Appendix C Risk Mitigation Accountability Report Guidelines

Risk Mitigation Accountability Report Guidelines

RMAR Definitions

In addition to the terms listed here, all terms listed in the Risk-based Decision-making Framework¹ are relevant to an RMAR submission.

| Term | Definition |
|--------------------------|--|
| Class | Class determines table structure and interpretation in RMAR. There are two Classes: Stock tables and Flow tables. |
| Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) | The ratio of Mitigation Benefits to Mitigation Costs as defined by D.22-12-027 and refinements required in subsequent Commission Decisions. |
| Flow | A Class that describes tables where the values accumulate over time and can be added. Flow Line-items include Mitigation Benefits and Mitigation Costs, and BCR. See a full explanation below. |
| Forecasts | Future estimates of Line-item values that are unique to the Plan Phase in RMAR, typically based on outputs from a model and/or SME judgement. Forecasts will be used for comparing against Monetized Outcomes, Results and Projections in the Reporting Phase. Forecast values are established in a Decision adopted in a GRC or other cost recovery venue. See also Scenario. |
| Line-item | A line in the RMAR with values associated with it. This could include, but is not limited to, BCR, Mitigation Benefit, Mitigation Cost, Postmitigated Risk, Pre-mitigated Risk, Risk Reduction, and Work Units. |
| Mitigation Benefit | The monetized risk reduction of mitigations that is presented as a Flow. Mitigation Benefits are typically calculated by a model and/or SME judgement. |
| Mitigation Cost | The cost of mitigations that is presented as a Flow. Historical costs are taken from actual costs incurred; while future costs are based on models and/or SME judgement. |
| Monetized Outcome | The monetized impact of Risk Events that have occurred in a given year. This could be estimated using, for instance, but not limited to, the Safety Performance Metrics. |
| Plan Phase | The section in RMAR that lays out the Plan. It only contains Forecasts of the future. |
| Post-mitigated Risk | The risk that remains after mitigations are applied, and is presented as Stock. |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | The current level of risk, before any new mitigations are applied, and is presented as Stock. |

¹ See Appendix A in this Decision or any subsequent Decision that updates Appendix A.

| Projections | A forecast of future Line-item values unique to the Reporting Phase in the RMAR, which is typically based on outputs from a model and/or SME judgement. Based on new data or models, Projections may update and change the Plan's Forecast values established in a Decision adopted in a GRC or other cost recovery venue. Projections should be compared to the Forecasts in the Plan Phase. See also Scenario. |
|-----------------|--|
| Results | Results are the impact of mitigation activities that have occurred in a given year. In the case of Mitigation Benefits, Results are the monetized value calculated from a model based on the mitigation activities that occurred in a given year. In the case of Mitigation Costs or Work Units, Results are based on actual costs incurred or actual work units performed in a given year. See also Scenario. |
| Reporting Phase | The section of RMAR that compares Monetized Outcomes, Results and Projections to the Forecasts in the Plan Phase. The Reporting Phase will include updated Projections based on the utility's current knowledge. The Reporting Phase contains both historical data of Results and future-looking Projections. |
| Risk Measure | How risk is presented in a table, e.g. Expected Value Risk or Tail Risk (Optional). |
| Risk Reduction | The monetized impact of mitigations, presented as a Stock value. Risk Reduction is typically calculated by a model and/or SME Judgement. |
| Scenario | Distinctions of Line-item values used to make comparisons between the Plan Phase and the Reporting Phase. Forecasts, Results, and Projections are Scenarios. If there are multiple Projections in the Reporting Phase, then each Reporting Phase with a unique Projection is a distinct Scenario. |
| Stock | A Class that describes tables where the Line-items represent point-in-time values. Stock Line-items include Pre-mitigated Risk, Post-mitigated Risk, and Risk Reduction. See a full explanation below. |

Stock and Flow Explanations

Stock and Flow are two different Classes of Line-items in an RMAR that determine how monetized mitigation impacts on risk are calculated and used. Mitigation impacts are based on the output of risk models.

Flow describes the calculation of a Mitigation Benefit, which contributes to the numerator in the BCR. Once a mitigation is completed, the benefit occurs every year for the expected life of the mitigation, and the total benefit is the sum over the expected life. As such, a Flow value is <u>additive</u>. For example, if a mitigation is modeled to reduce risk by \$10, and the expected life of the mitigation is 10 years, the mitigation benefit is the sum of the risk reduction over the 10 years, or \$100. The BCR would be calculated by using the \$100 Mitigation Benefit discounted by the appropriate discount rate.

Stock describes a Risk Reduction value. Once a mitigation is completed, risk is reduced from a Premitigated Risk level to a Post-Mitigated Risk level. As such, Stock is a <u>point-in-time value</u>. Using the same example as in Flow, above, if a mitigation is modeled to reduce risk by \$10 for 10 years, the modeled Risk Reduction is \$10. The level of Post-mitigated Risk is \$10 lower than the Pre-mitigated Risk.

RMAR Line-items

| | Source of Values | Stock or Flow |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Plan Phase: | | |
| Mitigation Benefits | Modeled Forecast | Flow |
| Mitigation Costs | Modeled Forecast | Flow |
| Work Units | Modeled Forecast | Flow |
| BCR | Modeled Forecast (Present Value) | Flow |
| Pre-Mitigated Risk | Modeled Forecast | Stock |
| Post-Mitigated Risk | Modeled Forecast | Stock |
| Risk Reduction | Modeled Forecast | Stock |
| Reporting Phase: | | |
| Mitigation Benefits | Modeled Result/Modeled Projection | Flow |
| Mitigation Costs | Actual Result/Modeled Projection | Flow |
| Work Units | Actual Result/Modeled Projection | Flow |
| BCR | Modeled Projection (Present Value) | Flow |
| Pre-Mitigated Risk | Modeled Projection | Stock |
| Post-Mitigated Risk | Modeled Result/Modeled Projection | Stock |
| Risk Reduction | Modeled Result/Modeled Projection | Stock |
| Monetized Outcomes | Actual Outcome | Stock |

RMAR Required Tables and Table Elements

- 1. Aside from the original RAMP backcast, the first RMAR must at a minimum be four years of reporting, including the Report Year, the Report Years to date and the Forecast years.
- 2. All tables should include the following roll-up points:
 - a. **Hierarchy**: Based on organizational structure, including, but not limited to, circuit, substation, pipeline, watershed region, High-Fire Threat District, region, division,

enterprise. Hierarchy defines how reports and tables are grouped in "parent-child" relationships.

- b. Scenario: Forecast, Results, Projection.
- c. **Version**: Risk model or methodology
- d. **Risk Event**: All risks included in the most recent RAMP and GRC Applications
- e. **Tranches**: Risk event-dependent.²
- f. Mitigations: Risk event-dependent.
- 3. All tables should include the following common elements:
 - a. Attribute: Safety, Reliability, Financial.
 - b. **Risk Measure**: Expected Value Risk, Tail Risk (Optional).
 - c. **Line-items**: This dimension contains all the key calculations in an RMAR, including, but not limited to, BCR, Mitigation Benefit, Mitigation Cost, Post-mitigated Risk, Premitigated Risk, Risk Reduction, and Work Units.
 - d. Work Unit: Corresponds to the Work Units presented in the GRC and RSAR.
 - e. **Time**: Periods under consideration, including years and GRC Cycle (i.e. PG&E's 2027 GRC).

² See D.24-05-064, Appendix A, Row 14

Required Plan Phase Tables

a. Forecasted Mitigation Costs and Benefits Table for Expected Value Risk by Mitigation for each Risk Event

| WILDFI | RE RISK MITIGATION FORECAST |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| | |
| Hierarchy | Enterprise |
| Risk Events | Wildfire |
| Scenario | Forecast |
| Version | Model 2.1 |
| Time | Years 1-4 |
| | |
| Sub-table 1. Wo | ork Unit Circuit Miles |
| | Plan Y1Y4 |
| UG | 1,400 |
| CC | 400 |
| Total | 1,800 |

| Total 1,800 | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Sub-table 2. Mitigation Benefit | Overvie | w | Expecte | ed Value | Risk | | |
| By Mitigation Type | | | itigation Benefit | M | itigation Cost | | |
| UG | | | \$640 | | \$500 | | |
| CC | | | \$630 | | \$340 | | |
| Total | | | \$1,27 0 | | \$790 | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| BCR: | | , | WACC | | Social | Hybrid | 1 |
| UG | | | 1.86 | | 2.79 | 2.34 | |
| CC | | | 2.14 | | 2.48 | 2.43 | |
| Total | | | 1.99 | | 2.65 | 2.39 | |
| Sub-table 3. Mitigation Benefit | Y1Y4 | | | | | | |
| Expected Value Risk | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 to | Expected Life | Total |
| 3a. UG | | | | | | | |
| Mitigation Benefit | \$ 0 | \$0 | \$80 | \$80 | | \$480 | \$640 |
| Mitigation Costs | \$ 0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$ O | | \$0 | \$500 |
| 3b. CC | | | | | | | |
| Mitigation Benefit | \$63 | \$63 | \$63 | \$63 | ! | \$378 | \$630 |
| Mitigation Costs | \$200 | \$ 10 | \$ 10 | \$10 | | \$60 | \$290 |
| 3c. Total | | | | | | | |
| Mitigation Benefit | \$63 | \$63 | \$143 | \$143 | | \$858 | \$1,270 |
| Mitigation Costs | \$200 | \$510 | \$10 | \$10 | | \$60 | \$ 790 |

b. Forecasted Risk Reduction Table by Attribute for each Risk Event

| 2. 7070000 | WILDFIRE RISK MITIGA | | | | 1 |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Hierarchy | Enterprise | 1101110 | REGIIO I | | |
| Risk Events | Wildfire | | | | |
| Scenario | Forecast | | | | |
| Version | Model 2.1 | | | | |
| Time | Years 1-4 | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Sub-table 1: Ris | k Reduction Overview | | | | |
| Expected Value | <u>Risk</u> | Safety | Reliability | Financial | |
| Pre-mitigated r | isk | \$270 | \$300 | \$300 | |
| Risk reduction | | \$35 | \$54 | \$54 | |
| Post-mitigated | risk | \$235 | \$246 | \$246 | |
| | | | | | |
| Tail Risk* | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated r | isk | \$1,760 | \$1,760 | \$1,540 | |
| Risk reduction | | \$183 | \$282 | \$282 | |
| Post-mitigated | | \$1,578 | \$1,478 | \$1,258 | |
| *Tail Risk is no | | | | | |
| | k Reduction Y1Y4 | T == . | | l == - | |
| Expected Value | e Risk | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 |
| Safety | | 0070 | | | |
| Pre-mitigated r | ısk | \$270 | 0.4 F | #2.5 | #25 |
| Risk reduction | • • | \$15 | \$15 | \$35 | \$35 |
| Post-mitigated | risk | \$255 | \$255 | \$235 | \$235 |
| Reliability | 1 | #200 | | | |
| Pre-mitigated r. Risk reduction | ISK | \$300 \$24 | \$24 | \$54 | \$54 |
| Post-mitigated | wialz | \$276 | \$276 | \$246 | \$34 \$246 |
| Financial | ner i | \$270 | \$270 | Ψ 2 +0 | Ψ2 1 0 |
| Pre-mitigated r | iek | \$300 | | | |
| Risk reduction | | \$24 | \$24 | \$54 | \$54 |
| Post-mitigated | risk | \$276 | \$276 | \$246 | \$246 |
| 1 oot innigated | | Ψ270 | Ψ210 | Ψ210 | Ψ210 |
| Tail Risk* | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 |
| Safety | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated r | isk | \$1,760 | | | |
| Risk reduction | | \$83 | \$83 | \$183 | \$183 |
| Post-mitigated | risk | \$1,678 | \$1,595 | \$1,413 | \$1,230 |
| Reliability | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated r | isk | \$1,760 | | | |
| Risk reduction | | \$132 | \$132 | \$282 | \$282 |
| Post-mitigated | risk | \$1,628 | \$1,628 | \$1,478 | \$1,478 |
| <u>Financial</u> | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated r | isk | \$1,540 | | | |
| Risk reduction | | \$132 | \$132 | \$282 | \$282 |
| Post-mitigated | | \$1,408 | \$1,408 | \$1,258 | \$1,258 |
| *Tail Risk is no | ot additive | | | | |

Required Reporting Phase Tables

The following example tables are from a hypothetical RMAR submitted in Year 3 of a GRC Cycle:

a. Monetized Outcomes Flow Table by Attribute for each Risk Event

| WILDFIRE ATTRIBUTES I | MONETIZE | D OUTCOM | E | | |
|---|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|--|
| Hierarchy | Enterprise | | | | |
| Risk Events | Wildfire | | | | |
| Scenario | Monetized Outcome vs. Forecast | | | | |
| Version | Model 2.1 | | | | |
| Time | Year 3 | | | | |
| | | <u>Y3</u> | | | |
| | Safety | Reliability | Financial | Risk | |
| Monetized Outcome by Attribute | \$600 | \$300 | \$1,800 | \$2,700 | |
| Forecast - Expected Value Post-mitigated Risk | \$235 | \$246 | \$246 | \$727 | |
| Monetized Outcome better(worse) than Forecast | (\$365) | (\$54) | (\$1,554) | (\$1,973) | |
| | -155% | -22% | -632% | -271% | |
| | | | | | |
| Forecast - Tail Risk Post-mitigated Risk* | \$1,578 | \$1,478 | \$1,258 | \$3,921 | |
| Outcome better(worse) than Forecast | \$978 | \$1, 178 | (\$542) | \$1,221 | |
| | 38% | 20% | -143% | 69% | |
| *Tail Risk is not additive | | | | | |

b. Monetized Outcomes Stock Table by Attribute for each Risk Event

| WILDFIRE ATTRIBUTES MONETIZ | ZED OU | TCOME | | |
|--|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| Hierarchy | Enterpr | ise | | |
| Risk Events | Wildfire | | | |
| Scenario | Monetized Outcome vs. Forecast | | | |
| Version | Model 2.1 | | | |
| Time | Years 1 | Years 1-3 | | |
| | | <u>Y1</u> | <u>Y3</u> | |
| | Safety | Reliability | Financial | Risk |
| Average Y1Y3 Monetized Outcome by Attribute | \$600 | \$330 | \$1,845 | \$2,775 |
| Average Y1Y3 Forecast - Expected Value Post-mitigated risk | \$745 | \$798 | \$798 | \$2,341 |
| Monetized Outcome better(worse) than Forecast | \$145 | \$468 | (\$1,047) | (\$434) |
| · | 19% | 59% | -131% | -19% |

c. Expected Value Risk Mitigation Benefit and Mitigation Cost by Risk Event Table

| RISK EVENTS MI | TIGATION BEN | NEFIT AND MIT | IGATION C | OST |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Hierarchy | Enterprise | | | |
| Risk Events | All | | | |
| Scenario | Results vs. Forec | ast and Projections | vs. Forecast | |
| Version | Model 2.1 | | | |
| Time | Year 3 and Years | s 1-3 | | |
| Sub-table 1. Mitigation Benef | it and Cost, Y3 | | | |
| | | | Results B | (W) Forecast |
| Expected Value Risk | Results Y3 | Forecast Y3 | \$ | % |
| <u>Wildfire</u> | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit | \$106 | \$143 | (\$37) | -26% |
| Actual Mitigation Cost | \$260 | \$10 | (\$250) | -2500% |
| <u>Cyber</u> | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit | \$12 | \$12 | \$0 | 0% |
| Actual Mitigation Cost | \$5 | \$5 | \$0 | 0% |
| <u>Hydro</u> | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit | \$50 | \$60 | (\$10) | -17% |
| Actual Mitigation Cost | \$15 | \$15 | \$0 | 0% |
| <u>Total</u> | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit | \$168 | \$215 | (\$47) | -22% |
| Actual Mitigation Cost | \$280 | \$30 | (\$250) | -833% |
| Sub-table 2. Mitigation Bene | fit and Cost, Y1Y | 3 | | |
| | | | | (W) Forecast |
| Expected Value Risk | Results Y1Y3 | Forecast Y1Y3 | \$ | % |
| Wildfire | **** | **** | (# = 0) | • • • • • |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit | \$216 | \$269 | (\$53) | -20% |
| Actual Mitigation Cost | \$770 | \$720 | (\$50) | -7% |
| Cyber | *** | *** | ** | 007 |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit | \$36 | \$36 | \$ 0 | 0% |
| Actual Mitigation Cost | \$15 | \$15 | \$0 | 0% |
| <u>Hydro</u> | #F 0 | \$4.2 0 | (450) | 5 00/ |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit | \$50 | \$120 | (\$70) | -58% |
| Actual Mitigation Cost | \$215 | \$210 | (\$5) | -2% |
| Total | #A ^ A | # 40F | (#4.00) | 2007 |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit | \$302 | \$425 | (\$123) | -29% |
| Actual Mitigation Cost | \$1,000 | \$945 | (\$55) | -6% |

| Sub-table 3 | 6. Mitigation Be | enefit and Cos | ts: Results and | Projection | n versus F | orecast | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------|
| | | | | | Results | | | Projection | |
| Expected V | Value Risk: | | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 to | Total |
| | | | | | | | | Expected Life | |
| <u>Wildfire</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Modeled M | litigation Bene | fit: Results/P | rojection | \$55 | \$55 | \$106 | \$135 | \$810 | \$1,161 |
| Modeled M | litigation Bene | fit: Forecast | | \$63 | \$63 | \$143 | \$143 | \$858 | \$1,270 |
| Results/Pr | ojection B(W) | Forecast | | (\$8) | (\$8) | (\$37) | (\$8) | (\$48) | (\$109) |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Actual/Mo | deled Mitigation | on Costs: Resu | ılts/Projection | \$200 | \$310 | \$260 | \$10 | \$60 | \$840 |
| Modeled M | litigation Cost: | Forecast | | \$200 | \$510 | \$ 10 | \$ 10 | \$60 | \$790 |
| Results/Pr | ojection B(W) | Forecast | | \$0 | \$200 | (\$250) | \$0 | \$0 | (\$50) |
| Cyber | | | | | | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit: Results/Projection | | \$12 | \$12 | \$12 | \$12 | \$72 | \$120 | | |
| Modeled M | Modeled Mitigation Benefit: Forecast | | \$12 | \$12 | \$12 | \$12 | \$72 | \$120 | |
| | ojection B(W) | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$ O | \$0 |
| | . , , | | | | | | | | |
| Actual/Mo | deled Mitigatio | on Costs: Resu | ılts/Projection | \$5 | \$5 | \$5 | \$5 | \$30 | \$50 |
| | litigation Cost: | | · , | \$5 | \$5 | \$5 | \$5 | \$30 | \$50 |
| | ojection B(W) | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Hydro | , , | | | " | " | " | " | " | |
| | litigation Bene | fit: Results/P | roiection | \$0 | \$0 | \$ 50 | \$50 | \$300 | \$400 |
| | Iitigation Bene | | , | \$0 | \$60 | \$60 | \$60 | \$360 | \$540 |
| | ojection B(W) | | | \$0 | (\$60) | (\$10) | (\$10) | (\$60) | (\$140) |
| | -, | | | W - | (123) | (1 - 2) | (1 - 2) | (133) | (1 33) |
| Actual/Mo | deled Mitigatio | on Costs: Resu | ılts/Projection | \$0 | \$200 | \$15 | \$15 | \$90 | \$320 |
| | litigation Cost: | | | \$180 | \$15 | \$15 | \$15 | \$90 | \$315 |
| | ojection B(W) | | | \$180 | (\$185) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$5) |
| Total | | | | 7 - 2 - 2 | (+===) | 7 - | 7 - | 7.2 | (+-) |
| | litigation Bene | fit: Results/P | roiection | \$67 | \$67 | \$168 | \$197 | \$1,182 | \$1,681 |
| | litigation Bene | | | \$75 | \$135 | \$215 | \$215 | \$1,290 | \$1,930 |
| | ojection B(W) | | | (\$8) | (\$68) | (\$47) | (\$18) | (\$108) | (\$249) |
| 11000100711 | | 2 020000 | | (+0) | (+00) | (+11) | (+20) | (+100) | (+= 1>) |
| Actual/Mo | deled Mitigatio | on Costs: Resi | ılts/Projection | \$205 | \$515 | \$280 | \$30 | \$180 | \$1,210 |
| | litigation Cost: | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | \$385 | \$530 | \$30 | \$30 | \$180 | \$1,155 |
| | ojection B(W) | | | \$180 | \$15 | (\$250) | \$0 | \$0 | (\$55) |
| | -,,,,, | | | # - 0 0 | π | (+==+) | πν | π ~ | (+55) |
| BCR | Projection | Forecast | B(W) | | | | | | |
| Wildfire: | | | , , | | | | | | |
| WACC | 1.73 | 1.92 | -0.19 | | | | | | |
| Social | 2.44 | 2.72 | -0.28 | | | | | | |
| Hybrid | 2.14 | 2.36 | -0.22 | | | | | | |
| Cyber: | | | | | | | | | |
| WACC | 2.40 | 2.40 | 0.00 | | | | | | |
| Social | 2.40 | 2.40 | 0.00 | | | | | | |
| Hybrid | 2.64 | 2.64 | 0.00 | | | | | | |
| Hydro | | | | | | | | | |
| WACC | 1.18 | 1.52 | -0.34 | | | | | | |
| Social | 1.35 | 1.72 | -0.38 | | | | | | |
| Hybrid | 1.35 | 1.70 | -0.35 | | | | | | |
| TTYDIIG | 1.JJ | 1./0 | -0.33 | | | | | | |

d. Expected Value Risk Mitigation Benefit by Attribute for each Risk Event Table

| d. Expected Value R | | | | | | ידי | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | LDFIRE AT | IKIBUT | ES MITTO | JATION | BENEF. | 11 | |
| Hierarchy Risk Events | Enterprise Wildfire | | | | | | |
| Scenario Scenario | Results vs. Fo | arogast and | d Decination | ena via Eo. | rogast | | |
| Version | Model 2.1 | mecast and | a Projectic | 0118 VS. 1 O | iecasi | | |
| Time | Year 3 and Y | ears 1-3 | | | | | |
| Sub-table 1. Mitigation Be | | | | | | | |
| Sub-table 1. Mitigation De | chemis Overvi | C W | | | | Results B(W) I | |
| Mitigation benefit, Y3 | | | | | | results B(W) I | orccust |
| Expected Value Risk | | Resu | ılts Y3 | Fore | cast Y3 | \$ | % |
| Safety | | | 30 | | 35 | (\$5) | -14% |
| Reliability | | \$ | 38 | \$ | 54 | (\$16) | -30% |
| Financial | | \$ | 38 | \$ | \$54 | (\$16) | -30% |
| Total | | \$1 | 106 | \$ | 143 | (\$37) | -26% |
| Mitigation benefit, Y1Y3 | | | | | | | |
| Expected Value Risk | | | ts Y1Y3 | _ | ast Y1Y3 | \$ | % |
| Safety | | | 60 | | 65 | (\$5) | -8% |
| Reliability | | | 78 | | 102 | (\$24) | -24% |
| Financial | | | 78 | | 102 | (\$24) | -24% |
| Total | | \$2 | 216 | \$. | 269 | (\$53) | -20% |
| Sub-table 2. Mitigation Be | enefit Y1Y3 | | | | | | |
| | | | Results | | | Projection | |
| Expected Value Risk | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 to | Total |
| | | | | | | Expected Life | |
| 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| <u>Safety</u> | | | | | | | |
| Safety Modeled Mitigation Bene | fit: | \$15 | \$15 | \$30 | \$35 | \$210 | \$305 |
| Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection | | | " | | | " | |
| Modeled Mitigation Bene | | \$15 \$15 | \$15 \$15 | \$30 \$35 | \$35 \$35 | \$210 \$210 | \$305 \$310 |
| Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection | fit: Forecast | | " | | | " | |
| Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene | fit: Forecast | \$15 | \$15 | \$35 | \$35 | \$210 | \$310 |
| Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) | fit: Forecast Forecast | \$15 \$0 | \$15 \$0 | \$35 (\$5) | \$35 \$0 | \$210 \$0 | \$310 (\$5) |
| Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) | fit: Forecast Forecast | \$15 | \$15 | \$35 | \$35 | \$210 | \$310 |
| Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) Reliability Modeled Mitigation Bene | fit: Forecast Forecast fit: | \$15 \$0 | \$15 \$0 | \$35 (\$5) | \$35 \$0 | \$210 \$0 | \$310 (\$5) |
| Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) Reliability Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection | fit: Forecast Forecast fit: fit: | \$15 \$0 \$20 | \$15 \$0 \$20 | \$35 (\$5) \$38 | \$35 \$0 \$50 | \$210 \$0 \$300 | \$310 (\$5) \$428 |
| Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) Reliability Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene | fit: Forecast Forecast fit: fit: | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 | \$35 (\$5) \$38 \$54 | \$35 \$0 \$50 \$54 | \$210 \$0 \$300 \$324 | \$310 (\$5) \$428 \$480 |
| Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) Reliability Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) | fit: Forecast fit: fit: Forecast Forecast | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) | \$35 (\$5) \$38 \$54 (\$16) | \$35 \$0 \$50 \$54 (\$4) | \$210 \$0 \$300 \$324 (\$24) | \$310 (\$5) \$428 \$480 (\$52) |
| Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) Reliability Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) Financial Modeled Mitigation Bene | fit: Forecast fit: fit: Forecast Forecast | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 | \$35 (\$5) \$38 \$54 | \$35 \$0 \$50 \$54 | \$210 \$0 \$300 \$324 | \$310 (\$5) \$428 \$480 |
| Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) Reliability Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) | fit: Forecast fit: Forecast fit: Forecast Forecast | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) | \$35 (\$5) \$38 \$54 (\$16) | \$35 \$0 \$50 \$54 (\$4) | \$210 \$0 \$300 \$324 (\$24) | \$310 (\$5) \$428 \$480 (\$52) |
| Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Reliability Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Financial Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection | fit: Forecast fit: Forecast fit: Forecast fit: Forecast fit: Forecast | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) \$20 | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) \$20 | \$35 (\$5) \$38 \$54 (\$16) \$38 | \$35 \$0 \$50 \$54 (\$4) \$50 \$54 | \$210 \$0 \$300 \$324 (\$24) \$300 | \$310 (\$5) \$428 \$480 (\$52) \$428 |
| Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Reliability Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Financial Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) | fit: Forecast fit: Forecast fit: Forecast fit: Forecast fit: Forecast | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) | \$35 (\$5) \$38 \$54 (\$16) | \$35 \$0 \$50 \$54 (\$4) | \$210 \$0 \$300 \$324 (\$24) | \$310 (\$5) \$428 \$480 (\$52) |
| Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Reliability Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Financial Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Total | fit: Forecast fit: fit: Forecast Forecast fit: fit: Forecast fit: Forecast | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) \$20 \$24 (\$4) | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) \$20 \$24 (\$4) | \$35 (\$5) \$38 \$54 (\$16) \$38 | \$35 \$0 \$50 \$54 (\$4) \$50 \$54 (\$4) | \$210 \$0 \$300 \$324 (\$24) \$300 \$324 (\$24) | \$310 (\$5) \$428 \$480 (\$52) \$428 \$480 (\$52) |
| Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Reliability Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Financial Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Total Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Total Modeled Mitigation Benere | fit: Forecast fit: fit: Forecast Forecast fit: fit: Forecast fit: Forecast | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) \$20 | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) \$20 | \$35 (\$5) \$38 \$54 (\$16) \$38 | \$35 \$0 \$50 \$54 (\$4) \$50 \$54 | \$210 \$0 \$300 \$324 (\$24) \$300 | \$310 (\$5) \$428 \$480 (\$52) \$428 |
| Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) Reliability Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) Financial Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection B(W) Total Modeled Mitigation Bene Results/Projection | fit: Forecast Forecast fit: Forecast Forecast fit: Forecast fit: Forecast fit: Forecast | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) \$20 \$24 (\$4) | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) \$20 \$24 (\$4) | \$35 (\$5) \$38 \$54 (\$16) \$38 \$54 (\$16) | \$35 \$0 \$50 \$54 (\$4) \$50 \$54 (\$4) | \$210 \$0 \$300 \$324 (\$24) \$300 \$324 (\$24) | \$310 (\$5) \$428 \$480 (\$52) \$428 \$480 (\$52) |
| Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Reliability Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Financial Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Total Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) Total Modeled Mitigation Bener Results/Projection B(W) | fit: Forecast Forecast fit: Forecast Forecast fit: Forecast fit: Forecast fit: Forecast fit: Forecast | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) \$20 \$24 (\$4) | \$15 \$0 \$20 \$24 (\$4) \$20 \$24 (\$4) | \$35 (\$5) \$38 \$54 (\$16) \$38 | \$35 \$0 \$50 \$54 (\$4) \$50 \$54 (\$4) | \$210 \$0 \$300 \$324 (\$24) \$300 \$324 (\$24) | \$310 (\$5) \$428 \$480 (\$52) \$428 \$480 (\$52) |

e. Expected Value Risk Mitigation Benefit and Cost by Mitigation for each Risk Event Table

| WILDFIRE MITIG | ATION BENE | FIT FOR EACH | MITIGAT | ION | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Hierarchy | Enterprise | | | | |
| Risk Events | Wildfire | | | | |
| Scenario | Results vs. Fore | ecast and Projection | ns vs. Foreca | ast | |
| Version | Model 2.1 | , | | | |
| Time | Year 3 and Year | rs 1-3 | | | |
| Sub-table 1. Mitigation Benefi | it and Cost Over | rview | | | |
| | Expected | Value Risk | Results B | (W) Forecast | |
| <u>Y3</u> | Results Y3 | Forecast Y3 | \$ | 0/0 | |
| Undergrounding (UG) | | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit | \$51 | \$80 | -\$29 | -36% | |
| Actual Mitigation Cost | \$250 | \$0 | -\$250 | | |
| Covered Conductor (CC) | | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit | \$55 | \$63 | -\$8 | -13% | |
| Actual Mitigation Cost | \$10 | \$10 | \$0 | 0% | |
| | Expected | Value Risk | Results B(W) Foreca | | |
| X 74 X 70 | D 1. X/4X/0 | E . X/4X/0 | | 0.7 | |
| <u>Y1Y3</u> | Results Y1Y3 | Forecast Y1Y3 | \$ | % | |
| Y1Y3 Underground (UG) | Results Y1Y3 | Forecast Y1Y3 | \$ | % | |
| Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit | \$51 | \$80 | \$ -\$29 | -36% | |
| Underground (UG) | | | · | | |
| Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Covered Conductor (CC) | \$51 | \$80 | -\$29 | -36% | |
| Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost | \$51 | \$80 | -\$29 | -36% | |
| Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Covered Conductor (CC) | \$51 \$550 \$165 \$220 | \$80 \$500 \$189 \$220 | -\$29 -\$50 | -36% -10% | |
| Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Covered Conductor (CC) Modeled Mitigation Benefit | \$51 \$550 \$165 \$220 | \$80 \$500 \$189 | -\$29 -\$50 -\$24 \$0 Project | -36% -10% -13% 0% etion B(W) | |
| Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Covered Conductor (CC) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost | \$51 \$550 \$165 \$220 Expected | \$80 \$500 \$189 \$220 Value Risk | -\$29 -\$50 -\$24 \$0 Project | -36% -10% -13% 0% etion B(W) | |
| Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Covered Conductor (CC) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Projection Total | \$51 \$550 \$165 \$220 | \$80 \$500 \$189 \$220 | -\$29 -\$50 -\$24 \$0 Project | -36% -10% -13% 0% etion B(W) | |
| Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Covered Conductor (CC) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Projection Total Underground (UG) | \$51 \$550 \$165 \$220 <u>Expected</u> Projection | \$80 \$500 \$189 \$220 Value Risk | -\$29 -\$50 -\$24 \$0 Projec Fo | -36% -10% -13% 0% etion B(W) precast | |
| Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Covered Conductor (CC) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Projection Total Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit | \$51 \$550 \$165 \$220 Expected Projection | \$80 \$500 \$189 \$220 Value Risk Forecast | -\$29 -\$50 -\$24 \$0 Projec Fo \$ | -36% -10% -13% 0% ction B(W) precast % -5% | |
| Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Covered Conductor (CC) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Projection Total Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost | \$51 \$550 \$165 \$220 <u>Expected</u> Projection | \$80 \$500 \$189 \$220 Value Risk | -\$29 -\$50 -\$24 \$0 Projec Fo | -36% -10% -13% 0% etion B(W) precast | |
| Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Covered Conductor (CC) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Projection Total Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Covered Conductor (CC) | \$51 \$550 \$165 \$220 Expected Projection \$611 \$550 | \$80 \$500 \$189 \$220 Value Risk Forecast \$640 \$500 | -\$29 -\$50 -\$24 \$0 Projec Fo \$ -\$29 -\$50 | -36% -10% -13% 0% etion B(W) precast % -5% -10% | |
| Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Covered Conductor (CC) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost Projection Total Underground (UG) Modeled Mitigation Benefit Actual Mitigation Cost | \$51 \$550 \$165 \$220 Expected Projection | \$80 \$500 \$189 \$220 Value Risk Forecast | -\$29 -\$50 -\$24 \$0 Projec Fo \$ | -36% -10% -13% 0% ction B(W) precast % -5% | |

| Sub-table 2. Mitigation Benefits and Mitigation Costs: Details | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| | Results Projection | | | | | | | | | |
| Average Risk | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 to Expected Life | Total | | | | |
| <u>UG</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit: Results/Projection | \$0 | \$0 | \$51 | \$80 | \$480 | \$611 | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit: Forecast | \$0 | \$0 | \$80 | \$80 | \$480 | \$640 | | | | |
| Results/Projection B(W) Forecast | \$0 | \$0 | (\$29) | \$0 | \$0 | (\$29) | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Actual/Modeled Mitigation Costs: Results/Projection | \$0 | \$300 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 | \$550 | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Cost: Forecast | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$500 | | | | |
| Results/Projection B(W) Forecast | \$0 | \$200 | (\$250) | \$0 | \$0 | (\$50) | | | | |
| CC | | | | | | | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit: Results/Projection | \$55 | \$55 | \$55 | \$55 | \$330 | \$550 | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit: Forecast | \$63 | \$63 | \$63 | \$63 | \$378 | \$630 | | | | |
| Results/Projection B(W) Forecast | (\$8) | (\$8) | (\$8) | (\$8) | (\$48) | (\$80) | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Actual/Modeled Mitigation Costs: Results/Projection | \$200 | \$10 | \$10 | \$10 | \$60 | \$290 | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Cost: Forecast | \$200 | \$10 | \$10 | \$10 | \$60 | \$290 | | | | |
| Results/Projection B(W) Forecast | \$0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | |
| <u>Total</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit: | \$55 | \$55 | \$106 | \$135 | \$810 | \$1,161 | | | | |
| Results/Projection | | | | | | | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Benefit: Forecast | \$63 | \$63 | \$143 | \$143 | \$858 | \$1,270 | | | | |
| Results/Projection B(W) Forecast | (\$8) | (\$8) | (\$37) | (\$8) | (\$48) | (\$109) | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Actual/Modeled Mitigation Costs: Results/Projection | \$200 | \$310 | \$260 | \$10 | \$60 | \$840 | | | | |
| Modeled Mitigation Cost: Forecast | \$200 | \$510 | \$10 | \$10 | \$60 | \$790 | | | | |
| Results/Projection B(W) Forecast | \$0 | \$200 | (\$250) | \$ 0 | \$0 | (\$50) | | | | |

f. Expected Value Risk Reduction by Risk Event Table

| RISK EVEN | Г ЕХРЕСТЕО | VALUE RISK R | EDUCTION | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Hierarchy | Enterprise | | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Events | All | All | | | | | | | | | |
| Scenario | Results vs. F | Results vs. Forecast, Results & Projections | | | | | | | | | |
| Version | Model 2.1 | · | | | | | | | | | |
| Time | Year 3 and Y | Zears 1-3 | | | | | | | | | |
| | ıble 1. Expecte | d Value Risk Red | luction Overvie | W | | | | | | | |
| | | Y3 | Results B(V | | | | | | | | |
| Wildfire | Results | Forecast | \$ | % | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$870 | \$870 | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$106 | \$143 | (\$37) | -26% | | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$764 | \$727 | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyber | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$249 | \$249 | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$12 | \$12 | \$0 | 0% | | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$237 | \$237 | | | | | | | | | |
| Hydro | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$581 | \$581 | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$50 | \$60 | (\$10) | -17% | | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$531 | \$521 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$1, 700 | \$1,7 00 | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$168 | \$215 | (\$47) | -22% | | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$1,532 | \$1,485 | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub-table 2. Expected Value | e Risk Reduction | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Results | | Projections | | | | | | | |
| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | | | | | | | |
| <u>Wildfire</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$870 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$55 | \$55 | \$106 | \$135 | | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$815 | \$815 | \$764 | \$735 | | | | | | | |
| <u>Cyber</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$249 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$12 | \$12 | \$12 | \$12 | | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$237 | \$237 | \$237 | \$237 | | | | | | | |
| <u>Hydro</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$581 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$0 | \$0 | \$50 | \$50 | | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$581 | \$581 | \$531 | \$531 | | | | | | | |
| <u>Total</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$1,700 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$67 | \$67 | \$168 | \$197 | | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$1,633 | \$1,633 | \$1,532 | \$1,503 | | | | | | | |

g. Expected Value Risk Reduction by Tranche Table

| WILDFIRE TRANCHE RISK REDUCTION Y3 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Hierarchy | Enterprise | | | | | | |
| Risk Events | Wildfire | | | | | | |
| Scenario | Results vs. Forecast | | | | | | |
| Version | Model 2.1 | | | | | | |
| Time | Year 3 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|-------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|------|-----|-------------|
| | Tranche Number | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
| Expected Value Risk | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated risk | \$870 | \$191 | \$87 | \$61 | \$52 | \$44 | \$35 | \$35 | \$35 | \$35 | \$35 | \$26 | \$26 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$9 | \$9 |
| Tranche share | 100% | 22% | 10% | 7% | 6% | 5% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Results | \$106 | \$10 | \$5 | \$4 | \$25 | \$24 | \$10 | \$11 | \$13 | \$2 | \$1 | \$1 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Forecast | \$143 | \$19 | \$8 | \$6 | \$31 | \$26 | \$15 | \$14 | \$17 | \$3 | \$2 | \$2 | \$0 | \$ 0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$ 0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$ 0 |
| Results B(W) Forecast | -26% | -47% | -38% | -33% | -20% | -8% | -33% | -21% | -24% | -33% | -50% | -50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Torcust | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated risk | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Results | \$764 | \$181 | \$82 | \$57 | \$27 | \$20 | \$25 | \$24 | \$22 | \$33 | \$34 | \$25 | \$26 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$9 | \$9 |
| Forecast | \$727 | \$172 | \$79 | \$55 | \$21 | \$18 | \$20 | \$21 | \$18 | \$32 | \$33 | \$24 | \$26 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$17 | \$9 | \$9 |
| Results B(W) Forecast | -5% | -5% | -4% | -4% | -30% | -11% | -25% | -14% | -22% | -3% | -3% | -4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Tranche share (Results) | 100% | 24% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 4% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% |

h. Tail Risk Reduction by Risk Event Table (Optional)

| RISK EVENT TAIL RISK REDUCTION | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Hierarchy | Enterpris | se | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Events | Wildfire | | | | | | | | | |
| Scenario | Results v | s. Forecast, | Results & Proje | ctions | | | | | | |
| Version | Model 2. | 1 | · | | | | | | | |
| Time | Year 3 an | nd Years 1-3 | | | | | | | | |
| Sub-table 1. Tail Risk Reduction Overview* | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Y3 Results B(W) Forec | | | | | | | | | |
| | Results | Forecast | \$ | 0/0 | | | | | | |
| Wildfire | | | " | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$4,600 | \$4,600 | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$507 | \$679 | (\$172) | -25% | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$4,093 | \$3,921 | \" / | | | | | | | |
| Cyber | " , | " , | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$1,160 | \$1,160 | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$72 | \$72 | \$0 | 0% | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$1,088 | \$1,088 | " | | | | | | | |
| Hydro | " 3 | " 3 | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$3,480 | \$3,480 | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$325 | \$390 | (\$65) | -17% | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$3,155 | \$3,090 | (#00) | 1175 | | | | | | |
| Total | ₩ <i>5</i> ,100 | ₩ 3, 020 | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$8,400 | \$8,400 | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$868 | \$1,099 | (\$231) | -21% | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$7,532 | \$7,301 | (#231) | 2170 | | | | | | |
| *Tail Risk is not additive | Ψ1,332 | Ψ',5001 | | | | | | | | |
| Sub-table 2. Tail Average-Rish | z Roductio | n V1V/* | | | | | | | | |
| Sub-table 2. Tail Tivelage Hist | X Reduction | Results | | Projections | | | | | | |
| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | | | | | | |
| Wildfire | 10011 | 1001 - | 2 002 0 | 2002 1 | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$4,600 | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$275 | \$275 | \$507 | \$639 | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$4,325 | \$4,325 | \$4,093 | \$3,961 | | | | | | |
| Cyber | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$1,160 | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$72 | \$72 | \$72 | \$72 | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$1,088 | \$1,088 | \$1,088 | \$1,088 | | | | | | |
| Hydro | *** 400 | | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk | \$3,480 | ** | **** | 2005 | | | | | | |
| Risk Reduction | \$0 | \$0 | \$325 | \$325 | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$3,480 | \$3,480 | \$3,155 | \$3,155 | | | | | | |
| Total Pro mitigated Piels | \$9.400 | | | | | | | | | |
| Pre-mitigated Risk Risk Reduction | \$8,400 \$340 | \$340 | \$868 | \$1,000 | | | | | | |
| Post-mitigated Risk | \$8,060 | \$8,060 | \$7,532 | \$7,400 | | | | | | |
| *Tail #Risk is not additive | ψ0,000 | ΨΟ,ΟΟΟ | Ψ1,JJ4 | ₩/, T OO | | | | | | |
| I will I to Hot additive | | | | | | | | | | |

| Matigatian | 1/1/0 rl/ | autto bull | ///・けいべつけいへい ナ | tor oooh Di | isk Event Table |
|-------------------|------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|
| IVIIIIVAIIIII | VVIIIK LIIIII BE | | viiiiyaiiiii i | OI PACIL BI | SK EVELLI JALLIE |
| 1 IIIISUUUII | VVOIN OILLION | Julio Dy I | IIIISationi | or odorrin | ON EVOITE TOOLS |
| | | | | | |

| W | ILDFIRE MITI | GATION WORK | UNITS | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---------------|-----------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Hierarchy | Enterprise | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk Events | Wildfire | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scenario | Results vs. Forecast and Projections vs. Forecast | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Version | Model 2.1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time | Year 3 and Years 1-3 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub-table 1. Work Units | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Work Units Y3 | | | Results B | (W) Forecast | | | | | | | | |
| | Results Y3 | Forecast Y3 | \$ | 0/0 | | | | | | | | |
| Circuit Miles | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG | 250 | 0 | 250 | 0% | | | | | | | | |
| CC | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Mitigated | 250 | 0 | 250 | | | | | | | | | |
| Work Units Y1Y3 | | | F | Results B(W) Forecast | | | | | | | | |
| | Results Y1Y3 | Forecast Y1Y3 | \$ | % | | | | | | | | |
| Circuit Miles | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG | 1,000 | 1,400 | (\$400) | -29% | | | | | | | | |
| CC | 380 | 400 | (\$20) | -5% | | | | | | | | |
| Total Mitigated | 1,380 | 1,800 | (\$420) | -23% | | | | | | | | |
| Work Units Projection | | | Pr | ojection B(W) Forecast | | | | | | | | |
| | Projection | Forecast | \$ | % | | | | | | | | |
| Circuit Miles | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UG | 1,320 | 1,400 | (\$80) | -6% | | | | | | | | |
| CC | 380 | 400 | (\$20) | -5% | | | | | | | | |
| Total Mitigated | 1,700 | 1,800 | (\$100) | -6% | | | | | | | | |

RMAR Required Narrative Sections

- 1. Include a narrative description of every table listed in the Required Tables and Table Elements. Explain any deficiencies or negative variances to the plan found in these tables. Explain what steps the utility intends to take to address these deficiencies and negative variances.
- 2. Include a narrative description of a Risk Reporting Unit (RRU) which enables aggregation of reports.
- 3. Include a narrative description of any discrepancies between the modeled risk and the actual outcomes recorded during the previous GRC cycle.
- 4. Include a narrative section that describes any new tranche structures that were not used in a previous RAMP or GRC Cycle. Provide details of the key that is used as a bridge between the old and new tranche structures. This key must also be filed with the RMAR.
- 5. Include a narrative description of any subjective elements and assumptions related to each mitigation that have changed during the most recent update to the RMAR. The narrative must explain how the change has affected any RMAR information from the Plan Phase.
- 6. Include a narrative justification for assigning attribution for risk reduction from each mitigation. The utility must explain the causal mechanism that allows them to infer attribution. The utility must also highlight any additional factors other than the mitigation

R.20-07-013

- itself that could have contributed to any apparent risk reduction. Any assumptions or SME judgements must be made transparent.
- 7. Include a narrative discussion describing the model and data quality as well as certifies that internal quality control requirements have been met. This section should include description of any sensitivity analysis that was conducted on various model inputs or assumptions for each mitigation. This section can draw from the results of the Transparency Guidelines³ or whatever sensitivity analyses are required by a future Decision in this or a successor proceeding or a Staff Resolution. The utility must also provide tables or workpapers to back up any sensitivity analysis results discussed in this narrative section.

³ D.24-05-064, Appendix B.