THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK DATA REQUEST
TURN-DR-004
SDG&E/SOCALGAS 2021 RAMP REPORTS- A.21-05-011/014
DATE RECEVIED: JULY 12, 2021
DATE RESPONDED: JULY 23, 2021

Question 1:
We were wondering why the Wings model only considers covered conductor and undergrounding, and not all wildfire (WF) mitigations?

SDG&E/SoCalGas Response 01:

As stated in Chapter SDG&E-Risk-1 at 18, "While it is in the first year of development, WiNGS is expected to help prioritize SDG&E's grid hardening mitigations in the coming years." The reason SDG&E focused its WiNGS efforts on grid hardening mitigations (specifically covered conductor and undergrounding) first is because these grid hardening programs can be a significant investment in infrastructure, will be in SDG&E's system for a long period of time (after implementation), and have the potential for substantial risk reducing opportunities. Unlike cyclical programs that tend to cover the entire service territory in a short timeframe (e.g., vegetation inspections or asset inspections), the deployment of grid hardening programs over SDG&E's system takes a longer period of time to implement, is more costly, and requires a risk-informed approach to prioritizing the work and targeting such initiatives.

Bare conductor hardening can also be evaluated in WiNGS. As explained in Chapter SDG&E-Risk-1 at 27: "SDG&E utilized an early version of WiNGS to identify some circuit segments to pivot from bare conductor hardening to covered conductor hardening based on the risk analysis conducted in the model. As it continues to scope specific covered conductor projects, SDG&E plans to utilize its WiNGS model to both evaluate mitigation alternatives and prioritize the deployment of mitigations at the circuit segment level." The same process was utilized for strategic undergrounding (*see* Chapter SDG&E-Risk-1 at 41). SDG&E focuses more heavily on the covered conductor and undergrounding than in the past because of their increased potential for reducing both wildfire risk and PSPS impacts.

SDG&E continues to explore opportunities to implement risk assessment approaches similar to WiNGS for other mitigation areas. Such an implementation will depend on the level of granularity that is appropriate for the specific program or area of mitigation that needs to be analyzed. The segment-level analysis in WiNGS was deployed specifically to address the need for incorporating PSPS impacts and targeting grid hardening mitigations to take such impacts into account. However, not all programs are a good fit for such a level of granularity. For example, vegetation management initiatives may warrant a different level of granularity based on vegetation clusters or how the work is divided (e.g., Vegetation Management Areas rather than circuit segments). Any type of assessment and level of granularity that is selected must be considered in the context of the program, the value of doing the analysis at more granular levels, and whether it would significantly impact the outcome. For programs that have cyclical requirements, such an analysis may not provide the same value. All these factors are being considered and will inform how SDG&E continues to mature its risk evaluation tools to inform its mitigation efforts.

THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK DATA REQUEST
TURN-DR-004
SDG&E/SOCALGAS 2021 RAMP REPORTS- A.21-05-011/014
DATE RECEVIED: JULY 12, 2021
DATE RESPONDED: JULY 23, 2021

Question: 2
Why were these mitigations chosen?

SDG&E/SoCalGas Response 02:

Please see Response 1 above.

THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK DATA REQUEST
TURN-DR-004
SDG&E/SOCALGAS 2021 RAMP REPORTS- A.21-05-011/014
DATE RECEVIED: JULY 12, 2021
DATE RESPONDED: JULY 23, 2021

Question: 3
And is it possible to consider the risk reduction potential of all WF mitigations through the Wings model or is there some reason only CC and undergrounding can be considered in this way?

SDG&E/SoCalGas Response 03:

At this time, due to the shift in grid hardening strategy to focus on covered conductor and underground, only those two initiatives are scoped and designed at a segment level which is why they are the most applicable for the analysis of risk reduction through WiNGS. As described in the response to Question 1 above, SDG&E continues to explore opportunities to implement risk assessment approaches similar to WiNGS for other mitigation areas. However, it is important to recognize that WiNGS is not a one-size-fits-all solution, and the level of granularity of risk assessment has to fit the context of the program being evaluated. Additionally, there are mitigations that are foundational in nature (such as Fire Science and Climate Adaptation Department, Centralized Repository for Data, and Emergency Management Operations) for which a risk reduction calculation was not provided and thus would not be assessed through WiNGS.