1		
2		
3		
4		
5	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES	S AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
6	In the Matter of the Application of QWEST	
7	CORPORATION	
8	Regarding the Sale and Transfer of Qwest Dex	Docket No. UT-021120
9	to Dex Holdings, LLC, a non-affiliate	CORRECTED ANSWER TO PETITIONS OF PUBLIC COUNSEL AND WeBTEC
10		FOR REVIEW OF FIRST
11		SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER
12		
13		
14	I. <u>PROCEDURAI</u>	L BACKGROUND
15	On September 27, 2002, Qwest Co	rporation ("Qwest") filed the majority of the
16	transaction documents at issue in this proceeding as	public documents or as "confidential"
17	documents pursuant to the protective order issued in	n this docket on September 12, 2002 (the
18	"Protective Order"). On September 27, 2002, Qwe	est also filed a motion with the Commission
19	seeking amendment of the Protective Order to prove	ide for additional "highly confidential"
20	protection for the few remaining transaction docume	ents that contain extremely sensitive and
21	commercially valuable information. On October 4,	2002 the Commission issued its First
22	•	
23	Supplemental Order amending the Protective Order	to provide for extra protection for documents
24	designated as "highly confidential."	
25	At the prehearing conference in this	s docket on October 8, 2002, Public Counsel
26	and WeBTEC raised certain concerns about the Fire	st Supplemental Order. The administrative
	CORRECTED ANSWER TO PETITIONS OF PUBLIC AND WeBTEC FOR REVIEW OF FIRST SUPPL	

1	law judge noted that the First Supplemental Order was "meant to promote the exchange of
2	information among the parties, not to inhibit it". Tr. at 50. Further, the judge asked the
3	parties "to work together to try to work these things out among themselves". Id. at 49. The
4	judge asked the parties to "wait and see" whether the highly confidential documents could be
5 6	used as needed under the Protective Order. See Tr. at 47-48.
7	On October 11, just three days after the prehearing conference and without
8	attempting to negotiate with other parties, Public Counsel filed its petition. On October 14, also
9	without any negotiation with other parties, WeBTEC filed its petition. In order to allow an
10	opportunity for the parties to try to resolve their differences, Dex Holdings, LLC ("Dex") asked
11	that the response date to both petitions be set for October 24, 2002. However, the discussion
12	among the parties did not resolve the concerns of all of the parties to the discussions.
13	Accordingly, Dex files this answer to the petitions.
14	
15	II. <u>DISCUSSION</u>
16 17	A. ALL PARTIES AND THE DISCOVERY PROCESS IN THIS CASE WILL BENEFIT FROM THE FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER.
18	Dex is <i>currently</i> the only party that has requested highly confidential treatment of
19	documents or information. Dex was and is very concerned about potential disclosure of certain
20	of the transaction documents. It is important to remember, however, that other parties, including
21	Qwest and the intervenors, could potentially be requested to provide highly confidential
22	information before this docket is over. Moreover, even though the "highly confidential"
23	designations to date have related to general (but high level) concerns about commercially
24	
25	While Public Counsel faced an October 14 deadline to file its petition under WAC 480-09-760, that did
26	not preclude any attempt to work things out with other parties during the intervening six days.

1	valuable information, there is no reason to believe that information of potential benefit to
2	competitors of Qwest and Dex will not be produced later in this docket. Finally, as discussed
3	more fully below and contrary to the arguments of Public Counsel and WeBTEC, it is not just
4 5	the interests of Qwest's and Dex's competitors which are implicated by the highly confidential
6	information in this docket. ²
7	Having a familiar framework ³ in place now will permit highly confidential
8	information to be timely disclosed and protect legitimate proprietary interests of any party that
9	are now or may be implicated. As the ALJ noted, the First Supplemental Order will promote the
10	free flow of information in this docket.
11	
12	B. THE FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER ALREADY ACCOMMODATES THE ONLY EXTANT SUBSTANTIVE CONCERN OF WEBTEC.
13	WaDTEC asserts that limiting access to highly confidential decomments to one
14	WeBTEC asserts that limiting access to highly confidential documents to one
15	attorney will impair its participation in the case. WeBTEC apparently overlooks the provisions
16	of the First Supplemental Order that permit it to "designate one outside counsel and no more than
17	one outside consultant, $legal\ or\ otherwise$ " to receive highly confidential information. Id., $\P\ 4$
18	(emphasis added). Thus, WeBTEC can designate Mr. Butler as outside counsel and Ms. Rackner
19	as legal consultant. They can both have access to highly confidential information under the
20	existing provisions of the First Supplemental Order. There is no need to modify the order as
21	WeBTEC requests.
22	Web The requests.
23	WeBTEC also speculates it may decide some day to retain a second outside
24	² For example, Boeing, a WeBTEC member, participates in the capital markets and could find the highly
25	confidential information discussed below to be of commercial value.
26	

1	expert. Such speculation does not justify a modification of the First Supplemental Order at this
2	time. Every party could claim they "might" need more experts, more attorneys, less restrictive
3	handling provisions, and the like. If a protective order can be watered down based on such
4 5	speculation, then no protective order could ever be sustained. Such arguments should be saved
6	for another day. As the ALJ noted at the prehearing conference, "I think we will continue to be
7	flexible and open-minded to meet the needs of the case" Tr. at 47.
8	C. PUBLIC COUNSEL HAS NO STANDING TO OBJECT TO THE FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER.
10	Public Counsel's petition is unusual in that Public Counsel alleges no provision of
11	the order has any direct adverse impact on Public Counsel. Indeed, Public Counsel's substantive
12	concern appears to be that of WeBTEC's. If so, then the foregoing discussion with regard to
13	WeBTEC should resolve Public Counsel's petition. Moreover, it is questionable whether Public
14 15	Counsel has standing to raise hypothetical concerns of other parties.
16	In an apparent attempt to create standing, Public Counsel argues the "public's"
17	right to open proceedings. But this argument is a red herring, since Public Counsel has raised no
18	objection to the "standard" Protective Order in this case. Even if the Commission were to vacate
19	the First Supplemental Order the "highly confidential" documents would continue to be kept
20	from the public as "confidential" documents. ⁴ The issue at hand has nothing to do with public
21 22	access. Rather, it has to do with how carefully fewer than a dozen people must handle a small
23	fraction of the documents that will be produced in this case and whether or not that small handful
24 25	³ "Highly Confidential" protective orders similar in form to the First Supplemental Order have been entered in a number of Commission dockets, including UT-991358, UT-000883, UE-001952, UT-

003022, and TO-011472.

26

1	of people might be expanded to include perhaps a dozen more people.
2	
3	D. ENTRY OF THE FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER WAS PROCEDURALLY CORRECT.
4	Public Counsel, while apparently not harmed itself, expresses concern about the
5	process for entry of the First Supplemental Order. Public Counsel's objection ignores the fact
6 7	that the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA") gives the Commission authority to enter
8	protective orders sua sponte. See RCW § 34.05.446. Indeed, the Commission did so in issuing
9	the Protective Order. It follows, then that the Commission had authority to amend its Protective
10	Order to permit Qwest to promptly file the remainder of the transaction documents. The
11	Commission could have issued the First Supplemental Order merely on receipt of a cover letter
12	from Qwest indicating that highly confidential documents had to be withheld from the
13 14	September 27 filing until the Protective Order was amended.
15	That Qwest filed a motion cannot eliminate the Commission's power to act
16	proactively on its own motion under RCW § 34.05.446. The Commission acted within its
17	authority in amending its Protective Order without waiting for responses by other parties to
18	Qwest's motion.
19	
20	E. RETAINING THE FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER PUTS NO BURDEN ON PUBLIC COUNSEL, WHILE VACATING THE FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER
21	WOULD BE HIGHLY PREJUDICIAL TO DEX.
22	The Commission's sua sponte action to amend the Protective Order did not
23	prejudice Public Counsel. As the judge stressed at the prehearing conference, "there is nothing
24	in the amendment to the protective order that affects the rights of Public Counsel with respect to
25	
26	⁴ Such withholding from the public is not absolute, however. The public will still have a right to request

1	the handling of documents." Tr. at 37. Moreover, unlike the protective order in Docket UT-
2	000883, the First Supplemental Order does not preclude Public Counsel or intervenors from
3	having access to the highly confidential information. \underline{Cf} . Second Supplement Order, ¶ 12,
4	Docket UT-000883. Each party in this docket can have at least one attorney and one expert
5 6	receive and review highly confidential information.
7	In contrast to the lack of demonstrable harm to Public Counsel, granting the
8	request to vacate would severely and unfairly prejudice Dex. After Public Counsel filed its
9	petition to vacate Public Counsel and its expert, Michael Brosch, received highly confidential
10	documents in reliance on the First Supplemental Order. Mr. Brosch has already reviewed the
11	documents and Public Counsel may have as well. Dex permitted Qwest to provide those
12 13	documents to Public Counsel and expert in reliance on the provisions of the First Supplemental
14	Order. Public Counsel and its expert received the documents under the terms of the First
15	Supplemental Order. Having already received the documents, Public Counsel should not now be
16	permitted to challenge the very existence of the order.
17	
18	F. IN ADDITION TO BEING PROCEDURALLY CORRECT, ENTRY OF THE FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER WAS SUBSTANTIVELY APPROPRIATE.
19	The Commission routinely provides protective orders and "highly confidential"
20	protective orders to ensure that proceedings are not delayed because parties withhold information
21	out of concern that the risk of disclosure may outweigh tangential relevance to the proceedings. ⁶
2223	The threshold for entry of such protective orders is intentionally set low to promote such free
24	
25	specific confidential documents under the procedures of WAC 480-09-015.
26	Moreover, the judge made it clear that the parties had other avenues to address any practical problems that may arise as the case unfolds: See, e.g., Tr. at 47. See note 2, supra.
	CODDECTED ANSWED TO DETITIONS OF DUDI IC COLINSEI

1	flow of information. As the judge noted repeatedly at the prehearing conference, the goal is to
2	facilitate the discovery process. The remedy for any abuses of a protective order is <u>not</u> to vacate
3	the order. Rather, the remedy is to move to reclassify documents that a party believes are not
4 5	deserving of the claimed level of protection. Protective Order, ¶ 16. Moreover, the Commission
6	reserved the right to review confidential designations on its own initiative. Id., ¶ 17. With these
7	remedies the amended Protective Order adequately balances three important and well-recognized
8	but competing goals: protection of commercially sensitive and valuable information, free and
9	timely flow of information in the discovery process, and public policy favoring open
10	government.
11	Qwest's motion met the relatively low threshold for the mere entry of a protective
12 13	order. Nevertheless, Dex provides below additional information regarding the need for highly
13	confidential protection of the documents already filed under that designation in this docket.
15	 The documents filed to date require highly-confidential treatment.
16	
17	The documents for which Qwest sought highly confidential protection are of
18	limited relevance to the Commission's review, yet extremely sensitive from the Buyer's
19	perspective and potentially commercially valuable to the Buyer's competitors. These documents
20	contain highly-sensitive and commercially valuable information relating to financial terms of
21	anticipated debt and equity offerings of the Buyer and SGN LLC (the "Company"), trade secrets
22	relating to potential product names, and commercially sensitive directory publishing information.
23	
24	
25	
26	

1	Letter (Exhibit N to the Dexter and Rodney Purchase Agreements), Equity
2	Financing Commitment Letters (Exhibit O to the Dexter and Rodney Purchase
3	Agreements) and the Equity Term Sheet (Exhibit R to the Rodney Purchase Agreement), Term Sheet for Seller Financing (Section 1.2BS of Sellers'
4	Disclosure Schedule to the Rodney Purchase Agreement) and the PIK Preferred Stock Term Sheet (Exhibit V to the Rodney Purchase Agreement)]
5	These documents contain information relating to the Buyer's financing of the
6	Dexter and Rodney transactions that would be of great value to those competing for limited
7 8	funds available in today's relatively narrow debt and equity capital markets. Under current
9	market conditions, there is a limited pool of equity capital and a number of similar competing
10	investment opportunities for directory businesses, including deals relating to the acquisitions of
11	the directory businesses of Sprint and Bell Canada. Public disclosure of the details of the
12	financial terms of these offerings could impair the ability of the issuers to raise equity or debt on
13	the most commercially favorable terms by making the Buyer's and the Company's offerings of
14	securities less competitive with these similar offerings. If they had knowledge of the expected
15	financial terms of the Buyer's and the Company's offerings, other directory publishing
16 17	businesses seeking financing could enhance the attractiveness of their offerings by changing the
18	terms, marketing strategy and timing of competing investment opportunities. Moreover,
19	disclosure of material details relating to the issuance of additional debt or equity securities prior
20	to the offering and marketing of such securities and the issuer or equity sponsors having an
21	opportunity to organize presentations and road shows to institutional and other investors could
22	impair the ability of the issuer or equity sponsor, as the case may be, to decide when to enter the
23	capital markets, so as to optimize the amount of debt or equity securities to be sold to generate
2425	the best price and the highest level of demand.

26

1	While public disclosure of this information would be highly damaging to the
2	Buyer, the information has limited relevance to the Commission's review. The Exhibits
3	identified above include documents and information that relate solely to the Buyer's ongoing and
4 5	future efforts to provide for additional sources of financing for the acquisition of the Qwest Dex
6	business. They have no bearing on the Commission's evaluation of the nature and structure or
7	terms and conditions of the acquisition, the Buyer's commitment to consummate the
8	Transactions by paying the negotiated purchase price, the impact of the Dex sales on Qwest, or
9	the operation of the Dex business going forward. Such information is already fully detailed in
10	other documents that Qwest has provided.
11	
12	3. <u>Documents Containing Trade Secrets [Sections 3.14 and 3.20 of the Seller's Disclosure Schedule to the Dexter and Rodney Purchase Agreements]</u>
13	Two additional documents contained in the Seller's Disclosure Schedules to the
14	Two deditional documents contained in the Benef & Bisciosare senedates to the
15	Dexter and Rodney purchase agreements contain highly-confidential information disclosing
16	trade secrets that would be commercially valuable to competitors.
17	Section 3.14 of Seller's Disclosure Schedule to the Dexter and Rodney Purchase
18	Agreements contains information relating to potential product names that have not yet been
19	registered as trademarks. Until Dex obtains trademark protection for these product names,
20	disclosure may provide impetus for competitors to use similar names, impair Dex's ability to use
21	these names if competitors register the same or similar trademarks, or reduce the economic value
2223	attached to these names by using them in the marketplace.
24	Section 3.20 of Seller's Disclosure Schedule to the Dexter and Rodney Purchase
25	Agreements contains tables with information setting forth key directories, the financial
26	importance to Rodney and Dexter of certain key directories, and information related to
	CORRECTED ANSWER TO PETITIONS OF PUBLIC COUNSEL

ORDER - 9

1	publishing schedules and publishing dates. This information would have great strategic and
2	commercial value to competitors, which could use it to target their launch of competing
3	directories to new, lucrative markets or to determine the markets in which advertising dollars
4 5	will have the greatest impact.
6	In contrast, the probative value of this information to the Commission in
7	evaluating the Dex sale is low. The information for which Qwest has designated for highly
8	confidential treatment has no bearing on the nature and structure or terms and conditions of the
9	acquisition, Buyer's commitment to consummate the Transactions, the impact on Qwest of the
10	Dex sale, or the operation of the Dex business going forward.
11	
12	III. <u>CONCLUSION</u>
13	The petitions of Public Counsel and WeBTEC should be denied.
14	DATED this 25 th day of October, 2002.
15	
16	MILLER NASH LLP
17	
18	Brooks E. Harlow WSB No. 11843
19	Attorneys for Intervenor
20	Dex Holdings, LLC
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	