

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
Wildfire Mitigation Plans Discovery 2022
Data Response

PG&E Data Request No.:	CalAdvocates_008-Q04		
PG&E File Name:	WMP-Discovery2022_DR_CalAdvocates_008-Q04		
Request Date:	January 28, 2022	Requester DR No.:	CalAdvocates-PGE-2022WMP-08
Date Sent:	February 25, 2022	Requesting Party:	Public Advocates Office
PG&E Witness:		Requester:	Alan Wehrman

The following questions relate to the PG&E Independent Monitor Report of November 19, 2021, Kirkland & Ellis LLP, filed on November 23, 2021 (the Monitor's 2021 report),¹ and PG&E's responses to Data Request CalAdvocates-PGE-2022WMP-06, dated January 10 and 14, 2022.

QUESTION 04

PG&E's response to Data Request CalAdvocates-PGE-2022WMP-06 includes an inspection report from June 13, 2021. Regarding this inspection:

- a) Since June 16, 2021, has PG&E performed any quality control or reinspection activities to validate the completeness and accuracy of other inspections performed by the individual who performed the inspection on June 13, 2021?
- b) If the answer to part (a) is yes, please list and describe the specific actions PG&E has taken.
- c) If the answer to part (a) is no, please explain why not.

ANSWER 04

- a) Yes, we have performed quality control/re-inspection activities to validate the completeness and accuracy of other inspections performed by the individual who performed the inspection on June 13, 2021 (June 13 Inspector).
- b) PG&E System Inspection Quality Control (SI QC) uses a random sampling method to identify completed inspections for QC review. SI QC uses two methods to conduct QC reviews: a Desktop Review method and a Field Review method.

In 2021, SI QC completed Desktop Reviews for 303 inspections completed by the June 13 Inspector. 235 of those reviews were for inspections completed after June 16, 2021. The results of the reviews for inspections completed after June 16, 2021 are as follows:

- 75% had no mistakes.
- Of the 25% that had mistakes, only 12% of the mistakes resulted in a "Failed

¹ Kirkland & Ellis LLP, PG&E Independent Monitor Report of November 19, 2021 (Case No. 14-CR-00175- WHA Doc. No. 1524-1), November 23, 2021.

Review”, where the inspection record review indicates a compelling abnormal condition was miss-identified by the inspector, resulting in an incorrectly updated EC/LC notification, or failure to create an EC/LC notification.

- The overall performance of the June 13 Inspector was above average as compared to the population performance (60% no mistakes, 13% Fail Rate).
- The June 13, 2021 inspection that is the subject of this question was not identified for “Desktop” review in the random sampling.

In 2021, SI QC completed Field Reviews for 36 inspections completed by the June 13 Inspector. 13 of those reviews were for inspections completed after June 16, 2021.

The results of the reviews for inspections completed after June 16, 2021 are as follows:

- 46% had no mistakes.
- Of the 54% that had mistakes, 31% of the mistakes resulted in a “Failed Review.”
- The overall performance of the June 13 Inspector, was below average as compared to the population performance (45% no mistakes, 20% Fail Rate).
- The June 13, 2021 inspection that is the subject of this question, was not identified for Field Review in the random sampling.

c) Not applicable.