

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
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

No. CR 14-00175 WHA

v.

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY,

Defendant.

ORDER RE MONITOR LETTER

The Monitor has submitted a letter in response to the Court’s request, appended hereto as Exhibit A, providing an update on its field inspections of PG&E’s vegetation management and infrastructure inspection operations since last year.


The Monitor has found more exceptions per mile this year than from September to December of last year. The Monitor believes that one of the reasons for this discrepancy is that PG&E completed its 2019 EVM work in low-risk portions of its high-fire threat districts in order to meet its 2019 EVM targets, instead of prioritizing wildfire risk reduction according to its risk model.

The Monitor also notes that as of August 31, 2020, PG&E failed to conduct any enhanced, ignition-based climbing inspections of the 967 applicable transmission structures selected for 2020 inspections in high-fire threat districts. The Monitor believes that this shortcoming was caused by “human error, lack of oversight, miscommunications, and failure to appropriately escalate matters,” the same problems that offender PG&E has long had.

1 By **NOVEMBER 3 AT NOON**, PG&E shall please explain these shortcomings and any other
2 points in the Monitor's letter it wishes to address.

3
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5
6 Dated: October 20, 2020.

7
8 
9 _____
10 WILLIAM ALSUP
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
United States District Court
Northern District of California