**BEFORE THE**

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission : R-2022-3031211

Office of Small Business Advocate : C-2022-3031632

Office of Consumer Advocate : C-2022-3031767

Pennsylvania State University : C-2022-3031957

Columbia Industrial Intervenors : C-2022-3032178

Jose A. Serrano : C-2022-3031821

Constance Wile : C-2022-3031749

Richard C. Culbertson : C-2022-3032203

:

v. :

:

Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc :

**PREHEARING ORDER #2**

On May 6, 2022, Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc. (Columbia or Respondent), filed its Motion of Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc. for Protective Order (Motion) pursuant to the provisions of 52 Pa. Code § 5.365(a). In support of its Motion, Columbia averred: that proprietary information within the definition of 52 Pa. Code § 5.365(a) has been shared in discovery pursuant to protective agreements between individual parties; that Parties may desire to use proprietary information for cross-examination purposes; and that treatment of such information as set forth in the proposed Protective Order is justified because unrestricted disclosure of this information would not be in the public interest. Columbia Motion at 2-3, ¶ 9. In further support of its Motion, Columbia asserted:

Limitations on the disclosure of Proprietary Information will not prejudice the rights of the participants, nor will such limitation frustrate the prompt and fair resolution of this proceeding. The proposed Protective Order balances the interests of the Parties, the public, and the Commission.

The attached proposed Protective Order will protect the Proprietary Information sought in discovery or submitted for the record while allowing the Parties to use such information for purposes of litigation.

Columbia Motion at 2, ¶¶ 13-14. Moreover, we note that the language of the proposed Protective Order also provides as follows:

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.

Columbia Proposed Protective Order at ¶ 17.

Columbia advised that it has shared the Proposed Protective Order with the other Parties to this proceeding, and that no Party has indicated that it opposes the Protective Order. As the Proposed Protective Order is consistent with protective Orders that have been issued in previous Columbia rate cases, and since no active party to this proceeding has objected to Columbia’s Motion, we will grant Columbia’s Motion for Protective order filed on May 6, 2022.

ORDER

THERERFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The Motion is hereby granted with respect to all materials and information identified in Paragraphs 2 and 3 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 Paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Protective Order shall use and disclose such information only in accordance with this Order.
2. The information subject to this Protective Order is all correspondence, documents, data, information, studies, methodologies and other materials, furnished in discovery in this proceeding, as well as written and oral testimony, exhibits, examination and cross-examination questions, motions, briefs, oral argument, and other writings submitted by the parties to this proceeding, which are believed by the producing party to be of a proprietary or confidential nature and which are so designated by being stamped “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL.” 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.
3. This Protective Order applies to the following categories of materials: (A) the Parties 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 parties may designate as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” 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. For example, but without limitation, “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” information may include Proprietary Information that constitutes or describes: (a) customer names or customer prospects’ names, addresses, annual volumes of gas usage, or other customer-identifying information; (b) marketing plans; (c) competitive strategies or service alternatives; (d) market share projections; (e) competitive pricing or discounting information; and (f) marketing materials that have not yet been used. The parties shall endeavor to limit their designation of information as Highly confidential.
4. Proprietary Information shall be made available to counsel for a party who has entered an appearance in this proceeding and does not have responsibilities constituting a Restricted Person, 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 or argument 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.
5. Information deemed as “CONFIDENTIAL”, shall be made available to a “Reviewing Representative” who is a person who has signed a Non-Disclosure Certificate and who is:
6. an attorney for one of the parties to this proceeding who has entered an appearance in this proceeding;
7. an attorney, paralegal, or other employee associated for purposes of this proceeding with an attorney described in subparagraph 5(i);
8. an expert or an employee of an expert retained by a Party to this Stipulated Protective Agreement for the purpose of advising, preparing for or testifying in this proceeding;
9. an employee or other representative of a party with significant responsibility in this proceeding; or
10. a person mutually agreed to by the parties

1. Information deemed as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL”, may be provided to a “Reviewing Representative” who has signed a Non-Disclosure Certificate and who is:

(i) an attorney for one of the parties to this proceeding who has entered an appearance in this proceeding;

(ii) an attorney, paralegal, or other employee associated for purposes of this proceeding with an attorney described in subparagraph 6(i);

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

(iv) a person mutually agreed to by the parties

Provided, further, that in accordance with the provisions of Sections 5.362 and 5.365(e) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.362, 5.365(e), any party may, by subsequent objection or motion, seek further protection with respect to HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL material, including, but not limited to, total prohibition of disclosure or limitation of disclosure only to particular parties.

1. 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; (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: (i) identify for the parties each Restricted Person and each expert or consultant; (ii) 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.

(c) The Office of Small Business Advocate’s (“OSBA”) consultants, Mr. Robert D. Knecht and Mr. Mark Ewen, will not be considered to be a “Restricted Person” and Paragraphs 7(a) and 7(b) will not apply to Mr. Knecht or Mr. Ewen, provided that Mr. Knecht and Mr. Ewen do not share, distribute, or discuss the Proprietary Information with any person except authorized OSBA representatives.

1. A qualified “Reviewing Representative” for “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” material may review and discuss “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” material 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 “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL,” material provided however that counsel for I&E, the Office of Consumer Advocate, and Office of Small Business Advocate may share Proprietary Information with the I&E Director and I&E Deputy Director, 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 the Stipulated Protective Agreement.
2. Proprietary Information shall be treated by the parties and by the Reviewing Representative in accordance with the certificate executed pursuant to Paragraph 11(a). 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.
3. 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. In the event that a Party wishes to designate as a Reviewing Representative a person not described in Paragraphs 5(i) through 5(iv) or 6(i) through 6(iii) above, the party shall seek agreement from the party providing the Proprietary Information. If an agreement is reached, that person shall be a Reviewing Representative pursuant to Paragraph 5(v) or 6(iv) above 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.
4. (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. A copy of each Non-Disclosure Certificate shall be provided to counsel for the party 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 the Protective Order.

1. 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.
2. The parties shall designate data or documents as constituting or containing Proprietary Information by stamping the documents “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL.” Where only part of data compilations or multi-page documents constitutes or contains 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 which constitute or contain Proprietary Information. The Proprietary Information shall be made available for review in a manner mutually acceptable by counsel of record, and shall be conspicuously marked “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL.”
3. The party 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, Act of February 14, 2008, P.L. 6, 65 P.S. §§ 67.101 *et seq.*, until such time as the information is found to be non-proprietary.
4. 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.
5. 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 15 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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 party, 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 the 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 other Party that the Proprietary Information has been destroyed.

Date: May 11, 2022 /s/

Christopher P. Pell

Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge

/s/

John Coogan

Administrative Law Judge
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:

Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc :

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The undersigned is the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (the

retaining party).

The undersigned has read and understands the Protective Order deals with the treatment of Proprietary Information. The undersigned agrees to be bound by and comply with the terms and conditions of said Protective Order.

Indicate by checking the appropriate box(es) what type of Propriety Information the

undersigned may review pursuant to the Protective Order.

CONFIDENTIAL [ ]

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL [ ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

PRINT NAME

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

EMPLOYER

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc.
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SERVICE LIST

Amy E. Hirakis, Esquire

[ahirakis@nisource.com](mailto:ahirakis@nisource.com)

NiSource Corporate Services Co.

800 N. Third St., Suite 204

Harrisburg, PA 17102

*Counsel for Columbia Gas*

Theodore J. Gallagher, Esquire

[tjgallagher@nisource.com](mailto:tjgallagher@nisource.com)

Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc.

121 Champion Way, Suite 100

Canonsburg, PA 15313

*Counsel for Columbia Gas*

Michael W. Hassell, Esquire

[mhassell@postschell.com](mailto:mhassell@postschell.com)

Lindsey A. Berkstresser, Esquire

[lberkstresser@postschell.com](mailto:lberkstresser@postschell.com)

Post & Schell PC

17 North Second Street, 12th Floor

Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601

*Counsel for Columbia Gas*

Erika L. McLain, Esquire

[ermclain@pa.gov](mailto:ermclain@pa.gov)

Bureau of Investigation & Enforcement

PA Public Utility Commission

400 North Street

Harrisburg, PA 17120

Steven C. Gray, Esquire

[sgray@pa.gov](mailto:sgray@pa.gov)

Office of Small Business Advocate

555 Walnut Street, 1st Floor   
Harrisburg, PA  17101

Barrett C. Sheridan, Esquire

Lauren E. Guerra, Esquire

Harrison W. Breitman, Esquire

Aron J. Beatty, Esquire

[OCAColumbiaGas2022@paoca.org](mailto:OCAColumbiaGas2022@paoca.org)

Office of Consumer Advocate

555 Walnut Street, 5th Floor

Forum Place

Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923

Todd S. Stewart, Esquire

[tsstewart@hmslegal.com](mailto:tsstewart@hmslegal.com)

Hawke McKeon & Sniscak, LLP

100 N. Tenth Street

Harrisburg, PA 17101

*Counsel for The Retail Energy Supply*

*Association, Shipley Choice, and NRG*

*Energy, Inc.*

Thomas J. Sniscak, Esquire

[tjsniscak@hmslegal.com](mailto:tjsniscak@hmslegal.com)

Whitney E. Snyder, Esquire

[wesnyder@hmslegal.com](mailto:wesnyder@hmslegal.com)

Philip D. Demanchick, Jr., Esquire

[pddemanchick@hmslegal.com](mailto:pddemanchick@hmslegal.com)

Hawke McKeon & Sniscak LLP

100 North 10th Street

Harrisburg, PA 17105

*Counsel for Pennsylvania State University*

Joseph L. Vullo, Esquire

[jlvullo@bvrrlaw.com](mailto:jlvullo@bvrrlaw.com)

1460 Wyoming Avenue

Forty Fort, PA 18704

*Counsel for Pennsylvania Weatherization*

*Provider’s Task Force, Inc.*

John W. Sweet, Esquire

Ria M. Pereira, Esquire

Lauren N. Berman, Esquire

Elizabeth R. Marx, Esquire

[pulp@pautilitylawproject.org](mailto:pulp@pautilitylawproject.org)

118 Locust Street

Harrisburg, PA 17101

*Counsel for CAUSE-PA*

Mark C. Szybist, Esquire

[mszybist@nrdc.org](mailto:mszybist@nrdc.org)

1152 15th Street NW, Suite 300

Washington, DC 20005

*Counsel for Natural Resources*

*Defense Council*

Andrew J. Karas, Esquire

[akaras@fairshake-els.org](mailto:akaras@fairshake-els.org)

Fair Shake Environmental Legal Services

600 Superior Avenue East,

Cleveland, OH 44114

*Counsel for Natural Resources*

*Defense Council*

Charis Mincavage, Esquire

[cmincavage@mcneeslaw.com](mailto:cmincavage@mcneeslaw.com)

Kenneth R. Stark, Esquire

[kstark@mcneeslaw.com](mailto:kstark@mcneeslaw.com)

McNees Wallace & Nurick, LLC

100 Pine Street, P.O. Box 1166

Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166

*Counsel for Columbia Industrial*

*Intervenors*

Jose A. Serrano

[Jas673@hotmail.com](mailto:Jas673@hotmail.com)

2667 Chadbourne Dr.

York, PA 17404

Constance Wile

[cjazdrmr@yahoo.com](mailto:cjazdrmr@yahoo.com)

922 Bebout Rd.

Venetia, PA 15367

Richard C. Culbertson

[Richard.C.Culbertson@gmail.com](mailto:Richard.C.Culbertson@gmail.com)

1430 Bower Hill Road

Pittsburgh, PA 15243