

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of)	
The Ohio Bell Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Ohio)	
For Approval of an Alternative Form of)	
Regulation of Basic Local Exchange)	Case No. 09-74-TP-BLS
And other Tier 1 Services Pursuant to)	
Chapter 4901:1-4, Ohio Administrative)	
Code.)	

MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER

AT&T Ohio¹, by its attorneys, and pursuant to Sections 4901-1-24(D) and 4901:1-4-09(E) of the Commission's rules (O.A.C. §§ 4901-1-24(D) and 4901:1-4-09(E)) moves for a protective order keeping confidential the designated confidential and/or proprietary information included in its application filed in the referenced case. 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, three unredacted copies of the confidential information which is the subject of this motion have been filed under seal.

Respectfully submitted,

AT&T Ohio

/s/ Jon F. Kelly
Jon F. Kelly (Counsel of Record)
Mary Ryan Fenlon
AT&T Services, Inc.
150 E. Gay St., Rm. 4-A
Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 223-7928

Its Attorneys

¹ The Ohio Bell Telephone Company uses the name AT&T Ohio.

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 4901:1-4-09(E) of the Commission's rules provides that confidential information filed by the ILEC will be eligible for proprietary treatment in accordance with Section 4901-1-24 of the Commission's rules. Division (D) of that section 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 business information and, therefore, should be protected from disclosure.

The confidential information consists of CLEC-specific information relative to their presence and services in the specific telephone exchanges that are included in the application. CLEC-specific information of this nature is generally protected from public disclosure in Commission proceedings.

Non-disclosure of the identified confidential 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 competitive showings made in the application. 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.

For all of the information which is the subject of this motion, AT&T considers and has treated the information as a trade secret. In the ordinary course of business of AT&T Ohio, this information is stamped confidential, is 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. During the course of discovery, information of this type information has generally been provided only pursuant to a protective agreement.

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

Respectfully submitted,

AT&T Ohio

/s/ Jon F. Kelly

Jon F. Kelly (Counsel of Record)

Mary Ryan Fenlon

AT&T Services, Inc.

150 E. Gay St., Rm. 4-A

Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 223-7928

Its Attorneys

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing has been served by hand delivery this 30th day of January, 2009 on:

David C. Bergmann
Terry Etter
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 W. Broad St., Suite 1800
Columbus, OH 43215

/s/ Jon F. Kelly
Jon F. Kelly

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

1/30/2009 12:22:38 PM

in

Case No(s). 09-0074-TP-BLS

Summary: Motion for protective order electronically filed by Jon F Kelly on behalf of AT&T
Ohio