

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
Wildfire Mitigation Plans Discovery 2023
Data Response**

PG&E Data Request No.:	TURN_005-Q003		
PG&E File Name:	WMP-Discovery2023_DR_TURN_005-Q003		
Request Date:	April 14, 2023	Requester DR No.:	TURN-PG&E- 5
Date Sent:	April 19, 2023	Requesting Party:	The Utility Reform Network
DRU Index #:		Requester:	Tom Long

SUBJECT: SYSTEM HARDENING

QUESTION 003

In choosing among alternative system hardening mitigation techniques – i.e., undergrounding, covered conductor, remote grid installation, etc. – for a given location, please explain how PG&E takes into account the execution and schedule risks associated with undergrounding compared to other alternatives. PG&E discusses those risks in its 2023-2025 WMP at pages 344-346. They were also discussed in PG&E's Revised 2021 WMP (version dated 6/30/21) at pages 600- 601 (Section 7.3.3.17.1, Subsection 3)(b)), where PG&E uses the terms “execution risk” and “schedule risk.”

ANSWER 003

During the field scoping process, the team reviews all high-impact dependencies that could extend the execution. During review, we evaluate alternative undergrounding routes to avoid such impacts, design decisions that could mitigate that risk, and the steps we can take to work with the applicable agencies to address potential scheduling and execution risk issues (e.g., permitting and land rights).

Our current strategy is to plan for potential schedule and execution risks and work with agency partners to remove roadblocks where encountered. If there is a location where undergrounding is infeasible that we cannot solve through relocation, or other mitigation measures, then other design alternatives (e.g., covered conductor) may be considered later in the design stage.