


**Public Safety
Long Term Incentive Plan (LTIP)
Target Setting**

January 5, 2021







Why System Hardening and Enhanced Vegetation Management?

System Hardening (SH) and Enhanced Vegetation Management (EVM) focus on mitigation of potential wildfire risk from Distribution Overhead Assets, which have resulted in a significantly higher number of ignitions (nearly 90% of the total CPUC Reportable ignitions from 2015 – 2020 YTD)

- Distribution assets represent high ignition risk due to a combination of high exposure area (overhead assets traversing HFTDs), proximity to risk factors (vegetation), and intrinsic asset characteristics
- SH and EVM mitigation work focus on mitigating these risk factors on Distribution Assets and are key mitigation programs to continue addressing potential wildfire risk

Initiating Cause	2015 - 2020 YTD ¹ CPUC Reportable Ignitions in HFTD		Estimated Ignitions per 1,000 Circuit Miles in HFTD ²	
	Distribution	Transmission	Distribution	Transmission
Equipment – PG&E	217	30	8.5	5.4
Vegetation	305	11	11.9	2.0
All Other ³	195	34	7.6	6.1

For Equipment-driven ignitions, the Distribution ignitions per Mile rate is 5.6x greater than Transmission


For Vegetation-driven ignitions, the Distribution rate is 5.9x greater than Transmission

1. YTD represents data as of the end of September, 2020
2. Circuit mileage in HFTD areas source: 2020 O&M Safety Plan – 25,598 of distribution overhead mileage in HFTD areas, 5,542 of transmission overhead mileage
3. Other includes ignitions primarily driven by 3rd Party and Animal


Risk Model and Risk Quantification

1/20/2014





Risk Profile Curve for the 2018 vs. 2021 Equipment Risk Model




2021 Risk Model improves prediction of large destructive fires



Risk models provide risk profile curves to guide workplan

The risk profile curve shows *the amount of risk that can be addressed* with every subsequent mile within a Circuit Section or CPZ that is mitigated. This view illustrates the relative magnitude of risk associated with the top 100 CPZs and the visualization highlights the consolidation of risk by CPZ as you move down the prioritization list.




The improvement in the Risk Model results in a significant shift in the highest risk circuit protection zones

8

Project Example

© 2000

The top 50 highest risk-miles represent 1.4% of the total risk




Protection Zone Name	Miles	Cumulative Miles	Mean MAUF Score	Total CPZ MAUF	% total risk reduced ¹
OREGON TRAIL 1109CJUS91	0.02	0.02	3.16	3.16	0.01%
CALPINE 1144276-G	0.01	0.03	1.88	1.88	0.01%
MARIPOSA 210190130	0.08	0.12	1.69	1.69	0.02%
SHEPHERD 2111688294	0.01	0.13	1.44	1.44	0.02%
MIDDLE TOWN 1109CB	0.05	0.18	1.30	3.20	0.03%
UPPER LAKE 1101CB	1.00	1.17	1.26	3.77	0.04%
KESWICK 11011586	6.66	7.83	1.25	48.84	0.17%
MIDDLETOWN 110130N510	4.21	12.04	0.92	48.56	0.23%
KENOC11 1102965078	5.61	17.65	0.88	51.70	0.42%
MARIPOSA 2102241564	0.64	18.29	0.77	10.81	0.44%
BUCKS CREEK 1101CB	4.20	22.58	0.72	3.55	0.47%
SILVER MOUNTAIN 110278446	0.09	22.67	0.74	4.38	0.47%
MIDDLETOWN 1102CB	0.42	23.08	0.72	8.70	0.48%
MIDDLETOWN 1103830	24.80	47.88	0.72	151.83	0.57%

¹Based on assuming an OH hardening risk mitigation (62% risk reduction effectiveness)


Key Takeaway

On each project a more granular risk spend efficiency evaluation will be performed on an NPV basis (total cost of ownership for the asset life) once the project is fully scoped similar to what is shown on the Keswick 11011586 circuit protection zone on the next slide



Target Setting

H. Smith




System Hardening

Conditions

Condition 1: 80%¹ of system hardening miles have to be highest-risk miles over the three-year period or LTIP is 0

Risk Profile (Highest Risk Miles defined as)

1. Top 20%² of risk buydown curve
2. Fire rebuild miles
3. PPS mitigation miles



Condition 2: Minimum percentage of miles mitigated with either Line Removal or Undergrounding over the three-year period or LTIP is 0

Risk Effectiveness

- 10% of Undergrounding or Line Removal work in the System Hardening project portfolio³

Risk Exposure

- Count of circuit miles system hardened in the HTD and HFRA

System Hardening Targets (Risk Miles)

	LTIP 0.5	LTIP 1.0	LTIP 2.0
2021	180	199	208
2022	423	464	485
2023	423	464	485
2021-2023	1,026	1,127	1,178

1. Basis of the 80% is to allow for operational execution considerations including permitting, weather related access, and mob/demob efficiencies
2. Basis of the top 20% correlates to ~70% of the risk on the risk buydown curve
3. Risk reduction effectiveness for Overhead Hardening is estimated at 62% and Undergrounding or Line Removal is estimated at 99%



System Hardening targets are set based on 2021 risk miles and program funding assumptions

Program Funding

- Forecast of [redacted] Wildfire Mitigation capital spend in 2021 and 2022, respectively, consistent with the Proposed Decision Revision for the 2020-2022 GRC. 2023 forecast escalates 2022 by 10%.

Unit Costs

- Assumes [redacted] per circuit miles of Overhead SH work and [redacted] for Underground work

Program Duration

- Execution of the 13-year plan focusing on top 20% circuit protection zones by 2032

System Hardening LTIP Targets

	LTIP 0.5	LTIP 1.0	LTIP 2.0
2021	180	199	208
2022	423	464	485
2023	423	464	485
2021-2023	1,026	1,127	1,178

Targets are miles of system hardening work for specific risk-prioritized work

- The total mileage of the proposed 2021 Project Portfolio was set as the threshold goal (LTIP 0.5) for 2021
- LTIP 0.5 goal in 2022 reflects escalation of program funding level; the 2023 LTIP 0.5 goal is set equal to the 2022 level based on the 2023 GRC funding level forecast
- The target and stretch goals (LTIP 1.0, 2.0) were set as 10% and 15% higher, respectively

[redacted] includes scoping and engineering costs for future system hardening projects beyond 2021 and additional minor capital spend for other Wildfire Mitigation Programs



Enhanced Vegetation Management (EVM)

Conditions

- Condition 1: 80%¹ of EVM miles have to be highest-risk miles over the three-year period or LTIP is 0**
- Risk Profile (Highest Risk Miles defined as)**
- Top 20%² of risk model buydown curve
 - Fire impacted miles
- Risk Effectiveness**
- Execute work consistent with defined EVM scope
 - Achieve 12' recommended radial clearance
 - Access viable potential trees including high risk species
 - Remove overhangs above and within 4 feet of power lines
 - Mitigate vegetative fuels under and adjacent to powerlines on targeted basis
- Risk Exposure**
- Count of EVM miles worked in the HFTD and HFRA

EVM Targets (Risk Miles)

	LTIP 0.5	LTIP 1.0	LTIP 2.0
2021	1,800	1,890	2,070
2022	1,800	1,890	2,070
2023	1,800	1,890	2,070
2021-2023	5,400	5,670	6,210

1. Basis of the 80% is to allow for operational execution considerations including permitting, weather-related access and customer approvals
 2. Basis of the top 20% correlates to ~85% of the risk on the risk buydown curve



EVM targets are set based on work to be completed over the remaining twelve years of the program

- Program Duration**
 - Assumes execution of the 12-year Enhanced Vegetation Management Plan (2021-2032)
 - Evaluating viability of 10-year pace (2021-2030)
- Program Funding**
 - Forecast of [redacted] spend on EVM program in 2021, 2022 and 2023 respectively (in alignment with POR)
- Unit Costs**
 - Assumes [redacted] per miles of EVM work

Enhanced Vegetation Management LTP Targets

	LTP 0.5	LTP 1.0	LTP 2.0
2021	1,800	1,890	2,070
2022	1,800	1,890	2,070
2023	1,800	1,890	2,070
2021-2023	5,400	5,670	6,210

- Targets are miles of EVM work for specific risk-prioritized work.
- The total mileage of the proposed 2021 Project Portfolio was set as the threshold goal (LTP 0.5) for 2021
 - The target and stretch goals (LTP 1.0, 2.0) were set as 5% and 15% higher, respectively



Governance and Oversight

Wildfire Risk Governance Committee

- System Hardening project lists (by CPZ) consistent with the Target Setting methodology will be formally approved annually by the Chief Risk Officer
- Enhanced Vegetation Miles (by CPZ) consistent with the Target Setting methodology will also be formally approved annually by the Chief Risk Officer


PG&E Board – SNO and Compensation Committees


- Annual submission of a) System Hardening project list and b) specific locations of the Enhanced Vegetation Management miles to the SNO and Compensation Board Committees by the Chief Risk Officer
- Quarterly progress updates on plan vs. actual for both System Hardening and Enhanced Vegetation Management will be submitted to the SNO and Compensation Board Committees by the Chief Risk Officer

17

Appendix

11/20/2014





Selected list of most destructive fires in the past thirty years

Fire Name	Cause	Date	County	Acres	Structures Damaged	Deaths	PG&E Electric Power caused
Yupond - Commercial	Arson	Oct 05	Alameda	2000	20000	28	No
Langley - Multiple residential	Unlabeled	Oct 09	Alameda	28,000	350	1	No
Chico	Human Released	Oct 00	San Diego	272340	2800	15	No
Old	Human Released	Oct 00	San Bernardino	91,281	1,000	0	No
Levin	Power Line	Oct 00	San Diego	181,990	1,000	2	No
Orange	Fireworks Released	Aug 15	Los Angeles	70,000	1,000	4	No
Butte	Powerlines	Sep 10	Alameda, Colusa	70,000	700	2	Yes
Clayton	Arson	Aug 06	Yuba	5,500	700	0	No
Del Norte	Arson	July 17	Mariposa	63,628	100	0	No
Laboo	Electric Transformer	Oct 17	Napa and Sonoma	38000	1000	20	No
Blaine	Powerlines	Oct 17	Sonoma	15,000	1,000	3	Yes
Alta	Powerlines	Oct 17	Napa, Sonoma	31,000	700	6	Yes
San Francisco	Powerlines	Oct 17	San Diego	98,000	600	9	No
Cascade (Raw Wood Complex)	Powerlines	Oct 17	Yuba	5,000	200	4	Yes
Palmer	Powerlines	Oct 17	Yuba	2,000	100	0	Yes
Thomas	Powerline	Dec 17	Ventura, Santa Barbara	200,000	1,000	2	No
Can	Human Released	Jul 18	Alameda, Contra Costa	220,000	1,000	0	No
Camp Fire	Powerlines	Nov 18	Butte	330,000	1800	80	Yes
Woolsey	Under Investigation	Nov 18	Ventura	98,000	1,400	0	No
Waldport	Powerlines	Oct 18	Sonoma	77,700	170	0	Yes
Red Bluff	Human Released	Nov 18	Del Norte	2,500	0	0	No
August Complex	Under Investigation	Aug 20	Maricopa, Humboldt, Trinity, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa	1,000,000	600	1	No
North Complex	Under Investigation	Aug 20	Butte, Plumas, Yuba	1,000,000	2,000	10	No
UKL Lightning Complex	Under Investigation	Aug 20	Lake, Nevada, Wash, Idaho	100,000	1,400	0	No
CDU Lightning Complex	Under Investigation	Aug 20	San Diego, San Mateo	88,500	1,400	0	No
CDU Lightning Complex	Under Investigation	Aug 20	San Bernardino, Inyo, Mono	100,000	1,000	0	No
Chico Fire	Under Investigation	Sep 20	Napa, Sonoma	47,000	1,000	0	No
Creek Fire	Under Investigation	Sep 20	Fresno, Modoc	377,000	0	0	No

PG&E Electric Power caused fires in which PG&E electric power was a contributing factor.