

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 111 FERC ¶61,381  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Pat Wood, III, Chairman;  
Nora Mead Brownell, Joseph T. Kelliher,  
and Suedeen G. Kelly.

Bridgeport Energy, LLC

Docket Nos. ER05-611-000  
ER05-611-001

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER AND GRANTING  
EXTENSION OF TIME

(Issued June 9, 2005)

1. On May 17, 2005, Bridgeport Energy, LLC (Bridgeport) filed a request for the adoption of a protective order. Bridgeport states that one counter-party informed Bridgeport that it is of the view that the confidentiality provisions of its contract, which the Commission requested Bridgeport file with the Commission,<sup>1</sup> only allow for disclosure of the contract if Bridgeport has obtained a protective order from the Commission. On June 3, 2005, Bridgeport filed a notice that all the parties to this proceeding request adoption of Bridgeport's proposed protective order and a request for an extension of time to comment on Bridgeport's deficiency letter response filed May 26, 2005.

2. Consistent with prior orders,<sup>2</sup> there is no need to issue a protective order. Therefore, we will deny Bridgeport's motion. A protective agreement entered into by the parties will provide as much protection as a Commission-issued protective order. In this regard, Bridgeport has indicated that the parties do not object to its proposed protective

---

<sup>1</sup> Deficiency Letter issued by the Director Division of Tariffs & Market Development – East (April 20, 2005).

<sup>2</sup> *Southern Company Energy Marketing, Inc.*, 111 FERC ¶ 61,011 (2005); *Cranberry Pipeline Corp.*, 107 FERC ¶ 61,147 (2004); *PG&E Texas Pipeline, L.P.*, 92 FERC ¶ 61,111 (2000); *Trunkline Gas Co.*, 53 FERC ¶ 61,065 (1990).

Docket Nos. ER05-611-000 and ER05-611-001

2

agreement and has given no reason why a protective order issued by the Commission is necessary where the parties are willing to sign a protective agreement among themselves. Accordingly, the parties should enter into a protective agreement with Bridgeport to gain access to the information at issue.

3. Furthermore, we will extend the comment date to Bridgeport's deficiency letter response to June 24, 2005.<sup>3</sup>

The Commission orders:

(A) Bridgeport's motion for issuance of a protective order is denied for the reasons discussed in the body of this order.

(B) The comment date to Bridgeport's deficiency letter response is extended to June 24, 2005.

By the Commission.

( S E A L )

Linda Mitry,  
Deputy Secretary.

---

<sup>3</sup> Our extension thus moots the joint request for extension of time filed by the Connecticut Parties.