

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of)
Ohio Power Company to Adjust) Case No. 14-193-EL-RDR
The Economic Development Cost)
Recovery Rider Rate)

**MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER AND
MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT
OF ERAMET MARIETTA INC.**

Samuel C. Randazzo
Frank P. Darr (Counsel of Record)
Matthew R. Pritchard
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

February 26, 2014

Attorneys for Eramet Marietta Inc.

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of)
Ohio Power Company to Adjust) Case No. 14-193-EL-RDR
The Economic Development Cost)
Recovery Rider Rate)

**MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER
OF ERAMET MARIETTA INC.**

Pursuant to Rule 4901-1-24, Ohio Administrative Code (“O.A.C.”), Eramet Marietta Inc. (“Eramet”) respectfully moves the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“Commission”) to issue a Protective Order to protect the confidentiality and prohibit the disclosure of the confidential information contained in the revised schedules of Ohio Power Company (“AEP-Ohio”) filed by AEP-Ohio under seal on February 21, 2014 in this proceeding to support its February 3, 2014 application to adjust its Economic Development Cost Recovery Rider (“EDR”) rates. Eramet has already moved for protective treatment of its confidential information contained in the February 3, 2014 application. However, AEP-Ohio’s revised schedules filed on February 21, 2014 also contain Eramet’s confidential information that is not subject to disclosure and includes competitively sensitive and highly proprietary business information comprising trade secrets. The grounds for this Motion are set forth in the attached Memorandum in Support.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Matthew R. Pritchard

Samuel C. Randazzo

Frank P. Darr (Counsel of Record)

Matthew R. Pritchard

MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC

21 East State Street, 17th Floor

Columbus, OH 43215-4228

sam@mwncmh.com

fdarr@mwncmh.com

mpritchard@mwncmh.com

Attorneys for Eramet Marietta Inc.

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of)
Ohio Power Company to Adjust) Case No. 14-193-EL-RDR
The Economic Development Cost)
Recovery Rider Rate)

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

On June 19, 2009, Eramet filed an application for approval of a reasonable arrangement with AEP-Ohio to permit Eramet to upgrade its manufacturing facility in Ohio.¹ On August 5, 2009, Eramet and Commission Staff filed a Joint Stipulation and Recommendation resolving the issues in the case (“Stipulation”).² On October 15, 2009, the Commission issued an Opinion and Order approving the Stipulation with modifications. On March 24, 2010, the Commission issued an Entry on Rehearing denying Applications for Rehearing and upholding its Opinion and Order approving the Stipulation.

In AEP-Ohio’s initial electric security plan (“ESP”) proceeding (Case Nos. 08-917-EL-SSO, *et al.*), the Commission authorized AEP-Ohio’s EDR to recover economic development amounts authorized by the Commission in reasonable arrangement cases. In the initial ESP proceeding, the Commission also set the initial

¹ The application, as filed and approved, was between Eramet and Columbus Southern Power Company (“CSP”). However, CSP has since merged with Ohio Power Company.

² *In the Matter of the Application for Establishment of a Reasonable Arrangement between Eramet Marietta Inc. and Columbus Southern Power Company*, Case No. 09-516-EL-AEC, Joint Stipulation and Recommendation (August 5, 2009).

level of the rider at zero.³ The EDR was reauthorized in AEP-Ohio's second ESP proceeding.⁴ The rider is calculated as a percentage of a customer's distribution charges. On February 3, 2014, AEP-Ohio initiated this semiannual update case by filing an application requesting that the Commission adjust AEP-Ohio's EDR. AEP-Ohio's February 3, 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. On February 3, 2014, AEP-Ohio also filed a Motion for Protective Order regarding the Eramet-specific information, but took no position as to whether the Eramet-specific information should remain confidential.⁵ On February 4, 2014, Eramet filed a Motion to Intervene and a Motion for Protective Order regarding Eramet's confidential information contained in the February 3, 2014 application.

On February 21, 2014, AEP-Ohio filed revised schedules supporting its February 3, 2014 application. The revised schedules filed on February 21, 2014 also contain 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.

For the reasons stated in Eramet's first Motion for Protective Order filed on February 4, 2014 in this proceeding and for the reasons stated below, Eramet

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 (March 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 (August 8, 2012).

⁵ AEP-Ohio Motion for Protective Order at 2 (February 3, 2014).

respectfully requests that the Commission grant protective treatment of Eramet's customer-specific information included to support AEP-Ohio's EDR adjustment filed under seal.

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.⁶ 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.⁷ 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

⁶ See Sections 4901.12 and 4905.07, Revised Code.

⁷ 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).

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.

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.⁸ 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. Further, the efforts to protect the confidential pricing information are reasonable under the circumstances. Finally, actual customer usage and pricing terms are routinely accorded protected status by the Commission and the Commission accorded such treatment to Eramet's information in AEP-Ohio's previous EDR update proceedings.⁹

⁸ Section 1333.61(D), Revised Code.

⁹ *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 (October 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 (March 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*

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 for Protective Order be granted for the reasons set forth herein.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Matthew R. Pritchard

Samuel C. Randazzo
Frank P. Darr (Counsel of Record)
Matthew R. Pritchard
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
mpritichard@mwncmh.com

Attorneys for Eramet Marietta Inc.

Code, Case No. 12-2210-EL-RDR, Finding and Order at 4-5 (September 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 (March 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 (September 18, 2013).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing *Motion for Protective Order of Eramet Marietta Inc. and Memorandum in Support* was served upon the following parties of record this 26th day of February 2014, *via* electronic transmission, hand-delivery or first class U.S. mail, postage prepaid.

/s/ Matthew R. Pritchard

MATTHEW R. PRITCHARD

Steven T. Nourse
American Electric Power Service
Corporation
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
stnourse@aep.com

ON BEHALF OF OHIO POWER COMPANY

M. Howard Petricoff
Michael J. Settineri
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP
52 E. Gay Street
Columbus, OH 43215
mhpeticoff@vorys.com
mjsettineri@vorys.com

ON BEHALF OF THE TIMKEN COMPANY

BRUCE J. WESTON
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL
Maureen R. Grady, Counsel of Record
Edmund J. Berger
Assistant Consumers' Counsel
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, OH 43215-3485
maureen.grady@occ.state.oh.us
edmund.berger@occ.state.oh.us

ON BEHALF OF THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

William L. Wright
Assistant Attorney General
Chief, Public Utilities Section
180 E. Broad Street, 6th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793
William.wright@puc.state.oh.us

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

Samuel C. Randazzo
Frank P. Darr (Counsel of Record)
Matthew R. Pritchard
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

ON BEHALF OF GLOBE METALLURGICAL, INC. AND INDUSTRIAL ENERGY USERS-OHIO

Sarah Parrot
Attorney Examiner
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 East Broad Street, 12th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
sarah.parrot@puc.state.oh.us

ATTORNEY EXAMINER

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

2/26/2014 10:15:45 AM

in

Case No(s). 14-0193-EL-RDR

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