

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Ohio Power Company to Adjust The)	Case No. 13-325-EL-RDR
Economic Development Cost Recovery)	
Rider Rates)	

**MOTION OF ERAMET MARIETTA, INC. FOR
PROTECTIVE ORDER AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

Samuel C. Randazzo
Frank P. Darr (Counsel of Record)
Matthew R. Pritchard
MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC
21 East State Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-4228
Telephone: (614) 469-8000
Telecopier: (614) 469-4653
sam@mwncmh.com
fdarr@mwncmh.com
mpritchard@mwncmh.com

February 4, 2013

Attorneys for Eramet Marietta, Inc.

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Ohio Power Company to Adjust The)	Case No. 13-325-EL-RDR
Economic Development Cost Recovery)	
Rider Rates)	

**MOTION OF ERAMET MARIETTA, INC.
FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Pursuant to Rule 4901-1-24, Ohio Administrative Code ("O.A.C."), Eramet Marietta, Inc. ("Eramet") respectfully moves the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("Commission") to issue a Protective Order to protect the confidentiality and prohibit the disclosure of the confidential information contained in the Application of Ohio Power Company ("AEP-Ohio") to Adjust its Economic Development Cost Recovery Rider ("EDR") rates filed under seal on February 1, 2013. The confidential information is not subject to disclosure and includes competitively sensitive and highly proprietary business information comprising trade secrets. The grounds for this Motion are set forth in the attached Memorandum in Support.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Matthew R. Pritchard

Samuel C. Randazzo
Frank P. Darr (Counsel of Record)
Matthew R. Pritchard
MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC
21 East State Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-4228
sam@mwncmh.com
fdarr@mwncmh.com
mpritchard@mwncmh.com

Attorneys for Eramet Marietta, Inc.

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Ohio Power Company to Adjust The)	Case No. 13-325-EL-RDR
Economic Development Cost Recovery)	
Rider Rates)	

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

On June 19, 2009, Eramet filed an application before the Commission for a reasonable arrangement with AEP-Ohio to permit Eramet to upgrade its manufacturing facility in Ohio.¹ On August 5, 2009, Eramet and Commission Staff filed a Joint Stipulation and Recommendation resolving the issues in the case ("Stipulation").² On October 15, 2009, the Commission issued an Opinion and Order approving the Stipulation with modifications. On March 24, 2010, the Commission issued an Entry on Rehearing denying Applications for Rehearing and upholding its Opinion and Order approving the Stipulation.

In AEP-Ohio's initial electric security plan ("ESP") proceeding (Case Nos. 08-917-EL-SSO, *et al.*), the Commission authorized AEP-Ohio's EDR, to recover economic development amounts authorized by the Commission in reasonable

¹ The application, as filed and approved, was between Eramet and Columbus Southern Power Company ("CSP"). However, CSP has since merged with Ohio Power Company.

² *In the Matter of the Application for Establishment of a Reasonable Arrangement between Eramet Marietta, Inc. and Columbus Southern Power Company*, Case No. 09-516-EL-AEC, Stipulation and Recommendation (August 5, 2009).

arrangement cases. In the initial ESP proceeding, the Commission also set the initial level of the rider at zero, to be updated quarterly.³ The EDR was reauthorized in AEP-Ohio's second ESP proceeding.⁴ The rider is calculated as a percentage of a customer's distribution charges. On February 1, 2013, AEP-Ohio initiated this quarterly update case by filing an Application requesting that the Commission adjust AEP-Ohio's EDR. AEP-Ohio's February 1, 2013 Application contains Eramet's customer-specific information that was clearly marked as confidential and was filed under seal, separate from the redacted public version of the Eramet-specific schedule. Prior to filing this Motion, on February 4, 2013, Eramet filed a Motion to Intervene in this proceeding.

For the reasons stated below, Eramet respectfully requests that the Commission grant protective treatment of Eramet's customer-specific information included to support AEP-Ohio's EDR adjustment filed under seal.

II. ARGUMENT

The billing information of the Eramet reasonable arrangement schedule filed by AEP-Ohio contains competitively sensitive and highly proprietary business information that constitutes trade secrets under Ohio law and the Commission's rules. State law recognizes the need to protect information that is confidential in nature. Accordingly, the General Assembly granted the Commission statutory authority to exempt certain

³ *In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company for Approval of an Electric Security Plan; an Amendment to its Corporate Separation Plan; and the Sale or Transfer of Certain Generating Assets*, Case Nos. 08-917-EL-SSO, *et al.*, Opinion and Order at 47-48 (March 18, 2009).

⁴ *In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case Nos. 11-346-EL-SSO, *et al.*, Opinion and Order at 66-67 (August 8, 2012).

documents from disclosure.⁵ Pursuant to this statutory grant of authority, the Commission promulgated Rule 4901-1-24, O.A.C. Rule 4901-1-24(D), O.A.C., provides for the issuance of an order that is necessary to protect the confidentiality of information contained in documents filed at the Commission to the extent that state and federal law prohibit the release of such information and where non-disclosure of the information is not inconsistent with the purposes of Title 49 of the Revised Code.

Trade secrets protected by state law are not considered public records and are therefore exempt from public disclosure.⁶ A trade secret is defined by Section 1333.61(D), Revised Code, as follows:

"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.

Section 1333.61(D), Revised Code (emphasis added).

The Eramet-related information contained within the Eramet schedule is competitively sensitive and highly proprietary business and financial information falling within the statutory characterization of a trade secret.⁷ The information for which

⁵ See Sections 4901.12 and 4905.07, Revised Code.

⁶ Section 149.43(A)(1)(v), Revised Code; *State ex rel. The Plain Dealer v. Ohio Dept. of Insurance*, 80 Ohio St. 3d 513, 530 (1997).

⁷ Section 1333.61(D), Revised Code.

protective treatment is sought includes Eramet's billings paid for electricity based upon its actual and estimated usage. Public disclosure of the pricing information would jeopardize Eramet's business position and its ability to compete. The actual and projected billing information Eramet seeks to protect derives independent economic value from not being generally known and not being readily ascertainable by proper means by Eramet's competitors. Further, the efforts to protect the confidential pricing information are reasonable under the circumstances. Finally, actual customer usage and pricing terms are routinely accorded protected status by the Commission and the Commission accorded such treatment to Eramet's information in AEP-Ohio's previous EDR update proceedings.⁸

The non-disclosure of the actual usage and pricing information will not impair the purposes of Title 49 as the Commission and its Staff will have full access to the confidential information in order to complete its review process. Because Eramet's information constitutes a trade secret it should be accorded protected status.

⁸ *In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company to Adjust Their Economic Development Cost Recovery Rider Pursuant to Rule 4901:1-38-08(A)(5), Ohio Administrative Code*, Case No. 11-4570-EL-RDR, Finding and Order at 4 (October 12, 2011); *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust Its Economic Development Cost Recovery Rider Pursuant to Rule 4901:1-38-08(A)(5), Ohio Administrative Code*, Case No. 12-688-EL-RDR, Opinion and Order at 4-5 (March 28, 2012); *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust Its Economic Development Cost Recovery Rider Pursuant to Rule 4901:1-38-08(A)(5), Ohio Administrative Code*, Case No. 12-2210-EL-RDR, Opinion and Order at 4-5 (September 29, 2012).

III. CONCLUSION

Eramet respectfully requests that this Motion for Protective Order be granted for the reasons set forth herein.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Matthew R. Pritchard

Samuel C. Randazzo

Frank P. Darr (Counsel of Record)

Matthew R. Pritchard

MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC

21 East State Street, 17th Floor

Columbus, OH 43215-4228

Telephone: (614) 469-8000

Telecopier: (614) 469-4653

sam@mwncmh.com

fdarr@mwncmh.com

mpritchard@mwncmh.com

Attorneys for Eramet Marietta, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing *Motion of Eramet Marietta, Inc. for Protective Order and Memorandum in Support* was served upon the following parties of record this 4th day of February 2013, via electronic transmission, hand-delivery or first class mail, U.S. postage prepaid.

/s/ Matthew R. Pritchard

MATTHEW R. PRITCHARD

Steven T. Nourse
Matthew J. Satterwhite
American Electric Power Service
Corporation
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
stnourse@aep.com
mjsatterwhite@aep.com

ON BEHALF OF OHIO POWER COMPANY

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

2/4/2013 2:43:40 PM

in

Case No(s). 13-0325-EL-RDR

Summary: Motion of Eramet Marietta, Inc. for Protective Order and Memorandum in Support electronically filed by Mr. Matthew R. Pritchard on behalf of Eramet Marietta, Inc.