 and 2 above.</p> <p>4) Please provide a spreadsheet that lists (as many) each circuit-segment that is included in the Wildlife Distribution Risk Model v4. This spreadsheet should include, at minimum, the following columns:</p> <p>a) Name or ID number of each circuit segment.</p> <p>b) Circuit name for the circuit that each segment is part of.</p> <p>c) Circuit ID for the circuit that each segment is part of.</p> <p>d) Tower voltage.</p> <p>e) The total length of the circuit segment. (Cal Area Utilities understands this to be the number of 100m x 100m plots analyzed by the WDRM v4 along the length of the circuit segment).</p> <p>f) The average risk value(s) associated with each plot along the circuit segment. (In previous versions of the risk model, the risk referred to as the "mean WDFV" core risk or "mean risk").</p> <p>5) Total circuit-miles on the circuit-segment.</p> <p>6) Total overhead circuit-miles on the circuit-segment.</p> <p>7) Total non-HFTD overhead circuit-miles on the circuit-segment.</p> <p>8) Total Tier 2 overhead circuit-miles on the circuit-segment.</p> <p>9) Total Tier 3 overhead circuit-miles on the circuit-segment.</p> <p>10) Total underground circuit-miles on the circuit-segment.</p> <p>11) Total non-HFTD underground circuit-miles on the circuit-segment.</p>	4) - 4) As stated in the response to Questions 001 - 004, the WDRM v4 is not currently available. PG&E plans to make the model information available with the 2025 WMP Update.	Holly Whitman	10/1/2023	10/25/2023	10/23/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf">https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf</a>	0	N/A	2022 WMP Section 4.5	Model Metrics and Calculation Methodologies	NA
470	CaPA	Sat WMP-30	CaPA_Sat WMP-30	6	CaPA_Sat WMP-30_06	<p>Has E3 or another entity performed an independent review of the WDRM v4?</p> <p>5) If the answer to part (a) is yes, please provide a copy of any report and output from the independent review.</p> <p>6) If the answer to part (a) is no, does PG&amp;E plan to have E3 or a similar entity perform an independent review of the WDRM v4?</p> <p>7) If the answer to part (a) is no, please explain why not.</p> <p>8) If the answer to part (a) is yes, when does PG&amp;E expect the report to be completed?</p>	4) - 1) The WDRM v4 is currently under review by E3. PG&E expects that the E3 review will be completed and available with the 2025 WMP Update.	Holly Whitman	10/1/2023	10/25/2023	10/23/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf">https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf</a>	0	N/A	2022 WMP Section 4.5	Model Metrics and Calculation Methodologies	NA
471	CaPA	Sat WMP-30	CaPA_Sat WMP-30	7	CaPA_Sat WMP-30_07	<p>The following questions refer to the risk scores generated from WDRM v4. This should be understood to refer to PG&amp;E's responses to questions 1 and 2 above.</p> <p>4) Has PG&amp;E created a detailed overview document that details the WDRM v4, similar to the "2021 Wildlife Distribution Risk Model Overview" that PG&amp;E submitted following the public workshop held on October 5 and 6, 2021?</p> <p>5) If the answer to part (a) is yes, please provide a copy of the document.</p> <p>6) If the answer to part (a) is no, does PG&amp;E plan to create such a document?</p> <p>7) If the answer to part (a) is no, please explain why not.</p> <p>8) If the answer to part (a) is yes, when does PG&amp;E expect the document to be completed?</p>	4) - 4) As stated in the response to Questions 001 - 005, the WDRM v4 is not currently available. PG&E plans to make the model information available with the 2025 WMP Update. Along with the model information, PG&E anticipates preparing a similar document as part of the 2025 WMP Update.	Holly Whitman	10/1/2023	10/25/2023	10/23/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf">https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf</a>	0	N/A	2022 WMP Section 4.5	Model Metrics and Calculation Methodologies	NA
472	CaPA	Sat WMP-30	CaPA_Sat WMP-30	8	CaPA_Sat WMP-30_08	<p>The following questions refer to the risk scores generated from WDRM v4. This should be understood to refer to PG&amp;E's responses to questions 1 and 2 above.</p> <p>Page 76 of PG&amp;E's 2023-2025 Wildfire Mitigation Plan Supplemental Response to Revision Notice, September 27, 2023 states, "When we began using the WDRM v4 and incorporating it with the WSCA (Wildfire Benefit Cost Analysis) risk scoring and project prioritization initiative, we considered wildfire risk reduction, reliability benefits, public safety, project costs, long-term savings, and other factors that present a more holistic view into the costs and benefits of an energy project."</p> <p>4) - 1) The WDRM v4 scope does not include the estimated benefits requested in parts a, b, and c. Reliability benefits, public safety, and project costs will be considered as part of the WSCA and are not part of the WDRM v4.</p> <p>Does the WDRM v4 include an estimation of reliability benefits, as discussed in the above quote? Please explain if yes.</p> <p>Does the WDRM v4 include an estimation of public safety, as discussed in the above quote? Please explain if yes.</p> <p>Does the WDRM v4 include an estimation of project costs, as discussed in the above quote? Please explain if yes.</p>	4) - 1) The WDRM v4 scope does not include the estimated benefits requested in parts a, b, and c. Reliability benefits, public safety, and project costs will be considered as part of the WSCA and are not part of the WDRM v4.	Holly Whitman	10/1/2023	10/25/2023	10/23/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf">https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf</a>	0	N/A	2022 WMP Section 4.5	Model Metrics and Calculation Methodologies	NA
473	CaPA	Sat WMP-31	CaPA_Sat WMP-31	1	CaPA_Sat WMP-31_01	<p>The following questions pertain to PG&amp;E's 2023 - 2025 WMP Revision 3, submitted on September 27, 2023, Section 8.1.7 - Open Work Orders.</p> <p>On page 530 of your 2023 - 2025 WMP R3, PG&amp;E provided a table (Table 8-8-1) showing the total number of open work orders by asset and work order by age and HFTD tier. Please provide an updated version of Table 8-8-1 as of September 30, 2023.</p> <p>Number of Open Work Orders by Asset/Work Order Categorized by Age (through September 30, 2023)</p> <p>HFTD Area 0 - 30 Days 91</p> <p>HFTD Area 1 - 30 Days 91</p> <p>HFTD Area 2 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 3 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 4 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 5 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 6 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 7 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 8 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 9 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 10 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 11 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 12 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 13 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 14 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 15 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 16 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 17 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 18 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 19 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 20 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 21 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 22 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 23 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 24 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 25 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 26 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 27 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 28 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 29 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 30 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 31 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 32 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 33 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 34 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 35 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 36 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 37 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 38 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 39 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 40 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 41 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 42 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 43 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 44 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 45 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 46 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 47 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 48 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 49 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 50 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 51 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 52 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 53 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 54 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 55 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 56 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 57 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 58 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 59 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 60 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 61 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 62 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 63 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 64 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 65 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 66 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 67 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 68 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 69 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 70 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 71 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 72 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 73 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 74 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 75 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 76 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 77 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 78 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 79 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 80 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 81 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 82 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 83 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 84 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 85 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 86 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 87 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 88 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 89 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 90 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 91 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 92 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 93 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 94 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 95 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 96 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 97 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 98 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 99 - 30 Days 149</p> <p>HFTD Area 100 - 30 Days 149</p>	Please see the table below for the requested information: Number of Open Work Orders by Asset/Work Order Categorized by Age (through September 30, 2023) HFTD Area 0 - 30 Days 91 HFTD Area 1 - 30 Days 91 HFTD Area 2 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 3 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 4 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 5 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 6 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 7 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 8 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 9 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 10 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 11 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 12 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 13 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 14 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 15 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 16 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 17 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 18 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 19 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 20 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 21 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 22 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 23 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 24 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 25 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 26 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 27 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 28 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 29 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 30 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 31 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 32 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 33 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 34 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 35 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 36 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 37 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 38 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 39 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 40 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 41 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 42 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 43 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 44 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 45 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 46 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 47 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 48 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 49 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 50 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 51 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 52 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 53 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 54 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 55 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 56 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 57 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 58 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 59 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 60 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 61 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 62 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 63 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 64 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 65 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 66 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 67 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 68 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 69 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 70 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 71 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 72 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 73 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 74 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 75 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 76 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 77 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 78 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 79 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 80 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 81 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 82 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 83 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 84 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 85 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 86 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 87 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 88 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 89 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 90 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 91 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 92 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 93 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 94 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 95 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 96 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 97 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 98 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 99 - 30 Days 149 HFTD Area 100 - 30 Days 149	Holly Whitman	10/1/2023	10/26/2023	10/26/2023	<a href="https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf">https://www.pge.com/legal/ahd/ahd-common/pdf/va/1616/emergency-preparedness/04/04-01-wildfire-mitigation-plan-update-2025-030.pdf</a>	0	N/A	8.1.7	Open Work Orders	NA



