

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Purchased Gas Adjustment) DOCKET NO. 970003-GU
(PGA) true-up.) ORDER NO. PSC-97-0538-CFO-GU
_____) ISSUED: May 9, 1997

ORDER GRANTING PEOPLES GAS SYSTEM, INC.'S REQUEST FOR
CONFIDENTIAL TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PORTIONS OF ITS
DECEMBER 1996 PGA FILINGS
(DOCUMENT NO 00713-97)

On January 21, 1997, Peoples Gas System, Inc. ("Peoples" or "Company") filed a request for confidential classification of certain portions of its purchased gas adjustment ("PGA") filings for the month of December 1996. Peoples asserts that the information for which confidential classification is sought is intended to be and is treated by Peoples and its affiliates as private and has not been disclosed. The confidential information is located in Document No. 00713-97.

Florida law presumes that documents submitted to governmental agencies shall be public records. The only exceptions to this presumption are the specific statutory exemptions provided in the law and exemptions granted by governmental agencies pursuant to the specific terms of a statutory provision. This presumption is based on the concept that government should operate in the "sunshine." It is the Company's burden to demonstrate that the documents fall into one of the statutory examples set out in Section 366.093, Florida Statutes, or to demonstrate that the information is proprietary confidential information, the disclosure of which will cause the Company or its ratepayers harm.

To establish that material is proprietary confidential business information under Section 366.093(3)(d), Florida Statutes, a utility must demonstrate (1) that the information is contractual data, and (2) that disclosure of the data would impair the efforts of the utility to contract for goods or services on favorable terms. The Commission has previously recognized that this latter requirement does not necessitate the showing of actual impairment, or the more demanding standard of actual adverse results; instead, it must simply be shown that disclosure is "reasonably likely" to impair the Company's contracting for goods or services on favorable terms.

In its monthly PGA filing, Peoples must show the quantity and cost of gas purchased from Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT) during the month and period shown. The purchased gas adjustment, which is subject to FERC review, can have a significant effect on the price charged by FGT.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

04677 MAY-97

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

Peoples seeks confidential classification for the information at lines 9 and 13-26, column L ("Total Cents Per Therm") of Schedule A-3. Peoples argues that this information is contractual data, the disclosure of which would impair the efforts of Peoples to contract for goods or services on favorable terms. This information shows the rates Peoples paid to its suppliers for gas during December 1996. Peoples argues that disclosure of these prices would give other competing suppliers information which could be used to control gas pricing; these suppliers could all quote a particular price (equal to or exceeding the price paid by Peoples), or could adhere to the price offered by a particular supplier. Peoples asserts that suppliers would likely refuse to sell gas at prices lower than this average rate. Peoples argues that disclosure is reasonably likely to lead to increased gas prices, which would result in increased rates to Peoples' ratepayers.

Peoples also seeks confidential treatment for the information at lines 9 and 13-26, columns E-K ("System Supply", "End Use", "Total Purchased", "Commodity Cost/Third Party", "Commodity Cost/Pipeline", "Demand Cost", and "Other Charges") of Schedule A-3. These data are algebraic functions of the price per therm paid by Peoples as shown on lines 9 and 13-26 of column L ("Total Cents Per Therm"). Peoples argues that disclosure of the information in these columns would allow suppliers to derive the prices Peoples paid to its suppliers during the month. Peoples asserts that disclosure of this information would enable a supplier to derive contractual information which would impair the efforts of the Company to contract for goods or services on favorable terms.

Peoples further seeks confidential treatment for the information at lines 9-26, column B ("Purchased From") of Schedule A-3. Peoples argues that disclosing the names of its suppliers would be detrimental to the interests of Peoples and its ratepayers since it would provide competitors with a list of prospective suppliers. Peoples also argues that a third party could use such information to interject itself as a middleman between Peoples and the supplier. In either case, Peoples argues, the end result is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices and, therefore, an increased cost of gas which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers.

Peoples seeks confidential treatment for the information at lines 1-32 and 36, columns G and H ("Wellhead Price" and "Citygate Price") in Schedule A-4. Peoples asserts that this information is contractual information which, if made public, would impair the efforts of the Company to contract for goods or services on favorable terms. The information in column G consists of the invoice price per MMBtu paid for gas by Peoples. The information

in column H consists of the delivered price per MMBtu paid by Peoples for such gas, which is the invoice price plus charges for transportation. Peoples claims that disclosure of the prices paid to its gas suppliers during this month would give competing suppliers information with which to potentially or actually control the pricing of gas, either by all quoting a particular price which could equal or exceed the price Peoples paid, or by adhering to a price offered by a particular supplier. Peoples contends that a supplier who might have been willing to sell gas at a lower rate would be less likely to make any price concessions. The end result, Peoples asserts, is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices and, therefore, an increased cost of gas which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers.

Peoples also seeks confidential classification of the information at lines 1-32 and 36, columns C-F ("Gross Amount," "Net Amount," "Monthly Gross," and "Monthly Net") of Schedule A-4. Peoples maintains that since it is the specific rates (or prices) at which the purchases were made which Peoples seeks to protect from disclosure, it is also necessary to protect the volumes or amounts of the purchases in order to prevent the use of such information to calculate the rates or prices.

In addition, Peoples requests confidential classification of the information at lines 1-32, columns A and B ("Producer/Supplier" and "Receipt Point") of Schedule A-4. Peoples indicates that publishing the names of suppliers and the respective receipt points at which the purchased gas is delivered to the Company would be detrimental to the interests of Peoples and its ratepayers, since it would provide a complete illustration of Peoples' supply infrastructure. Specifically, Peoples asserts that if the names in column A are made public, a third party might interject itself as a middleman between the supplier and Peoples. Peoples further asserts that disclosure of the receipt points in column B would give competitors information that would allow them to buy or sell capacity at those points. Peoples argues that the resulting loss of available capacity for already-secured supply would increase gas transportation costs. Peoples concludes that, in either case, the end result is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices and, therefore, an increased cost of gas which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers.

Peoples seeks confidential treatment for lines 8 and 21-43, columns C and E of its Open Access Report. Peoples argues that this information is contractual data which, if made public, would impair the efforts of the Company to contract for goods or services on favorable terms. The information in column C shows the terms purchased from each supplier for the month, and column E shows the

total cost of the volumes purchased. Peoples states that this information could be used to calculate the actual prices Peoples paid to each of its suppliers for gas in December 1996. Peoples argues that disclosure of the prices Peoples paid to its gas suppliers during the month would give competing suppliers information with which to potentially or actually control gas pricing. Peoples asserts that a supplier who might have been willing to sell gas at a lower price would be less likely to make any price concessions. Peoples argues that the end result is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices and, therefore, an increased cost of gas which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers.

Peoples also seeks confidential treatment for lines 8-10 and 21-45, column A of its Open Access Report. The information in column A includes the names of Peoples' gas suppliers. Peoples maintains that disclosure of the suppliers' names would be detrimental to the interests of Peoples and its ratepayers since it would provide a list of prospective suppliers to Peoples' competitors. Peoples asserts that if the names were made public, a third party might try to interject itself as a middleman between the supplier and Peoples. Peoples argues that the end result is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices and, therefore, an increased cost of gas which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers.

Peoples requests confidential treatment for the supplier name (lines 1, 6, and 22) on page 7 of 11 of its Invoices for December 1996. Peoples also requests confidential treatment for information that would tend to indicate the identity of the supplier (lines 2-5 and 7-9) on page 7 of 11 of its December invoices. Peoples argues that disclosure of the supplier's name or facts that could lead to its identification would be detrimental to the interests of Peoples and its ratepayers since it would provide competitors with a list of prospective suppliers. Peoples asserts that if the supplier's name was made public, a third party might try to interject itself as a middleman between the supplier and Peoples. Peoples argues that the end result is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices and, therefore, an increased cost of gas which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers.

Also regarding its December 1996 Invoices, Peoples requests confidential classification for the "Rate" information at lines 10 and 11 on page 7 of 11. These rates are the prices at which Peoples purchased gas from its suppliers. Peoples asserts that this information is contractual information which, if made public, would impair the efforts of the Company to contract for goods or services on favorable terms. Peoples argues that disclosure of the

prices Peoples paid to its gas suppliers during the month would give competing suppliers information with which to potentially or actually control gas pricing; a supplier which might have been willing to sell gas at a price less than the price reflected in any individual invoice would likely refuse to do so. Peoples argues that the end result is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices and, therefore, an increased cost of gas which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers.

Peoples also requests confidential classification for the "Therms" and "Amount" information at lines 10, 11, and 25 on page 7 of 11 of its December 1996 Invoices. These lines contain the volumes and total costs of Peoples gas purchases. Peoples argues that this information could be used to calculate the rates for which it has also requested confidentiality.

Peoples seeks confidential treatment for the entirety of page 11 of 11 of its December 1996 Invoices. Peoples states that a large amount of proprietary and confidential information is contained in these invoices, mainly rates (including volume and total cost data that would allow one to determine rates) and supplier names (including information that would tend to indicate the identity of suppliers).

Peoples argues that disclosure of the prices, or data that would allow one to determine the prices, Peoples paid to its gas suppliers during the month would give competing suppliers information with which to potentially or actually control gas pricing. A supplier which might have been willing to sell gas at a price less than the price reflected in any individual invoice would likely refuse to do so. Peoples argues that the end result is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices and, therefore, an increased cost of gas which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers.

Peoples maintains that disclosure of supplier names or facts that could lead to the identification of suppliers would be detrimental to the interests of Peoples and its ratepayers since it would provide competitors with a list of prospective suppliers and would facilitate the intervention of a middleman. Peoples argues that the end result is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices and, therefore, an increased cost of gas which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers.

Peoples seeks confidential treatment for certain information contained in its Accruals For Gas Purchased Report for December 1996, pages 1-13. Specifically, Peoples seeks confidential treatment of the information in columns B-D at: lines 1, 8-13, and

16 on page 1; lines 1 and 15 on page 2; lines 1, 8, 9, and 16 on page 3; lines 1, 2, and 15 on page 4; lines 1, 8, 9, and 16 on page 5; lines 1, 8-14, and 16 on page 6; lines 1 and 15 on page 7; lines 1, 8, 9, and 16 on page 8; lines 1 and 15 on page 9; lines 1, 2, and 15 on page 10; lines 1 and 15 on page 11; lines 1, 2, and 15 on page 12; and lines 1 and 15 on page 13. Peoples argues that disclosure of this information would impair its efforts to contract for goods or services on favorable terms. The information consists of rates and volumes purchased, as well as the total cost of the purchase accrued. Peoples maintains that disclosure of the rates at which Peoples purchased gas from its suppliers would give competing suppliers information with which to potentially or actually control the pricing of gas either by all quoting a particular price (equal to or exceeding the rates Peoples paid) or by adhering to a rate offered by a particular supplier. Peoples claims that a supplier which might have been willing to sell gas at a lower rate would be less likely to make any price concessions. Peoples argues that the end result is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers. Since it is the rates at which purchases were made which it seeks to protect from disclosure, Peoples claims that it is also necessary to protect data showing the volumes and total costs of its purchases in order to prevent the use of such information to calculate rates.

Further, Peoples seeks confidential treatment for the names of suppliers which appear on its Accruals For Gas Purchased Report for December 1996, pages 1-13. Specifically, Peoples seeks confidential treatment of the information in column A at: lines 1 and 9-13 on page 1; line 1 on page 2; lines 1 and 9 on page 3; lines 1-2 on page 4; lines 1 and 9 on page 5; lines 1 and 9-14 on page 6; line 1 on page 7; lines 1 and 9 on page 8; line 1 on page 9; lines 1-2 on page 10; line 1 on page 11; lines 1-2 on page 12; and line 1 on page 13. Disclosure of these supplier names would be detrimental to the interests of Peoples and its ratepayers since it would provide competitors with a list of prospective suppliers and would facilitate the intervention of a middleman. The end result, Peoples argues, is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices and, therefore, an increased cost of gas which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers.

Peoples requests confidential classification for certain information on its Actual/Accrual Reconciliation of Gas Purchased Report for November 1996, pages 1-5. Specifically, Peoples requests confidential treatment of the information in columns C and E at lines 1-44 and 93-95, and in column D at lines 1-44. Peoples argues that disclosure of this information would impair its efforts to contract for goods or services on favorable terms. The

information consists of rates and volumes purchased, as well as the total cost of the purchase accrued. Peoples maintains that disclosure of the rates at which Peoples purchased gas from its suppliers would give competing suppliers information with which to potentially or actually control the pricing of gas either by all quoting a particular price (equal to or exceeding the rates Peoples paid) or by adhering to a rate offered by a particular supplier. Peoples states that a supplier which might have been willing to sell gas at a lower rate would be less likely to make any price concessions. Peoples argues that the end result is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers. Since it is the rates at which purchases were made which it seeks to protect from disclosure, Peoples claims that it is also necessary to protect data showing the volumes and total costs of its purchases in order to prevent the use of such information to calculate rates.

Peoples further requests confidential treatment of supplier names provided on its Actual/Accrual Reconciliation of Gas Purchased Report for November 1996, pages 1-5. Specifically, Peoples requests confidential treatment of the information in column A at lines 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, and 43 on pages 1-3. Peoples maintains that disclosure of its suppliers' names would be detrimental to the interests of Peoples and its ratepayers since it would provide competitors with a list of prospective gas suppliers and would facilitate the intervention of a middleman. The end result, Peoples argues, is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices and, therefore, an increased cost of gas which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers.

Peoples requests confidential treatment for its Gas Purchase Invoices for November 1996, pages 1-12, in their entirety. The information on these pages includes the rates at which purchases covered by the invoices were made (except for the rates of FGT which are public), the volumes purchased, and the total cost of the purchase. Since it is the rates at which the purchases were made which Peoples seeks to protect from disclosure, Peoples argues that it is also necessary to protect the volumes and costs of the purchases in order to prevent the use of such information to calculate the rates. Peoples argues that this information is contractual data which, if made public, would impair the efforts of Peoples to contract for goods or services on favorable terms.

The information in Peoples' November 1996 Invoices also includes the names of its suppliers. Peoples maintains that disclosure of supplier names would be detrimental to the interests of Peoples and its ratepayers since it would provide competitors

with a list of prospective suppliers and would facilitate the intervention of a middleman. In either case, Peoples argues, the end result is reasonably likely to be increased gas prices and, therefore, an increased cost of gas which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers.

Peoples' November 1996 Invoices also include information that tends to indicate the identity of each gas supplier. Such information includes supplier addresses, phone and fax numbers, contact persons, logos, and miscellaneous numerical references such as invoice numbers, account numbers, wire instructions, contract numbers, and tax I.D. information. Peoples asserts that the format of the invoices alone might indicate with whom Peoples is dealing. Since this information may indicate to persons knowledgeable in the industry the identity of the otherwise undisclosed gas supplier, Peoples has requested confidential treatment of it.

Peoples seeks confidential treatment for its Prior Month Adjustment Invoices in their entirety in order to protect two major types of information. First, Peoples wishes to protect from disclosure the rates at which purchases covered by the invoice were made (except for the rates of FGT which are public), the volumes purchased, and the total cost of the purchase. Second, Peoples desires confidential treatment for the names of its suppliers, as well as information that tends to indicate the identity of its suppliers. Peoples argument is based on the rationale, stated above, used to support its request for confidential treatment of its November 1996 Invoices.

Peoples seeks confidential treatment for certain information in its Cashout/Bookout Invoices. Specifically, Peoples seeks confidential treatment for the trading price, or book-out price-per-therm, found at line 14 on page 1; line 4 on page 2; and line 3 on page 3. Peoples asserts that this is contractual information, the disclosure of which would impair the efforts of Peoples to contract for goods and services on favorable terms. Peoples argues that disclosure of this information would give other FGT customers information with which to potentially or actually control the pricing of booked-out balances either by all quoting a particular price or by adhering to a price offered to a particular FGT customer in the past. As a result, Peoples contends, an FGT customer which might have been willing to trade imbalances at a price more favorable to Peoples than the price reflected in these lines would likely refuse to do so. Peoples asserts that the end result is reasonably likely to be higher book-out transaction costs and/or FGT imbalance charges, causing an increased cost of gas which Peoples must recover from its ratepayers. Peoples also seeks confidential treatment for the volumes booked-out and the total

cost of each trade found at lines 10 and 15 on page 1; line 5 on page 2; and lines 3-4 on page 3. Peoples asserts that this information could be used to calculate the book-out price-per-therm in a specific transaction.

In addition, Peoples seeks confidential treatment for information in its Cashout/Bookout Invoices which includes the names of Peoples trading partners and facts that tend to reveal the identity of those trading partners. This information is found at lines 1-7, 11-12, and 16 on page 1; lines 1-3 and 6-12 on page 2; and lines 1-14 on page 3. Peoples argues that disclosure of this information would be detrimental to the interests of Peoples and its ratepayers since it would provide other FGT customers with a list of prospective imbalance traders and would allow third parties to interject themselves as middlemen between Peoples and the FGT customer. Peoples asserts that publishing this information would reveal elements of Peoples' capacity strategy and help illustrate Peoples' supply and transportation structure. Peoples contends that disclosing the amount of available pipeline capacity at a specific point could encourage the intervention of competing shippers, suppliers, industrial end users, or capacity brokers, and could affect a potential customer's decisions regarding the type of service it desires. The end result, Peoples argues, is reasonably likely to be an increased cost of transportation, which would lead to an increased cost of gas to recover from ratepayers.

I find that the information discussed above is proprietary confidential business information and should be given confidential treatment to avoid harm to Peoples and its ratepayers. Peoples has requested that the proprietary information discussed above not be declassified for a period of 18 months, as provided in Section 366.093(4), Florida Statutes. According to Peoples, the period requested is necessary to allow Peoples and its affiliates to negotiate future gas purchase contracts. Peoples argues that if this information were declassified at an earlier date, suppliers and competitors would have access to information which could adversely affect the ability of Peoples and its affiliates to negotiate future contracts on favorable terms. It is noted that this time period of confidential classification will ultimately protect Peoples and its ratepayers. The request for a confidential classification period of 18 months shall, therefore, be granted.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is therefore,

ORDERED by Commissioner J. Terry Deason, as Prehearing Officer, that the requested information in Document No. 00713-97 shall be treated as proprietary confidential business information to the extent discussed above. It is further

ORDER NO. PSC-97-0538-CFO-GU
DOCKET NO. 970003-GU
PAGE 10

ORDERED that the information discussed above shall be afforded confidential treatment for a period of 18 months from the issuance date of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that this Order will be the only notification by the Commission to the parties concerning the expiration of the confidentiality time period.

By ORDER of Commissioner J. Terry Deason, as Prehearing Officer, this 9th day of May, 1997.


J. TERRY DEASON, Commissioner and
Prehearing Officer

(S E A L)

WCK

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Any party adversely affected by this order, which is preliminary, procedural or intermediate in nature, may request: 1) reconsideration within 10 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.038(2), Florida Administrative Code, if issued by a Prehearing Officer; 2) reconsideration within 15 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code, if issued by the Commission; or 3) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court, in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility, or the First District Court of Appeal, in the case of a water or wastewater utility. A motion for reconsideration shall be filed with the Director, Division of

ORDER NO. PSC-97-0538-CFO-GU
DOCKET NO. 970003-GU
PAGE 11

Records and Reporting, in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code. Judicial review of a preliminary, procedural or intermediate ruling or order is available if review of the final action will not provide an adequate remedy. Such review may be requested from the appropriate court, as described above, pursuant to Rule 9.100, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.