


④

In the Matter of the Annual Filing Requirements)
For 2013 Pertaining to the Provisioning of High) Case No. 13-1115-TP-COI
Cost Universal Service)

Arthur Mutual Telephone Company (hereinafter, "Arthur Mutual"), by its attorneys and pursuant to Section 4901-1-24(D) of the Commission's Rules, moves for a protective order keeping confidential the designated confidential and/or proprietary information contained in the sealed filing accompanying this motion. The reasons underlying this motion are detailed in the attached Memorandum in Support.

0000

Respectfully submitted,


William A. Adams, Counsel of Record

William A. Adams, Counsel of Record
BAILEY CAVALIERI LLC
10 West Broad Street, Suite 2100
Columbus, OH 43215-3422
(614) 229-3278 (telephone)
(614) 221-0479 (fax)
William.Adams@baileycavalieri.com
Attorneys for Arthur Mutual Telephone Company

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

Arthur Mutual 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. The confidential information is financial and operational information filed confidentially with the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") as part of Arthur Mutual's FCC Form 481 filing. This information constitutes Arthur Mutual's confidential trade secret information and is deserving of protection.

The information set forth in this filing is clearly competitively sensitive trade secret information. Public disclosure of this information would impair Arthur Mutual's ability to respond to competitive opportunities in the marketplace, and would provide competitors with an unfair competitive advantage. A redacted version of the document has been filed on the public record showing the non-confidential information.

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 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)(v). 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 *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, Arthur Mutual considers and has treated the information as a trade secret. In the ordinary course of business of Arthur Mutual, this information is treated as proprietary and confidential by Arthur Mutual employees, and is not disclosed to anyone except in a Commission proceeding and/or pursuant to staff data request. Information of this type will be provided to other parties only pursuant to an appropriate protective agreement.

For the foregoing reasons, Arthur Mutual requests that the designated information be protected from public disclosure.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William A. Adams", is written over a horizontal line.

William A. Adams, Counsel of Record

BAILEY CAVALIERI LLC

10 West Broad Street, Suite 2100

Columbus, OH 43215-3422

(614) 229-3278 (telephone)


(614) 221-0479 (fax)

William.Adams@baileycavalieri.com

Attorneys for Arthur Mutual Telephone Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true copy of the foregoing *Motion for Protective Order of Arthur Mutual Telephone Company* by electronic mail this 15th day of October, 2013, upon the persons listed below.



William A. Adams, Counsel of Record

SERVICE LIST

United Telephone Company of Ohio d/b/a CenturyLink

Christen M. Blend
Porter Wright Morris & Arthur, LLP
41 South High Street, 30th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
cblend@porterwright.com

Frontier Communications Corporation

Cassandra F. Cole
1300 Columbus-Sandusky Road
Marion, OH 43301
cassandra.cole@ftr.com

Interstate Telecom Consulting, Inc.

Eileen M. Bodamer
415 Hepplewhite Drive
Johns Creek, GA 30022
nkelco@nktelco.net

Cincinnati Bell

Patricia L. Rupich
221 East Fourth Street, 103-1280
Cincinnati, OH 45202
pat.rupich@cinbell.com

The Pinnacle Group Inc.

Kym D. Rupeiks
167 Tampa Avenue E, # 712
Venice, FL 34285
pinnacle@blissnet.com