

ORDER NO. 26-223

ENTERED Jun 25 2026

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UM 2209

In the Matter of

IDAHO POWER COMPANY,

Wildfire Protection Plan.

ORDER

DISPOSITION: STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED

At its Special Public Meeting on June 25, 2026, the Public Utility Commission of Oregon adopted Staff's recommendation in this matter. The Staff Report with the recommendation is attached as Appendix A.

BY THE COMMISSION:



Alison Lackey

Chief Administrative Law Judge



A party may request rehearing or reconsideration of this order under ORS 756.561. A request for rehearing or reconsideration must be filed with the Commission within 60 days of the date of service of this order. The request must comply with the requirements in OAR 860-001-0720. A copy of the request must also be served on each party to the proceedings as provided in OAR 860-001-0180(2). A party may appeal this order by filing a petition for review with the Circuit Court for Marion County in compliance with ORS 183.484.

ITEM NO. RA3

**PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON
STAFF REPORT
SPECIAL PUBLIC MEETING DATE: June 25, 2026**

REGULAR X **CONSENT** **EFFECTIVE DATE** Upon Commission Approval

DATE: June 10, 2026

TO: Public Utility Commission

FROM: Heide Caswell

THROUGH: Nolan Moser **SIGNED**

SUBJECT: IDAHO POWER:
 (Docket No. UM 2209)
 Idaho Power's 2026-2028 Multi-year Wildfire Mitigation Plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approve Idaho Power's 2026-2028 Multi-year Wildfire Mitigation Plan and adopt Staff recommendations for additional improvement.

DISCUSSION:

Issue

Whether the Oregon Public Utility Commission (Commission) should approve Idaho Power's (IPC or Company) 2026-2028 Multi-year Wildfire Mitigation Plan (MYP). Whether the Commission should direct Idaho Power to take the actions recommended by Staff.

Applicable Rule or Law

ORS 757.960 directs the Commission to evaluate electric companies' risk-based wildfire protection plans and planned activities to protect public safety, reduce risks to utility customers, and promote energy system resilience in the face of increased wildfire frequency and severity, and in consideration of the recommendations made by the Governor's Council on Wildfire Response 2019 Report and Recommendations.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 2

Senate Bill (SB) 762 (2021), incorporated as ORS 757.960 through ORS 757.969, established standards for electric utility's Wildfire Mitigation Plans and required the Commission to promulgate rules related to the requirements of the Plans. Pursuant to ORS 757.963 the Commission may "approve with conditions" a public utility's Wildfire Mitigation Plan or update.

Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR), in 860-300, articulate the minimum requirements for the plan filings as well as the process for Commission approval of the plans. Further, In Order No. 24-326,¹ the Commission adopted guidelines for wildfire mitigation plans.

The Commission approved the Idaho Power 2025 WMP in Order No. 25-235² and directed the Company to work with Staff to implement Staff's recommendations for future plans.

Analysis

Background

Idaho Power's 2026-2028 Multi-year Wildfire Mitigation Plan represents the fifth year of wildfire planning under Oregon statute. Staff recognizes that requirements will continue to evolve as mitigation strategies, risk analysis, cost-benefit assessment tools, and related programs mature. Emerging technologies and advances in fire science also create opportunities to collaboratively improve wildfire-mitigation programs, helping ensure that customers, regulators, utilities, and other stakeholders understand each utility's current practices and progress. These developments, combined with continued co-creation, can support cost-effective resilience investments that strengthen the electric system while balancing customer cost impacts. Changes in wildfire mitigation plans have largely been adopted through Docket No. UM 2340. This report presents Staff's recommendations for Idaho Power's 2026-2028 Multi-year Wildfire Mitigation Plan and identifies additional information for inclusion in the 2027 Plan Update, to be filed by December 31, 2026.

Staff recognizes the extensive effort required to produce a WMP. Idaho Power's first multi-year plan offered a detailed view of the Company's wildfire planning practices utilizing the Shared Format adopted in UM 2340.³ This format improved the readability across the investor-owned utilities' (IOUs) plans. Staff values the IOUs' continued collaboration in this evolving process, their openness in discussing their Plans, and their ongoing commitment mitigating utility wildfire risks.

¹ Order No. 24-326, <https://apps.puc.state.or.us/orders/2024ords/24-326.pdf>.

² Order No. 25-235, <https://apps.puc.state.or.us/orders/2025ords/25-235.pdf>.

³ Order No. 24-326, <https://apps.puc.state.or.us/orders/2025ords/25-326.pdf>.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 3

Process

On December 31, 2025, Idaho Power filed its 2026-2028 Multi-year Wildfire Mitigation Plan with the Commission and concurrently submitted the 2025 Risk Spend Efficiency (RSE) Workbook⁴ and the 2025 Initial WMP Data Template Workbook, containing data through the third quarter of 2025 and forecasts through 2028, which it subsequently updated on February 27, 2026. On March 5, 2026, IOUs presented their 2026-2028 Multi-year Mitigation Plans during a Special Public Meeting.⁵ On March 31, 2026, Idaho Power filed its Final 2025 WMP Data Template Workbook, which included updated the Initial 2025 WMP Data Template Workbook and fourth-quarter 2025 results, which it subsequently updated on May 27, 2026.

Review Method

Staff's analysis evaluates the Company's compliance with minimum requirements primarily in Division 300. The findings and recommendations in this memo are based on Staff's review of the Company's MYP, Data Templates, RSE Workbook, the Independent Evaluator's (IE) Report, and stakeholder comments. Staff additionally considered information obtained through WMP workshops, structured stakeholder engagement, and consultation with subject matter experts to evaluate the Company's alignment with current industry standards and practices.

Climate Wildfire and Energy Strategies, LLC (CWE) served as the IE for the 2026-2028 WMP filings, providing analytical support and written reports.⁶ For the 2026 WMP submissions, the IE continued using the previously established compliance metrics of "Met", "Partially Met" and "Not Met" to determine OAR compliance and recommendation completion. Staff uses "Met" and "Not Met" for OAR compliance and "Met", "Partially Met" and "Not Met" for areas of additional improvement. Staff appreciates the valuable work and perspective that the IE contributes to the WMP review process. Staff ultimately chose to incorporate some, but not all, of the IE's recommendations into its final recommendations for Idaho Power.

Staff groups its recommendations for the MYP into two categories: (1) recommendations applicable to all Investor-Owned Utilities, denoted with "ALL", and (2) recommendations specific to Idaho Power, denoted with "IPC". Introduced this year are two additional components regarding completion timeframes. Each recommendation is assigned a completion timeframe. Recommendations denoted with a "U" identify near-term improvements to be addressed in the next MYP Update, and

⁴ The 2025 Data Template Workbook and 2025 RSE Workbook supports the IOUs 2026-2028 MYP.

⁵ Recording of March 5, 2026, WMP Special Public Meeting, https://oregonpuc.granicus.com/player/clip/1621?view_id=2&redirect=true.

⁶ The IE is not responsible for assessing the IOUs overall modeling processes.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 4

recommendations denoted with “B” identify longer-term improvements to be implemented in the next Multi-year Plan, due by December 31, 2028.⁷

Several recommendations will require joint effort between Staff and the IOUs as part of the WMP evolution process under UM 2340. Staff’s objective is to evaluate current IOU processes and deliver clear, actionable guidance for incorporation of its recommendations into the reporting structure adopted in UM 2340.

Incorporation of 2024 and 2025 Recommendations for Additional Improvement

In Order Nos. 24-231⁸ and 25-235,⁹ the Commission adopted Staff Recommendations as areas of additional improvement for Idaho Power. The IE and Staff assessments summarized in Table 1 reflect the Company’s responses to prior feedback. Staff recognizes that the IOUs continue to evolve the content contained in their wildfire mitigation plans, as well as complementary materials that inform customers about wildfire mitigation more broadly. As a result, certain of the recommendations, while not fully complete, have shown demonstrable progress and warrant evaluation in the future to determine how much advancement is appropriate. As a result, Staff suggests that the following recommendations be considered materially complete at this time, ALL_M, ALL_N, ALL_O, ALL_P, ALL_2505, ALL_2506, All_2513, and All_2514. Appendix B consolidates and tracks outstanding recommendations and lists Staff’s current recommendations for Idaho Power’s Areas for Additional Improvement.

Table 1: Areas for Additional Improvement

OPUC Order #	Description	IE Conclusion: Met/Partially Met/Did Not Meet/Not Due	Staff Conclusion: Met/Partially Met/Did Not Meet/Not Due
Order No. 24-231¹⁰			
IPC_3	Location Risk Methodology	Met	Met
IPC_4	Template	Met	Met
IPC_5	Annual Estimate of Mitigation Units and Risk Reduction	Partially Met	Partially Met

⁷ Staff recommends the continued adoption of a numbering approach. Utility specific recommendations will begin with “IPC” while joint IOU recommendations will begin with “ALL”. Additionally, each recommendation will reflect the recommended year “26” followed by a distinct ID number as was similarly done in 2025. A timeframe component will now be added to each recommendation, “U” denotes the recommendation be addressed in the next Updated to the current MYP (in this case 2027) and “B” denoted the recommendation be addressed in the next MYP in 2029, designating it as a base multi-year plan.

⁸ <https://apps.puc.state.or.us/orders/2024ords/24-231.pdf>.

⁹ <https://apps.puc.state.or.us/orders/2025ords/25-235.pdf>.

¹⁰ Orders identified as 2026 or Phase 2.

Docket No. UM 2209
 June 10, 2026
 Page 5

OPUC Order #	Description	IE Conclusion: Met/Partially Met/Did Not Meet/Not Due	Staff Conclusion: Met/Partially Met/Did Not Meet/Not Due
IPC_8	Feedback from PSPs	Met	Met
IPC_12	Community Outreach Topics	Met	Met
IPC_13	Measuring Effectiveness of Community Outreach	Did Not Meet	Partially Met
IPC_17	Advancing Technology	Partially Met	Partially Met
IPC_20	Inspection and Root Cause Analysis	Did Not Meet	Partially Met
ALL_A	Meet Report Compliance	Met	Met
ALL_C	Shared Glossary	Met	Met
ALL_D	Standard Format	Met	Met
ALL_H	Industry Engagement Information	Met	Met
ALL_I	Pilot Technology Information	Met	Met
ALL_J	Risk Map Working Group	Met	Met
ALL_K	Calibrate Risk Modeling Methods	Met	Met
ALL_L	RSE Methodology	Met	Met
ALL_M	Reliability Best Practices	-	Met
ALL_N	Public Safety Partner Engagement	-	Met
ALL_O	Consistent Outreach & Education	-	Met
ALL_P	PSPS Reporting	-	Met
Order No. 25-235			
IP_2501	Timeline for Circuit Segment/ ZOP Assessment Modeling	Did Not Meet	Partially Met
IP_2502	Battery Program Analysis	Met	Met
IP_2503	VRI Sharing	Met	Met
ALL_2501	WMP Update Templates	Not Due Until 2027	Not Due – Complete for 2027
ALL_2502	IWRMC Maturity model Results	Partially Met	Partially Met
ALL_2503	2025 Data Submissions	Met	Met
ALL_2504	Outage Data/Ignition Risk Drivers	Met	Met
ALL_2505	Analysis of Outage Causes	-	Met
ALL_2506	Utility Risk Areas	-	Met
ALL_2507	Planned Mitigation Investments	Partially Met	Partially Met
ALL_2508	Grant Information	Met	Met
ALL_2509	Changes in Work Completed	Met	Met
ALL_2510	Equipment Upgrades	Met	Met

Docket No. UM 2209
 June 10, 2026
 Page 6

OPUC Order #	Description	IE Conclusion: Met/Partially Met/Did Not Meet/Not Due	Staff Conclusion: Met/Partially Met/Did Not Meet/Not Due
ALL_2511	Survey Details and Analysis	Met	Partially Met
ALL_2512	Real-time Emergency Communication	Met	Met
ALL_2513	Inspection Programs Coordination	-	Met
ALL_2514	Industry Engagement Activities	-	Met

Stakeholder Comments on Idaho Power's MYP

Staff values the perspectives offered through stakeholder comments and appreciates the time and effort invested in providing them. Based upon feedback received from stakeholders, Staff adjusted the schedule to allow for more preparation time and additional opportunities for input. Staff reviewed comments submitted by Joint Advocates¹¹, and incorporated viewpoints into both the general recommendations for all IOUs and utility specific recommendations.

This year, the stakeholder comments focused on several key themes: readability, risk spend efficiency, capital investments, vegetation management, situational awareness, public safety, and diversified outreach, including partnerships. Attachment A provides a summary of comments received in the UM 2209 . Where applicable, Staff incorporated some, but not all, of the stakeholders' recommendations. Where stakeholder recommendations were not incorporated, Staff intends to work jointly with Advocates and IOUs to further consider how to advance many of the concepts that were shared.

Staff Findings of Idaho Power's 2026-2028 Multi-year Wildfire Mitigation Plan

In Staff's review of Idaho Power's MYP, it observed Idaho Power's plan includes a proposed investment of \$16 M over the next three years and while it seems modest compared to the other IOUs, is supported by a substantially smaller customer base. The result will likely be upward pressure on customer rates. Staff takes this opportunity to underscore the importance of utility spending discipline and cost containment, with an eye towards affordability given recent rate increases.

While Staff recognizes that ignition risk and fire spread can occur outside designated HFRZ areas, Staff believes it is critical that utilities provide clear, evidence-based justification, and precise wildfire risk reductions for each proposed program or mitigation. This includes supplying the underlying data, calculations, analytical processes, and specific results used to demonstrate a program's effectiveness. Such

¹¹ Joint Advocates are NW Energy Coalition, Community Energy Project, and Oregon Citizens' Utility Board.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 7

transparency is essential to show cost discipline and to support future cost-recovery requests.

Staff Recommendations:

ALL_2601U: Staff recognizes that the WMP template¹² provides the structure for MYPs and Updates, however, recommends Staff, IOUs and stakeholders develop guidelines for content that is appropriately contained in an Update and how best to make this information useful for a variety of readers. At minimum, Staff believes Updates need to include: 1) items that summarize the year's deliverables (actuals versus plans, units and costs), 2) any modeling or refinement in analysis that either results in a change in designated risk or mitigation approach, 3) explanations of actions taken and progress made in response to recommendations that were approved by the Commission, even if not completely fulfilled at the time of Update filing, and 4) thresholds for significant Initiative updates as defined in UM 2340 Order No. 24-236 Appendix A Section 3.4. Staff proposes that a workshop with the utilities, Joint Advocates, and other stakeholders could be an ideal venue for discussion and alignment to occur and suggests it be held during late summer

ALL_2602U: Recognizing that IOUs are developing explicit evidence supporting how and why they have chosen a particular wildfire mitigation initiative activity, in the interim (if there is not yet detailed data or analysis underlying the activity) they should identify the fundamental principle of the activity (for example reducing probability of risk event, ignition risk, consequence, impact or enhancing awareness, responsiveness, etc.) as well as the key assumptions made to support that strategy, in addition to identifying the intended metrics that will be used to demonstrate the effectiveness of the approach (such as reducing certain types of outages, shortening the duration of fault current, etc.).

ALL_2603B: By the next MYP, the utilities should augment explanations from ALL_2602U with data, calculations, analysis methods, and measurable results—demonstrating the effectiveness of their wildfire mitigation program's initiative activities. In their WMP Reports, IOUs should outline any analysis performed, including whether the initiative activity succeeded or fell short, the lessons learned, and the reasons for any program expansions, reductions, or redesigns. IOUs should also clearly identify the cost impacts associated with these outcomes. This information should be included in the appropriate WMP report initiative subsections initiative activity section that details the program which can be included in the framework or mitigation explanations. If providing effectiveness

¹² <https://apps.puc.state.or.us/orders/2025ords/25-326.pdf>.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 8

for an overall section, evidence can be included in results or continuous improvement subsections. This requirement applies to all major wildfire mitigation programs, including inspection and vegetation management, grid hardening, operational protocols, community outreach, risk assessment methodologies, emergency preparedness, and situational forecasting. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Idaho Power's use of a 20 ft vegetation clearance radius for distribution circuits.
- PGE's rationale for a two-person crew for inspection with an unknown quantity of corrections performed simultaneously.
- PGE's assessment of optimal clearance distance as discussed in VM 07.
- Pacific Power's choice of 100 percent quality assurance inspection on all grid hardening projects through post construction inspections.

ALL_2604U: Staff appreciates feedback supplied by the utilities relating to allocation and in an effort to be clear about costs specific to new WMP efforts, IOUs should provide initiative activity costs within each initiative category in the initiative summary tables (with subtotal) as well as those costs attributed to general or embedded programs (with subtotal). In addition, where the program is generally beneficial to other utility processes, Staff and the IOUs will work to detail within the data template workbook how to present that information. Finally, in cases where multistate allocation results in portions of the costs attributed to Oregon customers, Staff will work with the IOUs to clarify what amount the utility proposes to allocate to them. Where costs are grouped across initiative activities the IOU should estimate the percentage of the cost attributed to each initiative activity until cost singularity exists for the activity. IOUs should work with Staff to structure the submittals to fully describe the methods for cost estimation and outline the basis for the benefits being attributed to the measure.

ALL_2605U: Staff appreciates the utilities' response regarding the pilot template feedback. Staff asserts that a pilot template¹³, including substantial explanation is required whenever the IOU performs any new activity that has risk reduction benefits or that has short or long-term cost implications,. While the IOUs identified certain initiative activities as pilots there are a large number of initiative activities that have had no explanation for their existence within the wildfire mitigation program (and relate to new spending or should result in risk reduction). This results in commitment of resources to an action which have never had the rationale fully understood by Staff or stakeholders. Such has been the case with the creation and expansion of weather and camera networks, as well as Pacific Power's substantial expansion of its meteorology, emergency management and

¹³ Pilot templates were developed and ordered in Order No. 25-326 Appendix A, page 42 of 70.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 9

most recently wildfire intelligence center. This has resulted in significant costs that were not “piloted”, have never been cost-justified and were not compared against other measures to determine their priority as a mitigation measure. In addition to being more expansive in providing information regarding tooling up mitigation measures, IOUs should expand upon the new and additional resources as potential pilots as a means to measure and assess the value provided by these investments. IOUs should include details, where applicable, of the deployment locations/‘Application’ for pilot technologies and why the given area was chosen. When explaining the reasons for further investment, IOUs should provide more complete project management elements, including key goals, deliverables and milestones the Company intends to assess to measure the merits of the activity.

Plan Compliance Review and Recommendations for Future Plans by Section

OAR 860-300-0020 (1)(a)(A) & (B):

Identified areas that are subject to a heightened risk of wildfire, including determinations for such conclusions, and are:

(A) Within the service territory of the Public Utility, and

(B) Outside the service territory of the Public Utility but within the Public Utility's right-of-way for generation and transmission assets.

Staff Analysis:

Idaho Power met the requirements for identifying High Fire Risk Zones (HFRZ). Idaho Power has not made significant updates to its current HFRZ since its identification of a single extreme risk zone near Halfway, Oregon. The Company utilizes a fire model which measures the likelihood of a fire event occurrence at a specific location and employs consultation with local subject matter experts to drive its qualification of Tier 2 and Tier 3 HFRZ areas. Staff understands that Idaho Power’s current model measures risk based on proximity to assets. The Company has previously noted it did not limit this analysis to only service area and existing asset base, but included areas where assets were planned to be constructed.

As with all the IOUs, Staff would like to better understand the cadence with which the Company updates its model considering updated datasets and advancements in industry analysis. Additionally, Staff would like to know how the Company performs sensitivity analysis against its models and tests its assumptions, to ensure those areas designated as HFRZ are appropriate for long-term investment strategies. This level of transparency ensures models are grounded in verifiable evidence, supports consistent regulatory oversight between IOUs, and strengthens confidence in the resulting wildfire-risk assessments.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 10

Staff's goal is that the following recommendations will help guide the Company with providing the detailed data needed to understand how the revised model progresses the Company's assessment of risk. Staff would like the Company to provide clear details of the data-driven approach and processes it is using to assess risk, including a table outlining the circuit segments (at minimum differentiated at the sustained zone of protection), from highest risk to lowest risk, as well as any active or proposed mitigation projects on new or historically assessed risk circuit segments.

Staff Recommendations:

ALL_2606B: IOUs should identify key assumptions associated with risk quantification and test them, performing sensitivity analysis to establish resulting risk and consequences, explaining the modeling variability based on these changes. In cases where the utility uses a vendor product to model risk they should develop processes that can be conducted to evaluate the model's sensitivity to variations of key attributes. In cases where the IOU has internally developed its model Staff requests models be evaluated by an independent authority. In all cases, explanations regarding the rationale for the performed sensitivity analysis, and the tested variables should be provided. Utilities shall explicitly indicate which models and analysis are internally developed, vendor provided or contracted. Examples include:

- Weather and climate change scenarios and the basis for the choice, including wind speeds and directions, ambient temperature, and application within the gridded environment.
- Climate inputs, including long- and short-term drying patterns leading to, at minimum, fuel moisture metrics.
- Fuel characteristics and granularity of any gridded cells.
- Detection timing, if part of the consequence modeling (whether detection responsiveness, impact estimation, assumed burn period, etc.).
- Ignition probability (established to identify service territory HFRZ).
- Ignition spread under the given conditions, including identification of the spread-modeling algorithm or source.
- Spread consequences, including injuries, structures, timber loss, or other quantifiable losses and the sources considered and used.
- Burn period, and explanation for the choice given each scenario considered.
- Each subjective measure introduced into the calculation process, including detection assumptions based on population, distance to fire protection resource, coverage by camera viewsheds, etc.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 11

- Each multiplier used within the calculation process that is not directly attributed to a specific algorithm (i.e., calibration of burned area based upon comparison to a specific event chosen by the utility).
- When appropriate, utility equipment ignition probability to estimate utility wildfire consequences.
- And other assumptions used to arrive at probability, risk, impact, or consequences of wildfire.

ALL_2607U: Identified in an Appendix D of the WMP Report, the IOUs should provide:

1. Maps that show current and historically-identified areas designated as HFRZ or Areas of Interest from the first risk model and
2. When the HFRZ or Areas of Interest are modified, identify information relating to any changes comparing the current against the most recently-approved WMP HFRZs or Areas of Interest including:
 - A narrative description of why the boundary was adjusted, added, or removed, including the conditions that have changed and how the modification aligns with current wildfire risk.
 - The datasets, risk models, geospatial layers, climate projections, vegetation assessments, ignition probability analysis, or subject matter expertise were used to support the change, including a description of analytical methods, thresholds, weighting factors, and any expert judgment, including any sensitivity analysis or assessments used to ratify the revision.
 - A table showing asset types and customers affected by the change categorizing as added, removed, and unchanged for each Area of Interest, HFRZ or non-HFRZ.

IPC_2601B: Idaho Power should have an updated HFRZ model which incorporates portions of the framework for quantifying wildfire risk outlined in IPC_2602U.

OAR 860-300-0020 (1)(b):

Identified means of mitigating wildfire risk that reflects a reasonable balancing of mitigation costs with the resulting reduction of wildfire risk.

Staff Analysis:

Idaho Power met the requirements outlining its mitigations approaches and reflecting on how mitigation actions are utilized. Staff appreciates the Company's efforts to expand its evaluation and implementation of mitigation options aimed at reducing ignition risk. However, it remains unclear how Idaho Power prioritizes risk across its assets. Staff would like to understand how the Company assesses the effectiveness of various

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 12

mitigation measures based on the locations of the highest risk assets and historical fault events to determine which approach to pursue.

Idaho Power appears to be using the Staff-led RSE Workbook to determine the mitigation risk reduction options. Staff would like to better understand the locations of Idaho Power's current capital investment, including what the key risk drivers are for these locations, and which mitigation approaches the Company evaluated that ultimately resulted in the selected mitigation.

Staff believes there is still significant opportunity for Idaho Power to further develop and refine its modeling and evaluation practices within its wildfire risk profile. This includes integrating quantified fire risk consequences should a fire event occur within the service territory as well as incorporating climate change modeling to account for evolving environmental conditions.

Staff Recommendations:

ALL_2608U: Staff recommends that IOUs provide, in an Appendix to the WMP Reports, comprehensive documentation of all historical fire data used as part of the consequence modeling processes. At a minimum, IOUs should include:

- Criteria used to identify relevant fire events.
- All historical fire events included in the analysis, along with the basis for its selection.
- Relevant event details, such as injuries, fatalities, damaged or destroyed structures, acres burned, timber board feet lost, suppression, and any other quantifiable impacts used to inform consequence scoring and/or specific delineated costs.
- What adjustments, normalizations, and associated datasets are integrated into the consequence model, such as weighting factors, scaling methods, final affected areas impacted, or statistical techniques.
- Any limitations or uncertainties associated with the historical dataset and how those limitations influenced the results.
- Datasets used to evaluate affected populations, structures, and other associated measured effects of the fire consequence location.

IPC_2602U: Idaho Power should outline its approach to achieving a comprehensive, forward-looking framework for quantifying wildfire risk that incorporates the likelihood and consequence of a wildfire within its service territory. The Company should establish clear times and milestones for improving its quantitative wildfire-risk modeling, including the planned use of tools from its vendors, or internal experts. The model should incorporate work identified in ALL_2621U and include projections of evolving risk drivers—including climate change, vegetation

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 13

shifts, and land-use changes in the wildland-urban interface while also applying consistent monetary assumptions or weighted consequence metrics to measure the wildfire impacts, such as structures and acres burned, into a unified measure of risk.

OAR 860-300-0020 (1)(c):

Identified preventative actions and programs that the utility will carry out to minimize the risk of the utility's facilities causing wildfire.

Staff Analysis:

Idaho Power met this requirement. Within Idaho Power's MYP, the Company provides an overview of the various mitigation approaches it is currently utilizing to address ignition risk. While the MYP includes details regarding the mitigation and program types, Staff would like to understand the specific conditions and criteria the company uses to deploy the most cost-effective mitigation type based on risk scoring, the data driven risk drivers, and how it measures the longevity of risk (near-term, mid-term, and long-term).

As previously mentioned, it remains unclear how the Company determines which circuits or circuit segments are selected for mitigation work and how various mitigation approaches are chosen. Staff seeks to understand how Idaho Power identifies the assets and targets mitigation work. As a result, Staff provides the following recommendations to obtain greater detail regarding the processes used to evaluate mitigation measures and prioritize risk reduction across the system.

Staff Recommendations:

ALL_2609U: IOUs should outline in a table the options for mitigation approaches versus risk event drivers and generally describe criteria that would influence the choice, resulting in a preferred mitigation. For example, outage history that indicates vegetation contacts might result in either vegetation management, covered conductor or undergrounding as options. However, additional considerations may result in a preference toward one of them.

ALL_2610U: The IOUs should clearly explain how they determine whether to proceed with or suspend completion of projects that are no longer identified as priorities (due to limited risk reduction or due to reductions in utility ignition consequence) as their understanding of risk and mitigation selections evolves, with an eye toward maximizing risk reduction while avoiding stranded or underutilized investments. As part of this process, IOUs should review all planned or targeted mitigations to determine priorities based upon: 1)

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 14

modifications to the risk areas; 2) changes in sustained zone of protection risk scores; or 3) new mitigation measures and their impact on reducing risk. Specifically, each utility should identify its approach to establishing "off ramps" for any programs when it determines there may be higher value approaches to reducing wildfire risk.

OAR 860-300-0020 (1)(d) and OAR 860-300-0070:

OAR 860-300-0020 (1)(d) Discussion of the outreach efforts to regional, state, and local entities, including municipalities, regarding a protocol for the de-energization of power lines and adjusting power system operations to mitigate wildfires, promote the safety of the public and first responders, and preserve health and communication infrastructure.

860-300-0070 (1) The Public Utility is required to file annual reports on de-energization lessons learned, providing a narrative description of all PSPS events which occurred during the fire season. Reports must be filed no later than December 31st of each year. (2) Non-confidential versions of the reports required under this section must also be made available on the Public Utility's website.

Staff Analysis:

Idaho Power met the requirements of the regulation, providing outreach to governing agencies. Staff believes the Company can further elaborate within its MYP or Updates on the partnerships and collaborative efforts it has developed with community-based organizations, wildfire response partners, and local stakeholders, as well as its participation in community outreach events.

Staff Recommendations:

ALL_2611U: The IOUs should outline how they ensure positive PSPS notification confirmation occurs for critical customers, including individuals identified as medically vulnerable and how the Company works with public safety partners if they are unable to communicate with an affected customer. Also, the IOUs should outline their methods of informing customers and communities (particularly critical and medically vulnerable customers) when sensitive settings are enabled.

Additionally, in their annual PSPS filings, pursuant to OAR 860-300-0070, IOUs should work with advocates, partners and Staff to enhance these reports to include details relating to:

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 15

- Methods to communicate with customers regarding sensitive settings and IOU attempts to mitigate reliability impacts to the customers and communities experiencing them;
- PSP outreach and coordination, including partner engagement, cadence of outreach, and how feedback received from these partners has influenced the IOU's program;
- CBO outreach and coordination, including communication content shared through the CBO;
- Tabletops, functional exercises or PSPSs conducted within their service territories; and
- After-action reviews for each tabletop, functional exercise or PSPS performed and how that feedback has changed processes within the IOU.

OAR 860-300-0020 (1)(e):

Identified protocol for the de-energization of power lines and adjusting of power system operation to mitigate wildfires, promote the safety of the public and first responders, and preserve health and communication infrastructure.

Staff Analysis:

Idaho Power's communications protocols met the requirements for PSPS communications in alignment with the regulations. Idaho Power provided two additional appendices in its WMP regarding PSPS Implementation Considerations and PSPS Operations and Communication Phases. Staff appreciates the details provided by the Company; however, Staff was unable to locate company protocols regarding notification goals and timelines regarding PSPS events. Staff understands that PSPS events can be dynamic in nature; however, establishing an outline of communication timeline goals would help create a consistent standard for the Company to act upon when there is sufficient advance planning time. The Company could provide additional clarity outlining the communication protocols it utilizes to notify Public Safety Partners (PSPs) and critical customers of impending de-energizations as well as when sensitive settings are implemented.

Staff Recommendations:

IPC_2603U: Idaho Power should enhance its PSPS outreach and education efforts by more clearly explaining how it prepares customers, Public Safety Partners (PSPs), emergency responders, critical facilities, and access and functional needs (AFN) customers for PSPS events, including how it leverages batteries, community resource centers or other community supports. The Company should have available a complete list of PSPs, critical facilities, and other community partners within its service territory that it will coordinate with during a PSPS. In

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 16

addition, Idaho Power should establish, document, and clearly outline its notification timelines for the various phases of a PSPS watch or activation event, distinguishing the communication approaches used for PSPs from those used for general customers.

OAR 860-300-0020 (1)(f):

Identification of the community outreach and public awareness efforts that the utility will use before, during, and after a wildfire season.

Staff Analysis:

Idaho Power met regulatory requirements outlining methods for community outreach. Staff recognizes the unique challenges associated with conducting community outreach in the rural communities Idaho Power serves in Oregon, as well as the limited feedback the Company currently receives. Staff encourages the Company to look to additional external resources, including those within its Idaho service territory, for insights into improving its outreach efforts.

Staff and the IE also express concern regarding the Company's limited communication resources in Spanish and other languages spoken within the service area. Staff would like to see Idaho Power expand its communication efforts to better reach non-English-speaking community members.

Staff Recommendations:

ALL_2612B: IOUs shall improve transparency by responding to stakeholder feedback and surveys on their Wildfire Mitigation Plan (WMP) and related processes. Survey questions and responses should be included in WMP Report Appendix F using charts or graphics to demonstrate the feedback received. Additionally, IOUs should include the following:

- IOUs should identify appropriate demographic cohorts, including language proficiency level (within their service territory), public safety partners (PSPs), community communicators (e.g., churches, schools), critical customers, medically vulnerable customers, and customers with access and functional needs, to better understand feedback from each group.
- IOUs should identify specific updates, completed or planned, to their notification and coordination programs based on survey results and feedback from critical customers and PSPs, including implementation timelines.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 17

- Due to Idaho Power's low customer feedback for its Oregon customers, Staff recommends Idaho Power develop proxy methods to establish ways to gauge how best to support Oregon customers.

ALL_2613U: Staff recommends that IOUs continue developing tailored messaging and other resources to support communication with distinct customer groups and expand their multilingual outreach efforts.

- The IOUs should analyze and report on the non-English languages spoken within their Oregon service territory, which could be based upon data such as that available through the ACS.
- Based upon these findings, the IOUs should provide recommendations regarding their plans to produce deliverables with timelines. Alternatively, the utility should explain, based on its research supported by verifiable data, why educational materials in additional languages are not necessary.
- Staff recommends that Idaho Power continue developing tailored messaging focused initially on Spanish language resources, including providing detailed deliverables with explicit timelines.

ALL_2614B: Staff recommends that IOUs expand the availability of third-party, industry-recognized wildfire-safety resources across their customer-facing platforms. IOUs should provide references to these materials on their websites, social media channels, and at community and wildfire-preparedness events, and should offer them in multiple languages where applicable. These resources should include, but not be limited to, information on home hardening, defensible space, community preparedness programs, and current fire-location and situational-awareness tools. In addition, at events that IOUs coordinate, they should provide opportunities for community partners to inform attendees about matters beyond utility wildfire risk, including such partners as OSFM and IBHS to provide information to homeowners about strategies they can use to improve their resilience to any wildfire event. IOUs may consider working jointing to develop these resources and strategies.

OAR 860-300-0020 (1)(g):

Description of procedures, standards, and time frames that the Public Utility will use to inspect utility infrastructure in areas the Public Utility identified as heightened risk of wildfire.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 18

Staff Analysis:

Idaho Power met the requirements for inspection and correction. Staff appreciates Idaho Power's system-wide inspect and correct program outline and the distinction between transmission and distribution assets. However, Staff was not able to understand which of the program's actions are specific to wildfire mitigation work.

Staff continues to seek clearer, data-driven justification for the frequency and timing of inspections, the cost and implementation timelines for new technologies, and the mechanisms that ensure prompt corrective actions while controlling program costs. These data-supported decisions can then guide the integration of new inspection technologies and inform the mechanisms the Company uses to ensure timely corrective action while effectively managing program costs. Staff provides the following recommendations to assist in this process.

Staff Recommendations:

ALL_2615B: IOUs should clearly describe the different inspection types and deployment locations within their inspect/correct and vegetation programs as they relate to mitigating wildfire risks in HFRZs. To the extent these programs exceed relevant regulations, IOUs should identify the rationale, detail the historic discovery of inspection conditions, their correction timeframes and their correlation to ignition risk events or risk event drivers. For inspect/correct and vegetation programs the utilities must identify the basis for optimal QA/QC, consistent with ALL-2618U, and the Company's underlying economic goals and results. Lastly, IOUs should explicitly identify the funding mechanism used to support these efforts, whether general rates, WMP AAC, or other cost recovery method.

ALL_2616B: As IOUs evaluate and consider line-monitoring and various asset/vegetation inspection technologies, they should provide clear data demonstrating the benefits of these technological advancements, including how the results guide program evolution and support the rationale for any location-specific deployment. This should include providing technology or practice details that clearly and completely identify what the general objective of the technology is, what criteria were used to optimize its deployment, as well as outlining where, why and when locations were chosen and how they are recorded into the IOUs records for future effectiveness analysis. The utility should further explain how these tools reduce wildfire risk, improve cost-effectiveness, their impact to standard operational work and how the tool will either replace, modify, or complement existing programs.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 19

ALL_2617U: IOUs shall include in their WMP reports quality assurance or quality control programs for the following WMP initiative activities: inspect/correct, vegetation management, and reconductoring programs. These programs should identify both the quality control requirements (where the work is being done by the utility) as well as the quality assurance requirements (where the work is being done by an agent). These programs should recognize both the delivered product being completed at a location, and outline program requirements including:

- Identified sample size and the rationale for that size.
- Pass rate percentages, considering environments, which could include HFRZ, rural, or urban environments, and the rationale to support the rate and its application to the environment, and the expected confidence interval.
- Procedures used to adjust sampling processes based on historic performance, i.e., tightened or loosened sampling.

The initiative quality assurance or control plan should also outline how record keeping, including mapping, is being quality controlled. It should identify the details of the work being done with locational precision, detailed accuracy, and completeness for the record produced, including, where appropriate, its existence within corporate databases, including GIS.

OAR 860-300-0020 (1)(h):

Description of the procedures, standards, and timeframes that the utility will use to carry out vegetation management in areas it has identified as heightened risk of wildfire.

Staff Analysis:

Idaho Power met the requirements for outlining its approach to vegetation management. Staff remains interested in the data and findings that drive the frequency and scope of inspections, particularly those resulting in multiple performed within a single year. Additionally further details around any pilot programs and their overlap with other wildfire mitigation actions would enable better understanding of the Company's holistic management of wildfire risk.

Staff Recommendations:

Staff recommends these issues are addressed in ALL_2615B through ALL_2617U.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 20

OAR 860-300-0020 (1)(i):

Identification of the development, implementation, and administrative costs for the plan, which includes discussion of risk-based cost and benefit analysis, including consideration of technologies that offer co-benefits to the utility's system.

Staff Analysis:

Idaho Power met the requirement by providing a description of costs as well as tables that show estimated versus forecast costs. Staff continues to request greater transparency, including detailed identification of the underlying data, analytical methods, and sensitivity modeling that inform the Company's cost estimates and decision-making processes. By performing this analysis and providing the details within the report the Company will demonstrate how proposed investments meaningfully reduce wildfire risk, enhance system resilience, and represent the most cost-effective means of achieving the intended risk-reduction outcomes.

While a standardized co-benefit integration into the WMPs has not yet been made, Staff anticipates continued progress on this topic will be made through joint IOU and Staff efforts in future WMP evolution.

Staff Recommendations:

Staff is recommending these issues are addressed in ALL_2604U.

OAR 860-300-0020 (1)(j):

Description of participation in national and international forums, including workshops identified in section 2, chapter 592, Oregon Law 2021, as well as research and analysis the utility has undertaken to maintain expertise in leading edge technologies and operational practices, as well as how such technologies and operational practices have been used to develop and implement cost effective wildfire mitigation solutions.

Staff Analysis:

Idaho Power met the requirement of this rule by explaining its engagement in industry collaboration. Staff acknowledges that the Company attends and participates in several industry events; however, Staff would like to understand what specific insights, lessons learned or expanded information the Company gains from these engagements and how such information informs its wildfire-mitigation strategies. As with all IOUs, Staff expects the information gained from the various wildfire forums and workshops to be clearly vetted with third party verification and/or an in-depth assessment of any results to be evaluated prior to any implementation or investment, consistent with ALL_2614U.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 21

Staff Recommendations:

ALL_2618B: IOUs should expand their consideration for collaboration and partnership, such as described in stakeholder comments, incorporating strategies with other wildfire-resilience organizations. Staff recommends the following inclusions as a tabled appendix within the WMP report updates:

- The partner organization.
- The objective of the joint partnership.
- The utility role in the partnership.
- How responsibilities are set and coordinated.
- Which initiative activity is the partnership supporting.
- How the partnership maximizes wildfire-resilience community benefit while minimizing customer cost.
- How costs and benefits are shared.
- How soon will the impact of the partnership be achieved, including any deliverables or milestones planned.
- Whether contributions are financial, technical, in-kind, or employee time.
- Resource participation by the partners, including any grants received from them.
- The utility, organization, or other actor that provided the example being leveraged.

As an example, Idaho Power describes how it collaborates with the All-Lands Partnership, which supports vegetation management across jurisdictional boundaries, while several of the consumer-owned utilities address partnerships they have found useful. Staff plans to jointly work with IOUs to further structure reporting in the Data Template Workbook and WMP Report Template with a partnerships/grants worksheet to create consistent IOUs' responses.

OAR 860-300-0020 (1)(k):

Description of ignition inspection programs, as described in Division 24 of these rules, including how the utility will determine, and instruct its inspectors to determine conditions that could pose an ignition risk on its own equipment and pole attachments.

Staff Analysis:

Idaho Power met the requirement explaining its process for identifying, documenting, and analyzing ignitions which may be associated with company equipment. Staff recognizes that the Company intends to expand its ignition tracking program by conducting root-cause analysis and appreciates their plans to incorporate these

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 22

findings into other program areas. Staff's recommendation below is intended to help IOUs advance their ignition-investigation programs, building upon these concepts.

Staff Recommendations:

ALL_2619B: IOUs should provide a comprehensive outline of their current ignition and investigation tracking, including clearly demonstrating processes for detecting, recording, analyzing and reviewing ignition events as well as all data elements documented for each event (such as those required for FM 221 reporting). Additionally, the IOU should provide information regarding any detailed procedures for conducting root-cause analyses; and mechanisms for incorporating findings from past and present ignition investigations into ongoing wildfire-mitigation initiatives. Details for the program shall be included as part of the Risk Methodology and Assessment section of the WMP.

Data Templates

Staff Analysis:

Idaho Power has demonstrated its commitment to the Data Template process by submitting an Initial Data Template on December 31, 2025, a revised Initial Data Template following Staff's completeness review, delivering its Final Data Template on March 31, 2026, and providing a subsequent update on May 27, 2026. While the Data Template provides Staff with an organized means to access WMP results and underlying drivers, it remains a work in progress and continues to evolve as requirements and data needs are refined. In addition to a workshop with advocates and IOUs to discuss various recommendations around the reporting structures and details Staff makes the following recommendation in addition to ALL_2621U.

Staff Recommendations:

Staff anticipates this work will continue through Docket No. UM 2340 and makes no additional recommendation in this docket.

RSE Workbook

Staff Analysis:

In addition to supplying Staff with its first RSE workbook on December 31, 2025, Idaho Power also provided a revised version after Staff completion review. Idaho Power also provided Staff with a version of the RSE workbook outlining the Company VSE/RSE values. Staff acknowledges the Company's provision of the RSE Workbook requested by Staff and the time and collaboration the Company contributed during the 2025 development process for the workbook's initial stage. Staff looks forward to the continued collaboration as we work to progress its development in future work, focusing on:

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 23

- Estimating ignition consequences using environmental and seasonal risk profiles regardless of ignition source while exploring point-of-ignition approaches.
- Quantifying impacts from measured inputs such as acres burned, structures lost, timber volume destroyed, and other ignition-relevant values.
- Estimating scenario probabilities.
- Modeling the impact for each given scenario.
- Aggregating probability and impact scenarios to calculate expected consequences.
- Improving risk quantification for circuit sustained zones of protection by applying aggregation methods to gridded values.
- Refining approaches for risk event drivers, including unplanned outages and ignition probabilities by outage cause or other event classifications.
- Defining methods to estimate mitigation effectiveness using utility operational data and industry-standard data-collection practices.
- Expanding estimated costs for mitigation measures beyond Phase 1 of UM 2340.
- Reconciling multiple mitigation measures applied within a single sustained zone of protection.
- Evaluating approaches to address the volume of sustained zone of protection results and how best to transparently produce such information while managing technology barriers that could complicate viewing by staff, stakeholders, and customers.
- Reviewing key deliverables by an independent party.
- Jointly constructing the summary results from the RSE Workbook for inclusion in the WMP Report, detailing at a minimum circuit-segment (sustained zone of protection) scoring with relevant details, including score, prominent ignition risk drivers, mitigations considered, mitigations chosen, post-mitigation risk, and planned completion date.

Staff Recommendations:

Staff anticipates this work will continue through Docket No. UM 2340 and makes no additional recommendation in this docket.

Conclusion

Staff recommends approval of Idaho Power's 2026-2028 Multi-year Wildfire Mitigation Plan and completion of previous Staff's recommendations for additional improvement. Staff submits its 2027 WMP recommendations, together with previously ordered recommendations, in Attachment B for incorporation into Idaho Power's 2027 Update Plan.

Docket No. UM 2209
June 10, 2026
Page 24

While Staff recommends the Commission accept Idaho Power's MYP, Staff's review makes no judgement on reasonableness or effectiveness of any mitigation measure. Commission acceptance of the Plan does not constitute a determination on the prudence of any individual actions discussed in the Plan. Staff understands that those individual actions, including project specific data, will be reviewed through the cost recovery process.

PROPOSED COMMISSION MOTION:

Approve Idaho Power's 2026-2028 Multi-year Wildfire Mitigation Plan and adopt Staff recommendations for additional improvement.

Stakeholder Comments in UM 2209
Attachment A

Stakeholder	Company	Topic	Stakeholder Recommendation	Staff Comments/ Applicable Recommendation
Joint Advocates ¹	IPC, PAC, PGE	Auditing	Auditing planning process (mitigation strategies and costs)	Staff looks to further their understanding of strategies and cost through the continued development of the RSE Workbook in conjunction with several recommendations throughout this report.
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	Modeling	Advocates recommend the Public Utility Commission consider auditing the companies' planning processes—or at a minimum utilities' wildfire mitigation strategies and costs—, consider re-evaluating the use of automatic adjustment clauses, and establishing structures and reporting that moves the needle on utility transparency and reasonable spending.	Staff request modeling transparency in recommendation ALL_2606B.
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	Approval Condition	Condition #1: Within 30 to 60 days of the Commission Order on these Wildfire Mitigation Plans, PGE, Idaho Power, and Pacific Power shall submit supplemental RSE filings that at a minimum address the six factors the IE identified that are necessary to justify wildfire mitigation investments (as well as any other factors the Commission believes are appropriate)—with evidence—and clearly explain why those strategies are the most cost-effective and risk-reducing solutions. We further request that no later than 60 days after the utilities file these reports, a third-party auditor review the supplemental filings and issue a report finding whether the utilities met the supplemental filing requirements, and accordingly issue recommendations for Commission action.	Staff appreciates Advocates' desire to better understand an IOUs decision around the mitigation strategies. Staff and IOUs are planning to further discuss the evolution of the RSE workbook in July. Additionally Staff has incorporated several recommendations within the report to gain greater transparency around decision driven cost-effectiveness.

¹ Joint Advocates (Advocates) are NW Energy Coalition, Community Energy Project, and Oregon Citizens' Utility Board.

Stakeholder	Company	Topic	Stakeholder Recommendation	Staff Comments/ Applicable Recommendation
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	Approval Condition	Condition #2: We request that the Commission hold a special public meeting to direct Staff to open a docket to investigate whether changes to the existing automatic adjustment clause cost recovery mechanism for wildfire mitigation costs are needed. Better understanding of how cost recovery and utility accountability are being ensured through the process.	AAC's were adopted with a provisional period and review of them is intended in a separate but related docket and WMP team members will support in the review process.
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	Increased Stakeholder Involvement	- A Staff Workshop to present findings and allow for further questions from stakeholders.	Staff is reviewing the possible development of joint workshops and hopes to hold specific workshops later this year to discuss the advancements in UM2340. Additionally, Staff would like to further explore the possibility of "office hours" to provide an avenue for communication with Stakeholders in the current development while providing a space to support questions or concerns throughout the year.
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	1. Readability, Format, and Reach of WMPs	Readability, Format, and Reach of WMPs: Balance details of the report for the various audiences. - limited report page numbers - Details within appendixes. - reduce redundancy combine mitigation measures and results.	Staff agrees with the advocate comments and plans to hold workshops to advance content and structure of Updates and Multi-year Plans.

Stakeholder	Company	Topic	Stakeholder Recommendation	Staff Comments/ Applicable Recommendation
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	2. The Risk-Spend Efficiency Tool: Consider interdisciplinary audiences	The Risk-Spend Efficiency Tool: Consider interdisciplinary audiences - Advocates strongly urge utilities and the OPUC to enhance the science communication of their RSE workbooks so that stakeholders and interested parties can more easily understand the IOUs' RSE metric score. Science communication refers to breaking down complex, technical topics and presenting the information in a coherent way that multiple audiences - from experts to members of the public - can understand and easily interpret.	See recommendation ALL_2621U.
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	5. Major advancements in Situational Awareness	Advocates recommend utilities and PUC Staff to take a deliberate approach to near-term and long-term data management planning, including establishing clear protocols for data retention, storage capacity planning, and criteria for secure deletion	See Staff recommendation ALL_2609U.
Joint Advocates	PAC	3. Grid Design and System Hardening: technology requires prudent investments	Grid Design and System Hardening: technology requires prudent investments - Concern with the 1.3 billion in investment - PAC's \$1.3 billion dollar investment into system hardening is a short-term solution to a long-term, more complex problem: continuing to invest billions of dollars into new infrastructure benefits the Company's asset portfolio - in order to boost their S & P credit rating - and does the bare minimum to make their infrastructure more resilient to uncharacteristic, large-scale wildfires. - We recommend that Staff provide PacifiCorp more detailed guidance and instructions for making significant grid design and system hardening upgrades, compared to other less capital-intensive strategies, and require PAC to clearly explain why its proposed wildfire mitigation strategies are the most cost-effective solution.	See Staff recommendation ALL_2610U (project tracking).

Stakeholder	Company	Topic	Stakeholder Recommendation	Staff Comments/ Applicable Recommendation
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	4. Monitoring Vegetation Programs by Gauging Forest Health	IOUs should look to smaller utilities, such as cooperatives or member-owned utilities, to enhance their wildfire mitigation plans. For example, Eugene Water and Electric Board and Consumer Powers provide concrete examples of engaging local communities and leveraging momentum built by previous wildfire mitigation initiatives funded through the Healthy Forest Restoration Act (2003), Community Wildfire Protection Plans (2003), the Collaborative Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP, 2009), or the Wildfire Crisis Strategy (2021), or the Wildfire Assessment and Resiliency Network (WARN) federal funding.	See recommendation ALL_2618B
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	4. Monitoring Vegetation Programs by Gauging Forest Health	IOUs should leverage relationships with the Oregon Department of Forestry's Prescribed Burn program and explore the cost-effective and ecologically effective prescribed burn method to reduce risk to communities and restore resiliency in different ecosystems.	See recommendation ALL_2618B.
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	4. Monitoring Vegetation Programs by Gauging Forest Health	Advocates recommend each IOU produce a 1-2 pager that can simply and easily communicate important metrics (such as # of miles of lines inspected in a year, or health of the trees within a territory or High Fire Risk Zone) in order to better communicate the state of a utility's vegetation management program.	Staff agrees with the advocate comments and plans to hold workshops to advance content and structure of Updates and Multi-year Plans. See also recommendation ALL_2615B.

Stakeholder	Company	Topic	Stakeholder Recommendation	Staff Comments/ Applicable Recommendation
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	4. Monitoring Vegetation Programs by Gauging Forest Health	IOUs in Oregon must join collaborative efforts through contractual MOUs with public land management agencies, such as through an All-Lands Partnership or a forest collaborative, as Idaho Power has done through the Southwest Idaho All-Lands Partnership, in order to reduce wildfire risk on both public and private land ownerships. This would create opportunities to save money by cutting the IOUs expenses through leveraging federal grants, rather than fronting the entirety of vegetation management costs by themselves.	See recommendation ALL_2618B
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	5. Major advancements in Situational Awareness	Continued coordination to support situational awareness initiatives that improve cost efficiency and maximize the value of shared investments through collaboration and resource sharing. - The lessons learned and the committee-based model exemplified by OWDCIC should be adapted and applied to other areas of utility wildfire mitigation to drive broader, system-wide improvements. It would be worthwhile for utilities to set up this type of model in a couple of areas– with relevant state and local groups for vegetation management activities, and local preparedness initiatives that come from Community Wildfire Protection Plans. It is important to know what is already being done and where priorities and goals overlap.	
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	5. Major advancements in Situational Awareness	IOUs must have accessible comparisons of grid hardening vs situational awareness and other similar cross-comparisons to better illustrate cost-benefits of mitigation strategies.	See recommendation All_2602U and ALL_2603B

Stakeholder	Company	Topic	Stakeholder Recommendation	Staff Comments/ Applicable Recommendation
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	7. Emergency Preparedness: Foster engagement and resiliency to wildfires	We recognize the differences that each utility has when it comes to their outreach and equity methods. For greater transparency and best practices, Advocates urge that utilities develop annual community outreach plans to be filed with the WMPs updates, and a follow-up report to be filed after fire season. These reports would consist of: - List of partners and efforts to expand partnerships at local-levels, both public safety and CBO, and opportunities for collaborative outreach in existing community outreach channels - Communication cadence (How often does communication happens with local government) - Qualitative insights (More narrative on community forums and FAQs) - Baseline equity standards (interpretation standards, facilitation tools, etc.) - Improvements and lessons learned that have shaped or will shape community engagement - Community Resource Center (CRC) coordination, listing community groups, tribal partnerships, etc. - Sharing best practices with other utilities to develop shared metrics of best practices.	See recommendation ALL_2618B
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	7. Emergency Preparedness: Foster engagement and resiliency to wildfires	During in-person workshops and tabletop events in high fire risk zones (HFRZs), utilities provide supplies and resources useful in a PSPS or power outage.	Staff appreciates this feedback for utilities to consider.
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	8. Public Safety Power Shutoffs are rare. Outages are not.	IOUs should provide worst-case restoration estimates to support adequate customer preparation when communicating outage durations.	Staff appreciates the feedback for utilities to consider.

Stakeholder	Company	Topic	Stakeholder Recommendation	Staff Comments/ Applicable Recommendation
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	8. Public Safety Power Shutoffs are rare. Outages are not.	IOUs need to seriously consider initiatives and efforts to mitigate customer harms, Advocates have suggested before including the improvement and expansion of food loss reimbursement processes (e.g., SNAP replacement process), offering bill credits for extended outages and developing both near-term and long-term strategies to reduce the financial, health, and safety impacts of outages associated with wildfire risk and grid operations. We would like explanations on why these strategies to address customer harm have not been considered by utilities or explored by PUC Staff.	No action recommended. Other dockets are exploring resilience valuation.
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	8. Public Safety Power Shutoffs are rare. Outages are not.	PUC Staff should require utilities to establish distinct protocols, data collection, and reporting requirements for sensitive setting-related outages. Given the absence of data and clear identification of sensitive setting outages so far, PUC Staff should consider expanding data collection and reporting requirements to all significant outages during fire season. With UM 2340 planning to capture customer impacts to plug into future RSE models, we have to start meaningfully gathering data now. - At minimum, sensitive setting or fire season outage reporting should align with existing and relevant PSPS rules to enable meaningful evaluation, lessons learned, and captured impacts to people, especially vulnerable communities and small businesses.	See recommendation ALL_2611U
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	8. Public Safety Power Shutoffs are rare. Outages are not.	IOUs should expand and prioritize customer-focused resilience investments, including improving battery backup programs, piloting microgrid projects (which have year-long flexible load benefits), and enhancing funding for local emergency preparedness planning with community partners, with a focus on vulnerable and high-risk populations	See recommendation ALL_2612B

Stakeholder	Company	Topic	Stakeholder Recommendation	Staff Comments/ Applicable Recommendation
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	9. Diversifying and Improving Outreach	To alleviate some of the cost for CRCs we encourage providing free supplies to customers at in-person events to help reduce burden.	Staff is unable to make this a recommendation but appreciates this feedback for utilities.
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	9. Diversifying and Improving Outreach	Advocates recommend having increased communications and information at CRC locations and resources provided. PACs survey information showed that those who rely on medical needs are more likely to have used 7 out of 9 resources.	See recommendation ALL_2611U, ALL_2612U, and IPC_2603U
Joint Advocates	PAC	9. Diversifying and Improving Outreach	PAC should clearly define what “other entities” qualify as a strategic customer, and how their prioritization benefits the community.	See recommendation ALL_2611U and ALL_2618B
Joint Advocates	PAC, IPC	9. Diversifying and Improving Outreach	PAC and IPC should include a greater social media ad campaign to help capture different audiences and languages	See recommendation ALL_2613U
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	10. Evolve mitigation strategies and maximize benefits	IOUs should convene with entities like the Oregon’s Building Codes Division, Oregon State Fire Marshal, and Firewise USA to explore collaborative home hardening education and incentive programs for customers in High Fire Risk Zones (HFRZs).	See Staff recommendation ALL_2614B.
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	10. Evolve mitigation strategies and maximize benefits	IOUs should provide defensible space and home hardening resources and information to all customers through various avenues including community WMP presentations.	See recommendation ALL_2614B
Joint Advocates	IPC, PAC, PGE	harden homes: Strategic investment to reduce catastrophic loss	- Current and new build home hardening. (ember-resistant vents, defensible space, and ignition-resistant materials	See recommendation ALL_2614B

Summary of Staff Recommendations UM 2209

Attachment B

Recommendations Specific to Idaho Power

- **IPC_2601B:** Idaho Power should have an updated HFRZ model which incorporates portions of the framework for quantifying wildfire risk outlined in IPC_2602U.
- **IPC_2602U:** Idaho Power should outline its approach to achieving a comprehensive, forward-looking framework for quantifying wildfire risk that incorporates the likelihood and consequence of a wildfire within its service territory. The Company should establish clear times and milestones for improving its quantitative wildfire-risk modeling, including the planned use of tools from its vendors, or internal experts. The model should incorporate work identified in ALL_2621U and include projections of evolving risk drivers—including climate change, vegetation shifts, and land-use changes in the wildland-urban interface while also applying consistent monetary assumptions or weighted consequence metrics to measure the wildfire impacts, such as structures and acres burned, into a unified measure of risk.
- **IPC_2603U:** Idaho Power should enhance its PSPS outreach and education efforts by more clearly explaining how it prepares customers, Public Safety Partners (PSPs), emergency responders, critical facilities, and access and functional needs (AFN) customers for PSPS events, including how it leverages batteries, community resource centers or other community supports. The Company should have available a complete list of PSPs, critical facilities, and other community partners within its service territory that it will coordinate with during a PSPS. In addition, Idaho Power should establish, document, and clearly outline its notification timelines for the various phases of a PSPS watch or activation event, distinguishing the communication approaches used for PSPs from those used for general customers.

Joint Recommendations

- **ALL-2601U:** Staff recognizes that the WMP template¹ provides the structure for MYPs and Updates, however, recommends Staff, IOUs, and stakeholders develop guidelines for content that is appropriately contained in an Update and how best to

¹ <https://apps.puc.state.or.us/orders/2025ords/25-326.pdf>.

make this information useful for a variety of readers. At minimum, Staff believes Updates need to include: 1) items that summarize the year's deliverables (actuals versus plans, units, and costs); 2) any modeling or refinement in analysis that either results in a change in designated risk or mitigation approach; 3) explanations of actions taken and progress made in response to recommendations that were approved by the Commission, even if not completely fulfilled at the time of Update filing; and 4) thresholds for significant Initiative updates as defined in UM 2340 Order No. 24-236 Appendix A Section 3.4. Staff proposes that a workshop with the utilities, Joint Advocates, and other stakeholders could be an ideal venue for discussion and alignment to occur and suggests it be held during late summer.

- **ALL_2602U:** Recognizing that IOUs are developing explicit evidence supporting how and why they have chosen a particular wildfire mitigation initiative activity, in the interim (if there is not yet detailed data or analysis underlying the activity) they should identify the fundamental principle of the activity (for example reducing probability of risk event, ignition risk, consequence, impact or enhancing awareness, responsiveness, etc.) as well as the key assumptions made to support that strategy, in addition to identifying the intended metrics that will be used to demonstrate the effectiveness of the approach (such as reducing certain types of outages, shortening the duration of fault current, etc.).
- **ALL_2603B:** By the next MYP, the utilities should augment explanations from ALL_2602U with data, calculations, analysis methods, and measurable results—demonstrating the effectiveness of their wildfire mitigation program's initiative activities. In their WMP Reports, IOUs should outline any analysis performed, including whether the initiative activity succeeded or fell short, the lessons learned, and the reasons for any program expansions, reductions, or redesigns. IOUs should also clearly identify the cost impacts associated with these outcomes. This information should be included in the appropriate WMP report initiative subsection's initiative activity section that details the program which can be included in the framework or mitigation explanations. If providing effectiveness for an overall section, evidence can be included in results or continuous improvement subsections. This requirement applies to all major wildfire mitigation programs, including inspection and vegetation management, grid hardening, operational protocols, community outreach, risk assessment methodologies, emergency preparedness, and situational forecasting. Examples include, but are not limited to:
 - Idaho Power's use of a 20 ft vegetation clearance radius for distribution circuits.

- PGE's rationale for a two-person crew for inspection with an unknown quantity of corrections performed simultaneously.
 - PGE's assessment of optimal clearance distance as discussed in VM 07.
 - Pacific Power's choice of 100 percent quality assurance inspection on all grid hardening projects through post construction inspections.
- **ALL_2604U:** Staff appreciates feedback supplied by the utilities relating to allocation and in an effort to be clear about costs specific to new WMP efforts, IOUs should provide initiative activity costs within each initiative category in the initiative summary tables (with subtotal) as well as those costs attributed to general or embedded programs (with subtotal). In addition, where the program is generally beneficial to other utility processes, Staff and the IOUs will work to detail within the data template workbook how to present that information. Finally, in cases where multistate allocation results in portions of the costs attributed to Oregon customers, Staff will work with the IOUs to clarify what amount the utility proposes to allocate to them. Where costs are grouped across initiative activities the IOU should estimate the percentage of the cost attributed to each initiative activity until cost singularity exists for the activity. IOUs should work with Staff to structure the submittals to fully describe the methods for cost estimation and outline the basis for the benefits being attributed to the measure.
- **ALL_2605U:** Staff appreciates the utilities' response regarding the pilot template feedback. Staff also recognizes that the IOUs have identified certain programs as pilots. However, Staff asserts that a pilot template², including substantial explanation is required whenever the IOU performs any new activity that has risk reduction benefits or that has short or long-term cost implications. While the IOUs identified certain initiative activities as pilots there are a large number of initiative activities that have had no explanation for their existence within the wildfire mitigation program (and relate to new spending or should result in risk reduction). This results in commitment of resources to an action which have never had the rationale fully understood by Staff or stakeholders. Such has been the case with the creation and expansion of weather and camera networks, as well as Pacific Power's substantial expansion of its meteorology, emergency management and most recently wildfire intelligence center. This has resulted in significant costs that were not "piloted", have never been cost-justified and were not compared against other measures to determine their priority as a mitigation measure. In addition to

² PGE: Pilot templates were developed and ordered in Order No. 25-326 Appendix A, page 42 of 70.

being more expansive in providing information regarding tooling up mitigation measures, IOUs should expand upon the new and additional resources as potential pilots as a means to measure and assess the value provided by these investments. IOUs should include details, where applicable, of the deployment locations/'Application' for pilot technologies and why the given area was chosen. When explaining the reasons for further investment, IOUs should provide more complete project management elements, including key goals, deliverables and milestones the Company intends to assess to measure the merits of the activity.

- **ALL_2606B:** IOUs should identify key assumptions associated with risk quantification and test them, performing sensitivity analysis to establish resulting risk and consequences, explaining the modeling variability based on these changes. In cases where the utility uses a vendor product to model risk, they should develop processes that can be conducted to evaluate the model's sensitivity to variations of key attributes. In cases where the IOU has internally developed its model Staff requests models be evaluated by an independent authority. In all cases, explanations regarding the rationale for the performed sensitivity analysis, and the tested variables should be provided. Utilities shall explicitly indicate which models and analysis are internally developed, vendor provided or contracted. Examples include:
 - Weather and climate change scenarios and the basis for the choice, including wind speeds and directions, ambient temperature, and application within the gridded environment.
 - Climate inputs, including long- and short-term drying patterns leading to, at minimum, fuel moisture metrics.
 - Fuel characteristics and granularity of any gridded cells.
 - Detection timing, if part of the consequence modeling (whether detection responsiveness, impact estimation, assumed burn period, etc.).
 - Ignition probability (established to identify service territory HFRZ).
 - Ignition spread under the given conditions, including identification of the spread-modeling algorithm or source.
 - Spread consequences, including injuries, structures, timber loss, or other quantifiable losses and the sources considered and used.
 - Burn period, and explanation for the choice given each scenario considered.
 - Each subjective measure introduced into the calculation process, including detection assumptions based on population, distance to fire protection resource, coverage by camera viewsheds, etc.

- Each multiplier used within the calculation process that is not directly attributed to a specific algorithm (i.e., calibration of burned area based upon comparison to a specific event chosen by the utility).
 - When appropriate, utility equipment ignition probability to estimate utility wildfire consequences.
 - And other assumptions used to arrive at probability, risk, impact, or consequences of wildfire.
- **ALL_2607U:** Identified in an Appendix D of the WMP Report, the IOUs should provide:
 1. Maps that show current and historically-identified areas designated as HFRZ or Areas of Interest from the first risk model and
 2. When the HFRZ or Areas of Interest are modified, identify information relating to any changes comparing the current against the most recently-approved WMP HFRZs or Areas of Interest including:
 - A narrative description of why the boundary was adjusted, added, or removed, including the conditions that have changed and how the modification aligns with current wildfire risk.
 - The datasets, risk models, geospatial layers, climate projections, vegetation assessments, ignition probability analysis, or subject matter expertise were used to support the change, including a description of analytical methods, thresholds, weighting factors, and any expert judgment, including any sensitivity analysis or assessments used to ratify the revision.
 - A table showing asset types and customers affected by the change categorizing as added, removed, and unchanged for each Area of Interest, HFRZ or non-HFRZ.
- **ALL_2608U:** Staff recommends that IOUs provide, in an Appendix to the WMP Reports, comprehensive documentation of all historical fire data used as part of the consequence modeling processes. At a minimum, IOUs should include:
 - Criteria used to identify relevant fire events.
 - All historical fire events included in the analysis, along with the basis for its selection.
 - Relevant event details, such as injuries, fatalities, damaged or destroyed structures, acres burned, timber board feet lost, suppression, and any other quantifiable impacts used to inform consequence scoring and/or specific delineated costs.

- What adjustments, normalizations, and associated datasets are integrated into the consequence model, such as weighting factors, scaling methods, final affected areas impacted, or statistical techniques.
 - Any limitations or uncertainties associated with the historical dataset and how those limitations influenced the results.
 - Datasets used to evaluate affected populations, structures, and other associated measured effects of the fire consequence location.
- **ALL_2609U:** IOUs should outline in a table the options for mitigation approaches versus risk event drivers and generally describe criteria that would influence the choice, resulting in a preferred mitigation. For example, outage history that indicates vegetation contacts might result in either vegetation management, covered conductor or undergrounding as options. However, additional considerations may result in a preference toward one of them.
- **ALL_2610U:** The IOUs should clearly explain how they determine whether to proceed with or suspend completion of projects that are no longer identified as priorities (due to limited risk reduction or due to reductions in utility ignition consequence) as their understanding of risk and mitigation selections evolves, with an eye toward maximizing risk reduction while avoiding stranded or underutilized investments. As part of this process, IOUs should review all planned or targeted mitigations to determine priorities based upon: 1) modifications to the risk areas; 2) changes in sustained zone of protection risk scores; or 3) new mitigation measures and their impact on reducing risk. Specifically, each utility should identify its approach to establishing "off ramps" for any programs when it determines there may be higher value approaches to reducing wildfire risk.
- **ALL_2611U:** The IOUs should outline how they ensure positive PSPS notification confirmation occurs for critical customers, including individuals identified as medically vulnerable and how the Company works with public safety partners if they are unable to communicate with an affected customer. Also, the IOUs should outline their methods of informing customers and communities (particularly critical and medically vulnerable customers) when sensitive settings are enabled.
 - Additionally, in their annual PSPS filings, pursuant to OAR 860-300-0070, IOUs should work with advocates, partners and Staff to enhance these reports to include details relating to:

- Methods to communicate with customers regarding sensitive settings and IOU attempts to mitigate reliability impacts to the customers and communities experiencing them;
 - PSP outreach and coordination, including partner engagement, cadence of outreach, and how feedback received from these partners has influenced the IOU's program;
 - CBO outreach and coordination, including communication content shared through the CBO;
 - Tabletops, functional exercises or PSPSs conducted within their service territories; and
 - After-action reviews for each tabletop, functional exercise or PSPS performed and how that feedback has changed processes within the IOU.
- **ALL_2612B:** IOUs shall improve transparency by responding to stakeholder feedback and surveys on their Wildfire Mitigation Plan (WMP) and related processes. Survey questions and responses should be included in WMP Report Appendix F using charts or graphics to demonstrate the feedback received. Additionally, IOUs should include the following:
 - IOUs should identify appropriate demographic cohorts, including language proficiency level (within their service territory), public safety partners (PSPs), community communicators (e.g., churches, schools), critical customers, medically vulnerable customers, and customers with access and functional needs, to better understand feedback from each group.
 - IOUs should identify specific updates, completed or planned, to their notification and coordination programs based on survey results and feedback from critical customers and PSPs, including implementation timelines.
 - Due to Idaho Power's low customer feedback for its Oregon customers, Staff recommends Idaho Power develop proxy methods to establish ways to gauge how best to support Oregon customers.
- **ALL_2613U:** Staff recommends that IOUs continue developing tailored messaging and other resources to support communication with distinct customer groups and expand their multilingual outreach efforts.
 - The IOUs should analyze and report on the non-English languages spoken within their Oregon service territory, which could be based upon data such as that available through the ACS.
 - Based upon these findings, the IOUs should provide recommendations regarding their plans to produce deliverables with timelines. Alternatively, the

- utility should explain, based on its research supported by verifiable data, why educational materials in additional languages are not necessary.
- Staff recommends that Idaho Power continue developing tailored messaging focused initially on Spanish language resources, including providing detailed deliverables with explicit timelines.
 - **ALL_2614B:** Staff recommends that IOUs expand the availability of third-party, industry-recognized wildfire-safety resources across their customer-facing platforms. IOUs should provide references to these materials on their websites, social media channels, and at community and wildfire-preparedness events, and should offer them in multiple languages where applicable. These resources should include, but not be limited to, information on home hardening, defensible space, community preparedness programs, and current fire-location and situational-awareness tools. In addition, at events that IOUs coordinate, they should provide opportunities for community partners to inform attendees about matters beyond utility wildfire risk, including such partners as OSFM and IBHS to provide information to homeowners about strategies they can use to improve their resilience to any wildfire event. IOUs may consider working jointing to develop these resources and strategies.
 - **ALL_2615B:** IOUs should clearly describe the different inspection types and deployment locations within their inspect/correct and vegetation programs as they relate to mitigating wildfire risks in HFRZs. To the extent these programs exceed relevant regulations, IOUs should identify the rationale, detail the historic discovery of inspection conditions, their correction timeframes and their correlation to ignition risk events or risk event drivers. For inspect/correct and vegetation programs the utilities must identify the basis for optimal QA/QC, consistent with ALL-2618U, and the Company's underlying economic goals and results. Lastly, IOUs should explicitly identify the funding mechanism used to support these efforts, whether general rates, WMP AAC, or other cost recovery method.
 - **ALL_2616B:** As IOUs evaluate and consider line-monitoring and various asset/vegetation inspection technologies, they should provide clear data demonstrating the benefits of these technological advancements, including how the results guide program evolution and support the rationale for any location-specific deployment. This should include providing technology or practice details that clearly and completely identify what the general objective of the technology is, what criteria were used to optimize its deployment, as well as outlining where, why and when locations were chosen and how they are recorded

into the IOUs records for future effectiveness analysis. The utility should further explain how these tools reduce wildfire risk, improve cost-effectiveness, their impact to standard operational work, and how the tool will either replace, modify, or complement existing programs.

- **ALL_2617U:** IOUs shall include in their WMP reports quality assurance or quality control programs for the following WMP initiative activities: inspect/correct, vegetation management, and reconductoring programs. These programs should identify both the quality control requirements (where the work is being done by the utility) as well as the quality assurance requirements (where the work is being done by an agent). These programs should recognize both the delivered product being completed at a location, and outline program requirements including:
 - Identified sample size and the rationale for that size.
 - Pass rate percentages, considering environments, which could include HFRZ, rural, or urban environments, and the rationale to support the rate and its application to the environment, and the expected confidence interval.
 - Procedures used to adjust sampling processes based on historic performance, i.e., tightened or loosened sampling.

The initiative quality assurance or control plan should also outline how record keeping, including mapping, is being quality controlled. It should identify the details of the work being done with locational precision, detailed accuracy, and completeness for the record produced, including, where appropriate, its existence within corporate databases, including GIS.

- **ALL_2618B:** IOUs should expand their consideration for collaboration and partnership, such as described in stakeholder comments, incorporating strategies with other wildfire-resilience organizations. Staff recommends the following inclusions as a tabled appendix within the WMP report updates:
 - The partner organization.
 - The objective of the joint partnership.
 - The utility role in the partnership.
 - How responsibilities are set and coordinated.
 - Which initiative activity is the partnership supporting.
 - How the partnership maximizes wildfire-resilience community benefit while minimizing customer cost.
 - How costs and benefits are shared.
 - How soon will the impact of the partnership be achieved, including any deliverables or milestones planned.
 - Whether contributions are financial, technical, in-kind, or employee time.

- Resource participation by the partners, including any grants received from them.
- The utility, organization, or other actor that provided the example being leveraged.

As an example, Idaho Power describes how it collaborates with the All-Lands Partnership, which supports vegetation management across jurisdictional boundaries, while several of the consumer-owned utilities address partnerships they have found useful. Staff plans to jointly work with IOUs to further structure reporting in the Data Template Workbook and WMP Report Template with a partnerships/grants worksheet to create consistent IOUs' responses.

- **ALL_2619B:** IOUs should provide a comprehensive outline of their current ignition and investigation tracking, including clearly demonstrating processes for detecting, recording, analyzing and reviewing ignition events as well as all data elements documented for each event (such as those required for FM 221 reporting). Additionally, the IOU should provide information regarding any detailed procedures for conducting root-cause analyses; and mechanisms for incorporating findings from past and present ignition investigations into ongoing wildfire-mitigation initiatives. Details for the program shall be included as part of the Risk Methodology and Assessment section of the WMP.

Previous Recommendations DUE 2027

- **ALL_2501:** A template for future WMP Updates should be created and that a standard "red line" with reconciliation against the Multi-Year WMPs should be developed. Accordingly in years where a WMP Update is required the following should be submitted: (1) a "red-line version" of the Multi-Year WMP indicating any and all changes made, (2) a "clean version" of the Multi-Year WMP with any and all changes made, and (3) a templated WMP Update showing original targets contained in the Multi-Year Plan, actual or projected costs and units for any completed year, changes in targets, changes in projected expenditures, new initiatives, projected expenses for new initiatives for the update year, and justification for all changes made.