

FILE

7

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Complaint of)
Revolution Communications, Ltd. Against)
AT&T Ohio for Unjust and Unreasonable) Case No. 06-427-TP-CSS
Billings and Other Violations Under the)
Parties' Interconnection Agreement.)

MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER

AT&T Ohio¹, by its attorneys, and pursuant to Sections 4901-1-12 and 4901-1-24(D) of the Commission's rules (O.A.C. §§ 4901-1-12 and 4901-1-24(D)) moves for a protective order keeping confidential the designated confidential and/or proprietary information included as attachments to its reply brief filed on December 5, 2007 in the captioned 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.

RECEIVED-DEC 6 2007
2007 DEC -6 PM 4:39

PUCO

Respectfully submitted,

AT&T Ohio


Jon F. Kelly (Counsel of Record)
Mary Ryan Fenlon
AT&T Ohio
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.

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business
technician Ann Date Processed 12/7/07

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

AT&T Ohio requests that the information marked as confidential attachments to its reply brief be considered as confidential and/or proprietary and be protected from public disclosure. This information is eligible for proprietary treatment in according 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 AT&T Ohio "WFA-DI" records on specific lines in service and may disclose addresses, customer names, or other confidential information associated with those lines. Information of this nature is generally protected from public disclosure in Commission proceedings. It is marked "Not for disclosure outside this company or Telcordia Technologies, Inc. without written permission." It was provided by AT&T Ohio during discovery to Revolution under seal and pursuant to a protective agreement.

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 data provided in support of the reply brief. 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 protective agreement in this case allows the Complainant to have such access. 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



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

(614) 223-7928

Its Attorneys

06-427.motion protective order

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served on December 6, 2007 by first class mail, postage prepaid, and by e-mail, as indicated, on the following parties:



Jon F. Kelly

Revolution Communications, Ltd.

Mary Christensen
Christensen Christensen Donchatz
Kettlewell and Owens, LLP
100 East Campus View Blvd., Suite 360
Columbus, Ohio 43235

e-mail: mchristensen@columbuslaw.org

Steven R. Shaver
Friedman & Feiger, LLP
5301 Spring Valley Rd. Suite 200
Dallas, TX 75254

e-mail: sshaver@fflawoffice.com