

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of)
Ohio Power Company to Adjust The) Case No. 14-1329-EL-RDR
Economic Development Cost Recovery)
Rider Rate)

**MOTION OF ERAMET MARIETTA, INC. TO EXTEND THE
PROTECTIVE ORDER AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

Samuel C. Randazzo (Reg. No. 0016386)
Frank P. Darr (Reg. No. 0025469)
(Counsel of Record)
Matthew R. Pritchard (Reg. No. 0088070)
MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC
21 East State Street, 17TH Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
Telephone: (614) 469-8000
Telecopier: (614) 469-4653
sam@mwncmh.com
fdarr@mwncmh.com
(willing to accept service by e-mail)
mpritchard@mwncmh.com
(willing to accept service by e-mail)

July 22, 2016

Attorneys for Eramet Marietta, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Matthew R. Pritchard

Samuel C. Randazzo (Reg. No. 0016386)

Frank P. Darr (Reg. No. 0025469)

(Counsel of Record)

Matthew R. Pritchard (Reg. No. 0088070)

MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC

21 East State Street, 17th Floor

Columbus, OH 43215-4228

sam@mwncmh.com

fdarr@mwncmh.com

mpritchard@mwncmh.com

level of the rider at zero, to be updated quarterly.³ The EDR was reauthorized in AEP-Ohio's second ESP proceeding and is filed semi-annually.⁴ The rider is calculated as a percentage of a customer's distribution charges.

On August 1, 2014, AEP-Ohio initiated this semi-annual update case by filing an application requesting that the Commission adjust AEP-Ohio's EDR. AEP-Ohio's August 1, 2014 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. To protect its confidential information, Eramet sought to intervene in this proceeding and filed a Motion for Protective Order.

The Commission granted Eramet's Motion to Intervene and Motion for Protective Order, finding that the customer-specific information constituted a trade secret in an Order dated September 17, 2014.⁵ In its Order, the Commission specified that its Protective Order would extend for a period of 24 months, and specified that should Eramet wish to extend the Protective Order it should file a motion requesting an extension at least 45 days before the expiration of the Protective Order.⁶

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

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 (Mar. 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 (Aug. 8, 2012).

⁵ Finding and Order at 4 (Sept. 17, 2014).

⁶ *Id.*

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 documents from disclosure.⁷ 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.⁸ 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.

⁷ See Sections 4901.12 and 4905.07, Revised Code.

⁸ 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).

- (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.⁹ The information for which 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. Additionally, the efforts to protect the confidential pricing information are reasonable under the circumstances. Further, actual customer usage and pricing terms are routinely accorded protected status by the Commission and the Commission has previously accorded such treatment to Eramet's information in other AEP-Ohio EDR cases.¹⁰ Finally, the Commission has already found in this

⁹ Section 1333.61(D), Revised Code.

¹⁰ *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 (Oct. 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, Finding and Order at 4-5 (Mar. 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, Finding and Order at 4-5 (Sept. 26, 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. 13-325-EL-RDR, Finding and Order at 4 (Mar. 27, 2013); *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust Its Economic Development Cost Recovery Rider Rate*, Case No. 13-1739-EL-RDR, Finding and Order at 4 (Sept. 18, 2013); *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. 13-325-EL-RDR, Finding and Order at 4 (Mar. 27, 2013); *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust Its Economic Development Cost Recovery Rider Rate*, Case No. 13-1739-EL-RDR,

proceeding that Eramet's customer-specific information filed under seal in the confidential version of AEP-Ohio's application was a trade secret and should be afforded protected status.¹¹

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.

III. CONCLUSION

Eramet respectfully requests that this Motion to Extend the Protective Order be granted and the Protective Order be extended for a period of 24 months for the reasons set forth herein.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Matthew R. Pritchard

Samuel C. Randazzo (Reg. No. 0016386)

Frank P. Darr (Reg. No. 0025469)

(Counsel of Record)

Matthew R. Pritchard (Reg. No. 0088070)

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

Finding and Order at 4 (Sept. 18, 2013); *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust Its Economic Development Rider Rate*, Case No. 14-193-EL-RDR, Finding and Order at 4-5 (Mar. 26, 2014); *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust Its Economic Development Rider Rate*, Case No. 15-279-EL-RDR, Finding and Order at 3-4 (Mar. 18, 2015); *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust Its Economic Development Rider Rate*, Case No. 15-1400-EL-RDR, Finding and Order at 3-4 (Nov. 18, 2015); *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust Its Economic Development Rider Rate*, Case No. 16-260-EL-RDR, Finding and Order at 3-4 (Mar. 31, 2016).

¹¹ Finding and Order at 4 (Sep. 17, 2014).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

In accordance with Rule 4901-1-05, Ohio Administrative Code, the PUCO's e-filing system will electronically serve notice of the filing of this document upon the following parties. In addition, I hereby certify that a service copy of the foregoing *Motion of Eramet Marietta, Inc. to Extend the Protective Order and Memorandum in Support* was sent by, or on behalf of, the undersigned counsel for Eramet Marietta, Inc. to the following parties of record this 22nd day of July 2016, via electronic transmission.

/s/ Matthew R. Pritchard

MATTHEW R. PRITCHARD

Steven T. Nourse (Reg. No. 0046705)

Matthew J. Satterwhite (Reg. No. 0071972)

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

Michael J. Settineri (Reg. No. 0073369)
(Counsel of Record)

Gretchen L. Petrucci (Reg. No. 0046608)

52 East Gay Street

P.O. Box 1008

Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008

mhpetricoff@vorys.com

mjsettineri@vorys.com

glpetrucci@vorys.com

ON BEHALF OF THE TIMKEN COMPANY AND TIMKENSTEEL CORPORATION

William L. Wright (Reg. No. 0018010)

Chief, Public Utilities Section

Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General

30 E. Broad St., 16th Floor

Columbus, OH 43215

william.wright@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

ON BEHALF OF THE STAFF OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

Sarah Parrot (Reg. No. 0082197)

Greta See

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Legal Department

180 East Broad Street, 12th Floor

Columbus, OH 43215

sarah.parrot@puc.state.oh.us

greta.see@puc.state.oh.us

ATTORNEY EXAMINERS

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

7/22/2016 1:18:14 PM

in

Case No(s). 14-1329-EL-RDR

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