

RELIABILITY CORPORATION

## PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS PUBLIC VERSION

NP11-251 Black Hills Power, Inc.

July 28, 2011

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose Secretary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 888 First Street, N.E. Washington, DC 20426

## Re: NERC Abbreviated Notice of Penalty regarding Unidentified Registered Entity, FERC Docket No. NP11-\_\_-000

Dear Ms. Bose:

The North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) hereby provides this Abbreviated Notice of Penalty (NOP) regarding Unidentified Registered Entity (URE), with information and details regarding the nature and resolution of the violation<sup>1</sup> discussed in detail in the Settlement Agreement (Attachment a) and the Disposition Document (Attachment b), in accordance with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission or FERC) rules, regulations and orders, as well as NERC Rules of Procedure including Appendix 4C (NERC Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program (CMEP)).<sup>2</sup>

This NOP is being filed with the Commission because Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC) and URE have entered into a Settlement Agreement to resolve all outstanding issues arising from WECC's determination and findings of the violation of CIP-006-1 Requirement (R) 1.1. According to the Settlement Agreement, URE admits to the stipulated violation facts and has agreed to the assessed penalty of seven thousand dollars (\$7,000), in addition to other remedies and actions to mitigate the instant violation and facilitate future compliance under the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement. Accordingly, the violation identified as NERC Violation Tracking Identification Number WECC201002031 is being filed in accordance with the NERC Rules of Procedure and the CMEP.

116-390 Village Blvd. Princeton, NJ 08540 609.452.8060 | www.nerc.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For purposes of this document, each violation at issue is described as a "violation," regardless of its procedural posture and whether it was a possible, alleged or confirmed violation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Rules Concerning Certification of the Electric Reliability Organization; and Procedures for the Establishment, Approval, and Enforcement of Electric Reliability Standards (Order No. 672), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,204 (2006); Notice of New Docket Prefix "NP" for Notices of Penalty Filed by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Docket No. RM05-30-000 (February 7, 2008). See also 18 C.F.R. Part 39 (2011). Mandatory Reliability Standards for the Bulk-Power System, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,242 (2007) (Order No. 693), reh'g denied, 120 FERC ¶ 61,053 (2007) (Order No. 693-A). See 18 C.F.R § 39.7(c)(2).

 PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS PUBLIC VERSION

 NERC Notice of Penalty
 PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

 Unidentified Registered Entity
 HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS PUBLIC VERSION

 July 28, 2011
 Page 2

### **Statement of Findings Underlying the Violation**

This NOP incorporates the findings and justifications set forth in the Settlement Agreement executed on March 9, 2011, by and between WECC and URE. The details of the findings and the basis for the penalty are set forth in the Disposition Document. This NOP filing contains the basis for approval of the Settlement Agreement by the NERC Board of Trustees Compliance Committee (NERC BOTCC). In accordance with Section 39.7 of the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 39.7, NERC provides the following summary table identifying each violation of a Reliability Standard resolved by the Settlement Agreement, as discussed in greater detail below.

NOC ID	NERC Violation ID	Reliability Std.	Req. (R)	VRF	Duration	Total Penalty (\$)
NOC-840	WECC201002031	CIP-006-1	1.1	Medium <sup>3</sup>	12/31/09- 9/21/10	7,000

The text of the Reliability Standard at issue and further information on the subject violations are set forth in the Disposition Document.

#### <u>CIP-006-1 R1.1 - OVERVIEW</u>

URE submitted its Self-Certification to WECC citing a violation of CIP-006-1 R1.1. WECC determined that URE failed to ensure all Cyber Assets within its Electronic Security Perimeter were located within an identified Physical Security Perimeter (PSP) defined as a "six-walled" border when it identified five Critical Cyber Assets outside of the identified PSP.

#### Statement Describing the Assessed Penalty, Sanction or Enforcement Action Imposed<sup>4</sup>

#### **Basis for Determination**

Taking into consideration the Commission's direction in Order No. 693, the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the Commission's July 3, 2008, October 26, 2009 and August 27, 2010 Guidance Orders,<sup>5</sup> the NERC BOTCC reviewed the Settlement Agreement and supporting documentation on June 10, 2011. The NERC BOTCC approved the Settlement Agreement, including WECC's assessment of a seven thousand dollar (\$7,000) financial penalty against URE and other actions to facilitate future compliance required under the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement. In approving the Settlement Agreement, the NERC BOTCC reviewed the applicable requirements of the Commission-approved Reliability Standards and the underlying facts and circumstances of the violation at issue.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> CIP-006-1 R1, R1.1, R1.2, R1.3, R1.4, R1.5 and R1.6 are each assigned a Medium Violation Risk Factor (VRF) and CIP-006-1 R1.7, R1.8 and R1.9 are each assigned a Lower VRF.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See 18 C.F.R. § 39.7(d)(4).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> North American Electric Reliability Corporation, "Guidance Order on Reliability Notices of Penalty," 124 FERC ¶ 61,015 (2008); North American Electric Reliability Corporation, "Further Guidance Order on Reliability Notices of Penalty," 129 FERC ¶ 61,069 (2009); North American Electric Reliability Corporation, "Notice of No Further Review and Guidance Order," 132 FERC ¶ 61,182 (2010).

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS PUBLIC VERSIONNERC Notice of PenaltyPRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATIONUnidentified Registered EntityHAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS PUBLIC VERSIONJuly 28, 2011Page 3

In reaching this determination, the NERC BOTCC considered the following factors:

- 1. the violation constituted URE's first occurrence of violation of the subject NERC Reliability Standard;
- 2. WECC reported that URE was cooperative throughout the compliance enforcement process;
- 3. URE had a compliance program at the time of the violation which WECC considered a mitigating factor, as discussed in the Disposition Document;
- 4. there was no evidence of any attempt to conceal a violation nor evidence of intent to do so;
- 5. WECC determined that the violation did not pose a serious or substantial risk to the reliability of the bulk power system (BPS), as discussed in the Disposition Document; and
- 6. WECC reported that there were no other mitigating or aggravating factors or extenuating circumstances that would affect the assessed penalty.

For the foregoing reasons, the NERC BOTCC approved the Settlement Agreement and believes that the assessed penalty of seven thousand dollars (\$7,000) is appropriate for the violation and circumstances at issue, and is consistent with NERC's goal to promote and ensure reliability of the BPS.

Pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 39.7(e), the penalty will be effective upon expiration of the 30 day period following the filing of this NOP with FERC, or, if FERC decides to review the penalty, upon final determination by FERC.

## **Request for Confidential Treatment**

Information in and certain attachments to the instant NOP include confidential information as defined by the Commission's regulations at 18 C.F.R. Part 388 and orders, as well as NERC Rules of Procedure including the NERC CMEP Appendix 4C to the Rules of Procedure. This includes non-public information related to certain Reliability Standard violations, certain Regional Entity investigative files, Registered Entity sensitive business information and confidential information regarding critical energy infrastructure.

In accordance with the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 388.112, a non-public version of the information redacted from the public filing is being provided under separate cover.

Because certain of the attached documents are deemed confidential by NERC, Registered Entities and Regional Entities, NERC requests that the confidential, non-public information be provided special treatment in accordance with the above regulation.

RIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS PUBLIC VERSION NERC Notice of Penalty PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION Unidentified Registered Entity HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS PUBLIC VERSION July 28, 2011 Page 4

### Attachments to be included as Part of this Notice of Penalty

The attachments to be included as parts of this NOP are the following documents:

- a) Settlement Agreement by and between WECC and URE executed March 9, 2011, included as Attachment a;
- b) Disposition Document, included as Attachment b;
- c) URE's Self-Certification, included as Attachment c;
- d) URE's Mitigation Plan, included as Attachment d;
- e) URE's Certification of Mitigation Plan Completion, included as Attachment e; and
- f) WECC's Verification of Mitigation Plan Completion, included as Attachment f.

#### A Form of Notice Suitable for Publication<sup>6</sup>

A copy of a notice suitable for publication is included in Attachment g.

NERC Notice of Penalty Unidentified Registered Entity July 28, 2011 Page 5

## ORMATION HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS PUBLIC VERSION PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS PUBLIC VERSION

## **Notices and Communications**

Notices and communications with respect to this filing may be addressed to the following:

Gerald W. Cauley	Rebecca J. Michael*
President and Chief Executive Officer	Associate General Counsel for Corporate and
David N. Cook*	Regulatory Matters
Sr. Vice President and General Counsel	Davis Smith*
North American Electric Reliability Corporation	Attorney
116-390 Village Boulevard	North American Electric Reliability Corporation
Princeton, NJ 08540-5721	1120 G Street, N.W.
(609) 452-8060	Suite 990
(609) 452-9550 – facsimile	Washington, DC 20005-3801
david.cook@nerc.net	(202) 393-3998
uavid.cook@nere.net	(202) 393-3955 – facsimile
Mark Maher*	rebecca.michael@nerc.net
Chief Executive Officer	davis.smith@nerc.net
Western Electricity Coordinating Council	davis.simin@here.net
155 North 400 West, Suite 200	Christopher Luras*
Salt Lake City, UT 84103	Manager of Compliance Enforcement
(360) 213-2673	Western Electricity Coordinating Council
(801) 582-3918 – facsimile	155 North 400 West, Suite 200
Mark@wecc.biz	Salt Lake City, UT 84103
Wark(a) weee.biz	(801) 883-6887
Constance White*	(801) 883-6894 – facsimile
Vice President of Compliance	CLuras@wecc.biz
Western Electricity Coordinating Council	
155 North 400 West, Suite 200	
Salt Lake City, UT 84103	*Persons to be included on the Commission's
(801) 883-6855	service list are indicated with an asterisk. NERC
(801) 883-6894 – facsimile	requests waiver of the Commission's rules and
CWhite@wecc.biz	regulations to permit the inclusion of more than
	two people on the service list.
Sandy Mooy*	two people on the service list.
Associate General Counsel	
Western Electricity Coordinating Council	
155 North 400 West, Suite 200	
Salt Lake City, UT 84103	
(801) 819-7658	
(801) 883-6894 – facsimile	
SMooy@wecc.biz	

NERC Notice of Penalty Unidentified Registered Entity July 28, 2011 Page 6

## ORMATION HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS PUBLIC VERSION PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS PUBLIC VERSION

#### Conclusion

Accordingly, NERC respectfully requests that the Commission accept this Abbreviated NOP as compliant with its rules, regulations and orders.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald W. Cauley President and Chief Executive Officer David N. Cook Sr. Vice President and General Counsel North American Electric Reliability Corporation 116-390 Village Boulevard Princeton, NJ 08540-5721 (609) 452-8060 (609) 452-9550 – facsimile david.cook@nerc.net <u>/s/ Rebecca J. Michael</u>
Rebecca J. Michael
Associate General Counsel for Corporate and Regulatory Matters
Davis Smith
Attorney
North American Electric Reliability Corporation
1120 G Street, N.W.
Suite 990
Washington, DC 20005-3801
(202) 393-3998
(202) 393-3955 – facsimile
rebecca.michael@nerc.net
davis.smith@nerc.net

cc: Unidentified Registered Entity Western Electricity Coordinating Council

Attachments



# Attachment b

# **Disposition Document**

#### Attachment b

## **DISPOSITION OF VIOLATION**<sup>1</sup> Dated June 10, 2011

NERC TRACKING	REGIONAL ENTITY TRACKING	NOC#
NO.	NO.	
WECC201002031	WECC2010-609887	NOC-840

REGISTERED ENTITY Unidentified Registered Entity (URE) NERC REGISTRY ID NCRXXXXX

**REGIONAL ENTITY Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC)** 

#### I. <u>VIOLATION INFORMATION</u>

RELIABILITY	REQUIREMENT(S)	SUB-	VRF(S)	VSL(S)
STANDARD		REQUIREMENT(S)		
CIP-006-1	1	1.1	Medium <sup>2</sup>	N/A <sup>3</sup>

PURPOSE OF THE RELIABILITY STANDARD AND TEXT OF RELIABILITY STANDARD AND REQUIREMENT(S)/SUB-REQUIREMENT(S)

The purpose statement of CIP-006-1 provides in pertinent part: "Standard CIP-006 is intended to ensure the implementation of a physical security program for the protection of Critical Cyber Assets. Standard CIP-006 should be read as part of a group of standards numbered Standards CIP-002 through CIP-009."

CIP-006-1 R1 provides in pertinent part:

**R1.** Physical Security Plan — The Responsible Entity<sup>[4]</sup> shall create and maintain a physical security plan, approved by a senior manager or delegate(s) that shall address, at a minimum, the following:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For purposes of this document and attachments hereto, each violation at issue is described as a "violation," regardless of its procedural posture and whether it was a possible, alleged or confirmed violation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> CIP-006-1 R1, R1.1, R1.2, R1.3, R1.4, R1.5 and R1.6 are each assigned a Medium Violation Risk Factor (VRF) and CIP-006-1 R1.7, R1.8 and R1.9 are each assigned a Lower VRF.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> At the time of the violations, no VSLs were in effect for CIP-006-1. On June 30, 2009, NERC submitted VSLs for the CIP-002-1 through CIP-009-1 Reliability Standards. On March 18, 2010, the Commission approved the VSLs as filed, but directed NERC to submit modifications.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Within the text of Standard CIP-006, "Responsible Entity" shall mean Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Interchange Authority, Transmission Service Provider, Transmission Owner, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator, Load Serving Entity, NERC, and Regional Reliability Organizations.

**R1.1.** Processes to ensure and document that all Cyber Assets within an Electronic Security Perimeter also reside within an identified Physical Security Perimeter. Where a completely enclosed ("six-wall") border cannot be established, the Responsible Entity shall deploy and document alternative measures to control physical access to the Critical Cyber Assets.

#### (Footnote added.)

VIOLATION DESCRIPTION

URE submitted a Self-Certification of noncompliance with CIP-006-1 R1.1 to WECC stating that at a facility, five Critical Cyber Assets (CCAs) thought to be within an identified Physical Security Perimeter (PSP) were discovered outside the identified PSP.

A WECC Compliance Subject Matter Expert (SME) reviewed URE's Self-Certification and six documents that together comprise the Physical Security Plan for URE. The SME confirmed that URE identified a single PSP at the facility. The five CCAs, were discovered outside the identified PSP, however they were within an Electronic Security Perimeter (ESP). Therefore, URE created and implemented its Physical Security Plan (Plan), but processes in place did not ensure all Cyber Assets within an ESP were located within an "identified PSP," which in this case was the control room. This failure was a violation of CIP-006-1 R1.1.

RELIABILITY IMPACT STATEMENT- POTENTIAL AND ACTUAL

WECC determined that the violation posed a minimal risk and did not pose a serious or substantial risk to the reliability of the bulk power system (BPS) because although URE failed to locate five CCAs within an identified PSP, each CCA was contained within a secured physical area. The CCAs were secured within a layered security area. The facility is surrounded by eight foot high gates with access points monitored and controlled by security personnel and controlled key access. Further, each CCA was located within a building with some form of access control and monitoring. Additionally, each device was identified as a CCA and further protected by within a locker. URE provided evidence demonstrating its Plan did ensure all other CCAs at the facility resided within an identified PSP secured by measures under Requirements 2 and 3. Further, each Cyber Asset contained within these borders had some measure of access control and security monitoring.

IS THERE A SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

YES NO

		IVILEGED AND CONF BEEN REMOVED FRO		PUBLIC VI	
WITH RI	ESPECT TO THE VIO	LATION(S), REGISTERI	ED ENTIT	Y	
A	DMITS TO IT	R DENIES IT (SETTLEN	IENT ONI	LY) YES YES	$\square$
	<b>ipulates to the facts o</b> OES NOT CONTEST	I the violation IT (INCLUDING WITHIN	N 30 DAYS	S) YES	
WITH RI ENTITY	ESPECT TO THE ASS	ESSED PENALTY OR S.	ANCTION	, REGISTE	RED
A	CCEPTS IT/ DOES NO	OT CONTEST IT		YES	$\boxtimes$
	III.	<b>DISCOVERY INFORM</b>	MATION		
METHO	COMPLL COMPLL SPOT CH COMPLA PERIODI	RTIFICATION ANCE AUDIT ANCE VIOLATION INVI IECK	ESTIGATI	ON	
DURATI	ON DATE(S) 1/1/10 tl	hrough 9/21/10 (Mitigatio	on Plan co	mpletion)	
	ISCOVERED BY OR I IONAL ENTITY	REPORTED	Se	lf-Certifica	tion
	THE VIOLATION ST YES, EXPLAIN	TILL OCCURRING	YES [	] NO	$\square$
	EMEDIAL ACTION D RE TO POST JUNE 18		YES YES	] NO ] NO	$\boxtimes$
	IV.	<b>MITIGATION INFORM</b>	<u>MATION</u>		
M D D D	AL ACCEPTED MITI ITIGATION PLAN NO ATE SUBMITTED TO ATE ACCEPTED BY ATE APPROVED BY ATE PROVIDED TO 1	O. ) REGIONAL ENTITY REGIONAL ENTITY NERC		MIT-09-2 10/1 11/1 12/1 12/1	4/10 0/10 3/10

# IDENTIFY AND EXPLAIN ALL PRIOR VERSIONS THAT WERE ACCEPTED OR REJECTED, IF APPLICABLE

On February 10, 2010, URE submitted a Mitigation Plan followed by its Certification of Mitigation Plan Completion submitted on March 15, 2010. The WECC SME reviewed URE's Completed Mitigation Plan as well as evidence demonstrating completion as of March 15, 2010. The WECC SME originally accepted URE's completed Mitigation Plan and Certification of Mitigation Completion on June 23, 2010. WECC Enforcement reviewed URE's Mitigation Plan on August 1, 2010 and determined that the WECC SME erred in accepting URE's Completed Mitigation Plan. URE had failed to demonstrate mitigation of the violation because all identified PSPs did not constitute a "six-walled" border. Accordingly, WECC sent URE a letter on September 15, 2010 requesting URE revise its Mitigation Plan to include the full scope of mitigation action taken.

MITIGATION PLAN COMPLETED	YES	$\square$	NO	
EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE EXTENSIONS GRANTED ACTUAL COMPLETION DATE	Sub	mitted a		plete 1/10 <sup>5</sup>
DATE OF CERTIFICATION LETTER CERTIFIED COMPLETE BY REGISTERED EN	TITY A	S OF		5/10 <sup>6</sup> 1/10 <sup>7</sup>
DATE OF VERIFICATION LETTER VERIFIED COMPLETE BY REGIONAL ENTIT	Y AS O	F		0/10 1/10

ACTIONS TAKEN TO MITIGATE THE ISSUE AND PREVENT RECURRENCE

- Six individual PSPs were established within the facility perimeter fence.
- Five individual PSPs were established to contain the five CCAs
- Each PSP restricts access to the CCA therein
- Locks were changed to further restrict access to the controlled keys.
- Four additional cameras were installed to provide complete coverage for the perimeter fence and within the facility's yard. (Completed

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> URE voluntarily submitted a revised Mitigation Plan to include all mitigation undertaken after March 15, 2010. Action on the original Mitigation Plan was completed as of March 15, 2010. The Mitigation Plan submitted in October included a more complete description of URE's mitigation action including documentation revisions.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The Certification of Mitigation Plan Completion Letter is dated October 6, 2010, but was not submitted until October 14, 2010.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> The Certification of Mitigation Plan Completion lists an incorrect completion date of March 15, 2010, which was the completion date of the previously rejected Mitigation Plan.

3/5/2010) These cameras are monitored 24/7 by the security operations center.

- Badge readers were added to the two main perimeter fence gates. These readers act as the identification mechanism for those accessing the facility's yard. (Completed 3/10/2010)
- Gate position sensors were added to the two main perimeter fence gates. A direct connect "push-button" phone was also added to the main vehicle entry gate to allow direct, communication with the security operations center. The badge readers and gate position switches are monitored 24/7 by the URE's security operations center. (Completed on 3/10/2010)
- Three perimeter fence gates which were no longer required for access to the site were welded shut. (Completed 3/10/2010)
- The operational vehicle access gate on east side of perimeter is locked and has gate position sensors in place to alarm when gate is opened. (Completed 3/10/2010)
- Finally, URE revised its Physical Security Plan, and Physical Security process and policies, to correctly define "PSP" as a "six-walled" border with controlled access. (Completed 9/21/10)

LIST OF EVIDENCE REVIEWED BY REGIONAL ENTITY TO EVALUATE COMPLETION OF MITIGATION PLAN (FOR CASES IN WHICH MITIGATION IS NOT YET COMPLETED, LIST EVIDENCE REVIEWED FOR COMPLETED MILESTONES)

- Training presentation provided to SMEs, Class attendance sheet
- **PSP Documentation** 
  - Pre-mitigation location of PSPs and CCAs
  - Post mitigation location of individual PSPs
- Evidence of completed milestone activity
  - Project tracker task list indicating tasks, vendors, and completion dates
  - Photograph of CCAs enclosure lock and Corporate Security notice on CCA enclosure
  - Photograph of CCA door tamper switch
  - Photograph of welded portion of gate
  - Photograph of gate position sensors, card reader, and direct dial phone.
  - "Receiving Document" for delivery of 4 added cameras
  - Receipt for CCA enclosures locks and tamper switches
  - Emails indicating completion of locks and document updates

#### V. <u>PENALTY INFORMATION</u>

TOTAL ASSESSED PENALTY OR SANCTION OF **\$7,000** FOR **ONE** VIOLATION OF RELIABILITY STANDARDS.

(1) REGISTERED ENTITY'S COMPLIANCE HISTORY

PREVIOUSLY FILED VIOLATIONS OF ANY OF THE INSTANT RELIABILITY STANDARD(S) OR REQUIREMENT(S) THEREUNDER YES NO

LIST VIOLATIONS AND STATUS

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

PREVIOUSLY FILED VIOLATIONS OF OTHER RELIABILITY STANDARD(S) OR REQUIREMENTS THEREUNDER YES NO

LIST VIOLATIONS AND STATUS

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

(2) THE DEGREE AND QUALITY OF COOPERATION BY THE REGISTERED ENTITY (IF THE RESPONSE TO FULL COOPERATION IS "NO," THE ABBREVIATED NOP FORM MAY NOT BE USED.)

FULL COOPERATION	YES	$\bowtie$	NO	
IF NO, EXPLAIN				

(3) THE PRESENCE AND QUALITY OF THE REGISTERED ENTITY'S COMPLIANCE PROGRAM

IS THERE A DOCUMENTED COMPLIANCE PROGRAM YES NO UNDETERMINED EXPLAIN

WECC reviewed URE's Internal Compliance Program (ICP), in place at the time of the violation, and found it to be a mitigating factor in determining the penalty.

> EXPLAIN SENIOR MANAGEMENT'S ROLE AND INVOLVEMENT WITH RESPECT TO THE REGISTERED ENTITY'S COMPLIANCE PROGRAM, INCLUDING WHETHER SENIOR MANAGEMENT TAKES ACTIONS THAT SUPPORT THE COMPLIANCE PROGRAM, SUCH AS TRAINING, COMPLIANCE AS A FACTOR IN EMPLOYEE EVALUATIONS, OR OTHERWISE.

(4) ANY ATTEMPT BY THE REGISTERED ENTITY TO CONCEAL THE VIOLATION(S) OR INFORMATION NEEDED TO REVIEW, EVALUATE OR INVESTIGATE THE VIOLATION.

YES NO IF YES, EXPLAIN

(5) ANY EVIDENCE THE VIOLATION(S) WERE INTENTIONAL (IF THE RESPONSE IS "YES," THE ABBREVIATED NOP FORM MAY NOT BE USED.)

YES NO IF YES, EXPLAIN

(6) ANY OTHER MITIGATING FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

YES NO IF YES, EXPLAIN

(7) ANY OTHER AGGRAVATING FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

YES NO IF YES, EXPLAIN

## (8) ANY OTHER EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES

YES  $\square$  NO  $\boxtimes$  IF YES, EXPLAIN

EXHIBITS:

SOURCE DOCUMENT URE's Self-Certification

MITIGATION PLAN URE's Revised Mitigation Plan MIT-09-2992

**CERTIFICATION BY REGISTERED ENTITY URE's Certification of Mitigation Plan Completion** 

VERIFICATION BY REGIONAL ENTITY WECC's Verification of Mitigation Plan Completion

#### OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION:

NOTICE OF ALLEGED VIOLATION AND PROPOSED PENALTY OR SANCTION ISSUED DATE: 9/16/10 OR N/A

SETTLEMENT REQUEST DATE DATE: 10/29/10 OR N/A

NOTICE OF CONFIRMED VIOLATION ISSUED DATE: OR N/A SUPPLEMENTAL RECORD INFORMATION DATE(S) OR N/A S

REGISTERED ENTITY RESPONSE CONTESTED FINDINGS PENALTY BOTH DID NOT CONTEST X

HEARING REQUESTED YES NO X DATE

OUTCOME APPEAL REQUESTED

Document Content(s)		
Public_FinalFiled_ANOP	_NOC-840.PDF1	L