

| Link to Summary Responses: <a href="https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html">https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html</a> |           |          |              |             |          |               |   |  |               |            |                |   |   |                   |               |                               |  |             |
|--|-----------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------|---------------|---|--|---------------|------------|----------------|---|---|-------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------|
| Count  | Pump Name | Data Set | Data Request | Question ID | Supplier | Question ID   | Question Text   | Responses  | Requestor     | Date Rec'd | Final Due Date | Date Due  | Links   | Number of Answers | NCA Requested | 2025 WMP Section              | Category                                 | Subcategory |
| 1  | TURN      | 002      | TURN_002     | 1           | No       | TURN_002_Q1   | Section 5.2.1, page 47 states, "Starting in January 2023, PG&E incorporated additional customers who could be impacted into the PSPS consequence model and classified them as a Potentially-Impacted Customer (PIC)."<br><br>a. How were the PICs selected?<br><br>b. How were the PICs selected?<br><br>c. What types of consequences do they have that were not included in the 12-year historical database?<br><br>d. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>e. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>f. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>g. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>h. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>i. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>j. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>k. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>l. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>m. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>n. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>o. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>p. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>q. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>r. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>s. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>t. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>u. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>v. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>w. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>x. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>y. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model?<br><br>z. How were the PICs selected for the PSPS consequence model? | A Minda Palfy  | 4/7/2025      | 4/10/2025  | 4/10/2025      | <a href="https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html">https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html</a> | 0   | No                | 5             | Risk Methodology & Assessment | 5.2.1                                    |             |
| 2  | TURN      | 002      | TURN_002     | 2           | No       | TURN_002_Q2   | Section 5.2.2, page 48 provides the formula for PSPS likelihood. Please explain why 5 years was selected as the denominator?  | 1. The statement that PG&E no longer accounts for potentially impacted customers (PICs) in PSPS constraints must date to the historical database values associated with customers that were not included in our database. Thus, the statement on page 47 of the 2023-2025 WMP is inaccurate in nature.<br><br>2. The selection criteria for PICs were created by using our distribution planning process under the scenario of "Level 1" every distribution line in a HTDFPA is assumed to be energized.<br><br>3. Potentially impacted customers (i.e., all customers who would be impacted by the distribution reconfiguration of every HTDFPA distribution line) were identified through our distribution planning process.<br><br>4. PG&E's historical database values are based on HTDFPA distribution lines that have not been energized.<br><br>5. The inclusion of PICs results in an increased risk associated with customers in locations where PSPS hardware was not included in our database. PG&E has been responsive to PSPS risk based on HTDFPA location and system configuration. This evaluation does not include the addition of new consequences.<br><br>6. The meaning behind this statement is that this is a low probability event, and the basis was to assign risk exposure to customers that are not accounted for in PG&E's historical database. The historical data methods to based on historical weather conditions that have not PSPS hardware to initiate a PSPS event. This is not an HTDFPA HTDFPA that have not PSPS hardware to initiate a PSPS event.<br><br>7. The statement is based on the fact that all customers that would be impacted by the event are included in the database. | A Minda Palfy | 4/7/2025   | 4/10/2025      | 4/10/2025   | <a href="https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html">https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html</a> | 0                 | No            | 5                             | Risk Methodology & Assessment            | 5.2.2.1     |
| 3  | TURN      | 002      | TURN_002     | 3           | No       | TURN_002_Q3   | Section 6.1.2, page 118 states that, instead of undergrounding, "in certain circumstances we may choose to overhead hauler a third segment or segment of a circuit segment because of feasibility constraints." Please explain why we would choose to overhead hauler a third segment or segment of a circuit segment because of feasibility constraints? Please explain why we would choose to overhead hauler a third segment or segment of a circuit segment because of feasibility constraints?   | 1. The statement that PG&E no longer accounts for potentially impacted customers (PICs) in PSPS constraints must date to the historical database values associated with customers that were not included in our database. Thus, the statement on page 47 of the 2023-2025 WMP is inaccurate in nature.<br><br>2. The selection criteria for PICs were created by using our distribution planning process under the scenario of "Level 1" every distribution line in a HTDFPA is assumed to be energized.<br><br>3. Potentially impacted customers (i.e., all customers who would be impacted by the distribution reconfiguration of every HTDFPA distribution line) were identified through our distribution planning process.<br><br>4. PG&E's historical database values are based on HTDFPA distribution lines that have not been energized.<br><br>5. The inclusion of PICs results in an increased risk associated with customers in locations where PSPS hardware was not included in our database. PG&E has been responsive to PSPS risk based on HTDFPA location and system configuration. This evaluation does not include the addition of new consequences.<br><br>6. The meaning behind this statement is that this is a low probability event, and the basis was to assign risk exposure to customers that are not accounted for in PG&E's historical database. The historical data methods to based on historical weather conditions that have not PSPS hardware to initiate a PSPS event. This is not an HTDFPA HTDFPA that have not PSPS hardware to initiate a PSPS event.<br><br>7. The statement is based on the fact that all customers that would be impacted by the event are included in the database. | A Minda Palfy | 4/7/2025   | 4/10/2025      | 4/10/2025   | <a href="https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html">https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html</a> | 0                 | No            | 6                             | Wildfire Mitigation Strategy Development | 6.1.2       |
| 4  | TURN      | 002      | TURN_002     | 4           | No       | TURN_002_Q4   | Section 6.1.3.1, page 120, states, "While undergrounding is PG&E's preferred solution for mitigating system risk in the highest risk areas, we recognize that undergrounding takes longer to execute than overhead hardening and is a more costly solution than the hardening of the system." Please explain why we would choose to overhead hauler a third segment or segment of a circuit segment because of feasibility constraints? Please explain why we would choose to overhead hauler a third segment or segment of a circuit segment because of feasibility constraints?   | 1. The statement that PG&E no longer accounts for potentially impacted customers (PICs) in PSPS constraints must date to the historical database values associated with customers that were not included in our database. Thus, the statement on page 47 of the 2023-2025 WMP is inaccurate in nature.<br><br>2. The selection criteria for PICs were created by using our distribution planning process under the scenario of "Level 1" every distribution line in a HTDFPA is assumed to be energized.<br><br>3. Potentially impacted customers (i.e., all customers who would be impacted by the distribution reconfiguration of every HTDFPA distribution line) were identified through our distribution planning process.<br><br>4. PG&E's historical database values are based on HTDFPA distribution lines that have not been energized.<br><br>5. The inclusion of PICs results in an increased risk associated with customers in locations where PSPS hardware was not included in our database. PG&E has been responsive to PSPS risk based on HTDFPA location and system configuration. This evaluation does not include the addition of new consequences.<br><br>6. The meaning behind this statement is that this is a low probability event, and the basis was to assign risk exposure to customers that are not accounted for in PG&E's historical database. The historical data methods to based on historical weather conditions that have not PSPS hardware to initiate a PSPS event. This is not an HTDFPA HTDFPA that have not PSPS hardware to initiate a PSPS event.<br><br>7. The statement is based on the fact that all customers that would be impacted by the event are included in the database. | A Minda Palfy | 4/7/2025   | 4/10/2025      | 4/10/2025   | <a href="https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html">https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html</a> | 0                 | No            | 6                             | Wildfire Mitigation Strategy Development | 6.1.3.1     |
| 5  | TURN      | 002      | TURN_002     | 5           | No       | TURN_002_Q5   | Regarding Table PG&E-6.1.3.1 on page 120, please provide the supporting data on which the "Standard Average Effectiveness" values for these 4, 5, and 6 are based.  | 1. The statement that PG&E no longer accounts for potentially impacted customers (PICs) in PSPS constraints must date to the historical database values associated with customers that were not included in our database. Thus, the statement on page 47 of the 2023-2025 WMP is inaccurate in nature.<br><br>2. The selection criteria for PICs were created by using our distribution planning process under the scenario of "Level 1" every distribution line in a HTDFPA is assumed to be energized.<br><br>3. Potentially impacted customers (i.e., all customers who would be impacted by the distribution reconfiguration of every HTDFPA distribution line) were identified through our distribution planning process.<br><br>4. PG&E's historical database values are based on HTDFPA distribution lines that have not been energized.<br><br>5. The inclusion of PICs results in an increased risk associated with customers in locations where PSPS hardware was not included in our database. PG&E has been responsive to PSPS risk based on HTDFPA location and system configuration. This evaluation does not include the addition of new consequences.<br><br>6. The meaning behind this statement is that this is a low probability event, and the basis was to assign risk exposure to customers that are not accounted for in PG&E's historical database. The historical data methods to based on historical weather conditions that have not PSPS hardware to initiate a PSPS event. This is not an HTDFPA HTDFPA that have not PSPS hardware to initiate a PSPS event.<br><br>7. The statement is based on the fact that all customers that would be impacted by the event are included in the database. | A Minda Palfy | 4/7/2025   | 4/10/2025      | 4/10/2025   | <a href="https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html">https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html</a> | 1                 | No            | 6                             | Wildfire Mitigation Strategy Development | 6.1.3.1     |
| 6  | TURN      | 002      | TURN_002     | 6           | No       | TURN_002_Q6   | Section 6.1.3.2, page 121, states, "Overhead system hardening combined with vegetation mitigation (EPSP and PSPS) has a high risk reduction benefit that is roughly comparable to that of undergrounding without these operational mitigations." Please explain why we would choose to overhead hauler a third segment or segment of a circuit segment because of feasibility constraints? Please explain why we would choose to overhead hauler a third segment or segment of a circuit segment because of feasibility constraints?  | 1. The statement that PG&E no longer accounts for potentially impacted customers (PICs) in PSPS constraints must date to the historical database values associated with customers that were not included in our database. Thus, the statement on page 47 of the 2023-2025 WMP is inaccurate in nature.<br><br>2. The selection criteria for PICs were created by using our distribution planning process under the scenario of "Level 1" every distribution line in a HTDFPA is assumed to be energized.<br><br>3. Potentially impacted customers (i.e., all customers who would be impacted by the distribution reconfiguration of every HTDFPA distribution line) were identified through our distribution planning process.<br><br>4. PG&E's historical database values are based on HTDFPA distribution lines that have not been energized.<br><br>5. The inclusion of PICs results in an increased risk associated with customers in locations where PSPS hardware was not included in our database. PG&E has been responsive to PSPS risk based on HTDFPA location and system configuration. This evaluation does not include the addition of new consequences.<br><br>6. The meaning behind this statement is that this is a low probability event, and the basis was to assign risk exposure to customers that are not accounted for in PG&E's historical database. The historical data methods to based on historical weather conditions that have not PSPS hardware to initiate a PSPS event. This is not an HTDFPA HTDFPA that have not PSPS hardware to initiate a PSPS event.<br><br>7. The statement is based on the fact that all customers that would be impacted by the event are included in the database. | A Minda Palfy | 4/7/2025   | 4/10/2025      | 4/10/2025   | <a href="https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html">https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html</a> | 0                 | No            | 6                             | Wildfire Mitigation Strategy Development | 6.1.3.2     |
| 6  | TURN      | 002      | TURN_002     | 6a)         | Yes      | TURN_002_Q6a) | Section 6.1.3.2, page 121, states, "Overhead system hardening combined with vegetation mitigation (EPSP and PSPS) has a high risk reduction benefit that is roughly comparable to that of undergrounding without these operational mitigations." Please explain why we would choose to overhead hauler a third segment or segment of a circuit segment because of feasibility constraints? Please explain why we would choose to overhead hauler a third segment or segment of a circuit segment because of feasibility constraints?  | 1. The statement that PG&E no longer accounts for potentially impacted customers (PICs) in PSPS constraints must date to the historical database values associated with customers that were not included in our database. Thus, the statement on page 47 of the 2023-2025 WMP is inaccurate in nature.<br><br>2. The selection criteria for PICs were created by using our distribution planning process under the scenario of "Level 1" every distribution line in a HTDFPA is assumed to be energized.<br><br>3. Potentially impacted customers (i.e., all customers who would be impacted by the distribution reconfiguration of every HTDFPA distribution line) were identified through our distribution planning process.<br><br>4. PG&E's historical database values are based on HTDFPA distribution lines that have not been energized.<br><br>5. The inclusion of PICs results in an increased risk associated with customers in locations where PSPS hardware was not included in our database. PG&E has been responsive to PSPS risk based on HTDFPA location and system configuration. This evaluation does not include the addition of new consequences.<br><br>6. The meaning behind this statement is that this is a low probability event, and the basis was to assign risk exposure to customers that are not accounted for in PG&E's historical database. The historical data methods to based on historical weather conditions that have not PSPS hardware to initiate a PSPS event. This is not an HTDFPA HTDFPA that have not PSPS hardware to initiate a PSPS event.<br><br>7. The statement is based on the fact that all customers that would be impacted by the event are included in the database. | A Minda Palfy | 4/7/2025   | 4/14/2025      | 4/14/2025   | <a href="https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html">https://www.pgc.com/community-and-safety/safety-community-wildfire-safety-impacts.html</a> | 0                 | No            | 6                             | Wildfire Mitigation Strategy Development | 6.1.3.2     |









[illegible]





[illegible]



[illegible]

