January 6, 2017

Advice 3796-G/4996-E
(Pacific Gas and Electric Company ID U 39 M)

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California

Subject:   Add Four New Sites to Hazardous Substance Mechanism

Purpose


A description of the four additional sites is set forth in Attachment I to this filing. The sites are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benson Ridge Facility</td>
<td>7260 S Highway 29, Kelseyville, Lake County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montezuma Hills Facility</td>
<td>292 Little Honker Bay Road, Rio Vista, Solano County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panoche Facility</td>
<td>2251 Lake Herman Road, Benicia, Solano County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine Hill Complex</td>
<td>896 Waterbird Way, Martinez, Contra Costa County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

D.94-05-020 requires California utilities to file an advice letter in order to include additional sites as part of the Hazardous Substance Mechanism. For each site the advice letter shall list: 1) the name of the site(s); 2) the location of the site(s); 3) the source, nature and approximate date of the contamination; 4) utility operations
(historical and current) at the site(s), if any; and 5) environmental agency actions and oversight regarding the site(s), if any. In addition, D.96-07-016 requires utilities to demonstrate that: 1) clean-up costs for which recovery is being sought are not being recovered through base rates or through any other recovery procedure, and 2) all of the costs for which recovery is being sought are hazardous waste clean-up costs (including insurance costs) found appropriate for recovery in the Hazardous Substance Cleanup Cost Recovery Collaborative Report.

**Protests**

Anyone wishing to protest this filing may do so by letter sent via U.S. mail, facsimile or E-mail, no later than January 26, 2017, which is 20 days after the date of this filing. Protests must be submitted to:

CPUC Energy Division  
ED Tariff Unit  
505 Van Ness Avenue, 4th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94102  

Facsimile: (415) 703-2200  
E-mail: EDTariffUnit@cpuc.ca.gov

Copies of protests also should be mailed to the attention of the Director, Energy Division, Room 4004, at the address shown above.

The protest shall also be sent to PG&E either via E-mail or U.S. mail (and by facsimile, if possible) at the address shown below on the same date it is mailed or delivered to the Commission:

Erik Jacobson  
Director, Regulatory Relations  
c/o Megan Lawson  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
77 Beale Street, Mail Code B10C  
P.O. Box 770000  
San Francisco, California 94177  

Facsimile: (415) 973-1448  
E-mail: PGETariffs@pge.com

Any person (including individuals, groups, or organizations) may protest or respond to an advice letter (General Order 96-B, Section 7.4). The protest shall contain the following information: specification of the advice letter protested; grounds for the protest; supporting factual information or legal argument; name,
telephone number, postal address, and (where appropriate) e-mail address of the protestant; and statement that the protest was sent to the utility no later than the day on which the protest was submitted to the reviewing Industry Division (General Order 96-B, Section 3.11).

**Effective Date**

PG&E requests that this Tier 2 advice filing become effective on February 5, 2017, which is 30 days after the date of filing.

**Notice**

In accordance with General Order 96-B, Section IV, a copy of this advice letter is being sent electronically and via U.S. mail to parties shown on the attached list. Address changes to the General Order 96-B service list and all electronic approvals should be directed to e-mail PGETariffs@pge.com. For changes to any other service list, please contact the Commission’s Process Office at (415) 703-2021 or at Process_Office@cpuc.ca.gov. Advice letter filings can also be accessed electronically at http://www.pge.com/tariffs/.

______________________________
Erik Jacobson
Director, Regulatory Relations

cc: Robert Finkelstein - TURN (bfinkelstein@turn.org)

Attachments
Company name/CPUC Utility No. **Pacific Gas and Electric Company (ID U39 M)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility type:</th>
<th>Contact Person: Annie Ho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ ELC ☑ GAS ☑ PLC ☐ HEAT ☐ WATER</td>
<td>Phone #: (415) 973-8794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ E-mail: <a href="mailto:AMHP@pge.com">AMHP@pge.com</a> and <a href="mailto:PGETariffs@pge.com">PGETariffs@pge.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPLANATION OF UTILITY TYPE**

| ELC = Electric | GAS = Gas |
| PLC = Pipeline | HEAT = Heat |
| WATER = Water |

Advice Letter (AL) #: **3796-G/4996-E**  
Subject of AL: **Add Four New Sites to Hazardous Substance Mechanism**

Keywords (choose from CPUC listing): Compliance

AL filing type: ☑ Monthly ☐ Quarterly ☐ Annual ☑ One-Time ☐ Other _____________________________

If AL filed in compliance with a Commission order, indicate relevant Decision/Resolution #: **D.94-05-020**

Does AL replace a withdrawn or rejected AL? If so, identify the prior AL: **No**

Summarize differences between the AL and the prior withdrawn or rejected AL: ____________________

Is AL requesting confidential treatment? If so, what information is the utility seeking confidential treatment for: **No**

Confidential information will be made available to those who have executed a nondisclosure agreement: **N/A**

Name(s) and contact information of the person(s) who will provide the nondisclosure agreement and access to the confidential information: __________________________________________________________________________________________________

Resolution Required? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Requested effective date: **February 5, 2017**  
No. of tariff sheets: **N/A**

Estimated system annual revenue effect (%): **N/A**

Estimated system average rate effect (%): **N/A**

When rates are affected by AL, include attachment in AL showing average rate effects on customer classes (residential, small commercial, large C/I, agricultural, lighting).

Tariff schedules affected: **N/A**

Service affected and changes proposed: **N/A**

Pending advice letters that revise the same tariff sheets: **N/A**

Protests, dispositions, and all other correspondence regarding this AL are due no later than 20 days after the date of this filing, unless otherwise authorized by the Commission, and shall be sent to:

**California Public Utilities Commission**  
**Energy Division**  
**EDTariffUnit**  
505 Van Ness Ave., 4th Flr.  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
E-mail: EDTariffUnit@cpuc.ca.gov

**Pacific Gas and Electric Company**  
Attn: Erik Jacobson  
Director, Regulatory Relations  
c/o Megan Lawson  
77 Beale Street, Mail Code B10C  
P.O. Box 770000  
San Francisco, CA 94177  
E-mail: PGETariffs@pge.com
Site Name: Benson Ridge Facility

Location: 7260 Highway 29, Kelseyville, Lake County

Source, Nature, and Approximate Date of Contamination: The site consists of a 150-acre closed hazardous waste treatment facility. The site was used for commercial hazardous waste treatment and disposal operations from 1979-1984 by the IT Corporation. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has identified PG&E as a responsible party based on historic waste sent to the site for treatment and disposal.

Utility Operations at the Site: PG&E had no direct operations at the site but has been identified as a responsible party by the DTSC based on historic waste sent to the site for treatment and disposal.

Environmental Agency Actions: The site received closure certification in 1993 and it transitioned to post closure status pursuant to a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Hazardous Waste Post Closure Facility Permit ("Permit"). DTSC authorized a renewal of the Permit in 2008.

On February 29, 2016, DTSC issued a Summary of Violations ("SOV") to the current site owner/operator, IT Environmental Liquidating Trust (ITELT). The SOV stated that the post closure amount submitted to demonstrate financial assurance for the site and three other sites operated by ITELT under post closure permits was less than the post closure cost estimates.

On November 29, 2016, the DTSC issued an Imminent and Substantial Endangerment Determination and Order and Remedial Action Order Identifying PG&E as a responsible party for the Benson Ridge Facility.

Nature of Costs: The costs for which PG&E is now seeking HSM recovery are not being recovered in base rates, or through any other recovery procedure. All cleanup costs to be recorded by PG&E in the HSM memorandum accounts will be hazardous waste cleanup costs found appropriate for recovery in the Hazardous Substance Cleanup Cost Recovery Collaborative Report. Benson Ridge Facility is a Landfill and Other Hazardous Substance Facilities site as described in Section III.B of the Hazardous Substance Cleanup Cost Recovery Collaborative Report. PG&E sent hazardous substances for treatment, storage or disposal to the facility.
Site Name: Montezuma Hills Facility

Location: 6292 Little Honker Bay Road, Rio Vista, Solano County

Source, Nature, and Approximate Date of Contamination: The site consists of a 156-acre closed Class I hazardous waste facility. From at least 1979 to 1986 the IT Corporation operated the site as a hazardous waste treatment facility treating multiple types of hazardous waste. The DTSC has identified PG&E as a responsible party based on historic waste sent to the site for treatment and disposal.

Utility Operations at the Site: PG&E had no direct operations at the site but has been identified as a responsible party by the DTSC based on historic waste sent to the site for treatment and disposal.

Environmental Agency Actions: The Site received closure certification from the DTSC in 1992 and it transitioned to post closure status pursuant to a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Hazardous Waste Post Closure Facility Permit ("Permit"). DTSC authorized a renewal of the Permit in 2008.

On February 29, 2016, DTSC issued a Summary of Violations ("SOV") to the current site owner/operator, IT Environmental Liquidating Trust (ITELT). The SOV stated that the post closure amount submitted to demonstrate financial assurance for the site and three other sites operated by ITELT under post closure permits was less than the post closure cost estimates.

On November 29, 2016, the DTSC issued an Imminent and Substantial Endangerment Determination and Order and Remedial Action Order Identifying PG&E as a responsible party for Montezuma Hills Facility site.

Nature of Costs: The costs for which PG&E is now seeking HSM recovery are not being recovered in base rates, or through any other recovery procedure. All cleanup costs to be recorded by PG&E in the HSM memorandum accounts will be hazardous waste cleanup costs found appropriate for recovery in the Hazardous Substance Cleanup Cost Recovery Collaborative Report. Montezuma Hills Facility is a Landfill and Other Hazardous Substance Facilities site as described in Section III.B of the Hazardous Substance Cleanup Cost Recovery Collaborative Report. PG&E sent hazardous substances for treatment, storage or disposal to the facility.
**Site Name:** Panoche Facility

**Location:** 2251 Lake Herman Road, Benicia, Solano County

**Source, Nature, and Approximate Date of Contamination:** The site consists of a 500-acre closed Class I hazardous waste facility. Beginning in 1968 the site was operated as a hazardous waste treatment facility treating multiple types of hazardous waste through 1986. The DTSC has identified PG&E as a responsible party based on historic waste sent to the site for treatment and disposal.

**Utility Operations at the Site:** PG&E had no direct operations at the site but has been identified as a responsible party by the DTSC based on historic waste sent to the site for treatment and disposal.

**Environmental Agency Actions:** In 2003, the site received closure certification and transitioned to post closure status pursuant to a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Hazardous Waste Facility Post Closure Permit (" Permit").

On February 29, 2016, DTSC issued a Summary of Violations ("SOV") to the current site owner/operator, IT Environmental Liquidating Trust (ITELT). The SOV stated that the post closure amount submitted to demonstrate financial assurance for the Site and three other sites operated by ITEL T under post closure permits was less than the post closure cost estimates.

On November 29, 2016, the DTSC issued an Imminent and Substantial Endangerment Determination and Order and Remedial Action Order Identifying PG&E as a responsible party for the Panoche Facility site.

**Nature of Costs:** The costs for which PG&E is now seeking HSM recovery are not being recovered in base rates, or through any other recovery procedure. All cleanup costs to be recorded by PG&E in the HSM memorandum accounts will be hazardous waste cleanup costs found appropriate for recovery in the Hazardous Substance Cleanup Cost Recovery Collaborative Report. Panoche Facility is a Landfill and Other Hazardous Substance Facilities site as described in Section III.B of the Hazardous Substance Cleanup Cost Recovery Collaborative Report. PG&E sent hazardous substances for treatment, storage or disposal to the facility.
Site Name: Vine Hill Complex

Location: 896 Waterbird Way, Martinez, Contra Costa County

Source, Nature, and Approximate Date of Contamination: The site consists of a 71-acre closed Class I hazardous waste facility. Beginning in 1959 the IT Corporation began operating the site as a hazardous waste treatment facility treating multiple types of hazardous waste through 1989. The DTSC has identified PG&E as a responsible party based on historic waste sent to the site for treatment and disposal.

Utility Operations at the Site: PG&E had no direct operations at the site but has been identified as a responsible party by the DTSC based on historic waste sent to the site for treatment and disposal.

Environmental Agency Actions: In 1995, the DTSC approved the Closure and Post-Closure Plans for the site. In 1999, the site received closure certification and transitioned to post closure status pursuant to a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Hazardous Waste Facility Post Closure Permit ("Permit").

On February 29, 2016, DTSC issued a Summary of Violations ("SOV") to the current site owner/operator, IT Environmental Liquidating Trust (ITELT). The SOV stated that the post closure amount submitted to demonstrate financial assurance for the Site and three other sites operated by ITELT under post closure permits was less than the post closure cost estimates.

On November 29, 2016, the DTSC issued an Imminent and Substantial Endangerment Determination and Order and Remedial Action Order Identifying PG&E as a responsible party for the Vine Hill Complex site.

Nature of Costs: The costs for which PG&E is now seeking HSM recovery are not being recovered in base rates, or through any other recovery procedure. All cleanup costs to be recorded by PG&E in the HSM memorandum accounts will be hazardous waste cleanup costs found appropriate for recovery in the Hazardous Substance Cleanup Cost Recovery Collaborative Report. Vine Hill Complex is a Landfill and Other Hazardous Substance Facilities site as described in Section III.B of the Hazardous Substance Cleanup Cost Recovery Collaborative Report. PG&E sent hazardous substances for treatment, storage or disposal to the facility.
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