## **Confidential Release**

Case Number: 93-487-TP-ALT

**Date of Confidential Document:** 5/1/1997

Today's Date: July 30, 2009

Motion

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of The Ohio Bell Telephone Company for Approval of an Alternative Form of Regulation.

Case No. 93-487-TP-ALT

#### AMERITECH OHIO'S MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER

Ameritech Ohio, 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 contained in the filing accompanying this motion. 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.

Respectfully submitted,

AMERITECH OHIO

By:

Michael T. Mulcahy (Trial Attorney)
45 Erieview Plaza, Suite 1400
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

(216) 822-3437

Jon F. Kelly 150 E. Gay St., Rm. 4-C Columbus, Ohio 43215 (614) 223-7928

Its Attorneys

## MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

Ameritech Ohio requests that the information designated as confidential and/or proprietary in the accompanying filing (along with any and all copies, including electronic copies) 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, state law prohibits the release of the information which is the subject of this motion. Moreover, the 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 fulfill its statutory obligations. 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 obliqations 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).

The Ohio General Assembly recently amended R. C. §§
4901.12 and 4905.07 in order to facilitate the protection of
trade secrets in the Commission's possession. Am. Sub. H. B.
476, effective September 17, 1996. 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 <u>Pyromatics</u>, <u>Inc. v. Petruziello</u>, 7 Ohio App. 3d 131, 134-135 (Cuyahoga County 1983), the Court of Appeals, citing <u>Koch</u> <u>Engineering Co. v. Faulconer</u>, 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, Ameritech Ohio considers and has treated the information as a trade secret. In the ordinary course of business of

Ameritech Ohio, this information is stamped confidential, is treated as proprietary and confidential by Ameritech 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 protective agreement.

The Attachment to this Memorandum in Support lists the information which has been redacted from the associated filing and further describes why it should be granted protected status. For the foregoing reasons, Ameritech Ohio requests that the designated information be protected from public disclosure.

Respectfully submitted,

AMERITECH OHIO

By:

Jon F. Kelly

150 E. Gay St., Room 4-C

Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 223-7928

Its Attorney

#### Information Redacted

Quantities and Revenues

#### Reasons

The quantity and revenue information set forth in Exhibit 3 to the price cap filing is competitively sensitive. It identifies quantity and revenue numbers associated with the proposed price reductions for discrete services. The totals have not been redacted so as to permit confirmation of the price cap calculations. Public disclosure of the quantities and revenues for discrete services would impair Ameritech Ohio's ability to respond to competitive opportunities in the marketplace and would reveal the Company's trade secret information to competitors.

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Motion for a Protective Order was served upon counsel for the parties as shown on the attached service list, by prepaid first class U. S. mail, this 1st day of May, 1997.

Jon F. Kelly

### SERVICE LIST CASE NO. 93-487-TP-ALT

#### TIME WARNER AxS

Samuel C. Randazzo Emens, Kegler, Brown, Hill & Ritter 65 East State Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215

## CABLEVISION LIGHTPATH, INC.

**NEW PAR COMPANIES** 

Sally W. Bloomfield Mary W. Christensen Bricker & Eckler 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291

#### **METAS**

Dennis K. Muncy Meyer, Capel, Hirschfield, Muncy, Jahn & Aldeen Athenaeum Building 306 West Church Street, P.O. Box 6750 Champaign, Illinois 61826-6750

#### AT&T

Robert W. Quinn, Jr. AT&T 227 West Monroe Street, Suite 1300 Chicago, Illinois 60606

#### <u>ENHANCED TELEMANAGEMENT.</u> INC.

Gena M. Doyscher
Director, External Affairs
730 2nd Avenue South, Suite 1200
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2467

#### CITY OF TOLEDO

Kerry Bruce, Utility Rate Coordinator Department of Public Utilities City of Toledo One Government Center, Suite 1520 Toledo, Ohio 43604

#### CITY OF CLEVELAND

William M. Ondrey Gruber Chief Assistant Director of Law City of Cleveland 601 Lakeside Avenue, Room 106 Cleveland, Ohio 44114

#### LITEL/LDDS/MCI/SPRINT

Judith B. Sanders
Barth Royer
Bell, Royer & Sanders Co., L.P.A.
33 South Grant Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3927

#### **GCWRO**

Joseph P. Meissner
Director of Urban Development
Cleveland Legal Aid Society
1223 West Sixth Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44113

#### DOD/FEA

Robert Ganton
Department of the Navy
Office of Judge Advocate General
901 North Stuart Street, Room 400
Arlington, Virginia 22203-1837

## BELL COMMUNICATIONS

RESEARCH, INC.
William A. Adams
Arter & Hadden
10 West Broad Street, Suite 2100
Columbus, Ohio 43215

#### DOE

Karin W. Rilley
John Ware
Office of the Attorney General
30 East Broad Street, 15th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0410

#### **AARP**

Bruce J. Weston 169 West Hubbard Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43215-1439

#### **CITY OF COLUMBUS**

Gregory J. Dunn, Esq.
Crabbe, Brown, Jones, Potts & Schmidt
500 South Front Street, Suite 1200
Columbus, Ohio 43215

#### DAS

Daniel A. Malkoff
Jerry Kasai
Office of the Attorney General
30 East Broad Street, 26th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3428

#### OPCA/ODVN/MENTOR

Randy J. Hart Hahn, Loeser & Parks 3300 BP American Building 200 Public Square Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Janine Migden
Hahn, Loeser & Parks
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3420

#### TCG CLEVELAND

Douglas W. Trabaris
Madelon Kuchera
Teleport Communications Group
233 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606

#### LDDS COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Frank T. Gardella LDDS Communications, Inc. 2800 River Road, Suite 490 Des Plaines, Illinois 60018

# OHIO NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION OHIO LIBRARY COUNCIL

Sheldon A. Taft Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease 52 East Gay Street, P.O. Box 1008 Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008

#### **SPRINT**

Martha Jenkins 8140 Ward Parkway Kansas City, Missouri 64114

#### MCl

Darrell Townsley
MCI
205 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60601

#### GAIL O. LUNDSTROM

No More Phone Tag 2550 Corporate Exchange Drive Columbus, Ohio 43231

## EDGEMONT NEIGHBORHOOD

## COALITION

Ellis Jacobs
333 West First Street, Suite 500
Dayton, Ohio 45402

### PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

Ann E. Henkener, Assistant Attorney
General, Public Utilities Section
180 East Broad Street, 7th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

# OFFICE OF THE CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

David C. Bergmann
Assistant Consumers' Counsel
77 South High Street, 15th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0550

<u>OCTVA</u>

William S. Newcomb, Jr.
Stephen M. Howard
Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease
52 East Gay Street, P.O. Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216

ļ