

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

PG&E Data Request No.:	MGRA_002-Q07		
PG&E File Name:	WMP-Discovery2022_DR_MGRA_002-Q07		
Request Date:	March 23, 2022	Requester DR No.:	MGRA-PGE-WMP22_DataRequest2
Date Sent:	March 28, 2022	Requesting Party:	Mussey Grade Road Alliance
PG&E Witness:		Requester:	Joseph Mitchell

SUBJECT: RISK MODELING

QUESTION 07

In Table PG&E-4.2-2; WILDFIRE RISK DRIVERS, the frequency of facility failures plus object contact in the HFTD is 60, compared to 74 for vegetation contact. Frequency of vegetation contact is 23% larger than the other two drivers. For the percentage of risk in the HFTD, equipment failures plus object contact represents 36.6% of the risk, while vegetation contact represents 59.3% of the risk. Frequency of vegetation contact is 62% larger than the other two drivers combined. How does PG&E account for this discrepancy?

ANSWER 07

PG&E notes that the statement in question, "Frequency of vegetation contact is 62% larger than the other two drivers combined" is incorrect and corrected as "Risk of vegetation contact is 62% larger than the other two drivers combined."

Discrepancy in % frequency and % risk by drivers in Table PG&E-4.2-2 implies that the Consequence of a Risk Event (CoRE) value are different by drivers of a risk event. PG&E's Bow Tie analysis that produced this table used different CoRE values by circuit segment as well as different Likelihood of Risk Event (LoRE) values by each driver by circuit segment. The circuit segment-level LoRE and CoRE values were then aggregated into the HFTD Distribution tranches in order to produce Table PG&E-4.2-2. Percent frequency by drivers and percent risk by drivers at the HFTD level will not be the same unless we have the same CoRE for all tranches in HFTD.