BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND)
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION)
)
Complainant,)
)
V.)
)
OLYMPIC PIPE LINE COMPANY, INC.)
)
Respondent.)
)

DOCKET NO. TO-011472

TESORO REFINING AND MARKETING COMPANYS COMMENTS REGARDING THE SEVENTH SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER: <u>AMENDING PROTECTIVE ORDER</u>

1

Tesoro Refining and Marketing Company (ATesoro@), by and through its attorneys, Brena,

Bell & Clarkson, P.C., pursuant to Administrative Law Judge Robert Wallis=s request, hereby submits its comments regarding the Seventh Supplemental Order: Amending Protective Order of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (AWUTC@). In accordance with WAC 480-09-420(3), the name and address of the pleading party is set forth below. Please direct all service and correspondence regarding the above-captioned docket to the following:

Robin O. Brena, Esq. David W. Wensel, Esq. Brena, Bell & Clarkson, P.C. 310 K Street, Suite 601 Anchorage, AK 99501 (907) 258-2000 ph (907) 258-2001 fax <u>rbrena@brenalaw.com</u> dwensel@brenalaw.com

TESORO-S COMMENTS Docket TO**B**011472 Page 1 of 4 At the prehearing conference on Friday, March 8^h, 2002, in response to a general discussion about the disclosure of information relating to the Whatcom Creek incident which may be relevant to this proceeding, counsel for Olympic raised the concern that such information could be improperly used in the general civil litigation arising from the Whatcom Creek incident. Specifically, the parties= prehearing conference comments on this point are set forth as Appendix A.

TESORO-S COMMENTS Docket TOB011472 Page 2 of 4 Tesoro is concerned that the proposed supplement to the protective order is far broader than meets Olympic=s concern and raises additional issues because of its focus on information provided among competitors rather than the misuse of information by common litigants. Stated differently, the standard set forth in the proposed supplement concerns heightened competitive impacts from information which is unrelated to Olympic=s concern. In addition, Tesoro is concerned with the limited handling, limited access, locked storage, and advanced notice requirements imposed by the proposed supplement on information designated highly confidential. To cite one example, outside counsel for Tesoro works with a team of experts and attorneys within two firms; therefore, adopting requirements limiting access among this team to **A**one outside counsel@ and **A**one outside consultant@ would be extremely burdensome.

4

5

Tesoro believes the proposed supplement should be fashioned to meet Olympic=s concern and not be expanded beyond the stated need. Accordingly, Tesoro would propose the following:

- C The current protective order simply be modified to have a highly confidential category that does not allow the review by in-house counsel (the current protective order does not allow review by other employees of the parties).
- C In all other respects, the highly confidential information be treated the same as confidential information under the existing protective order.

This solution is intended to minimize the impact and burden of adding another category of confidential information while at the same time meeting Olympic=s concern that in-house counsel not be permitted access to highly confidential information. Regrettably, counsel for Tesoro has not had

TESORO-S COMMENTS Docket TOB011472 Page 3 of 4 an opportunity to discuss this matter with counsel for the other parties to this proceeding prior to

filing these comments.

DATED this 12th day of March, 2002.

BRENA, BELL & CLARKSON, P.C. Attorneys for Tesoro Refining and Marketing Company

By

Robin O. Brena, ABA #8410089 David A. Wensel, ABA #9306041

TESORO-S COMMENTS Docket TOB011472 Page 4 of 4

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 12, 2002, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was faxed, emailed, and mailed to the following:

OLYMPIC PIPELINE COMPANY, INC.

Steven C. Marshall, Esq. Patrick W. Ryan, Esq. Counsel for Olympic Pipe Line Company Perkins Coie LLP One Bellevue Center, Suite 1800 411 - 108th Ave. N.E. Bellevue, WA 98004-5584 Fax: 425-453-7350 Email: <u>marss@perkinscoie.com</u>

William H. Beaver, Esq. Karr Tuttle Campbell 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98101 Fax: 206-682-7100 wbeaver@karrtuttle.com

WUTC STAFF

Donald Trotter, Assistant Attorney General Counsel for Commission Staff Attorney Generals Office Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 S. Evergreen Park Drive S.W. P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504-0128 Fax: 360-586-5522 Email: <u>dtrotter@wutc.wa.gov</u>

TOSCO CORPORATION

Edward A. Finklea, Esq. Counsel for Tosco Corporation Energy Advocates LLP 526 N.W. 18th Avenue Portland, OR 97209-2220 Fax: 503-721-9121 Email: <u>efinklea@energyadvocates.com</u>

Elaine Houchen

TESORO-S COMMENTS Docket TOB011472 Page 5 of 4

APPENDIX A

TO-011472, -DRAFT- - Vol. 16 (3/8/2002), (Pages 124:6 to 127:10) 124

- 6 MR. MARSHALL: One of the concerns that
- 7 I have, and it's a fairly deep concern, Your Honor, is
- 8 because these Whatcom Creek expenses relate to a
- 9 litigation that is currently in process. Including
- 10 Tosco, by the way. Tosco has a claim, as we've
- 11 mentioned, for \$30- to \$40,000,000 for lost income,
- 12 lost revenues due to the accident.
- 13 There is significant potential for
- 14 other uses, misuses, of information of any sort from
- 15 this, whether it be the identities of experts that
- 16 have been hired in litigation, how people consulted,
- 17 even the amounts of attorneys' fees that have been
- 18 paid by insurance.
- 19 So all of this is some concern because
- 20 the very people who are parties to this case may also
- 21 be, at least some of them, may be litigants.
- 22 JUDGE WALLIS: Mr. Finklea, would you
- 23 object if this information is withheld from you and
- 24 persons working with you on behalf of Tosco, and from
- 25 Tosco?

1

7

125

- MR. FINKLEA: Well, Your Honor, I
- 2 certainly wouldn't object from it being withheld from
- 3 people at Tosco that would be involved in that
- 4 litigation. I've signed a protective order, and I can
- 5 sign even a more serious one. I'm not involved in
- 6 anything for Tosco other than this proceeding.
 - JUDGE WALLIS: Very well. Mr. Marshall,
- 8 does that respond to your concern? There is a
- 9 productive order, and if you mark the information as
- 10 confidential, then that does offer some protections.
- 11 And the Commission does have provisions and, in the
- 12 past, has implemented protective orders that are even
- 13 more restrictive than the standard to very much limit
- 14 the accessibility to information.

Appendix A Page 2 of 3

- 15 I'm sensitive to that concern, I think
- 16 it's a real concern.
- 17 MR. MARSHALL: I agree.
- 8 JUDGE WALLIS: I believe that if you

19 requested that to occur, that we can accommodate that

- 20 request.
- 21 MR. MARSHALL: We would have to have
- 22 that as a minimum, because this really does, depending
- 23 on what the kinds of invoices and information in
- 24 general we're talking about --
- 25 JUDGE WALLIS: We will see that such an

126

- 1 order is prepared. What I would like to do is
- 2 circulate a draft of that order to counsel to assure
- 3 that it is phrased in a way that actually does
- 4 identify and does protect the information that the
- 5 company seeks to protect.
- 6 Will that work for parties?
- 7 MR. BRENA: It will, Your Honor.
- 8 MR. FINKLEA: Yes.
- 9 MR. TROTTER: (Indicated affirmatively.)
- 10 MR. BRENA: And there is no reason for
- 11 rate purposes that I think that those kinds of issues
- 12 need be put forward in testimony.
- 13 JUDGE WALLIS: At this juncture we don't
- 14 know exactly what you're going to get back. It may or
- 15 may not provide information that is sensitive. If it
- 16 does, I just want us to be prepared so that the
- 17 information, such as it is, will flow freely.
- 18 MR. BRENA: Absolutely.
- 19 MR. MARSHALL: Again, we certainly want
- 20 that as a minimum protection in this area.
- 21 JUDGE WALLIS: Very well. I will see
- 22 that that is prepared, and I will circulate that in
- 23 the next few days to counsel.
- 24 MR. MARSHALL: Depending on the level of
- 25 detail produced by this insurance coordinator, we may

Appendix A Page 3 of 3

- 1 also seek to have some of that information blocked out
- 2 as not appropriate at all.
- 3 JUDGE WALLIS: I believe that Mr. Brena
- 4 has indicated that he's not interested in specifics
- 5 that may be relevant to the insurance claims. To the
- 6 extent that that occurs, rather than spend your time
- 7 and the company's scarce resources in proceeding, I
- 8 would suggest you talk with Mr. Brena to work out a
- 9 way that minimizes the effort on everybody's part and
- 10 yet makes essential information available.