INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION 02/20/96 FINANCE DOCKET # 32760 1320-1343 2.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

5

6

7 8

10

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

JUDGE NELSON: On the other hand, if I return that it's improperly claimed, then we have the basis for discovery. So, what do you lose by showing it to me?

MR. ROACH: Then there is -- then there is no threshold test for that point. And what I've got is my friend who's going to get our privileged log here momentarily and he'll be back. He'll say "Well, now you should look at every one of these documents because you've concluded in the first test litigation of this matter" --

JUDGE NELSON: Not necessarily.

MR. ROACH: So there really isn't any hurdle for them to jump over --

JUDGE NELSON: Well, I could distinguish this particular incident in terms of its timing, its personnel and so forth.

MR. ROACH: Well, I submit that they have made no showing whatsoever. We gave them a detailed proffer of proof, and offered to back it with an affidavit.

And if that isn't enough to just -- to put the burden where it belongs here --

JUDGE NELSON: I don't think you need the affidavit because I thin he's agreeing with anything

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

the affiate would say.

MR. ROACH: I didn't think I needed one either, but I'm careful in protecting these matters and careful in documenting our responsible conduct in redacting things.

And I don't think that it should just be automatic that you look behind what counsel does in discovery in a responsible way, especially if we make this short of showing.

JUDGE NELSON: Is there a way to distinguish this case, Mr. Lubel, so that we don't -- you don't come in and I have to look at every claim that's attorney/client privilege and review it in camera?

MR. LUBEL: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE NELSON: Is this one different?

MR. LUBEL: Well, it is because of the -- as I noted initially, the significance of the time period and what this is.

This is an early consideration by this company of the merger. And it -- you know, it's at a time that's critical, we think, in terms of showing what their motivations are in going forward with this merger.

And I can represent that I'm not going to

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

do what -- we're not going to have a floodgate problem here.

And you know, we're all here together. You're the referee here. You'll -- I know that you can deal with it if we try to get out of hand with it, Your Honor.

I think again that we've made the sufficient showing to allow --

JUDGE NELSON: Try again on why you think it is that Mr. Roach is improperly invoking the privilege.

MR. LUBEL: I'm sure that these are some interesting remarks. I would bet that they're interesting remarks about -- about this merger and maybe their own internal view of why they're doing this merger or whether it's appropriate or not.

JUDGE NELSON: But you're not going to see them if they're attorney/client.

MR. LUBEL: Well, that's true. That's true. But getting back to the showing, I'm really just repeating myself now.

I mean, I -- it's not presented by the lawyer. This is --

JUDGE NELSON: We've been through a lot of battles with Mr. Roach, hard fights. Sometimes he's

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

won, sometimes he's lost. Do we have any reason to believe --

MR. LUBEL: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE NELSON: -- that he would be improperly claiming a privilege here?

MR. LUBEL: Yes. Your Honor, I'm not saying that they would be doing anything in bad faith.

But I believe, and I've been --

JUDGE NELSON: it's a high stakes game if he's playing it because it will blow up in his face if I look at the stuff.

MR. LUBEL: Over 20 years, I have seen these situations come up before. And people make subjective judgements. If there is a remark that maybe would be a little damaging to their case, there's a way to make a subjective judgement and rationalize, you know, that's akin to what the attorney said. Let's call that, you know, attorney/client advice.

It's much like we dealt with earlier today when we talked about feasibility. They made the judgement that these build-outs were not feasible. But we shouldn't have to rely on their judgement. I mean, it should be tested.

And here, we're just asking it to be

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

tested by you for the reasons that I've set forth. JUDGE NELSON: Let me ask you something. MR. LUBEL: And I might also add that I said it was more than financial. JUDGE NELSON: I have a question, Mr. 5 Roach. Is there a difference between five and page 6 17? Page five looks like a chart. 8 MR. ROACH: They both refer to legal 9 considerations. JUDGE NELSON: Five could be simply a 10 11 chart that was handed to people. Seventeen could have been an outline of a talk that was given. Can you 12 13 help us on those? MR. ROACH: Five was a presentation that 14 was made. There were overheads. So five is 15 16 overheads. JUDGE NELSON: Who made -- oh, five is an 17 overhead --18 19 MR. ROACH: Mr. Matthews --JUDGE NELSON: -- while Mr. Matthews was 20 21 talking? 22 MR. ROACH: Right. And 17 is part of 23 back-up materials that are in the Board book that they can look at, but that aren't actually spoken from, 24 25 okay? **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

JUDGE NELSON: So the only thing they heard directly was five.

MR. ROACH: Right. Can I respond to the notion that I'm making subjective --

JUDGE NELSON: Well, you're helping me now.

MR. ROACH: I understand.

JUDGE NELSON: I was coming out just the other way. It looked to me like 17 was the more sensitive stuff in the sense that it got communicated to them in a speech. It isn't.

The representation is that 17 is back-up, which they may never even have looked at. Is that correct?

MR. ROACH: Yes.

JUDGE NELSON: But that five was an overhead that was projected while Mr. Matthews was making a talk?

MR. ROACH: They looked at both as far as I'm concerned, Your Honor. These are Board materials. I presume they looked at both.

But I'm really -- I need to respond to this argument that I'm making subjective judgements.

JUDGE NELSON: Well, don't you see a difference between a bunch of paper that's available

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

24

25

(202) 234-4433

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

12

14

15

17

18

20

22

23

24

25

to look at if they feel like it and t e actual stuff they heard?

MR. ROACH: I don't think so. I think the Board considers and looks at both. But the point I'd like to stress, Your Honor, is I didn't make tendentious, subjective judgements here.

JUDGE NELSON: You think both are in the same category?

MR. ROACH: I'm --

JUDGE NELSON: It seems to me he has a weaker case for the stuff that's in the background if we didn't even know if they looked at it. He has a stronger case for me to see the case that was up on projector that they actually heard about.

MR. ROACH: I really do not see the distinction. I think how strong a case he has turns on whether he has given you the slightest reason to believe that we have improperly redacted attorney/client advice from any of these papers.

And what I am here to represent to you is we discussed this with UP's general counsel. Our lawyers didn't sit off in a room making tendentious judgements. We discussed this with counsel.

And if necessary, we'll bring Mr. von Bernuth here and he'll explain to you the basis for

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

each of these decisions and why it is legal advice and why it was redacted.

This is not something where we just wing it, and we go out and redact things where it's even arguable that there's a legal context.

JUDGE NELSON: Do you want to hear Mr. Bernuth on these subjects?

MR. LUBEL: Your Honor, he made that offer.

MR. ROACH: I did.

MR. LUBEL: And again, my first thought was well, we can depose Mr. Bernuth. But why do through all that?

It's here. It can be looked at. It can be over with. And I don't think we need to make this to the level of professionalism, Your Honor.

I'm not challenging Mr. Roach's professionalism. But every -- every lawyer has a duty to his client to advocate vigorously for that client. And here, you know, you've got the financial officer making statements. He's talking about operational matters, not just financial matters.

JUDGE NELSON: Do you see a difference between page 17 and page five --

MR. LUBEL: Your Honor, I --

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE NELSON: -- as to which one you would want me to look at?

MR. LUBEL: I'd rather -- well, let me see, five seems to have more there. I find it hard to make the distinction, Your Honor. I have to agree with Mr. Roach on that.

I mean, quantitatively, five has more and it is -- it is more information. And when he's talking -- well, but he's talking, but it's a prepared slide.

JUDGE NELSON: What form is 17 in? MR. LUBEL: Well, 17 was just written -a written document that was handed out. There seems --

JUDGE NELSON: But in the back-up papers.

MR. LUBEL: -- from our point of view -from our point of view, either one -- this is the presentation by the chief financial officer, Mr. Matthews. We think that raises some question about whether it was financial and operative or business judgements rather than strictly legal information being given, and at least enough showing to have an in camera inspection.

JUDGE NELSON: Supposing I were to say to Mr. Roach, "Mr. Roach, there are" -- what are there --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

"five redactions at issue here. You pick any one of them, show me the one, and the claim stands or falls on the one, your pick." How would you react to that?

MR. ROACH: Well I'm a gambling man, I'd rather take that than nothing, Your Honor, but --

JUDGE NELSON: All right, that's what I'm going to do. I'm going to direct Mr. Roach to select any one of the five.

MR. LUBEL: He gets the choice of which one?

JUDGE NELSON: He picks. Show it to me and I'll rule whether it's attorney/client and I'll draw the inference from that having observed Mr. Roach in action here that he's an attorney of good faith.

MR. LUBEL: If I could suggest an alternative, just a slight alternative there, Your Honor, why doesn't Your Honor just pick one of the five places, and that would be a lot more random.

Again, no offense to them, but if they -if they have the right to choose, they would chose presumably the one that's most clearly within their privilege.

JUDGE NELSON: How do I find them without looking at them?

MR. LUBEL: No, I'm just saying there are

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

24

25

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
13/23 PHOU'S ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

at the --

MR. LUBEL: Okay.

4

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

(Pause.)

JUDGE NELSON: I have two reactions. One,

it undoubtedly reflects attorney/client advice and I

intend to protect it. Two, if you got it, you couldn't do anything with it.

MR. LUBEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

JUDGE NELSON: It seems to me of no litigation. It isn't thing that we couldn't see anyway. There are no dramatic words, no smoking guns, more or less legal truisms.

MR. LUBEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

JUDGE NELSON: All right.

MR. LUBEL: We'll always wonder what was on the other document?

JUDGE NELSON: Anything else?

MR. LUBEL: One last issue, Your Honor.

JUDGE NELSON: I may say, having seen those, that I have no doubt about the validity of other claims and would suspect that you would get nothing from them if I gave them to you.

Anything remaining?

MR. LUBEL: Your Honor, we have one other issue, and this has to do --

NEAL IR. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

JUDGE NELSON: Designating an advanced all-party --

MR. LUBEL: Yes, yes. And this is something that I think for other people also, although there's a deposition going on today.

The Applicants have followed the practice of in advance designating all portions of all depositions as highly confidential, meaning only an outside counsel can look at them, then to be followed up by their later -- you know, declassifying once they've had a chance to look at the transcript itself.

We feel, and I'll explain briefly why, that that is over-broad and an abuse of the highly confidential designation. I'll give some examples, and that the better practice would be for them to, as the deposition is going on, when a highly confidential document is mentioned or some testimony that they feel is highly confidential, that they designate it at that time.

We're not asking that there be a debace at that time.

JUDGE NELSON: When they do it?

MR. LUBEL: Yes. We're not saying that we have the right to debate it then. Once they designate it, it's their -- it's their right to do that.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

Let me give an example of how we did that, Your Honor.

JUDGE NELSON: We go through that here from time to time. And I can tell you, and I can tell you it's a lot more cumbersome to try to do it was you go along than it does once you're back looking at it.

MR. LUBEL: Your Honor, but --

JUDGE NELSON: You've got a hard one here.

MR. LUBEL: The example -- but I hope to make some progress on it, Your Honor, because we have a real --

JUDGE NELSON: You drew a FERC Judge. We have this practice.

MR. LUBEL: Well, we have a real live example here, Your Honor, and that was Mr. Rebensdorf's deposition. And Mr. Rebensdorf is a very key person, high up in the company, head of Strategic Planning. He negotiated the agreement with Burlington Northern.

In his deposition, there were two representatives from Conrail there, who aren't privy to highly confidential material. The deposition went on for two days.

At, I believe, three points during the deposition, they were asked to leave because highly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

confidential material was being discussed, and they did.

And I think that sets a model by which we could do this.

JUDGE NELSON: It can be done.

MR. LUBEL: Yes. And Your Honor, it -JUDGE NELSON: And you have another model,

MR. LUBEL: Seeing where you're going,
Your Honor --

this morning's proceedings, Mr. Lubel.

JUDGE NELSON: There have been times when during this proceeding, lawyers wanted these proceedings closed.

MR. LUBEL: If I might, I just have about a minute more, Mr. Roach. The problem we have, Your Honor, the problem for us with doing it this way is that they say they will later designate, okay?

We have had about 14 or 15 depositions. The designations have come 16 days later, eight days later.

We just, in the last day or two, got Mr. Runde's deposition, the designations of the highly confidential portions. It was taken January 16th.

The problem is we can't share things with our client --

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

25

JUDGE NELSON: Maybe -- maybe our problem is to speed that process up.

MR. LUBEL: That's what I'd ask for. And I'll give one more example and then I'll stop.

JUDGE NELSON: Because you need that declassified stuff to use with your consultants.

MR. LUBEL: Well, not the consultants so much as to be able to work with our clients to --

JUDGE NELSON: You can show it now to the consultants. It's the client you can't show it to.

MR. LUBEL: Right. But I'll give you just one more example, Your Honor. And that was Mr. Grinstein's deposition last Friday. Now, this was not their show. This was Burlington Northern. But they followed the lead of the Applicants.

We started the deposition. They designated the whole thing as highly confidential. What's one of the first things that was talked about? The Forbes article, you know, that was published in a national magazine.

Now here's my question: they've designated it highly confidential. Does that mean that I can't tell my client that Mr. Grinstein endorsed that article? He said he agreed with everything ir there, that they didn't misrepresent

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

him?

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE NELSON: I see the problem.

MR. LUBEL: That's not highly confidential. All I would ask, Your Honor, is that maybe some three-day period, that, you know, within three days after --

JUDGE NELSON: What we need here, Mr. Roach, is a suggestion which gets us somewhere in between doing it instantly as we go along and doing it 16 days later.

MR. ROACH: Sure.

JUDGE NELSON: I'd like to get some help on that.

MR. ROACH: Let me address it briefly if I may, Your Honor. First of all, I -- when Mr. Lubel raised this issue, again many weeks ago, I wrote to him and I said, "If there is anything that you want us to turn to first, we will do it immediately."

And we never heard back from him on that. We have had requests from some other parties and --JUDGE NELSON: I don't understand what that means.

MR. ROACH: It means if there's a segment of the deposition you want to promptly declassify so you can discuss it with your client, we'll do it --

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

4 5

7

8

6

9

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

we'll move it to the front of the line and do it promptly. And we have done that for some other parties.

We have never had that -- Mr. Lubel take us up on that offer. We are moving as fast as we can. I expect that we will be declassifying most of the remaining depositions this week.

I have been lashing my people to get it done. But here's the problem. First of all, I don't know when my witnesses are going to say highly confidential things. And a lot of these are just full of highly confidential material.

JUDGE NELSON: I know.

MR. ROACH: Second, this Conrail example is a perfect example of how I hurt myself by trying to be reasonable in these cases.

I let the Conrail people sit there. And I tried to guess when we were getting in trouble and had to ask them to leave the room. And I'm not going to do that again.

We're going to have these depositions on a highly confidential basis and then we'll declassify them properly.

As far as speed, I mean, I'll do my absolute darnest to get them done this week. We have

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

had 35 sets of discovery requests, written discovery requests, in the past --

JUDGE NELSON: What's left? How many depositions after these?

MR. ROACH: We're close to the end of the schedule. We've got about four or five left.

JUDGE NELSON: That have not been taken?

MR. ROACH: That have not been taken.
We've have, Lord, about 17 or 18 taken. We've declassified about a third of those, and we're getting close to being finished with --

JUDGE NELSON: Well, why don't you make an agreement that you can -- the outstanding depositions will be finished this week. And with those yet to be taken, you'll give them a turnaround of "X" days?

Tell me what "X" will be, and I'll approve it. You can work with him on that. We're going to take a recess for some discussions anyway.

MR. ROACH: I mean -- fine. I mean, barring that we come to you with good cause, we will try to finish in five business days.

JUDGE NELSON: If this were an ordinary litigation --

MR. LUBEL: If you can't, you know --

MR. ROACH: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

25

_

MR. LUBEL: -- we can talk about it.

JUDGE NELSON: We know that there's a tight time frame. But and we know --

MR. ROACH: That's fine with us, Your Honor.

JUDGE NELSON: So I want to -- we'll take a recess, and we're going to talk about the build-in materials and how to work out a scope of that and particularly with Mr. Norton, and the mechanics of turning over -- some of those build-in materials are more sensitive than others. I have forgotten which.

And then we're going to talk, I think, Mr. Roach and Mr. Lubel, with regard to this matter of declassifying of depositions so that we can clean up what's outstanding and make a commitment as to the future.

MR. ROACH: I think we're -- I think we're together on that.

JUDGE NELSON: If you are, then I don't need to do anything. But if you agree on something and you want -- if you find something that you want to be reflected, you tell me and I'll recite it as an order.

MR. LUBEL: Thank you.

JUDGE NELSON: How much time do we need?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

Do we want to get lunch sa well as do these talks, or -- Mr. Norton, you make a suggestion because you're going to be the one involved and on the phone and so forth here. Would an hour do it?

MR. NORTON: I think it probably won't be that much. Initially if we could just -- if I could see what they want and --

JUDGE NELSON: Why don't we take a break and then you call me when you're ready to resume.

MR. NORTON: Okay.

JUDGE NELSON: How would that be?

MR. NORTON: Fine.

JUDGE NELSON: All right. We're going to break, and I will be on call for Mr. Norton.

(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 12:36 p.m. and resumed at 1:54 p.m.)

JUDGE NELSON: Please be seated. Off the second.

(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 1:54 p.m. and resumed at 1:54 p.m.)

JUDGE NELSON: I'm advised with regard to the outstanding -- remainder of the outstanding issues that we discussed this morning that there's agreement between counsel, or among counsel, and all of that will be reflected in an exchange of correspondence

NEAL R. GROSS AT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBER

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

22

23

24

25

which will recite what the agreement is.

Any further comment on that? (No response.)

JUDGE NELSON: I want to ask whether we -what we should do in terms of the next discovery conference. Let's go off the record and see how we stand regarding that.

(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 1:55 p.m. and resumed at 1:56 p.m.)

JUDGE NELSON: We will keep in effect the current Wednesday/Friday machinery for discovery conference and be ready on each Friday as it may be needed.

> Anything else we need to discuss today? (No response.)

JUDGE NELSON: All right, that adjourns this discovery conference.

(Whereupon, the discovery conference was concluded at 1:56 p.m.)

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in the

matter of:

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD FINANCE DOCKET NO. 32760

Before:

THE HONORABLE JEROME NELSON

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

Date:

FEBRUARY 20, 1996

Place:

WASHINGTON, D.C.

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.

15 mike Rudoff

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433