

BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Complaint of AT&T Ohio,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	Case No. 08-690-TP-CSS
v.	)	
	)	
	)	
Global NAPs Ohio, Inc.,	)	
	)	
Defendant	)	

---

AT&T OHIO’S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

---

AT&T Ohio<sup>1</sup>, by its attorneys, and pursuant to Section 4901-1-24(D) of the Commission’s rules (O.A.C. § 4901-1-24(D)), moves for a protective order keeping confidential the designated confidential and/or proprietary information included in the testimony and attachments of James Hamiter, Rebecca Harlen, and Yolanda Williams filed in this case on this same date. The reasons underlying this motion are detailed in the attached Memorandum in Support. Consistent with the requirements of Section 4901-1-24(D) of the Commission’s rules, unredacted copies of the confidential information which is the subject of this motion have been filed under seal.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Ohio Bell Telephone Company uses the name AT&T Ohio.

Respectfully submitted,

AT&T OHIO

/s/ Mary Ryan Fenlon

Mary Ryan Fenlon  
AT&T  
150 E. Gay St., Rm. 4-A  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
(614) 223-3302

One of Its Attorneys

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

---

AT&T Ohio requests that certain information described below be considered as confidential and/or proprietary and be protected from public disclosure. Section 4901-1-24(D) of the Commission's rules provides that the Commission or certain designated employees may issue an order which is necessary to protect the confidentiality of information contained in documents filed with the Commission's Docketing Division to the extent that state or federal law prohibits the release of the information and where non-disclosure of the information is not inconsistent with the purposes of Title 49 of the Revised Code. As set forth herein, the information described below represents confidential sensitive business information and, therefore, should be protected from disclosure.

Non-disclosure of the information will not impair the purposes of Title 49. The Commission and its Staff have full access to the information in order to review the requested service quality information in this case. No purpose of Title 49 would be served by the public disclosure of the information.

The need to protect the designated information from public disclosure is clear, and there is compelling legal authority supporting the requested protective order. While the Commission has often expressed its preference for open proceedings, the Commission also long ago recognized its statutory obligations with regard to trade secrets:

The Commission is of the opinion that the "public records" statute must also be read in pari materia with Section 1333.31, Revised Code ("trade secrets" statute). The latter statute must be interpreted as evincing the recognition, on the part of the General Assembly, of the value of trade secret information.

In re: General Telephone Co., Case No. 81-383-TP-AIR (Entry, February 17, 1982). Likewise, the Commission has facilitated the protection of trade secrets in its rules (O.A.C. § 4901-1-24(A)(7)).

The definition of a "trade secret" is set forth in the Uniform Trade Secrets Act:

"Trade secret" means information, including the whole or any portion or phase of any scientific or technical information, design, process, procedure, formula, pattern, compilation, program, device, method, technique, or improvement, or any business information or plans, financial information, or listing of names, addresses, or telephone numbers, that satisfies both of the following:

(1) It derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable by proper means by, other persons who can obtain economic value from its disclosure or use.

(2) It is the subject of efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy.

R. C. § 1333.61(D). This definition clearly reflects the state policy favoring the protection of trade secrets such as the information which is the subject of this motion.

Courts of other jurisdictions have held that not only does a public utilities commission have the authority to protect the trade secrets of a public utility, the trade secret statute creates a duty to protect them. New York Tel. Co. v. Pub. Serv. Comm. N.Y., 56 N.Y. 2d 213 (1982). Indeed, for the Commission to do otherwise would be to negate the protections the Ohio General Assembly has granted to all businesses, including public utilities, through the Uniform Trade Secrets Act. This Commission has previously carried out its obligations in this regard in numerous proceedings. See, e.g., Elyria Tel. Co., Case No. 89-965-TP-AEC (Finding and Order, September 21, 1989); Ohio Bell Tel. Co., Case No. 89-718-TP-ATA (Finding and Order, May 31, 1989); Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc., Case No. 90-17-GA-GCR (Entry, August 17, 1990).

In 1996, the Ohio General Assembly amended R. C. §§ 4901.12 and 4905.07 in order to

facilitate the protection of trade secrets in the Commission's possession. The General Assembly carved out an exception to the general rule in favor of the public disclosure of information in the Commission's possession. By referencing R. C. § 149.43, the Commission-specific statutes now incorporate the provision of that statute that excepts from the definition of "public record" records the release of which is prohibited by state or federal law. R. C. § 149.43(A)(1). In turn, state law prohibits the release of information meeting the definition of a trade secret. R. C. §§ 1333.61(D) and 1333.62. The amended statutes also reference the purposes of Title 49 of the Revised Code. The protection of trade secret information from public disclosure is consistent with the purposes of Title 49 because the Commission and its Staff have access to the information; in many cases, the parties to a case may have access under an appropriate protective agreement. The protection of trade secret information as requested herein will not impair the Commission's regulatory responsibilities.

In Pyromatics, Inc. v. Petruziello, 7 Ohio App. 3d 131, 134-135 (Cuyahoga County 1983), the Court of Appeals, citing Koch Engineering Co. v. Faulconer, 210 U.S.P.Q. 854, 861 (Kansas 1980), has delineated factors to be considered in recognizing a trade secret:

- (1) The extent to which the information is known outside the business, (2) the extent to which it is known to those inside the business, i.e., by the employees, (3) the precautions taken by the holder of the trade secret to guard the secrecy of the information, (4) the savings effected and the value to the holder in having the information as against competitors, (5) the amount of effort or money expended in obtaining and developing the information, and (6) the amount of time and expense it would take for others to acquire and duplicate the information.

The information which is the subject of this motion consists of billing, ordering, and other information pertaining to the traffic delivered to AT&T Ohio by Global NAPs Ohio, Inc. For all of the information which is the subject of this motion, AT&T Ohio considers and has

treated the information as a trade secret. In the ordinary course of business of AT&T Ohio, this information is marked and treated as proprietary and confidential by AT&T Ohio employees, and is not disclosed to anyone except in a Commission proceeding and/or pursuant to staff data request, or to the competitor to whom the information pertains. During the course of discovery, information of this type information has generally been provided only pursuant to protective agreement.

AT&T Ohio considers and has treated similar information regarding traffic delivered by and services provided to its competitors as confidential. In the ordinary course of business of AT&T Ohio, this type of information is marked and treated as proprietary and confidential by AT&T Ohio employees, and is not disclosed to anyone except the competitor to whom the information pertains. The Commission has historically treated such competitive business information as confidential.

For the foregoing reasons, AT&T Ohio requests that the designated information be protected from public disclosure.

Respectfully submitted,

AT&T OHIO

By: /s/ Mary Ryan Fenlon

Mary Ryan Fenlon  
AT&T  
150 E. Gay St., Rm. 4-A  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
(614) 223-3302  
One of Its Attorneys

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**1/21/2009 2:31:31 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 08-0690-TP-CSS**

Summary: Motion for Protective Order electronically filed by Mrs. Verneda J. Engram on behalf of AT&T Ohio