

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio)	
Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric)	
Illuminating Company, and The Toledo)	
Edison Company for Authority to Provide)	Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO
for a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to)	
R.C. 4928.143 in the Form of an Electric)	
Security Plan.)	

SUPPLEMENTAL JOINT MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

Pursuant to Rule 4901-1-24(D), Ohio Administrative Code, the PJM Power Providers Group (“P3”) and the Electric Power Supply Association (“EPSA”) jointly file this motion for a protective order seeking confidential treatment of various pages within the supplemental testimony of Joseph P. Kalt, Ph.D. and Attachments to his supplemental testimony which was filed earlier on behalf of P3 and EPSA in this case. This supplemental joint motion seeks confidential treatment of the same type of testimony which was requested to be protected in December, 2014. The reasons underlying this motion are detailed in the attached memorandum in support. Consistent with the above cited rule, two (2) unredacted copies of the testimony are submitted under seal.

Respectfully submitted,



M. Howard Petricoff
Michael J. Settineri
Gretchen L. Petrucci
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP
52 E. Gay Street
Columbus, OH 43215
614-464-5414
mhpetricoff@vorys.com
mjsettineri@vorys.com
glpetrucci@vorys.com

Attorneys for the PJM Power Providers Group and the
Electric Power Supply Association

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT
OF SUPPLEMENTAL JOINT MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**

P3 and EPSA respectfully request that various pages and Attachments of their witness, Joseph R. Kalt, Ph.D., supplemental testimony be protected from public disclosure. The information for which protection is sought is the same type of information that the FirstEnergy Companies assert is confidential and proprietary and would harm FirstEnergy if released to the public. A similar motion for protective order was filed in December, 2014.

Rule 4901-1-24(D) of the Ohio Administrative Code 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. State law recognizes the need to protect certain types of information which are the subject of this motion. 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 financial information which is the subject of this motion.

In State ex rel The Plain Dealer the Ohio Dept. of Ins. (1997), 80 Ohio St. 3d 513, the Ohio Supreme Court adopted a six factor test to analyze whether information is a trade secret under the statute:

(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.

Id. at 524-525 (quoting Pyromatics, Inc. v. Petruziello, 7 Ohio App. 3d 131, 134-135 (Cuyahoga County 1983)).

Applying these factors to the redacted portion of the supplemental testimony of P3 and EPSA witness Dr. Kalt, it is clear that a protective order should be granted.

The redacted supplemental testimony and Attachments contain information that the FirstEnergy Companies assert is confidential and proprietary and would harm FirstEnergy if released to the public.

Courts of other jurisdictions have held that not only does a public utilities commission have the authority to protect the trade secrets of the companies subject to its jurisdiction, the trade secrets 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, and now the new entrants who will be providing power through the Uniform Trade Secrets Act.

WHEREFORE, for the above reasons, the PJM Power Providers Group and the Electric Power Supply Association respectfully request that the Commission grant its motion for protective order and maintain the subject portions of this supplemental testimony under seal.

Respectfully submitted,



M. Howard Petricoff
Michael J. Settineri
Gretchen L. Petrucci
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP
52 E. Gay Street
Columbus, OH 43215
614-464-5414
mhpetricoff@vorys.com
mjsettineri@vorys.com
glpetrucci@vorys.com

Attorneys for the PJM Power Providers Group and the
Electric Power Supply Association

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio e-filing system will electronically serve notice of the filing of this document on the parties referenced in the service list of the docket card who have electronically subscribed to this case. In addition, the undersigned certifies that a courtesy copy of the foregoing document is also being served upon the persons below via electronic mail this 11th day of May, 2015.

Gretchen L. Petrucci

Gretchen L. Petrucci

by Stephen M. Haward

burkj@firstenergycorp.com
cdunn@firstenergycorp.com
jlang@calfee.com
tallexander@calfee.com
dakutik@jonesday.com
cmooney@ohiopartners.org
drinebolt@ohiopartners.org
tdoughtery@theoec.org
joseph.clark@directenergy.com
gghull@eckertseamans.com
sam@mwncmh.com
fdarr@mwncmh.com
mpritchard@mwncmh.com
mkurtz@BKLlawfirm.com
kboehm@BKLlawfirm.com
jkylercohn@BKLlawfirm.com
larry.sauer@occ.ohio.gov
kevin.moore@occ.ohio.gov
joliker@igsenergy.com
mswhite@igsenergy.com
myurick@taftlaw.com
schmidt@sppgrp.com
ricks@ohanet.org
tobrien@bricker.com
stnourse@aep.com
mjsatterwhite@aep.com
yalami@aep.com
callwein@wamenergylaw.com
jfinnigan@edf.org
wtpmlc@aol.com

mkl@bbrslaw.com
gas@bbrslaw.com
ojk@bbrslaw.com
lhawrot@spilmanlaw.com
dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com
meissnerjoseph@yahoo.com
trhayslaw@gmail.com
lesliekovacik@toledo.oh.gov
cynthia.brady@exeloncorp.com
david.fein@exeloncorp.com
lael.campbell@exeloncorp.com
christopher.miller@icemiller.com
gregory.dunn@icemiller.com
jeremy.grayem@icemiller.com
BarthRoyer@aol.com
athompson@taftlaw.com
Marilyn@wflawfirm.com
blanghenry@city.cleveland.oh.us
hmadorsky@city.cleveland.oh.us
kryan@city.cleveland.oh.us
selisar@mwncmh.com
ccunningham@akronohio.gov
bojko@carpenterlipps.com
allison@carpenterlipps.com
hussey@carpenterlipps.com
gkrassen@bricker.com
dstinson@bricker.com
dborchers@bricker.com
asonderman@keglerbrown.com
mfleisher@elpc.org

mitch.dutton@fpl.com
matt@matthewcoxlaw.com
todonnell@dickinsonwright.com
amy.spiller@duke-energy.com
jeanne.kingery@duke-energy.com
jeffrey.mayes@monitoringanalytics.com
toddm@wamenergylaw.com
sechler@carpenterlipps.com
gpoulos@enernoc.com
mhpetricoff@vorys.com
mjsettineri@vorys.com
glpetrucci@vorys.com
thomas.mcnamee@puc.state.oh.us
Thomas.lindgren@puc.state.oh.us
ryan.orourke@puc.state.oh.us
sfisk@earthjustice.org
msoules@earthjustice.org
tony.mendoza@sierraclub.org
laurac@chappelleconsulting.net
gthomas@gtpowergroup.com
stheodore@epsa.org
mdortch@kravitzllc.com
rparsons@kravitzllc.com
dparram@taftlaw.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

5/11/2015 4:56:49 PM

in

Case No(s). 14-1297-EL-SSO

Summary: Motion Supplemental Joint Motion for Protective Order electronically filed by M
HOWARD PETRICOFF on behalf of PJM Power Providers Group and Electric Power Supply
Association