

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

<b>PG&amp;E Data Request No.:</b>	OEIS_002-Q014
<b>PG&amp;E File Name:</b>	WMP-Discovery2026-2028_DR_OEIS_002-Q014
<b>Request Date:</b>	April 11, 2025
<b>Requester DR No.:</b>	OEIS-P-WMP_2025-PG&E-002
<b>Requesting Party:</b>	Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety
<b>Requester:</b>	Nathan Poon
<b>Date Sent:</b>	April 21, 2025

**SUBJECT: REGARDING SUPPRESSION AND EGRESS IMPACTS**

**QUESTION 014**

On page 32 of PG&E's Wildfire Consequence Model Version 4 (WFC v4) Documentation, PG&E states that "This was not the original expectation for adding the wildfire Suppression and public Egress impacts, resulting in additional efforts to validate the results and confirm the model development" when discussing the adjusted consequence curve and associated work to mitigate 60% of the wildfire risk.

- a. How did PG&E calculate the mileages associated with mitigating 60% of the wildfire risk?
- b. What "additional efforts" were completed for model development as a result of this finding?
- c. How did any efforts resulting in response to this validation impact the consequence curve? Provide copies of the curve before and after.
- d. Provide a step-by-step process showing how PG&E calculated the associated mileage of work needed to mitigate 60% of the wildfire risk before and after.

**Answer 014**

- a. The plots were generated by creating risk rankings for all circuit segments with overhead conductor assets within the PG&E territory using approximated risk values. Approximated risk values were calculated using release candidate asset probability data that was converted into spatial values for simplified compositing and aggregation multiplied times the base and adjusted consequence values. Processing the circuit segments in order of their risk rank, each circuit segment's summed risk value, as a percentage of summed risk in the service territory, was sequentially subtracted from 100% to form the data series for the y-axis values for the buydown curves. The x-axis data series was formed by creating a running total of miles for each ordered circuit segment.

- b. The sentence highlighted from the Wildfire Consequence Model v4 documentation indicates that incorporating the egress and suppression impacts into wildfire consequence resulted in risk buydown curve that showed that the number of miles that needed to be undergrounded to mitigate 60% of the wildfire risk was higher than anticipated. As a result of this finding, the team dedicated extra validation to confirm the results by evaluating against historical fire outcomes. The additional validation resulted in the removal of several lightning fires from the consequence training data set as described in Section 3.2.4 on page 12 of the consequence documentation. In the end, the team concluded that the general flattening of the risk buydown curve when adjusting consequence for egress and suppression was a correct outcome.
- c. As stated above in (b.), lightning fires were taken out of the historical fire data set used to calibrate the wildfire consequence model as they skewed results for fires initiated on non-predicted destructive weather days, which resulted in slightly steeper buydown curves for both base and adjusted consequence. No changes were made that altered the Egress or Suppression impacts for the adjusted consequence. The relative differences between the base and adjusted consequence curves remained as depicted in Figure 20.
- d. The calculation process was described in the response for (a.).