

From: Tyrrell, Denise
Sent: 2/10/2014 8:32:34 AM
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: FW: WSJ Question

FYI

From: Redacted
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2014 8:10 AM
To: Prosper, Terrie D.
Cc: Malashenko, Elizaveta I.; Tyrrell, Denise
Subject: RE: WSJ Question

Terrie:

Most likely PG&E will not seek approval, unless it falls under the CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) requirements, which from a quick scan it does not appear to. Nor is PG&E required to inform us off physical changes to substations. However, PG&E and other utilities have been very proactive informing us of major changes to their system, so they will probably give us a heads up.

Ray

Redacted

Program & Project Supervisor
Safety and Enforcement Division
320 W. 4th Street, Suite 500
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Redacted

From: Prosper, Terrie D.

Sent: Sunday, February 09, 2014 4:55 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Malashenko, Elizaveta I.; Tyrrell, Denise
Subject: RE: WSJ Question

Thanks, Ray! For the changes (opaque walls) will PG&E have to seek our approval or let us know what they are doing at some point, or do they nor need to seek our ok or give us a heads-up?

----- Original message -----

From: [Redacted]
Date: 02/09/2014 4:46 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: "Prosper, Terrie D."
Cc: "Malashenko, Elizaveta I." , "Tyrrell, Denise"
Subject: Re: WSJ Question

Terrie:

Thank you forwarding the article to me. To answer your question, as far as I know we did not order the upgrades, nor do we have any emails or papers from PG&E concerning upgrades. We have had discussion (verbal communications) that they we looking to upgrade security and we have has similar discussions with other utilities.

Note, please keep this part confidential: the discussions with PG&E never discussed making the walls opaque as noted in the article. The upgrades dealt with cameras, motion sensors and gun shot detectors. I believe the walls are in response to Wellington's comments.

Ray

On Feb 9, 2014, at 1:18 PM, "Prosper, Terrie D." <terrie.prosper@cpuc.ca.gov> wrote:

I think these may be the changes the WSJ reporter is talking about (as seen in today's Chronicle

<http://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/matier-ross/article/Reminder-to-PG-amp-E-after-gunshots-fix-the-5217666.php>):

Whether it was a terrorist attack or just well-planned vandalism, the sniper assault in April on a Pacific Gas and Electric Co. substation in south San Jose

pointed up a simple truth - if you can see it, you can shoot it.

Jon Wellinghoff, who was chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission when someone shot up transformers at the Metcalf substation with a high-powered rifle, set off a firestorm last week when he called it "the most significant incident of domestic terrorism involving the grid that has ever occurred" in the United States.

The FBI, which is in charge of the investigation, said it wasn't terrorism. It has made no arrests and won't say if it has any suspects.

Whether the attack was the work of al Qaeda, someone with a grudge against PG&E or a sharpshooter on a joy run, Wellinghoff says there is something the utility could do to prevent a repeat attack.

"Make the fences around these substations, which are now chain-link fences, opaque so you couldn't see through them and shoot through them from 1,000 yards," he told CBS News.

Ten months after an attack that caused \$15.4 million in damage, however, the substation still has a see-through chain-link fence.

After we inquired about the fencing, PG&E spokesman Redacted called back to say that a change was in the works.

"Metcalf and other facilities will have opaque fencing. We are in the engineering and permitting phase and it should happen in the near future," Swanson said.

He said PG&E has also beefed up its camera surveillance at Metcalf, brought on a guard and cut back on the vegetation around the substation "to eliminate potential hiding places."

Funny what a little press will do.

On Feb 9, 2014, at 12:51 PM, "Prosper, Terrie D." <terrie.prosper@cpuc.ca.gov> wrote:

Hi there,

The Wall Street Journal ran an article last week re: the Metcalf Substation shooting. Now, the reporter says that PG&E says they

are making some security upgrades to substations (I don't know if this is accurate, but it's what she says).

The reporter is asking if the CPUC is the reason for the upgrades - if we asked/ordered them to make any changes? If so, she would like to note it in her next story (and would like to see any letters/paperwork we sent to PG&E about the changes).

If the answer is no, I assume the reporter's next question will be if PG&E has to have their security upgrades approved by us.

Can you please let me know what you suggest I tell the reporter? I know there are security/confidentiality issues at play.

Thanks!

Terrie