

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio)	
Power Company to Adjust The Economic)	Case No. 16-0260-EL-RDR
Development Cost Recovery Rider Rate)	

**MOTION OF TIMKENSTEEL CORPORATION
TO EXTEND PROTECTIVE ORDER AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

Under Rule 4901-1-24(F), Ohio Administrative Code (“O.A.C.”), TimkenSteel Corporation (“TimkenSteel”) respectfully moves the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“Commission”) to extend the Protective Order issued March 31, 2016 in this case to keep confidential certain of TimkenSteel's electrical use and billing information contained in Schedule Nos. 2 and 6 filed under seal with the February 2, 2016 Application of Ohio Power Company (“Ohio Power”) to adjust its Economic Development Cost Recovery rider (“EDR”) rates.¹ The confidential information includes competitively sensitive and highly proprietary business information comprising trade secrets and should be kept confidential.

Moreover, although this motion is filed fewer than 45 days before a March 31, 2018 deadline for expiration of protective treatment, that 45-day deadline should be waived or extended here because there is good cause to extend the protective order and no party will be prejudiced. No party challenged the protective order nor does any party have a right to public access to TimkenSteel’s individual customer information. As well, the Commission and its Staff have already decided Ohio Power’s Application and retain full access to the confidential information.

¹ *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust The Economic Development Cost Recovery Rider Rates*, Case No. 16-260-EL-RDR, Application (Feb. 2, 2016).

The grounds for this Motion are set forth in the attached Memorandum in Support.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ William A. Sieck
Michael J. Settineri (0073369)
William A. Sieck (0071813)
VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR AND PEASE LLP
52 East Gay Street
P.O. Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008
Phone: (614) 464-5462
Fax: (614) 719-5146
mjsettineri@vorys.com
wasieck@vorys.com
Attorneys for TimkenSteel Corporation

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF TIMKENSTEEL CORPORATION'S
MOTION TO EXTEND PROTECTIVE ORDER**

On December 16, 2015, TimkenSteel Corporation received approval from the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“Commission”) of a unique arrangement for TimkenSteel’s Stark County Facilities.² The Commission also granted TimkenSteel’s motion for protective order seeking to protect certain proprietary and confidential information that related to the unique arrangement application.³

On February 2, 2016, Ohio Power filed an Application, seeking to update its EDR rates.⁴ In support and as part of the Application, Ohio Power submitted under seal various schedules. Two of those schedules contain highly proprietary and confidential information as follows:

- Schedule No. 2 contains actual and estimated delta revenue amounts (by month) for TimkenSteel and monthly carrying charges.
- Schedule No. 6 contains detailed information regarding TimkenSteel’s actual and estimated monthly electric bill, monthly discounts and monthly delta revenue.⁵

The customer specific information in Schedule Nos. 2 and 6 is confidential, sensitive, and proprietary. TimkenSteel moved to intervene in Ohio Power’s EDR update case and for a protective order that its customer specific information in Schedule Nos. 2 and 6 be kept

² *In the Matter of the Application of TimkenSteel Corporation for Approval of a Unique Arrangement for the TimkenSteel Corporation’s Stark County Facilities*, Case No. 15-1857-EL-AEC, Opinion and Order (Dec. 16, 2015).

³ *See id.*, Opinion and Order at 6.

⁴ *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust The Economic Development Cost Recovery Rider Rates*, Case No. 16-260-EL-RDR, Application (Feb. 2, 2016).

⁵ Information in Schedule Nos. 2 & 6 concerns the unique arrangement approved in Case No. 15-1857-EL-AEC and a unique arrangement approved for The Timken Company and assigned to TimkenSteel in Case No. 10-3066-EL-AEC. *See In the Matter of the Joint Application of The Timken Company and the Ohio Power Company for Approval of a Unique Arrangement for The Timken Company’s Canton, Ohio Facilities*, Case No. 10-3066-EL-AEC, Opinion and Order (Apr. 27, 2011), Finding & Order at (Mar. 26, 2014) (approving assignment to TimkenSteel), Finding & Order at 3-4 (Oct. 29, 2014), and Finding & Order at 2 (Feb. 3, 2015).

confidential and under seal. The Commission granted TimkenSteel’s Motions to Intervene and for a Protective Order, finding that TimkenSteel’s customer-specific information constituted a trade secret in an Order dated March 31, 2016.⁶

The Commission specified that the Protective Order would expire after 24-months but that TimkenSteel could file a motion requesting an extension of the Protective Order at least 45 days before the expiration of the Protective Order.⁷ Although this motion is filed fewer than 45 days before a March 31, 2018 deadline for expiration of the Protective Order, that 45-day deadline should be waived or extended here because there is good cause to extend the protective order and no party will be prejudiced.

At its Stark County Facilities, TimkenSteel manufactures specialty steel products that are, and will continue to be, sold in a highly competitive international market. The confidential information contained in Schedule Nos. 2 and 6, if released to the public, would harm TimkenSteel by providing domestic and international competitors with proprietary information concerning the cost and use of electricity at the Stark County Facilities. The need to protect the designated information from public disclosure is clear, and the Commission long 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’s rules support trade secret protection. *See, e.g.*, Rule 4901-1-24(A)(7), O.A.C.

⁶ *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust The Economic Development Cost Recovery Rider Rates*, Case No. 16-0260-EL-RDR, Opinion and Order at 3-4 (Mar. 31, 2016).

⁷ *Id.* at 4 ¶ 12.

The Uniform Trade Secrets Act defines a “trade secret”:

“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.

Section 1333.61(D), Revised Code. This definition clearly reflects the state policy favoring the protection of trade secrets, such as the sensitive information in Scheduled 2 and 6.

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.

State ex rel The Plain Dealer v. Ohio Dept. of Ins., 80 Ohio St. 3d 513, 524-525 (1997) (citation and quotation omitted).

Applying these factors to the confidential information TimkenSteel seeks to protect, it is clear that the protective order should be extended. The information redacted from Schedule No. 6 contains information regarding the actual monthly electric bill, monthly discounts, and monthly

delta revenues for operations at TimkenSteel's Stark County Facilities. Schedule No. 2 contains actual delta revenue data that reflects usage at TimkenSteel's facilities. Such sensitive information is generally not disclosed. Its disclosure could disadvantage TimkenSteel relative to its competitors.

As well, no party will be prejudiced if the protective order is extended. Rule 4901-1-24(D), Ohio Administrative Code ("O.A.C.") provides for the protection of confidential 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. The non-disclosure of TimkenSteel's customer specific information in Schedule Nos. 2 and 6 will not impair the purposes of Title 49. Customer billing information and pricing terms are protected from disclosure by AEP-Ohio⁸ and are regularly accorded protected status by the Commission and the Commission accorded such treatment to Globe's information in AEP-Ohio's previous EDR update proceedings.⁹ The Commission and its Staff have already decided Ohio Power's Application and retain full access to the confidential information. As well, no party challenged

⁸ See, e.g., Rule 4901:1-37-04(D)(1), O.A.C. (prohibiting disclosure of "proprietary customer information (e.g., individual customer load profiles or billing histories)").

⁹ See, e.g., *In re Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust its Economic Development Cost Recovery Rider Rate*, Case No. 17-1714-EL-RDR, Finding and Order at 4 (Sep. 13, 2017); *In re Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust its Economic Development Cost Recovery Rider Rate*, Case No. 17-0295-EL-RDR, Finding and Order at 4 (Mar. 29, 2017); *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust Its Economic Development Rider Rate*, Case No. 16-1684-EL-RDR, Finding and Order (Sep. 22, 2016); *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust Its Economic Development Rider Rate*, Case No. 16-260-EL-RDR, Finding and Order (Mar. 31, 2016); *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust Its Economic Development Rider*, Case No. 15-279-EL-RDR, Finding and Order (March 18, 2015); *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Adjust Its Economic Development Rider Rate*, Case No. 14-1329-EL-RDR, Finding and Order (September 17, 2014); *In re 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 (March 27, 2013); *In re 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 (March 28, 2012); and *In re 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).

the Protective Order nor does any party have a right to public access to TimkenSteel's individual customer information.

Accordingly, because TimkenSteel's customer information contained in Schedule Nos. 2 and 6 of the Application constitutes a trade secret, TimkenSteel respectfully requests that this Motion be granted and the Protective Order be extended for a period of 24 months for the reasons set forth herein.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ William A. Sieck
Michael J. Settineri (0073369)
William A. Sieck (0071813)
VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR AND PEASE LLP
52 East Gay Street, P.O. Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008
Phone: (614) 464-5462
Fax: (614) 719-5146
mjsettineri@vorys.com
wasieck@vorys.com
Counsel for TimkenSteel Corporation

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

In accordance with Rule 4901-1-05, Ohio Administrative Code, the Commission's e-filing system will electronically serve notice of the filing of this document upon the following parties. In addition, I hereby certify that a service copy of the foregoing *Motion of TimkenSteel Corporation to Extend Protective Order and Memorandum in Support* is being served or on behalf of the undersigned counsel for TimkenSteel Corporation to the following counsel for parties of record *via* electronic transmission on February 19, 2018.

/s/William A. Sieck

William A. Sieck

Steven T. Nourse (0046705)
Matthew J. Satterwhite (0071972)
American Electric Power Service Corp.
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
stnourse@aep.com
mjsatterwhite@aep.com
Attorneys for Ohio Power Company

Michael J. Settineri (Reg. No. 0073369)
William A. Sieck (Reg. No. 0071813)
52 East Gay Street, P. O. Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008
mjsettineri@vorys.com
wasiack@vorys.com
Attorney for Globe Metallurgical Inc.

Greta Neeley-See (0062785)
Sarah Parrot (0082197)
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Legal Department
180 E. Broad St., 12th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43216
sarah.parrot@puc.state.oh.us
greta.see@puc.state.oh.us
Attorney Examiners

Frank P. Darr (0025469)
Matthew R. Pritchard (0088070)
McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
21 East State Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-4228
fdarr@mwncmh.com
mpritchard@mwncmh.com
Attorneys for Eramet Marietta, Inc.

William L. Wright (Reg. No. 0018010)
Chief, Public Utilities Section
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
30 E. Broad St., 16th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
william.wright@ohioattorneygeneral.gov
**Attorney for Staff of the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio**

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

2/19/2018 3:27:40 PM

in

Case No(s). 16-0260-EL-RDR

Summary: Motion of TimkenSteel Corporation to Extend Protective Order and Memorandum in Support electronically filed by Mr. William A Sieck on behalf of TimkenSteel Corporation