

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of)
Columbus Southern Power Company and)
Ohio Power Company for Authority to)
Recover Costs Associated with the Ultimate) Case No. 05-376-EL-UNC
Construction and Operation of an Integrated)
Gasification Combined Cycle Electric)
Generation Facility.)

ENTRY

The Attorney Examiner finds:

- (1) By Opinion and Order issued on April 10, 2006 (Order), the Commission, among other things, affirmed the Attorney Examiner's rule to grant the requests of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company (jointly, AEP-Ohio or Companies) and General Electric Company, GE Energy (USA), LLC, Bechtel Corporation and Bechtel Power Corporation (jointly, GE/Bechtel) for protective treatment of certain documents containing trade secrets, pursuant to Section 1333.61(D), Revised Code, and critical energy infrastructure information (CEII), as defined by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. GE/Bechtel are vendors with whom AEP-Ohio contracted to provide certain services in relation to the engineering, design and construction of an integrated gasification combined cycle (IGCC) facility. Accordingly, the Commission directed that the documents at issue remain under seal for 18 months from the date of the Order, until October 10, 2007.
- (2) By entries issued October 11, 2007, and April 29, 2009, the requests of AEP-Ohio and GE/Bechtel to extend the protective order were granted.
- (3) On August 25, 2010, AEP-Ohio filed a motion to further extend the protective order. The motion includes affidavits from American Electric Power Service Corporation (AEP-SC), Sargent & Lundy (S&L) and Battelle Memorial Institute (Battelle) in support of the original motion for protective order and the current motion to extend the protective order. AEP-Ohio notes that the Companies' request for protective

treatment in this case included only a portion of four exhibits (OCC Exs. 6 and 7, OEG Ex. 3 and IEU Ex. 8) and redacted versions of the protected exhibits are part of the public record. AEP-Ohio states that the protected documents refer to the site selection analyses performed in the Eastern State Site Selection Study prepared by S&L and the Site Screening Analysis for Geologic Carbon Sequestration Suitability conducted by Battelle. AEP-Ohio states that the materials deserve continued protection as represented in the affidavits filed by the Companies, S&L, and Battelle on August 8, 2005, and the current motion to extend protective treatment. AEP-Ohio argues that the affidavits establish that: (a) the protected information contains site evaluation data, ranking criteria, weighted values used and total weighted scores for the sites studied and includes S&L's or Battelle's evaluation methodology; (b) the protected information is treated as confidential by S&L or Battelle and is not released in the public domain; (c) the protected information represents S&L's or Battelle's work product and has commercial value to each of them; (d) the protected information could be used by S&L's or Battelle's respective competitors as a basis for providing similar services to other clients; and (e) Battelle and/or S&L will suffer competitive harm if the information is released into the public domain or treated in a non-confidential manner.

- (4) In regard to the site selection and carbon sequestration studies, AEP-Ohio contends that the list of sites in the reports is not in the public domain as identification of all the sites is strategically important to AEP-Ohio and its affiliates within the American Electric Power Corporation (AEP system) for future expansion plans. According to AEP-Ohio, knowledge of the sites by competitors could potentially affect AEP system's plans to use such sites for power facilities in the future. The sites listed in the studies also include development activities by non-affiliated entities with which AEP system has a non-disclosure agreement concerning proposed projects. AEP-Ohio states that the disclosure of the scoring of the individual sites, relative to one another, will likely harm AEP system and other non-affiliated entities by putting them at a competitive disadvantage in any negotiations to sell low ranking sites. Finally, AEP-Ohio states that AEP system has maintained the confidentiality of the reports and the reports have not been released to third parties without the execution of a non-

disclosure agreement. AEP-Ohio concludes that the law, on which the original motion for protective order was granted by the Commission, affirmed on rehearing, and extended, is the same and, therefore, as a matter of law, the information is still entitled to protection from public disclosure. AEP-Ohio contends that the information will remain commercially valuable for a prolonged period and, therefore, requests that the Commission extend the protective order for a four-year period.

- (5) On August 27, 2010, GE/Bechtel also filed a motion to extend the protective order for an additional 48 months. GE/Bechtel submits that the documents under protective order include financial and technical information relative to its association with AEP-Ohio for the construction of an IGCC facility. GE/Bechtel argues, as attested to in the affidavits previously provided and the affidavits attached to the current motion for an extension of the protective order, that the information protected under seal meets the requirements of a trade secret, pursuant to Section 1333.61(D), Revised Code. GE/Bechtel further states that the information continues to be highly valuable information to its competitors and the company continues to protect the secrecy of the information. GE/Bechtel, therefore, requests that the protective order be extended.
- (6) No party to the proceeding filed a memorandum opposing the requests to extend protective treatment.
- (7) Pursuant to Rule 4901-1-24, Ohio Administrative Code (O.A.C.), to be granted an extension of a protective order the applicant must comply with two requirements: timely file the motion and provide a detailed explanation stating why the information requires continued protective treatment. AEP-Ohio and GE/Bechtel have presented sufficient reason to extend their respective protective orders. The Order established that the protected documents include trade secrets and CEII; information which is entitled to protective treatment. AEP-Ohio and GE/Bechtel have presented reasonable arguments that the protected information continues to retain some value, as against their respective competitors and the protected information has not been made public. As such, the protected information retains a significant share of its value to

AEP-Ohio, and its third party vendors, S&L, Battelle and GE/Bechtel. Accordingly, the protective order should be extended.


- (8) However, AEP-Ohio and GE/Bechtel also request that the protective order be extended for at least four years. AEP-Ohio and GE/Bechtel argue that the information will retain its value for many years.
- (9) Rule 4901-1-24, O.A.C., provides that unless otherwise ordered, protective orders automatically expire after 18 months. In this case, AEP-Ohio and GE/Bechtel request that the Commission grant their request for protective treatment for four years due to the fact that the information continues to retain value as against their respective competitors. The Attorney Examiner recognizes that not only does the protected information include trade secrets that continue to retain their value, it also includes CEII. CEII is not as dynamic as an entity's financial statements, and CEII is also granted protective treatment for security purposes. Therefore, the Attorney Examiner finds it reasonable, in this case, to waive the standard 18-month protective order period. However, rather than extending the protective treatment for four years, AEP-Ohio's and GE/Bechtel's motions for an extension of the protective orders should be granted for a period of 36 months from the date the current protective order expired. Accordingly, the protective order granted in accordance with this entry to AEP-Ohio and GE/Bechtel shall be extended until October 10, 2013.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED, That AEP-Ohio's and GE/Bechtel's requests to extend the protective order are granted. Accordingly, the Docketing Division shall maintain under seal the information granted protective treatment in this case for an additional 36 months from the date the current protective order expired, until October 10, 2013. It is, further,

ORDERED, That a copy of this entry be served upon all parties of record in this case.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO




By: Greta See
Attorney Examiner

grg
/vrm

Entered in the Journal

MAR 02 2011



Renee J. Jenkins
Secretary