BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE INVESTIGATION OF THE COST OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCESS.

BY THE COMMISSION:

On July 10, 2007, Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") Utilities Division ("Staff") filed a Motion to consolidate the above-captioned dockets.

Docket No. T-00000D-00-0672, the "Access Charge Docket," was commenced to examine the cost of access for various companies operating in Arizona. Phase I of the Access Charge Docket, addressed Qwest Corporation's ("Qwest") access charges, and was consolidated with, and resolved, in conjunction with Qwest's rate cap review. Phase II of the Access Charge Docket is intended to address access charges for all other telephone companies that provide access services.

Docket No. RT-00000H-97-0137, the "Arizona Universal Service Fund Docket" was set up to review and revise the Arizona Universal Service Fund ("AUSF") rules in Article 12 of the Arizona Administrative Code. Changes being discussed at the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") indicate that at the federal level access charges and universal service are being linked to some degree, at least for high-cost rural areas.

By Procedural Orders dated February 12, 2008, April 23, 2008, and August 20, 2008, the Commission ordered the parties to file a matrix or list of issues and procedural recommendations by
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October 7, 2008, and scheduled a procedural conference for October 10, 2008, to determine the
procedures and set a schedule for moving forward in these consolidated dockets.

On October 7, 2008, Cox Arizona Telecom, LLC ("Cox"); AT&T Communications of the
Mountain States, Inc. and TCG Phoenix (collectively "AT&T"); Integra Telecom, Inc. ("Integra");
McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc. ("McLeodUSA"); the Arizona Local Exchange
Carriers Association ("ALECA"); the Residential Utility Consumer Office ("RUCO"); and Verizon
California, Verizon, Business Services, Verizon Long Distance, and Verizon Wireless (collectively
"Verizon"); tw telecom of Arizona llc ("tw telecom") and XO Communications Services, Inc.
("XO"); and Arizona Payphone Associations ("APA") filed statements of issues. While there was
some overlap in their recommendations, there was no clear consensus on how to proceed.

The parties and Staff appeared through counsel at a Procedural Conference on October 10,
2008. At that time, it was expected that the FCC would issue a decision in early November, 2008,
addressing intercarrier compensation, and which decision could impact these pending matters. It was
determined at the October 2008, Procedural Conference that the process would benefit from a
Protective Order to protect the exchange of information, and that pending the expected FCC order,
the parties should give thought to the best means to proceed--whether the Commission should
proceed with a rulemaking, and/or workshops or hearing, or a combination of proceedings.

By Procedural Order dated December 19, 2008, a Procedural Conference was scheduled for
January 28, 2009, with the intent to determine the best process to address the issues. In addition,
Staff was directed to submit a proposed form of Protective Order. The parties were directed to file
any comments on Staff’s form of Protective Order and any proposed procedural recommendations by

On January 16, 2009, Staff filed its Proposed Protective Order.

On January 23, 2003, Integra, McLeodUSA (dba PAETEC), Cox, AT&T, Qwest, RUCO and
ALECA filed comments on the Protective Order and made procedural recommendations.

On January 28, 2009, Qwest filed a Motion to Strike AT&T’s Procedural Comments Relating
to Qwest Corporation Docket No. T-01051B-03-0454 and Qwest Corporation’s Intrastate Switched
Access Rates ("Motion to Strike"). Qwest argues that its intrastate access rates were reduced in
Phase I of the Access Charge Docket in connection with its Price Cap Plan, and should not be re-
visited as part of Phase II.

On January 29, 2009, the parties appeared through counsel at a telephonic Procedural
Conference. Division of opinion continues on how to proceed, with AT&T advocating a schedule for
evidentiary hearing and a process that includes all carriers; the CLECs recommending to wait for
FCC direction and that CLEC access charges not be examined at this time; and the incumbent carriers
(excluding Qwest) advocating workshops that would address issues such as how FCC action might
impact a state decision and which carriers should be included in the inquiry, among other things. At
the Procedural Conference, Staff recommended a series of at least two workshops, one to address
access charge issues and the other to address Universal Service Fund reform. Staff believed that the
Commission should press on with these dockets as it has already waited for years for FCC action on
the issues, which action has not materialized; but Staff believes it is premature to schedule
evidentiary hearings, as critical policy matters need to be determined first.

There remain some critical preliminary matters to decide in these matters, including at a basic
level which carriers should be included in the investigation, as well as other policy issues. The
workshop process appears to be the best way to address these issues. With Staff’s guidance, the
parties may be able to make greater progress in narrowing the issues and coming to consensus on
further proceedings (e.g. a rulemaking or evidentiary hearings) than has been evident in the past.

There appears to be consensus that having Arizona- and carrier-specific data will assist the process,
although there was no agreement which carriers should be included in the inquiry. Staff’s suggested
approach that initially data requests should be sent to all incumbent carriers in Arizona is a
reasonable start. Whether CLECs should then be included in Phase II should be addressed as part of
the workshop process, and as a result, the inquiry for additional carrier information could be
expanded.

Qwest’s access charges were reduced in Phase I, but several years have passed since those
reductions, the last of which reduced access revenues by $12 million in 2006. AT&T has argued that

---

1 The Procedural Conference was continued one day to accommodate a scheduling conflict.
2 AT&T also proposed data requests designed to obtain carrier-specific information on access charges.
3 Decision No. 68604.
the earlier reductions do not preclude further inquiry into whether Qwest’s access charges are
currently at appropriate levels, and that Qwest should be included in Phase II. Whether Qwest’s rates
will be included as part of Phase II should be addressed prior to the workshops. Therefore, the
parties are directed to file any recommendations about including Qwest’s access charges in this Phase
II. In the meantime, until further Order, Qwest’s motion to Strike will be held in abeyance, and
further, Staff should refrain from including Qwest in any data requests until the issue is decided.

Staff has agreed to issue the data requests as proposed by AT&T. The incumbent carriers
object to the proposed request for 2008 information as they claim it would be burdensome for small
companies and they have already compiled most, if not all, of the information for 2007 and earlier,
which they argue, should be sufficient to provide the information needed to proceed. To address the
incumbents’ concerns, the proposed data request should encompass calendar year 2007, or the most
recent period available. Staff, however, can use its discretion to further modify or expand the data
request to obtain the information needed to make the workshops a meaningful process.

The parties, including Staff, agreed that the proposed modifications to Staff’s proposed
Protective Order, as set forth in their filed comments, were reasonable and should be adopted. The
proposed modifications are minor, but add clarity to the intent of the order. The Protective Order
attached hereto as Exhibit A, incorporates the proposed modifications and is adopted for this
proceeding.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that **Staff shall schedule a series of workshops** as
discussed during the January 29, 2009 Procedural Conference, and propound data requests to the
incumbent Arizona carriers designed to elicit the carrier-specific data deemed necessary to formulate
policy and procedural recommendations in these consolidated dockets. Staff should refrain from
issuing such data requests to Qwest, unless and until it is determined that Qwest’s access charges will
be addressed as part of Phase II of this proceeding.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **within 30 days after the conclusion of the final
workshop, Staff shall file a request for Procedural Conference** to discuss the next steps in these
dockets.
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall file any recommendations concerning whether Qwest’s intrastate access rates should be included as part of this Phase II inquiry by February 18, 2009, and any Responsive Comments to those recommendations by March 5, 2009.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Qwest’s Motion to Strike shall be held in abeyance pending further Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Protective Order attached hereto as Exhibit A, and incorporated herein by reference, is approved and shall apply to these proceedings and to all future phases of these dockets until further Order of the Commission.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Presiding Officer may rescind, alter, amend, or waive any portion of this Procedural Order either by subsequent Procedural Order or by ruling at hearing.

DATED this 3rd day of February, 2009.

JANE L. RODDA
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

Copies of the foregoing mailed this 3rd day of February, 2009 to:

Dan Pozefsky, Chief Counsel
Residential Utility Consumer Office
1110 West Washington, Suite 220
Phoenix, AZ 85007
dpozefsky@azruco.gov *

Norm Curtright
Qwest Corporation
20 East Thomas Road, 16th Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85012

Reed Peterson
Qwest Corporation
20 East Thomas Road
16th floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85012

Michael W. Patten
Roshka DeWulf & Patten, PLC
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, AZ 85004
mpatten@rdp-law.com *
Attorneys for Cox Arizona Telecom, LLC

Michael M. Grant
Gallagher & Kennedy
2575 East Camelback Road
Phoenix, AZ 85016
mmg@gknet.com *
Attorneys for AT&T

Craig A. Marks
Craig A. Marks, PLC
10645 N. Tatum Blvd.
Suite 200-676
Phoenix, AZ 85028
Craig.Marks@azbar.org
Attorney for ALECA

Isabelle Salgado
AT&T Nevada
645 E. Plumb Lane, B132
PO Box 11010
Reno, NV 89520
dan.foley@att.com *
ge1831@att.com *
Parties marked with an "*" have agreed to accept service electronically.
EXHIBIT A

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS

KRISTIN K. MAYES - Chairman
GARY PIERCE
PAUL NEWMAN
SANDRA D. KENNEDY
BOB STUMP

IN THE MATTER OF THE REVIEW AND POSSIBLE REVISION OF ARIZONA UNIVERSAL SERVICE FUND RULES, ARTICLE 12 OF THE ARIZONA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE

DOCKET NO. RT-00000H-97-0137

DOCKET NO. T-00000D-00-0672

PROTECTIVE ORDER

1. (a) Confidential Information. All documents, data, studies and other materials furnished pursuant to any requests for information, subpoenas or other modes of discovery (formal or informal), and including depositions, and other requests for information, that are claimed to be proprietary or confidential (herein referred to as “Confidential Information”), shall be so marked by the providing party by stamping the same with a “Confidential” designation. In addition, all notes or other materials that refer to, derive from, or otherwise contain parts of the Confidential Information will be marked by the receiving party as Confidential Information. Access to and review of Confidential Information shall be strictly controlled by the terms of this Order.

The Company shall memorialize in writing any Confidential Information that it verbally discloses to Staff or another party within five (5) business days of its verbal disclosure, and the writing shall be marked by the Company with the appropriate designation.

Company agrees that it will carefully consider the basis upon which any information is claimed to be trade secret, proprietary, confidential, or otherwise legally protected. Company shall designate as Confidential Information only such information as it may claim in good faith to be legally protected. Where only a part of a document, or only a part of an informational submittal may
reasonably be considered to be trade secret, proprietary, confidential, or otherwise legally protected, Company shall designate only that part of such information submittal as Confidential Information under this Agreement. Information that is publicly available from any other source shall not be claimed as Confidential Information under this Agreement. Any party shall have the right to challenge at any time the Company’s designation of any document or portion thereof as “Confidential” in accordance with the procedures described in Section 6 of this Agreement.

(b) Use of Confidential Information - Proceedings. All persons who may be entitled to review, or who are afforded access to any Confidential Information by reason of this Order shall neither use nor disclose the Confidential Information for purposes of business or competition, or any purpose other than the purpose of preparation for and conduct of proceedings in the above-captioned docket and all subsequent appeals, and shall keep the Confidential Information secure as confidential or proprietary information and in accordance with the purposes, intent and requirements of this Order.

This Order does not prohibit a party, including Staff, from using and disclosing Confidential Information provided by Company in reports or documents that aggregate all information gathered from the parties to this docket, provided that Company’s individual disclosure is indiscernible from the aggregate report. In addition, where Confidential Information provided by Company is confidential solely as a result of either disclosing individual customer information or disclosing specific prices, this Agreement shall not prohibit a party, including Staff, from the public disclosure of such information in an aggregated form, where no individual customer or specific individual price can be ascertained.

(c) Persons Entitled to Review. Each party that receives Confidential Information pursuant to this Order must limit access to such Confidential Information to (1) attorneys employed or retained by the party in these proceedings and the attorneys’ staff; (2) experts, consultants and advisors who need access to the material to assist the party in these proceedings; (3) only those employees of the party who are directly involved in these proceedings, provided that counsel for the party represents that no such employee is engaged in the sale or marketing of that
party’s products or services. In addition, access to Confidential Information may be provided to Commissioners and all Commission Administrative Law Judges, and Commission advisory staff members and employees of the Commission to whom disclosure is necessary. Where Commission Staff acts as an advocate in a trial or adversarial role, disclosure of both Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information to Staff members and consultants employed by the Staff shall be under the same terms and conditions as described herein for parties.

(d) **Nondisclosure Agreement.** Any party, person, or entity that receives Confidential Information pursuant to this Order shall not disclose such Confidential Information to any person, except persons who are described in section 1(c) above and who have signed a nondisclosure agreement in the form which is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit “A”. Court reporters shall also be required to sign an Exhibit “A” and comply with terms of this Order. Commissioners, Administrative Law Judges, and their respective Staff members are not required to sign an Exhibit “A” form.

The nondisclosure agreement (Exhibit “A”) shall require the person(s) to whom disclosure is to be made to read a copy of this Protective Order and to certify in writing that they have reviewed the same and have consented to be bound by its terms. The agreement shall contain the signatory’s full name, employer, job title and job description, business address and the name of the party with whom the signatory is associated. Such agreement shall be delivered to counsel for the providing party before disclosure is made, and if no objection thereto is registered to the Commission within three (3) business days, then disclosure shall follow. An attorney who makes Confidential Information available to any person listed in subsection (c) above shall be responsible for having each person execute an original Exhibit “A” and a copy of all such signed Exhibit “A’s” shall be circulated to all other counsel of record promptly after execution.

2. (a) **Notes.** Limited notes regarding Confidential Information may be taken by counsel and experts for the express purpose of preparing pleadings, cross-examinations, briefs, motions and argument in connection with this proceeding, or in the case of persons designated in section 1(c) of this Protective Order, to prepare for participation in this proceeding. Such notes shall
then be treated as Confidential Information for purposes of this Order, and shall be destroyed after the final settlement or conclusion of these proceedings in accordance with subsection 2(b) below.

(b) **Return.** All notes, to the extent they contain Confidential Information shall be destroyed after the final settlement or conclusion of these proceedings. The party destroying such Confidential Information shall advise the providing party of that fact within a reasonable time from the date of destruction.

3. **Highly Confidential Information.** Any person, whether a party or non-party, may designate certain competitively sensitive Confidential Information as “Highly Confidential Information” if it determines in good faith that it would be competitively disadvantaged by the disclosure of such information to its competitors. Highly Confidential Information includes, but is not limited to, documents, pleadings, briefs, and appropriate portions of deposition transcripts, which contain information regarding the market share of, number of access lines served by, or number of customers receiving a specified type of service from a particular provider or other information that relates to a particular provider’s network facility location detail, revenues, costs, and marketing, business planning or business strategies.

Parties must scrutinize carefully responsive documents and information and limit their designations as Highly Confidential Information to information that truly might impose a serious business risk if disseminated without the heightened protections provided in this section. The first page and individual pages of a document determined in good faith to include Highly Confidential Information must be marked by a stamp that reads:

“HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – USE RESTRICTED PER PROTECTIVE ORDER IN DOCKET NO. RT-00000H-97-0137”

Placing a “Highly Confidential” stamp on the first page of a document indicates only that one or more pages contain Highly Confidential Information and will not serve to protect the entire contents of a multi-page document. Each page that contains Highly Confidential Information must be marked separately to indicate Highly Confidential Information, even where that information has been redacted. The unredacted versions of each page containing Highly Confidential Information, and provided under seal, should be submitted on paper distinct in color from non-confidential information
and “Confidential Information” described in section 1 of this Protective Order.

Parties seeking disclosure of Highly Confidential Information must designate the person(s) to whom they would like the Highly Confidential Information disclosure in advance of disclosure by the providing party. Such designation may occur through the submission of Exhibit “B” of the non-disclosure agreement identified in section 1(d). Parties seeking disclosure of Highly Confidential Information shall not designate more than (1) a reasonable number of in-house attorneys who have direct responsibility for matters relating to Highly Confidential Information; (2) five in-house experts; and (3) a reasonable number of outside counsel and outside experts to review materials marked as “Highly Confidential”. Disclosure of Highly Confidential Information to Commissioners, Administrative Law Judges and Commission Advisory Staff members shall be limited to persons to whom disclosure is necessary. Commissioners, Administrative Law Judges, and their respective Staff members are not required to sign an Exhibit “B” form. The Exhibit “B” also shall describe in detail the job duties or responsibilities of the person being designated to see Highly Confidential Information and the person’s role in the proceeding. Highly Confidential Information may not be disclosed to persons engaged in strategic or competitive decision making for any party, including, but not limited to, the sale or marketing or pricing of products or services on behalf of any party.

Any party providing either Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information may object to the designation of any individual as a person who may review Confidential Information and/or Highly Confidential Information. Such objection shall be made in writing to counsel submitting the challenged individual’s Exhibit “A” or “B” within three (3) business days after receiving the challenged individual’s signed Exhibit “A” or “B”. Any such objection must demonstrate good cause to exclude the challenged individual from the review of the Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information. Written response to any objection shall be made within three (3) business days after receipt of an objection. If, after receiving a written response to a party’s objection, the objecting party still objects to disclosure of either Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information to the challenged individual, the Commission shall determine
whether Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information must be disclosed to the challenged individual.

Copies of Highly Confidential Information may be provided to in-house attorneys and experts, outside counsel and outside experts who have signed Exhibit “B”. The in-house experts who have signed Exhibit “B” may inspect, review and make notes from the in-house attorney’s copies of Highly Confidential Information.

Persons authorized to review the Highly Confidential Information will maintain the documents and any notes reflecting their contents in a secure location to which only designated counsel and experts have access. No additional copies will be made, except for use during hearings and then such disclosure and copies shall be subject to the provisions of Section 6. Any testimony or exhibits prepared that reflect Highly Confidential Information must be maintained in the secure location until removed to the hearing room for production under seal. Unless specifically addressed in this section, all other sections of this Protective Order applicable to Confidential Information also apply to Highly Confidential Information. Execution of this Agreement by the parties and performance of their obligations hereunder shall not result in waiver of any claim, issue, or dispute concerning the trade secret, proprietary, confidential, or legally protected nature of the Confidential Information provided.

4. **Objections to Admissibility.** The furnishing of any document, data, study or other materials pursuant to this Protective Order shall in no way limit the right of the providing party to object to its relevance or admissibility in proceedings before this Commission.

5. **Small Company Exemption.** Notwithstanding the restrictions in sections 1 and 3 applicable to persons who may access Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information, a Small Company may designate any employee or in-house expert to review Confidential Information and/or Highly Confidential Information if the producing party, upon request, gives prior written authorization for that person to review Confidential Information and/or Highly Confidential Information. If the producing party refuses to give such written authorization, the reviewing party may, for good cause shown, request an order from the Administrative Law Judge allowing a
prohibited person(s) to review Confidential Information and/or Highly Confidential Information. The producing party shall be given the opportunity to respond to the Small Company’s request before an order is issued. “Small Company” means a party with fewer than 5000 employees, including the employees of affiliates’ U.S. ILEC, CLEC, and IXC operations within a common holding company; provided, however, that no company that is classified as a Class A telephone utility under Commission Rule 1-3 shall qualify as a “Small Company” for purposes of this Order.

6. **Challenge to Confidentiality.** This Order establishes a procedure for the expeditious handling of information that a party claims is Confidential or Highly Confidential. It shall not be construed as an agreement or ruling on the confidentiality of any document. Any party may challenge the characterization of any information, document, data or study claimed by the providing party to be confidential in the following manner:

(a) A party seeking to challenge the confidentiality of any materials pursuant to this Order shall first contact counsel for the providing party and attempt to resolve any differences by stipulation;

(b) In the event that the parties cannot agree as to the character of the information challenged, any party challenging the confidentiality shall do so by appropriate pleading. This pleading shall:

(1) Designate the document, transcript or other material challenged in a manner that will specifically isolate the challenged material from other material claimed as confidential; and

(2) State with specificity the grounds upon which the documents, transcript or other material are deemed to be non-confidential by the challenging party.

(c) A ruling on the confidentiality of the challenged information, document, data or study shall be made by an Administrative Law Judge after proceedings in camera, which shall be conducted under circumstances such that only those persons duly authorized hereunder to have access to such confidential materials shall be present. This hearing shall commence no earlier than five (5) business days after service on the providing party of the pleading required by subsection 6(b) above.

(d) The record of said in camera hearing shall be marked “CONFIDENTIAL – SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER IN DOCKET NO. RT-00000H-97-0137”. Court reporter notes of such hearing shall be transcribed only upon agreement by the parties or Order of the Administrative Law Judge and in that event shall be separately bound, segregated, sealed, and withheld from inspection by any person not bound by the
terms of this Order.

(e) In the event that the Administrative Law Judge should rule that any information, document, data or study should be removed from the restrictions imposed by this Order, no party shall disclose such information, document, data or study or use it in the public record for five (5) business days unless authorized by the providing party to do so. The provisions of this subsection are intended to enable the providing party to seek a stay or other relief from an order removing the restriction of this Order from materials claimed by the providing party to be confidential.

7. (a) Receipt into Evidence. Provision is hereby made for receipt into evidence in this proceeding materials claimed to be confidential in the following manner:

(1) Prior to the use of or substantive reference to any Confidential Information, the parties intending to use such Information shall make that intention known to the providing party.

(2) The requesting party and the providing party shall make a good-faith effort to reach an agreement so that the Information can be used in a manner which will not reveal its confidential or proprietary nature.

(3) If such efforts fail, the providing party shall separately identify which portions, if any, of the documents to be offered or referenced shall be placed in a sealed record.

(4) Only one (1) copy of the document designated by the providing party to be placed in sealed record shall be made.

(5) The copy of the documents to be placed in the sealed record shall be tendered by counsel for the providing party to the Commission, and maintained in accordance with the terms of this Order.

(b) Seal. While in the custody of the Commission, materials containing Confidential Information shall be marked “CONFIDENTIAL – SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER IN DOCKET NO. RT-00000H-97-0137” and Highly Confidential Information shall be marked “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – USE RESTRICTED PER PROTECTIVE ORDER IN DOCKET NO. RT-00000H-97-0137” and shall not be examined by any person except under the conditions set forth in this Order.
(c) **In Camera Hearing.** Any Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information that must be orally disclosed to be placed in the sealed record in this proceeding shall be offered in an in camera hearing, attended only by persons authorized to have access to the information under this Order. Similarly, any cross-examination on or substantive reference to Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information (or that portion of the record containing Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information or references thereto) shall be received in an in camera hearing, and shall be marked and treated as provided herein.

(d) **Access to Record.** Access to sealed testimony, records and information shall be limited to the Administrative Law Judge, Commissioners, and their respective staffs, and persons who are entitled to review Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information pursuant to subsection 1(c) above and have signed Exhibit “A” or “B”, unless such information is released from the restrictions of this Order either through agreement of the parties or after notice to the parties and hearing, pursuant to the ruling of an Administrative Law Judge, the order of the Commission an/or final order of a court having final jurisdiction.

(e) **Appeal/Subsequent Proceedings.** Sealed portions of the record in this proceeding may be forwarded to any court of competent jurisdiction for purposes of an appeal but under seal as designated herein for the information and use of the court or the FCC. If a portion of the record is forwarded to a court or the providing party shall be notified which portion of the sealed record has been designated by the appealing party as necessary to the record on appeal.

(f) **Judicial Proceedings Related to NonParty’s Request for Disclosure.** Where the Commission, ALJ, or Staff determines that disclosure is not appropriate, the Company as the real party in interest shall join as a co-defendant in any judicial action brought against the Commission and/or Commissioners by the party seeking disclosure of the information, unless the Company is already specifically named in the action. Company also agrees to indemnify and hold the Commission harmless from any assessment of expenses, attorneys’ fees, or damages resulting from the Commission’s denial of access to the information found to be non-confidential.

In the event that the Commission becomes legally compelled (by deposition, interrogatory,
request for documents, subpoena, civil investigative demand, or similar process) to disclose any of
the Confidential Information, the Commission shall provide Company with prompt written notice of
such requirement so that Company may seek an appropriate remedy and/or waive compliance.

(g) **Return.** Unless otherwise ordered, Confidential Information and Highly
Confidential Information, including transcripts of any depositions to which a claim of confidentiality
is made, shall remain under seal, shall continue to be subject to the protective requirements of this
Order, and shall, at the providing party’s discretion, be returned to counsel for the providing party, or
destroyed by the receiving party, within thirty (30) days after final settlement or conclusion of these
proceedings. If the providing party elects to have Confidential Information or Highly Confidential
Information destroyed rather than returned, counsel for the receiving party shall verify in writing that
the material has in fact been destroyed. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs 3 and 7, the
Receiving Party ad any person executing Exhibit B may maintain and retain electronic copies of
Highly Confidential materials, but only if such electronic copies are generated, maintain and
subsequently destroyed subject to systems backup (i.e., non-manual and computer system generated).

8. **Use in Pleadings.** Where references to Confidential Information or Highly
Confidential Information in the sealed record or with the providing party is required in pleadings,
briefs, arguments or motions (except as provided in section 6), it shall be by citation of title or exhibit
number or some other description that will not disclose the substantive Confidential Information or
Highly Confidential Information contained therein. Any use of or substantive references to
Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information shall be placed in a separate section of
the pleading or brief and submitted to the Administrative Law Judge or the Commission under seal.
This sealed section shall be served only on counsel of record and parties of record who have signed
the nondisclosure agreement set forth in Exhibit “A” or “B.” All of the restrictions afforded by this
Order apply to materials prepared and distributed under this section.

9. **Summary of Record.** If deemed necessary by the Commission, the providing party
shall prepare a written summary of the Confidential Information referred to in the Order to be placed
on the public record.
10. **Breach of Agreement.** Company, in any legal action or complaint that it files in any court alleging breach of this Agreement shall, at the written request of the Commission, name the Arizona Corporation Commission as a Defendant therein.

11. **Non-Termination.** The provisions of this Agreement shall not terminate at the conclusion of this proceeding.
I have read the foregoing Protective Order dated ____________, 2009, in Docket No. RT-00000H-97-0137 (Consolidated) and agree to be bound by the terms and conditions of this Order.

Name

Employer

Job title and Job Description

Business Address

Party

Signature

Date
EXHIBIT B
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

I have read the foregoing Protective Order dated ____________, 2009, in Docket No. RT-00000H-97-0137 (Consolidated) and agree to be bound by the terms and conditions of this Order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title and Job Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>