**BEFORE THE**

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTLIITY COMMISSION**

Application of Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater, Inc. :

for Approval of its Acquisition of Delaware County :

Regional Water Quality Control Authority’s : A-2019-3015173

Wastewater Assets, inter alia, Pursuant to Sections :

507, 1102 and 1329 of the Public Utility Code :

**PROTECTIVE ORDER**

I. INTRODUCTION

A hearing notice dated July 27, 2020, scheduled a telephonic prehearing conference for Wednesday, September 2, 2020, at 10:00 a.m. On August 31, 2020, Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater, Inc. (Applicant or Petitioner) filed a Petition for Protective Order (Petition) at this docket. The prehearing conference convened as scheduled. The undersigned asked if any party objected to the Petition. Several parties indicated an objection.[[1]](#footnote-1) The undersigned directed that written objections were due on or before close of business (4:30 p.m.) September 18, 2020.

On Thursday, September 17, 2020, the County of Delaware (Delaware) filed its Answer to the Petition. Specifically, Delaware objected to paragraph 5 in the inequitable treatment for Highly Confidential Protected Material between the public advocates and Delaware. Paragraph 5 in the Proposed Protective Order states,

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL PROTECTED MATERIAL SHALL be produced remotely, via online video conference applications, solely for inspection by counsel of record for other parties. If the inspecting lawyer desires copies of such material, or desires to disclose its contents to persons other than counsel of record,

including Reviewing Representatives, she or he shall submit a written request to the producing party’s counsel. If the requesting and producing parties are unable to reach agreement with respect to such a request, they may submit the issue to the presiding Administrative Law Judge. In the meantime, the information shall be provided only to counsel of record and to I&E, OCA and OSBA and their experts as set forth above.

Delaware suggested language that would include it along with the public advocates regarding review of Highly Confidential Protected Material as a remedy. Delaware stated that the procedure it is advocating has been used previously in *Laurel Pipeline Co. LP and Buckeye Pipeline Co. LP v. PPL Electric Utilities Corp.,* Docket No. A-2016-2575829 (Protective Order dated April 26, 2017) at ¶ 6 (*Laurel Pipeline)*. Delaware Answer at 2-5, ¶¶ 5, 8 and 10.

On Friday, September 18, 2020, Kimberly-Clark Pennsylvania, LLC, Kimberly-Clark Corporation, and Sunoco Partners Marketing & Terminals L.P. (collectively KCC&SPMT) filed a Joint Answer to the Petition. KCC&SPMT objected to the same provision that Delaware objected to. KCC&SPMT suggest that any Highly Confidential Protective Material be provided solely to outside counsel and outside experts. Counsel to KCC&SPMT would consent to seek permission from the producing party prior to distributing any Highly Confidential Material to their respective employees who qualify as Reviewing Representatives. Joint Answer at 4, ¶ 9.

The KCC&SPMT also object to paragraph 4(d) of the proposed Protective Order, which reads,

Information deemed as “CONFIDENTIAL” may be made available to a “Reviewing Representative” who is a person that has signed a Non-Disclosure Certificate attached as Appendix A, and who is:

Employees or other representatives of a party appearing in this proceeding with significant responsibility for this docket, including municipal Solicitors.

The KCC&SPMT contend that the language as presented does not explicitly include in-house counsel and therefore could be interpreted to exclude in-house counsel because they are not always considered or classified as employees of a party. The KCC&SPMT advocate to make the language explicit to include in-house counsel of a party. Joint Answer at 2, ¶¶ 4 and 6.

In accordance with 52 Pa.Code § 5.362, the Applicant requests that the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PUC or Commission) provide protective or confidential treatment of certain documents, materials or information appropriately designated and involved in this proceeding. Delaware and KCC&SPMT (collectively, objectors) object to the proposed Protective Order. This matter is ripe for ruling.

II. DISCUSSION

1. Applicable Standard

Pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 5.365(a) in an adversarial proceeding, a proponent of a protective order must demonstrate that the potential harm of providing public access to certain information would be substantial and outweighs the public’s interest in free and open access to the administrative hearing process. A protective order to protect trade secrets or confidential information is to apply the least restrictive means of limitation which will provide the necessary protections from disclosure. In considering whether a protective order should be issued, the presiding officer is to consider, among other relevant factors, the following:

(1) the extent to which the disclosure would cause unfair economic or competitive damage;

(2) the extent to which the information is known by others and used in similar activities;

(3) the worth or value of the information to the party and to the party’s competitors;

(4) the degree of difficulty and cost of developing the information; and

(5) other statutes or regulations dealing specifically with disclosure of the information.

52 Pa.Code § 5.365(a).

A typical protective order permits a non-producing party’s expert to have access to confidential or proprietary information of a producing party for purposes of litigation, so long as the expert is not a competitor as described in 52 Pa.Code § 5.365(d). It is customary that the expert signs a written acknowledgment of nondisclosure, as set forth in an appendix (designated as Appendix A) attached to the protective order. The protective order also typically provides for the placement of proprietary or confidential information in a non-public record. 52 Pa.Code § 5.365(c)(1). Available restrictions for these protective orders, in the normal course, are listed in 52 Pa.Code § 5.365(c).

In addition, parties have the opportunity to seek a higher level of protection for information that would be designated as “highly confidential.” For example, “highly confidential” material could be precluded from disclosure to a non-producing party’s experts, unless consent of the producing party is obtained in writing. These more restrictive rules are to be issued only in extraordinary circumstances and only when the party demonstrates that a greater restriction is necessary “to avoid severe and extreme prejudice.” 52 Pa.Code § 5.365(e).

In summary, the petitioning party must demonstrate that the potential harm of providing certain information without protection would be substantial and outweighs the public’s interest in free and open access to the administrative hearing process, through consideration of the criteria set forth in 52 Pa.Code § 5.365(a). If this is established, then the undersigned must use the least restrictive means of limitation which will provide the necessary protection from disclosure. In order to obtain a higher level of restriction, the petitioning party must show that greater restriction is necessary “to avoid severe and extreme prejudice.” 52 Pa.Code § 5.365(e).

1. ALJ Ruling

It is compelling that the parties have agreed upon the terms except for the terms regarding Highly Confidential Protective Material (proposed Protective Order paragraph 5) and proposed a protective order outlining the information that is to be protected. Additionally, the parties have not agreed that the express language for review of Confidential information captures the full intent. However, it is persuasive that the parties can challenge information that is marked as confidential or proprietary such that treatment is appropriate from the perspective of all parties to the proceeding. Through their actions the parties have agreed that the first three factors in the Commissions regulations, 52 Pa.Code § 5.365(a) are present in this proceeding.

I find that through the parties’ submissions and actions that they did agree upon, the need for a protective order has been met in this proceeding.

I will address those provisions that are in controversy below.

* + 1. Paragraph 4(d)

Simply put, the objection to this paragraph as submitted is clarity. KCC&SPMT advocate, “All in-house counsel with responsibility for the docket in this case should be covered by Paragraph 4(d) and allowed to access confidential documents.” KCC&SPMT Joint Answer at 2, ¶ 4.

I agree.

There is no record basis to differentiate between in-counsel and municipal solicitors. Yet, there is the qualifier in Paragraph 4(d) as proposed to include municipal solicitors. I do not see the efficacy in the proposed language if it leaves room to debate whether in-house counsel is included in the provision. The Petitioner asserted that the rationale for implementing the Petition is, “serve administrative economy and efficiency by obviating the need for parties to address confidential/proprietary concerns on a piecemeal basis every time confidential/proprietary information is requested.” Petition at 2, ¶ 4. I find to promote administrative efficiency and economy by explicitly including in-house counsel in the language is an easy and reasonable remedy.

The modification proposed by KCC&SPMT to change Paragraph 4(d) as,

Information deemed as “CONFIDENTIAL” may be made available to a “Reviewing Representative” who is a person that has signed a Non-Disclosure Certificate attached as Appendix A, and who is:

Employees or other representatives of a party appearing in this proceeding with significant responsibility for this docket, including **in-house counsel and** municipal Solicitors.

is granted as directed by the ordering paragraph below. (emphasis added).

* + 1. Paragraph 5

Regarding the paragraph outlining review of Highly Confidential Protected Materials, it is again noted that the Petitioner advocated, “The issuance of the protective order…would serve administrative economy and efficiency by obviating the need for parties to address confidential/proprietary concerns on a piecemeal basis every time confidential/proprietary information is requested.” Petition at 2, ¶ 4. Additionally, the Petitioner advocated that the proposed protective order, “allows parties to… seek additional measures of protection beyond those provided in the Protective Order.” Petition at 2, ¶ 5.

I do not see the administrative economy or efficiency in separating the treatment of the Protestants into the rights of the public advocates versus the rights of other Protestants. Furthermore, I do not see the basis for the differential treatment. Delaware and KCC&SPMT are both Protestants and represent customers of the proposed acquired entity, DELCORA. Similarly, the public advocates are representing customers of the proposed acquired entity DELCORA and customers of the Applicant and protest or intervene to contest the Application. The Petition does not provide a rational basis for the inequitable treatment of the objectors versus the public advocates. If the objectors are of the same standing as the public advocates, and I do not see anything in the record that shows they are not, then it prevents economy and efficiency of the administrative process to institute further steps to obtain the Highly Confidential Protected Materials for the objectors than those put in place for the public advocates.

Additionally, the process was used in the *Laurel Pipeline*, proceeding. Consequently, the treatment requested by the objectors is not new or novel in implementation or use. Rather, the treatment advocated by the objectors has precedent without incident of negative occurrence. I simply do not see how the proposed restrictions for Highly Confidential Protected Materials is the **least** restrictive means to protect against harmful disclosure or prejudice pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 5.365(e) (emphasis added).

Lastly, the Petitioner advocated that it can seek additional protection beyond the proposed Protective Order if there is a threat to Highly Confidential Protected Material. If this is a fact, then the Petitioner has an avenue to use if the protections provided in the proposed Protective Order are not satisfactory. Consequently, the Petitioner is not without recourse or remedy. Therefore, I do not foresee the modification advocated by the objectors as against the public interest.

I find it reasonable that the Proposed Protective Order be modified as suggested by KCC&SPMT as,

Information deemed as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL PROTECTED MATERIAL” shall be made available to counsel for ~~I&E, OCA and OSBA~~ **all active parties represented by counsel**. Counsel for ~~I&E, OCA and OSBA~~ may make such information available to their experts who are designated and qualified as Reviewing Representatives. ~~HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL PROTECTED MATERIAL SHALL be produced remotely, online video conference applications, solely for inspection by counsel of record for other parties. If the inspecting lawyer desires copies of such material, or desires to disclose its contents to persons other than counsel of record, including Reviewing Representatives, she or he shall submit a written request to the producing party’s counsel. If the requesting and producing parties are unable to reach agreement with respect to such a request, they may submit the issue to the presiding Administrative Law Judge. In the meantime, the information shall be provided only to counsel of record and to I&E, OCA and OSBA and their experts as set forth above.~~

(edits as presented in Joint Answer).

1. Conclusion

The objections of Delaware and KCC&SPMT are sustained. The proposed protective order shall be modified consistent with the suggestions proposed by KCC&SPMT to paragraph 4(d) for review of Confidential material and paragraph 5 for the provision for Highly Confidential Protected Material. Under these circumstances it appears that the public interest is not harmed or inhibited by issuance of a protective order as modified. It is therefore appropriate to grant the protective order as proposed in part and deny in part.

**THEREFORE;**

**IT IS ORDERED THAT**:

* 1. The proposed Protective Order filed by counsel for Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater, Inc. on August 31, 2020, is hereby GRANTED in PART and DENIED in PART and shall establish procedures for the protection of all materials and information identified in the paragraphs after ordering paragraph 4 below, which are or will be filed with the Commission, produced in discovery, or otherwise presented during the above-captioned proceeding and all proceedings consolidated with it. All persons now or hereafter granted access to the materials and information identified in this Protective Order shall use and disclose such information only in accordance with this Order..
  2. The objection to the proposed Protective Order offered by counsel for Delaware County in the Answer filed on September 17, 2020, is granted consistent with the content of this Order.
  3. The objection to the proposed Protective Order offered by counsel for Kimberly-Clark Pennsylvania, LLC, Kimberly-Clark Corporation, and Sunoco Partners Marketing & Terminals L.P. in the Answer filed on September 18, 2020, is granted consistent with the content of this Order.
  4. That the terms of the Protective Order is presented below with the numbering paragraphs restarted.

1. That the Protective Order is granted in part consistent with the content of this Order with respect to all correspondence, documents, data, information, studies, methodologies and other materials, furnished in this proceeding, which are believed by the producing party to be of a proprietary or confidential nature and which are so designated by being marked "CONFIDENTIAL" or "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL PROTECTED MATERIAL." Such materials will be referred to below as "Proprietary Information." When a statement or exhibit is identified for the record, the portions thereof that constitute Proprietary Information shall be designated as such for the record.

2. This Protective Order applies to the following categories of materials:

(a) the producing party may designate as "CONFIDENTIAL" those materials which customarily are treated by that party as sensitive or proprietary, which are not available to the public, and which, if disclosed freely, would subject that party or its clients to risk of competitive disadvantage or other business injury;

(b) the producing party may designate as "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

PROTECTED MATERIAL" those materials that are of such a commercially sensitive nature

among the parties or of such a private, personal nature that the producing party is able to justify a

heightened level of confidential protection with respect to those materials. The producing party

shall endeavor to limit their designation of information as HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL PROTECTED MATERIAL.

3. Proprietary Information shall be made available to counsel for a Party, subject to the terms of this Protective Order. Such counsel shall use or disclose the Proprietary Information only for purposes of preparing or presenting evidence, cross examination, argument, or settlement in this proceeding. To the extent required for participation in this proceeding, counsel for a Party may afford access to Proprietary Information subject to the conditions set forth in this Protective Order.

4. Information deemed as "CONFIDENTIAL" may be made available to a

"Reviewing Representative" who is a person that has signed a Non-Disclosure Certificate

attached as Appendix A, and who is:

(a) An attorney for a statutory advocate pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 1.8, or a counsel who has entered an appearance in this proceeding for a party;

(b) Attorneys, paralegals, and other employees associated for purposes of this case with an attorney described in Paragraph (a);

(c) An expert or an employee of an expert retained by a party for the purpose of advising, preparing for or testifying in this proceeding; or

(d) Employees or other representatives of a party appearing in this proceeding with significant responsibility for this docket, including in-house counsel and municipal Solicitors.

With regard to I&E, information deemed as "CONFIDENTIAL" shall be made available to I&E Prosecutors subject to the terms of this Protective Order. The I&E Prosecutors shall use or disclose the CONFIDENTIAL information only for purposes of preparing or presenting evidence, cross examination, argument, or settlement in this proceeding. To the extent required for participation in this proceeding, the I&E Prosecutors may afford access to CONFIDENTIAL information only to I&E's experts, without the need for the execution of a Non-Disclosure Certificate, who are full-time employees of the Commission and bound by all the provisions of this Protective Order by virtue of the I&E Prosecutors' execution of a Non-Disclosure Certificate.

With regard to the OCA and OSBA, counsel for the OCA and OSBA may afford access to CONFIDENTIAL information to the Consumer Advocate and Small Business Advocate, respectively, without the need for execution of a Non-Disclosure Certificate. The Consumer Advocate and Small Business Advocate are bound by all of the provisions of the Protective Order Protective Order by virtue of the OCA counsel's and OSBA counsel's execution of a Non-Disclosure Certificate.

* 1. Information deemed as "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL PROTECTED

MATERIAL" shall be made available to counsel for all active parties represented by counsel.

Counsel may make such information available to their experts who are designated and

qualified as Reviewing Representatives.

6. For purposes of this Protective Order, a Reviewing Representative may not be a "Restricted Person."

(a) A "Restricted Person" shall mean:

(i) an officer, director, stockholder, partner, or owner of any competitor of the parties or an employee of such an entity if the employee's duties involve marketing or pricing of the competitor's products or services, or if the employee of such entity's duties involve strategic business decisions and activities in which the use of Proprietary Information could be reasonably expected to cause competitive harm to the parties;

(ii) an officer, director, stockholder, partner, or owner of any affiliate of a competitor of the parties (including any association of competitors of the parties) or an

employee of such an entity if the employee's duties involve marketing or pricing

of the competitor's products or services;

(iii) an officer, director, stockholder, owner or employee of a competitor of a customer of the parties if the Proprietary Information concerns a specific, identifiable customer of the parties; and

(iv) an officer, director, stockholder, owner or employee of an affiliate of a competitor of a customer of the parties if the Proprietary Information concerns a specific,

identifiable customer of the parties; provided, however, that no expert shall be disqualified on account of being a stockholder, partner, or owner unless that expert's interest in the business would provide a significant motive for violation of the limitations of permissible use of the Proprietary Information. For purposes of this Protective Order, stocks, partnership or other ownership interests valued at more than $10,000 or constituting more than a 1% interest in a business establishes a significant motive for violation.

(b) If an expert for a party, another member of the expert's firm or the

expert's firm generally also serves as an expert for, or as a consultant or advisor

to, a Restricted Person, said expert must:

identify for the parties each Restricted Person and each expert or consultant;

make reasonable attempts to segregate those personnel assisting in the expert's participation in this proceeding from those personnel working on behalf of a Restricted Person; and

(iii) if segregation of such personnel is impractical the expert shall give to the producing party written assurances that the lack of segregation will in no way jeopardize the interests of the parties or their customers. The parties retain the right to challenge the adequacy of the written assurances that the parties' or their customers'

interests will not be jeopardized. No other persons may have access to the Proprietary Information except as authorized by order of the Commission.

7. In the event that a Party wishes to designate as a Reviewing

Representative a person not described in Paragraphs 4(a) through 4(d) above, or a person that is a Restricted Person under Paragraph 6, the party shall seek agreement from the party providing the Proprietary Information. If an agreement is reached, that person shall be a Reviewing Representative with respect to those materials. If no agreement is reached, the party shall submit the disputed designation to the presiding Administrative Law Judge for resolution.

8. A qualified "Reviewing Representative" for "CONFIDENTIAL" information may review and discuss "CONFIDENTIAL" information with their client or with the entity with which they are employed or associated, to the extent that the client or entity is not a "Restricted Person", but may not share with or permit the client or entity to review the "CONFIDENTIAL" information. Such discussions must be general in nature and not disclose specific "CONFIDENTIAL" information. Counsel for I&E, OCA and OSBA may share

"CONFIDENTIAL" information with the I&E Director and the I&E Deputy Chief Prosecutor,

Consumer Advocate and Small Business Advocate, respectively, without obtaining a Non

Disclosure Certificate from these individuals, provided however, that these individuals otherwise

abide by the terms of this Protective Order.

9. Information deemed Proprietary Information shall not be used except as necessary for the conduct of this proceeding, nor shall it be disclosed in any manner to any person except a Reviewing Representative who is engaged in the conduct of this proceeding and who needs to know the information in order to carry out that person's responsibilities in this proceeding. Reviewing Representatives may not use information contained in any Proprietary Information obtained through this proceeding to give any party or any competitor of any party a commercial advantage.

10. Reviewing Representatives shall execute a Non-Disclosure Certificate:

(a) A Reviewing Representative shall not be permitted to inspect, participate

in discussions regarding, or otherwise be permitted access to Proprietary Information pursuant to this Protective Order unless that Reviewing Representative has first executed a Non-Disclosure Certificate provided that if an attorney qualified as a Reviewing Representative has executed such a certificate, the paralegals, secretarial and clerical personnel under the attorney's instruction, supervision or control need not do so, nor do Commission employees assisting

I&E as noted above in Paragraphs 4 and 5. A copy of each Non-Disclosure Certificate shall be provided to counsel for the Parties asserting confidentiality prior to disclosure of any Proprietary Information to that Reviewing Representative.

(b) Attorneys and outside experts qualified as Reviewing Representatives are

responsible for ensuring that persons under their supervision or control comply with this Protective Order.

11. None of the Parties waive their right to pursue any other legal or equitable

remedies that may be available in the event of actual or anticipated disclosure of Proprietary Information.

12. The Parties shall designate data or documents as constituting or containing

Proprietary Information by marking the documents "CONFIDENTIAL" or "HIGHLY

CONFIDENTIAL PROTECTED MATERIAL." Where only part of data compilations or multi-

page documents constitute or contain Proprietary Information, the Parties, insofar as reasonably practicable within discovery and other time constraints imposed in this proceeding, shall designate only the specific data or pages of documents that constitute or contain Proprietary Information. The Proprietary Information shall be served upon the Parties hereto only in an envelope (or through electronic service) separate from the nonproprietary materials, and the envelope (or electronic service) shall be conspicuously marked "CONFIDENTIAL" or "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL PROTECTED MATERIAL."

13. The Parties will consider and treat the Proprietary Information as within the exemptions from disclosure provided in Section 335(d) of the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 335(d), and the Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Act, 65 P.S. §§ 67.101 et seq., until such time as the information is found to be non-proprietary. In the event that any person or entity seeks to compel the disclosure of Proprietary Information, the non-producing party shall promptly notify the producing party in order to provide the producing party an opportunity to oppose or limit such disclosure.

14. Any public reference to Proprietary Information by a Party or its Reviewing Representatives shall be to the title or exhibit reference in sufficient detail to permit persons with access to the Proprietary Information to understand fully the reference and not more. The Proprietary Information shall remain a part of the record, to the extent admitted, for all purposes of administrative or judicial review.

15. Part of any record of this proceeding containing Proprietary Information,

including but not limited to all exhibits, writings, testimony, cross examination, argument, and responses to discovery, and including reference thereto as mentioned in Paragraph 14 above, shall be sealed for all purposes, including administrative and judicial review, unless such Proprietary Information is released from the restrictions of this Protective Order, either through the agreement of the parties to this proceeding or pursuant to an order of the Commission.

16. The Parties shall retain the right to question or challenge the confidential or proprietary nature of Proprietary Information and to question or challenge the admissibility of Proprietary Information. If a party challenges the designation of a document or information as proprietary, the party providing the information retains the burden of demonstrating that the designation is appropriate.

17. The Parties shall retain the right to question or challenge the admissibility of Proprietary Information; to object to the production of Proprietary Information on any proper ground; and to refuse to produce Proprietary Information pending the adjudication of the objection.

18. Within 30 days after a Commission final order is entered in the above-captioned proceeding, or in the event of appeals, within thirty days after appeals are finally decided, the Parties, upon request, shall either destroy or return to the parties all copies of all documents and other materials not entered into the record, including notes, which contain any Proprietary Information. In the event that a Party elects to destroy all copies of documents and other materials containing Proprietary Information instead of returning the copies of documents and other materials containing Proprietary Information to the parties, the party shall certify in writing to the producing party that the Proprietary Information has been destroyed.

Dated: September 25, 2020 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Angela T. Jones

Administrative Law Judge

**APPENDIX A**

**BEFORE THE**

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Application of Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater, Inc., for Approval of its Acquisition of Delaware County Regional Water Quality Control Authority’s Wastewater Assets, inter alia, pursuant to Sections 507, 1102 and 1329 of the Public Utility Code | **: : : : :**  **:** | Docket No. A-2019-3015173 |

**Administrative Law Judge Angela T. Jones, Presiding**
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1. The Office of Small Business Advocate (OSBA) was one of the parties that indicated an objection. By electronic mail (email) on September 3, 2020, counsel for OSBA notified the undersigned that it was withdrawing the objection. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)