

22 September 1997

Bruce Kaneshiro, Project Manger  
California Public Utilities Commission  
c/o Environmental Science Associates  
225 Bush Street, Ste. 1700  
San Francisco, CA 94104

Re: Mitigated Negative Declaration And Initial Study, dated august 25, 1997, PG&E Application 96-11-020, Proposal for Divestiture

Dear Mr. Kaneshiro,

[\[Begin ORA-1\]](#)

After reviewing the Mitigated Negative Declaration And Initial Study, the Office of Ratepayer Advocates' (ORA) main concern is the estimated cost of the proposed mitigation measures, and whether mitigation activities would delay divestiture. ORA is aware that PG&E proposed to submit to the Commission an environmental remediation cost forecast and supporting testimony on 1 October 1997.

[\[End ORA-1\]](#)

Sincerely yours,

/s/

Truman L. Burns

Project Manager  
415/703-2932

cc: PG&E/M. Christie McManus; ALJ Careaga

## **ORA - OFFICE OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES**

---

### **ORA-1.**

Five of the six mitigation measures listed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration ensure that an existing rule applies to a new owner, or the transfer of materials and documents from PG&E to the new owner. The sixth mitigation measure requires PG&E to “prepare and certify its intent to comply with a program to address potential impacts to archaeological resources from PG&E actions related to the divestiture at the Morro Bay and Moss Landing power plants, such as construction to separate the properties or soil remediation activities.” PG&E is not likely to incur delay or significant expense in complying with any of these mitigation measures. Soil remediation is not a mitigation measure, but rather is PG&E's liability, with or without divestiture (see response to CCC-2). The costs associated with remediation at plants to be divested are under consideration in the CPUC's divestiture proceeding (A96-11-020), as ORA is aware.