

**BEFORE THE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Commission's)	
Investigation into Intrastate Carrier)	Case No. 10-2387-TP-COI
Access Reform Pursuant to Sub. S.B. 162)	

**THE CHAMPAIGN TELEPHONE COMPANY'S
MOTION TO EXTEND PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Pursuant to Ohio Administrative Code § 4901-1-24(F), The Champaign Telephone Company ("Champaign") moves to continue to protect the information filed under seal in this docket in 2012 and protected by Entry of October 10, 2014, for the reasons set forth in the attached memorandum in support.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ William A. Adams

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)

Wadams@baileycav.com

Attorneys for The Champaign Telephone Company.

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION TO EXTEND PROTECTIVE ORDER

Champaign seeks continued protection for the confidential information previously filed under seal in 2012 and determined to be trade secret and protected from public disclosure by the October 10, 2014 Entry. The information was filed under seal in compliance with previous Commission Entries seeking highly sensitive access-related information as part of its investigation in this docket and accompanied by similar motions for protective order. The information includes intrastate access demand units and related derived revenues. The information filed under seal remains competitively sensitive trade secret information and public disclosure would impair Champaign's ability to compete in the marketplace and provide competitors with an unfair competitive advantage.

The existing protection expires on October 10, 2016. This motion is filed more than forty-five (45) days before that deadline in compliance with the requirements of Ohio Adm. Code § 4901-1-24(F).

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 (Ohio Adm. Code § 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.

Ohio Rev. Code § 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 Ohio Rev. Code §§ 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 Ohio Rev. Code § 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. Ohio Rev. Code § 149.43(A)(1)(v). In turn, state law prohibits the release of information meeting the definition of a trade secret. Ohio Rev. Code §§ 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. The Ohio Supreme Court has made clear that the "state or federal law" exemption is intended to cover trade secrets. *State ex rel. Besser v. Ohio State University*, 89 Ohio St. 396, 399, 732 N.E.2d 373 (2000).

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.

The Ohio Supreme Court adopted these factors in *State ex rel. The Plain Dealer v. Ohio Dept. of Ins.*, 80 Ohio St. 3d 513, 524-525, 687 N.E.2d 661 (1997).

Champaign has treated all of the designated information as a trade secret. In the ordinary course of business, this information is treated as proprietary and confidential by Champaign employees, and is not publicly disclosed.

For the foregoing reasons, Champaign requests that the protective order be extended and the designated information continue to be protected from public disclosure.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ William A. Adams

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)

WAdams@baileycav.com

Attorneys for The Champaign Telephone Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true copy of the foregoing *The Champaign Telephone Company's Motion to Extend Protective Order* by electronic mail this 17th day of August, 2016, upon the parties listed below.

/s/ William A. Adams

William A. Adams, Counsel of Record

SERVICE LIST

William Wright
Assistant Attorney General
Chief, Public Utilities Section
180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
bill.wright@puc.state.oh.us

Frontier Communications Corporation
Kevin Saville
Associate General Counsel
Frontier Communications Corporation
2378 Wilshire Boulevard
Mound, MN 55364
kevin.saville@FTR.com

Verizon
Barth E. Royer
Bell & Royer, LPA
33 South Grant Avenue
Columbus, OH 43215
barthroyer@aol.com

Ohio Cable Telecommunications Association
Stephen M. Howard
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP
P.O. Box 1008
Columbus, OH 43216-1008
smhoward@vorys.com

Ohio Consumers' Counsel
Terry L. Etter
Assistant Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, OH 43215
etter@occ.state.oh.us

Century Link
Joshua S. Motzer
CenturyLink
50 West Broad Street, Suite 3600
Columbus, OH 43215
Josh.motzer@centurylink.com

Cincinnati Bell
Douglas E. Hart
Cincinnati Bell
441 Vine Street, Suite 4192
Cincinnati, OH 45202
dhart@douglasschart.com

The AT&T Entities
Mark R. Ortlieb
AT&T Services, Inc.
225 West Randolph, Floor 25D
Chicago, IL 60606
mo2753@att.com

T-Mobile USA, Inc.

Garnet Hanly
T-Mobile USA, Inc.
401 Ninth Street, NW, Suite 550
Washington, DC 20004
garnet.hanly@T-Mobile.com

Sprint Nextel

Diane C. Browning
Sprint Nextel
6450 Sprint Parkway
Overland Park, KS 66251
diane.c.browning@sprint.com

Nova Telephone Company

David A. Ferris
The Ferris Law Group LLC
6797 North High Street, Suite 214
Worthington, OH 43085
dferris@ferrislawgroup.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

8/17/2016 4:15:36 PM

in

Case No(s). 10-2387-TP-COI

Summary: Motion to Extend Protective Order electronically filed by Mr. William A. Adams on behalf of The Champaign Telephone Company