SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD 09/05/97 FD #33388 1-60

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

+ + + + +

ORAL ARGUMENT

+ + + + +

CSX CORPORATION AND CSX
TRANSPORTATION, INC., NORFOLK
SOUTHERN CORPORATION AND NORFOLK
SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY -CONTROL AND OPERATING LEASES/
AGREEMENTS -- CONRAIL INC. AND
CONSOLIDATED RAIL CORPORATION -TRANSFER OF RAILROAD LINE BY
NORFOLK SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY
TO CSX TRANSPORTATION, INC.

Finance Docket No. 33388

Friday, September 5, 1997

Washington, D.C.

The above-entitled matter came on for a cral argument in Hearing Room 3 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E. at 9:30 a.m.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE JACOB LEVENTHAL Administrative Law Judge

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of CSX:

CHRISTOPHER DATZ, ESQ.
DREW A. HARKER, ESQ.
of: Arnold & Porter
555 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 942-5249 (CD)
(202) 942-5022 (DAH)

AND

DAVID H. COBURN, ESQ.
of: Steptoe & Johnson, LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-1795
(202) 429-8063

On behalf of Norfolk Southern Corporation and Norfolk Southern Railway Company:

JOHN V. EDWARDS, ESQ.

PATRICIA E. BRUCE, ESQ.

of: Zuckert, Scoutt & Rasenberger

888 17th Street, N.W.

Washington D.C. 20006

(202) 1 3-8660

On behalf o Conrail:

of: Harkins Cunningham
Suite 600
1300 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 973-7605 (GPN)

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

APPEARANCES (continued):

On Behalf of Atlantic City Electric, Delmarva
Power and Light, Indianapolis Power and
Light Company, and The Ohio Valley Coal
Company:

MICHAEL F. McBRIDE, ESQ.
BRENDA DURHAM, ESQ.

of: LeBoew, Lamb, Green & MacRae, LLP.
Suite 1200
1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009-5728
(202) 986-8050 (MFM)
(202) 986-8213 (BD)

On behalf of New York State Electric and Gas:

SANDRA L. BROWN, ESQ.
WILLIAM A. MULLINS, ESQ.

of: Troutman, Sanders, LLP
Suite 500 East
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3314
(202) 274-2959 (SLB)
(202) 274-2953 (WAM)

On behalf of Niagara Mowhawk Power Corporation:

KARYN A. BOOTH, ESQ.

of: Donelan, Cleary, Wood & Maser, P.C.
Suite 750
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-9500

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

APPEARANCES (continued):

On Behalf of Canadian Pacific Parties:

FARHANA Y. KHERA, ESQ.
ERIC VON SALZEN, ESQ.
of: Hogan & Hartson, L.L.P.
555 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 637-6863 (FYK)
(202) 637-5718 (EVS)

ALSO PRESENT:

Roger C. Prescott, L. E. Peabody & Associaties, Inc., Economic Consultants

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:30 A.M. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Good morning. Please be seated. Will somebody get the rear door, please? MR. MULLINS: Excuse us, Your Honor. Last 5 minute discussions. 6 7 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. When you go on the record, I would like you to make a brief 8 9 appearance. 10 All right. The oral argument will come to 11 order. This is an oral argument in STB Finance Docket 333888. We'll take appearances at this time. MR. McBRIDE: Good morning, Your Honor. 13 I'm Michael McBride from LeBoeuf, Lamb, Greene and 14 MacRae, LLP, for American Electric Power, Atlantic 15 16 City Electric Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, Indianapolis Power and Light Company, and the 17 18 Ohio Valley Coal Company. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. 19 MR. McBRIDE: I have a preliminary matter, 20 Your Honor, when you conclude the appearances. 22 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: When we finish the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 appearances, sure. 2 MS. DURHAM: Your Honor, Brenda Durham, with LeBoeuf, Lamb, Greene and MacRae, 3 representing American Electric Power, Atlantic City 4 Electric Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, 5 Indianapolis Power and Light Company, and the Ohic 6 7 Valley Coal Company. 8 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Very well. 9 MR. MULLINS: William Mullins, Troutman Sanders, representing New York State Electric and Gas. 10 11 MS. BROWN: Sandra Brown with Troutman Sanders, also representing New York State Electric and 12 13 Gas. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. 14 MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, John Edwards, Zuckert, Scoutt and Rasenberger for Norfolk Southern. MR. COBURN: David Coburn of Steptoe and 17 18 Johnson, LLP, for applicant CSX. 19 MR. DATZ: Your Honor, Chris Datz. I am from Arnold and Porter for CSX. 20 21 MR. HARKER: Drew Harker with Arnold and 22 Porter for CSX.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	MR. NORTON: Gerald Norton with Harkins
2	Cunningham for Conrail.
3	MS. BRUCE: Patricia Bruce, Zuckert,
4	Scoutt and Rasenberger for Norfolk Southern.
5	MS. KHERA: Good morning, Your Honor.
6	Farhana Khera of Hogan and Hartson for the Canadian
7	Pacific parties.
8	MS. BOOTH: Good morning, Your Honor.
9	Karyn Booth with Donelan, Cleary, Wood and Maser, here
10	for Niagara Mohawk Power Company.
11	MR. McBRIDE: And if Your Honor, please,
12	this gentleman over here is one of our consultants,
13	Mr. Roger Prescott from the LE Peabody firm. He has
14	signed a confidential and highly confidential
15	undertakings.
16	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Very well.
17	All right, Mr. McBride?
18	MR. McBRIDE: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.
19	As a preliminary matter, you may recall that in our
20	letter of August 28 forwarding our reply brief to Your
21	Honor, we informed you and counsel that we had been
22	furnished with some unredacted documents in error. We

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

got the taped over version instead of the copied 1 version. We neglected to return them before now, but I thought it might be appropriate to do that on the 3 record since I told Your Honor we would do that. We haven't lifted the tape or copied what's underneath, 5 but I wanted counsel for CSX to have those documents. 6 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. MR. McBRIDE: If Your Honor has that 8 9 matter of redacting cost information before him, we didn't think it was appropriate to seize on what 10 apparently was an inadvertent mistake. 11 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Very well. By the way, 12 I have issued my order on the redaction matter. Have 13 parties received it yet? 14 MR. McBRIDE: The board hasn't served it, 15 as far as I know. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: It should have been issued yesterday. But all right. It's in the works. 18 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went 19 20 briefly off the record.) JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Back on the record. MR. COBURN: Your Honor, obviously we 22

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

haven't seen the order. But knowing the way in which you have ruled on it, we would ask that the Board stay so that we would have an opportunity to appeal. I'm confident that our clients are going to want to appeal the issue. Once the cat is out of the bag, so to speak, it's out of the bag.

So it seems to us that since this is an issue that the Board has spoken on in previous cases and it's obviously an issue of great importance to the applicants, we would certainly commit to appealing promptly. The board of course has been acting very promptly on these appeals.

So we're adding a few more days. We realize that, but I think in light of the gravity of the issue, and in order to in fact preserve our rights on appeal that stay would be appropriate.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Just so the record is clear, in our off the record discussion, I indicated to the parties that I had ruled on the issue of redacted material by a decision which I signed on this last Wednesday in which I had requested the Board to issue yesterday.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

Obviously it appears in any event, that 1 the order, that the decision was not issued yesterday. But in order to move things along, I advised the parties that I had ruled that the material that had been redacted from the documents that were in question 5 I ordered unredacted. 6 I have to say that my order also required the material to be furnished without further delay. 8 Mr. Coburn has asked that I stay my ruling. How long 9 10 a time did you ask for? 11 MR. COBURN: Pending a determination by the Board on the appeal that we would file. 12 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Well I think the Board 13 rules within three days, do they not? I think you 14 15 have three days to appeal. 16 MR. COBURN: That's right. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: From the date of issue, 17 not from the date that I'm announcing now. Then the 18 Board rules within three days. 19 20 MR. COBURN: I don't know that the Board necessarily rules within three days. 22 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: They have been doing

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

| that.

MR. COBURN: Well they have been ruling on it quickly. I don't know whether it's been three days or not, but they generally have been ruling quickly. We would certainly ask for expedited consideration of the appeal.

MR. McBRIDE: Your Honor, first of all as you can tell from the fact that they didn't serve your order yesterday, nobody around here can be sure of when the Board is going to do anything.

There are matters pending before the Board in this case that have been pending the Board for weeks. The labor unions, for example, filed a petition and asked the Board to declare that the applicants already unlawfully control Conrail. They have obviously opposed that, but the matter has not been resolved. That's been weeks.

So we have to reply within three days to their appeal. They have three days to appeal, we have to reply in three days. But there is no obligation on the Board to rule within any given period of time.

I must say to you that as you know from my

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

.

correspondence, I hope I'm not wearing out my welcome, but I have to say this. They have wasted seven weeks of our time here since we first started these matters before Your Honor. We only have six weeks left to put our case on. They could string this out until presumably on the eve or even past the time that our evidence is due if Your Honor were to grant the stay.

So unless their clients are willing to commit to a day to day extension in the October 21 date from today, for the filing of our comments and evidence, so that if the Board takes two weeks plus the three days and three days for their appeal and our reply, then we would get that entire period of time. But they won't commit, I can confidently predict right now, that their clients would agree to give me even one day extension.

Unless they are not willing to give me an extension, then the applicants are hoist on their petard here. I mean they insist on expedition and they insist on the October 21 date. Yet they want to string out our ability to put our case together.

I've got my consultant here who will

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

attest if Your Honor needs what all these delays have done to our ability to put our case together. It is getting to be critical.

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, just two brief arguments on Norfolk Southern. Wornall is the only issue that is still pending from this week's period of time, that is in fact this one item in the area of petition. Any other appeal has been done in an expeditious manner. We would join the ACE et al. We would ask for expedited approval or expedited consideration in this matter.

We are talking about perhaps if the order was issued late yesterday, none of the parties would have received copies of it. So it could have been issued yesterday, in which case our reply would be -our appeal would be due on Tuesday. Their response would be due on Friday. We could conceivably see a decision a week after.

If the stay is not granted, the appeal is almost mooted given the nature of the issue.

MR. McBRIDE: That is simply not true because if the Board were to grant their appeal, and

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I think Your Honor knows what the track record is on discovery appeals, the Board denied them all in the UP SP case. There weren't any in BN SF. I am 0 for one in this case so far, Your Honor knows.

So I don't think it's very likely this appeal is going to be granted. But in any event, if it were granted and we have this documentation and we are putting our case together, we could be ordered to return it. And as I demonstrated in the first matter on the record this morning, whatever they want to say about me, we are honorable people and we return things when we are supposed to. That is what I just did. I would do that again.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: No, but if the unredacted, what good would be your returning it?
Once it's unredacted, it's unredacted.

MR. McBRIDE: Because we can only use the data for purposes of this proceeding. That's what the protective order says, that's what we're required to limit our use of this data to. That's what we would do. Therefore, if we return it, it would be of utterly no value to us because we couldn't use it in

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

the proceeding and we can't by terms of the protective 1 2 order use it any other way. But if you deny us that data, then you are 3 preventing us from putting our case together. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: 5 Let me make a suggestion. Both parties have briefed this. I don't 6 know that the Board needs any further argument than you have already made before me. Perhaps you can 8 stipulate to let this go up on appeal today based upon 9 your submissions to me without any further time delay. 10 MR. McBRIDE: I might consider that if 11 they were to agree to one thing. They filed an 12 impermissible reply to my reply. The Board's rules 13 are crystal clear that they don't allow replies to --14 15 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. I did not consider their reply. I ruled that it was out of 16 17 order. MR. McBRIDE: But if Your Honor intends to 18 limit it to their August 25 filing and my August 28 19 20 reply, which is all the Board's rules permit, I would be willing to have the appeal decided on the basis of 21 22 those two pleadings.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right.

MR. COBURN: Your Honor, I believe we would as well, subject to the caveat that we haven't read your order yet and there may be items, with all due respect, in your order that we might want to say something about to enhance the Board's views as to our view as to what you said.

So I think what we could agree to do is to submit the briefs as they are together with perhaps a letter, a brief letter brief, if no more than perhaps two or three pages, that we would produce very quickly, if not today.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Let's go off the record.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 9:43 a.m. and went back on the record at 9:45 a.m.)

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Let's defer this to the end of the morning session. We can check whether or not it's been issued.

Let me tell you, I wrote a very simple order. I found that your compliance with my earlier ruling was without substance because you took out the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

material, the very material that they wanted. So that my finding that it was relevant really was ignored. I pointed out that not only did I find it relevant, the but Board affirmed me in finding that what I permitted was relevant. I did not discuss the cases either side cited although I read them. But my finding was that discovery has to be decided on a case by case basis. So my ruling was very -- I don't like to call anything I do simple, but it was simple. I think that your briefing of both sides I think you argued well. In all these things, somebody wins, somebody loses, but I think the Board would certainly have sufficient information before it to make a reasonable ruling on

So that if you decide that you want to go up on a stipulated appeal today without any further delay, would you object if I stay my ruling say for one week?

MR. McBRIDE: Your Honor, I would stipulate if they would give me the amount of time the Board takes on an extension of the October 21 comments

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

your appeal.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	in evidence, then they don't have to give me the data
2	for however many days, from the date of the issuance
3	of the order.
4	MR. EDWARDS: We don't have the power to
5	do that.
6	MR. McBRIDE: Subject to the Boards
7	approval.
8	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: I was going to say I
9	don't know that they can.
10	MR. McBRIDE: But as subject to the
11	Board's
12	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Up to the Board's
13	approval?
14	MR. EDWARDS: We'd have to consult with
15	our clients.
16	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: You are talking about
17	one week.
18	MR. EDWARDS: We would have to talk to our
19	
20	MR. COBURN: The procedural schedule is a
21	matter of great interest to our clients.
22	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Obviously, but again,
	NEAL R. GROSS
NO FEED AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE PART	NEAL K. UKO33

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

we're only talking about five business days. Even 1 though it's a huge merger, I don't know that five 2 business days is going to affect it one way or 3 another. Of course you don't know whether or not the Board will go along with it. 5 6 MR. McBRIDE: They took an extra week to file. 8 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: What's that? MR. McBRIDE: They took an extra week to 9 file. They told all the world they were going to file 10 11 on June 16. They filed on June 23. 12 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Yes, but I think that's their privilege. I'll defer ruling on that until the 13 end of today's session. 14 I'm bothered by two things. Obviously I 15 am sympathetic to Mr. McBride's dilemma in getting his 16 case together. On the other hand, once the applicants 17 furnish unredacted material, it's unredacted and 18 nobody is questioning the honor of counsel on the 19 other side. Well, we'll see where we go by the end of 20

All right. Anything else? Mr. McBride.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

today.

21

22

MR. McBRIDE: Yes. I asked to be heard on three matters this morning, Your Honor, if you will I would like to deal with each of them recall.

The listing was of three matters and the applicants quite honorably have kind of added a fourth. I want to say first of all that nothing that I say, as I said in my letter, intended to impugn the integrity of anyone over there. They are a bunch of honorable lawyers and they are working at least as hard as I am, which means they are working too hard.

But apparently that's part of the reason for the delay, because Norfolk Southern has been quite candid with us in telling us it had 60 reel to reel cases of I understand described them to one of my colleagues, for the period 1980 to 1984. I've been aware of this for some time, but Mr. Edwards seems to be working night and day, and I gather maybe he or Bruce or somebody is involved in the review of these even though the applicants have 75,000 employees and over 50 lawyers working on this. I'm told they haven't yet reviewed those tapes. Our time is

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

-

briefly if I may.

running.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

There are relevant tapes within the scope of Your Honor's order. These are the tapes, the traffic data between 1980 and 1984. In order to cut through this, I asked them to simply provide us the tapes with both the record layout, which was part of our original request, so we would understand what's on the tapes so we could do the work. Because I am trying to meet my obligations under the procedural schedule the Board established. They don't want to do that.

They say they haven't yet reviewed the tapes. They won't say when they are going to review them.

Now secondly, I ask you for an order requiring them to state whether they have any documents for that period of time, obviously other than those tapes. They now say they don't. ccunsel said that, and counsel for CSX on behalf of all the applicants, and I don't question his integrity, but it seems a little hard to believe that Norfolk Southern has no coal marketing records

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

relevant to our clients for the period 1980 to 1984. But if that's what they meant to say, so be it.

Now the fourth item, I am going to skip to just for the moment. The same counsel, Mr. Harker, was candid enough to volunteer in the letter what I had been pressing for a statement on for some time. Your Honor may recall that originally Mr. Harker said at one of these conferences back I think in July that CSX couldn't find any tapes from the 1978 to 1982 period.

We then suggested that he look in a particular rate case file. There was a big coal rate case at the time called the 22 Percent case. There was a further report. They still hadn't found any. I don't know where they found them, but he now quite candidly reports that they have found tapes for the 1980 to 1982 period.

Again, these are within the scope of your original order. We don't know when we are going to get them. Apparently the applicants here, having the same few people review everything, and that's really slowing things down. So those are part of the

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18 19

20

21

problems that we are having.

1

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Then the rest of the information, Your Honor, that they have redacted is just as critical to us as the cost information. I mean they are redacting the very things that go to the heart of determining the profitability of the movement. I wanted to give Your Honor just an example of a hypothetical situation here that we're trying to deal with. They asked for a visual aid, so we brought some along this morning.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: My secretary is on leave. So you have markers?

MR. McBRIDE: Yes. Thank you. have done here, Your Conor, just to kind of illustrate for you what we have got so far and what we are trying to develop is for American Electric Power's Cardinal Plant, which is a plant that CSX provided us some data on because it's a destination served by Conrail, the red line if you'll notice on the graph, illustrates all the data that we have received to date, which is 1995, 1996, 1997. You will recall under your order, you limited it to those years.

Then what we would hope to get now, based

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

on the CSX tapes for 1980 to 1982 which they have just said that they have, would be to fill in in the earlier periods. Apparently we won't be able to fill in 1978 and 1979, even though you ordered them to produce them if they have them, because they don't say they have them.

Then what we would propose to do through other publicly available data, is try to fill in in between because Your Honor didn't require them to produce that information. Because what we are trying to do for each of our clients for each of its destinations is to create what are called time lines. Sort of if you'll think of it this way, lay them one on top of the other and try to determine patterns to the data. Then use that to determine statistically whether we can conclude things about the pricing policy of CSX or NS or Conrail from them.

Now in going into the process of setting a rate for a plant, and most of these now are under contract, there's a lot more to it than just picking a number and saying it's five dollars a ton or whatever. That's hypothetical.

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

3

6

9

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

But you might, for example, if you don't move any tons, and five dollars a ton isn't a competitive rate, it's an irrelevancy. So you need to know how many tons, whether there's any minimum tonnage which there typically is in these big contracts. You need to know what escalation factor applies to that base rate. You need to know a whole host of things that go into determining really what we're talking about here is the net revenues, the profitability of the traffic.

That goes to the heart of the matter that we're trying to develop. It's precisely of course, as you might expect, the very things that they have redacted. So we're not getting tonnages or minimum tonnages or escalation factors. We're not getting contribution which is the comparison of revenue to cost. Your Honor has now already informed us of your ruling on the cost issue.

So the guts of the elements that make up the profitability of any of these movements has not been provided to us because of the redactions.

We have tabulated many, if not all of the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

16 17

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

20

19

21

documents we're talking about here. Your Honor, we could spend the rest of the weekend with you here going through document by document. I don't propose to do it, but we have examples if Your Honor needs to see them of categories of things that they have redacted.

But just trying to make this simple, let me tell you that our consultants inform us that the following categories of things have been redacted. The first heading is rates divisions and revenues.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Is that rate?

MR. McBRIDE: Rates/divisions/revenues. Your Honor will recall, it already said they weren't going to redact divisions. Apparently they have. They have even redacted rates. I've got numbers of documents on that.

Operating costs, Your Honor has now ruled on that issue I gather. Contribution, which is the comparison of the first two. Contract term/volume. Term is very important too because sometimes a carrier will be willing to give you a lower rate if you agree to extend the contract for a longer period of time,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

21

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

and the converse can also be true.

Escalation/adjustments. Then we have a category called unknown. We didn't list that tape on those documents I gave back this morning to find out if we could fill in the unknown. But this is what's being redacted. This is not meaningless stuff. This isn't somebody's social security number. This is matters that go right to the heart of how you determine the profitability of these movements.

I don't want to complicate it further unless Your Honor wants to see documents, but we believe that all of that was within the scope of your original rule. They took it upon themselves to redact the information from the documents Your Honor ordered them to produce seven weeks ago. I don't think they have any right to do it under the protective order.

Now yesterday in Mr. Harker's letter they have resurrected this argument about your Grainland ruling. You may recall on July 16, I took the risk of wearing out my welcome with you forever by telling you that they have cited the very statute that Your Honor thought didn't permit the exchange of shipper specific

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

.

information. They relied on that as authority to permit one another, permit these applicants to exchange shipper-specific information in the application, in the petition for their protective order.

I have got the order here if Your Honor wants to see it. The Board relied on that very statute to permit them to exchange a shipper specific information.

So you know, I say this with the greatest of respect to Your Honor and to Mr. Harker, but I am afraid to say that given decision number one in this proceeding, and decision number four which modified the protective order and relied on that very statute to allow them to exchange shipper specific information, the notion that your ordering Grainland somehow precludes now the shippers from getting shipper specific information when the carriers have already been permitted to exchange our information with one another, would stand logic on its head.

I would like the documents without redaction that Your Honor ordered them to produce

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

seven weeks ago.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21 22

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Mr. Coburn?

MR. COBURN: Your Honor, we are a bit baffled as to Mr. McBride's discussion of what was redacted because we over the last several weeks have provided to Mr. McBride, and maybe there's just been a failure of communication between Mr. McBride as well because I am a consultant so I don't know, information about their own rates, which of course they know anyway. They know what they have been paying. Information about each client's own divisions and revenues. Costs is a different matter. Of course we did not provide them. That's the subject of your order and any order from the Board on appeal.

Contract term and volume, they should have that. We're not withholding that. We are not redacting it. We're not redacting escalation close information relevant to their own client's movements.

I'm sorry. I am being corrected. Escalation --

MR. DATZ: Yes. I should say that costs, contribution and escalation were sort of generally

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

lumped in the category of costs.

What we have been redacting, putting costs aside, is information that would be of use in terms of being used against us in pending and future negotiations that we might have or are having with Mr. McBride's clients. That comes in the form of market intelligence information, information that goes to bids that were considered by the railroads and never made, and information flowing from bids that were considered internally by the railroad and never made,

and other very sensitive market information that if

disclosed to Mr. McBride and really to

consultants, could be used against us at

MR. COBURN: Okay. I apologize for that.

But in terms of the actual rates, and to use Mr. McBride's chart, the actual rates that his clients are paying, well of course they know what they paid, but we haven't redacted information about what AEP has paid, what ACE has paid et cetera. We haven't redacted it, so I don't understand why we are having this problem.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

bargaining table.

MR. McBRIDE: I'll be happy to -- I have 1 a list. I'll give them the Bates numbers. 2 consultants prepared this for us. They have now conceded they have redacted contribution, escalation and costs. But as to rates/divisions/revenues, I have the very Bates numbers here. I can provide them for the record. I am not making this up.

> MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, have two minor points. I am not sure whether or not we are confusing the issue as to whether or not the information that Mr. McBride is discussing is redacted from the pockets which are placed in the document repository per your earlier order on this issue, or whether or not it's redacted from the copies that were provided to Mr. McBride and his consultant pursuant to your order.

Certain information with regard to AEP, their own contract charges that are reflected in contracts that they in fact should have and with rates that they should have. In fact, should have been --I'm not going to -- those have been redacted because he has that information from the copies which have been provided to Mr. McBride, because that's the

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

shipper-specific item to AEP or to ACE or Delmarva 1 which Mr. McBride represents. 2 3 Those same items have been further redacted pursuant to your earlier order for placement in the document repositories for the ACE and 5 Delmarva's competitors and compatriots in the utility 6 industry, would not see the specific contract information with regard to actual contracts, anything 8 to do with their parts plants. 9 10 So I am not sure. Maybe we're talking about the first level and the second level, but it's 11 12 not very clear. 13 MR. McBRIDE: It's exactly what was provided to us. So it's not what is in the 14 depository. I have the list here. 15 By the way, I should say in fairness to my 16 friend Mr. Norton over there, Conrail is not part of 17 this. Conrail hasn't redacted anything so far as we 18 can tell. MR. MULLINS: We'll confirm that. 20 21 MR. McBRIDE: But I have a list here for Norfolk Southern and for CSX by client. 22

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: But your clarification
2	is that this material has been redacted from the
3	information furnished to you?
4	MR. McBRIDE: Correct, sir.
5	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right.
6	MR. McBRIDE: Absolutely correct. I'll
7	give you the list. We have the documents if they want
8	to see them. We'll cut through this. We don't have
9	to just argue about it. We have them right
10	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Is there more than one -
11	- is the only information redacted the cost type
12	information?
13	MR. McBRIDE: No, Your Honor. It's
14	rates/divisions/revenues, cost, contributions, term of
15	volume, escalation, and unknown.
16	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Tony said that you have
17	the rate information.
18	MR. McBRIDE: He said it, but I am telling
19	you I have the documents right here and I can show you
20	that they have been redacted.
21	MR. DATZ: If I could just explain, Your
22	Honor. Actual rate information that was given to his

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

clients he should have. Stuff that probably you are referring to which may say on the document you are talking about, revenues or rates or divisions but were redacted, were things that never made it out of inhouse, never made it to the clients. So if it says rates, but they aren't actual rates, they aren't actual rates that your client ever got. Because we are talking about the same

movements of coal year after year after year, costs per ton vary by a few cents whatever, year by year by year, these are proposals that never went to the client. So they aren't the actual rates. I mean that's probably what had led to some of the confusion.

But our client's concern is they have given the same movements discussed year after year after year. Knowing that same information at the bargaining table to talk about this same movement, even though it has been two years later, would dramatically affect our ability to negotiate with Mr. McBride's clients.

So that may clear some of the confusion. We are happy to go document by document if you would

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

1

rather do it that way.

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

MR. EDWARDS: The other question that Mr. McBride might clarify is his categories, which we haven't been privy to. So we don't know what, which ones he is referring to. When he says rates, we are unsure whether these are the actual rates that we are talking about here which he said he needs this for or internal analysis of what we might propose in the future.

There is a basic difference between actual rates and something that we are considering in-house.

MR. McBRIDE: We need them both because what we are after here is how they set their rates. A lot of this is back and forth, give and take internal analysis and what have you. The consultants are trying to use all available evidence within the scope of your rule to use their internal work to determine how they set their rates. These other materials that they have now finally admitted they have in fact redacted go right to the heart of how they try to set their rates.

It is not just the actual rates. But it

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

what goes on here, Your Honor, often times is there may be two or three of these applicants competing for the business of one of our clients. That happens at Delmarva, for example. All three of the applicants are origin carriers. They may be bidding for the business. Only one of them gets it or two of them, each get part of it or what have you.

what these documents show is how they set rates for the process of trying to bid for that business. They have now said finally they have in fact redacted that too. Your Honor didn't let them do that. The protective order doesn't let them do that. We have been putting up with this for seven weeks. I'm telling you, we can spend the rest of the day and into the night going through this document by document. They don't have the time. I don't have the time.

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, I am not sure that I heard a clarification that I understand whether we are talking about actual numbers here or things

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

that our client is thinking about. We've got several categories where supposedly we've redacted rates. Mr. McBride needs to say are we redacting in his understanding, actual rates that were in effect and rates that are hypothetical or both.

MR. McBRIDE: I can not answer that question because there is a category called unknown. They know what they redacted. How do I know what they redacted? But I know it's rate/division and revenue information.

Your Honor, you can not constantly revisit every document line by line. Conrail gave us 2,000 pages. Thank god they didn't redact or I would be down here every day. But you know, we just got hundreds more pages in the other night. I stayed in to the night reading these things by a couple of the clients. This will go on into December, not just October 21, if we don't cut through this and tell them just give us the documents that Your Honor ordered us to get without redaction.

They didn't raise that on July 16. They could have. They didn't. They could have said, Your

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

Honor, now are we permitted to redact things that we really don't want them to see because we're worried about them across the bargaining table, which is what they just said? That's precisely what the protective order doesn't permit me to do with this information.

My clients are in the dark about this. The consultants are limited to using the information for purposes of putting our case together, period, end of discussion. Don't worry about it. We abide by protective orders. We're honorable people. Just give me the documents.

What I got a ruling on on July 16, and I know Your Honor tries to be fair and give each side a little bit, and that's commendable. But today is different. All we are asking you to do is enforce your earlier ruling.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Mr. Coburn?

MR. COBURN: Your Honor, the protective order is not the issue here because as a practical matter, because there is a small fraternity of attorneys, Mr. McBride among them and his consultants certainly among them, attorneys and consultants who

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

regularly advise his clients on negotiations, ongoing negotiations, they are the functional equivalent of in-house counsel.

The protective order says that it bars inhouse counsel from receiving highly confidential Obviously we are providing lots of information. highly confidential information to Mr. McBride and his consultants. But when it comes to information that could be used against us as we bargain year after year with the utility clients on these highly important commercially sensitive rate matters, we can't give away the store to people who will be using the information against us.

Now having said that, we are providing lots of information. What we are not providing, what we have been redacting is information of great market sensitivity.

For example, if CSX is considering, doesn't propose a particular rate but considers a particular rate for purposes of in-house analysis to see where that rate measures up in terms of CSX's needs, but that rate was never proposed, was never

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

proposed because on the basis of the in-house analysis, CSX decided not to make the rate proposal, we're not giving them that because that is information 3 that if he had it, if he knew what we were thinking 4 about, he could, his consultants and his client could 5 make use of that information in negotiations that are 6 7 ongoing with us. There is nothing in the protective order 8 that protects us against the possibility that his 9 consultants, who are advising his client, will knowing 10 what they know, will use the information to our 11 detriment. That is the problem. 12 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: What kind of document have you furnished him that deals with your internal discussion? MR. COBURN: There are notes, for example. MR. McBRIDE: I have one right here if you would like to see it, CSX. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Mr. Coburn?

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

reminded because this is a highly confidential

allow Mr. Datz to describe the document.

MR. COBURN: If I may, Your Honor. I'll

(202) 234-4433

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

document, we should be certain that everybody in the room has signed the protective order. 2 MR. MULLINS: Is that the protective order 3 for the super super highly confidential stuff or just the protective order for the case? I am a little 5 unsure. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: No. He means the highly 7 confidential, I take it. All right? Everybody in the 8 room has signed the confidentiality agreement. 9 10 All right. You have given me both. You have given me the document with redactions and the 11 12 unredacted document. 13 MR. DATZ: Correct, Your Honor. document appeared in the depository at CSX 31 HC 000174. This is a good example of the kind of 15 documents that we were tal 'ng about. As Mr. Coburn said earlier, all of the documents that deal with actual rates, actual divisions, those kinds of things that relate to Mr. McBride's clients, he should have. This sort of thing probably when he looked at it appeared to be stuff that we were withholding,

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

but in fact, it's not. This document deals with a

(202) 234-4433

1

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

(202) 234-4433

This

rate that never made it to his client IP&L.

What we redacted, and even in this case, we only redacted a little bit. Most of the information was furnished him completely unredacted. If you'll note, the document talks about assumptions, about a mine that didn't even exist at the time the thing was done, assuming that the mine was X number of miles up the track, assuming that a certain tonnage was used. Again, the kind of thing we're talking about was an analysis that was done internally, a work-out that was assuming all of these factors, and then assuming, if you'll note, there's a 75 car and 50 car column. Again, assuming certain sized trains were used, how would the rates work out.

made it to his client. Yet if this sort of thing came up again, this is a thing that would be extremely damaging in any kind of negotiations with Mr. McBride's client. Yet even when all of that is said and done, all that was redacted were costs and contributions, which I understand are the subject of your order. But then the potential rates on the 50

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

2

1

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

car train, which is in that first column on the righthand side there, that was redacted. The rest of the document was produced and unredacted.

MR. McBRIDE: These are the advocates over there, Your Honor, so they picked a document that I guess they thought would make their case for themselves pretty well. But even the one they picked, they deleted the escalation factors down there to the right of percent, which has a lot to do with --

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: I was going to ask an explanation of this document. Can you tell me what the lefthand column is? Under the date appears to be something 1695. The first word under that appears to be -- I can't read it. T-E-S?

MR. DATZ: Your Honor, that says, as far as I know in this document, as was explained to me by people in-house, so I'll give you the understanding of the document as I have it. But the first column there, it says rates I believe. Second line there says costs. The third line I believe says contribution --

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: What was that first

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

word?

MR. DATZ: Rates, Your Honor. Again, I would point out, I'll agree with Mr. McBride that the escalations were redacted. As I said before, when we did our redactions or when I should say when our client did the redactions, the escalations were lumped in with costs and contributions and will therefore I guess be subject to the order earlier.

But escalations aside, again, the information that was redacted were the costs and contributions which all again are all hypothetical. But then the rate information under the 50 car train, that never made it to his client, never made it into the form of an actual bid, at least as I understand it.

MR. McBRIDE: Now let's, if I may, Your Honor, put before you another couple of documents. Since this is an adversary proceeding here, I ought to be permitted to show you some evidence that makes my case.

MR. COBURN: Your Honor, can I make one other point about this document?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	GODGE LEVENTRAL: All right.
2	MR. COBURN: Before we move onto others.
3	This document is a document relative to Indianapolis
4	Power and Light, which is not one of the Mr. McBride's
5	clients that has any vertical competition issues
6	raised as a result of this transaction. The Board
7	indicated in decision number 17 that only one of his
8	clients, that is Delmarva Power and Light, has any
9	semblance of a one lump issue.
10	So it is not clear to us what use, what
11	constructive use could be made with respect to this
12	case of this document.
13	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: I was going to get to
14	that. We'll give you your chance to show me your
15	document. Let's deal with this document.
16	You are familiar with the document they
17	have given me a copy of?
18	MR. McBRIDE: Yes.
19	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Why do you need this
20	information?
21	MR. McBRIDE: First of all, I want to
22	respond to the last point. The Board did not say what

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

*

Mr. Coburn just said. The applicants said that this ought to be limited to Delmar a. The Board said, the Board got it straight despite what they were trying to do to confuse the issue, that I am arguing something well beyond the one lump theory. You may recall this from decision number 17.

The Board understood that my concern is any one of my client's rates, in NYSEG and other utilities, the rates might go up as a result of what we say and the Board repeated, is a bad business decision to spend four to five billion dollars more for Conrail than it was worth. We now know it's even more than that.

But that is what the Board understood. So it applies to all of them. So let's not go re-argue that point. That point has been decided.

Now as to this particular document, Your Honor, this is precisely the information you just ruled on. Let me say, by the way, I understand the logic in what Mr. Datz because contribution is what is left after you subtract cost from rates. So when they took the position they had the right to redact cost,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

logically that would include the contribution issue too. So we don't have to re-argue that. You have decided that.

But I understood why they redacted both at the same time, because the logic of their position was the two went hand in hand. So contribution is just what is leftover after you subtract cost from rates. If Your Honor would look at the unredacted version, for example, the very first column, this is not higher math. Under RR, far left, rate 3.06, cost 1.81, contribution 1.25, which is the arithmetic of subtracting 1.81 from 3.06.

So that is what those are about. Now you see this goes to the very core of what we're trying to get at because contribution is what they say is the profitability of the movement. The theories that we are working on under here, they say don't worry about it shippers, we're already maximizing the net revenues, the contribution, the profitability, however you want to characterize it. So what they redacted was precisely what we need to test whether the claims they have been making to the Board and to Your Honor

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
- 1 1

22

are true.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: You just read to me the material that has been redacted. Do you have a copy of the unredacted?

MR. McBRIDE: They just gave it to me for purposes of this argument.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Oh okay.

MR. McBRIDE: I wasn't violating any orders.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: I wasn't concerned with your violation. I wanted to be sure that they haven't already furnished it.

MR. McBRIDE: Just for purposes of the argument. Okay? So this goes to the very heart of things.

Then if Your Honor, please, then the rate, the 3.06 in this case or whatever it would be in a 50 car as to how they set rates to, these would be adjusted via formula. The shippers and the railroads have been fighting about this for 16 years. Norton's partner, Mr. Cunningham and I have been to the Court of Appeals five times on this issue about

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

rail cost adjustment factor.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

That is what is referred to here by RCAF. That's the unadjusted form and they are applying a percentage of that for the escalation. That is what they are trying to do. That goes as to how the rate will change over time, which is precisely the sort of thing that we are trying to demonstrate and why we brought in the hypothetical.

So this information goes to the very cure of determining the profitability of movement and how they set their rates.

Now if I may get to the document that I wanted to show you or a couple of examples of documents I want to show you to make my best case, and I don't think they have made much of a case with that one. But here is CSX 26 HC 000157, Atlantic City Electric, another one of my clients.

We have got headings. If they want to look on here, this is fine. You know, plant England, time share rates, they give you the rate. Then they have got a heading for division. Then the heading for refund, then a heading for net rate, then a heading

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

for cost per ton, then a heading for contribution, et It goes out with several different calculations of contribution.

Then there is another rate for a different time period. The first one was for a certain number of tons, short term. The second one is long term and on it goes. Everything but the initial rates. Everything on the entire page has been redacted. This is as it was provided to us.

The same sort of example, CSX 31 HC 000125. Virtually everything on the page, I think Your Honor will attest by the document I am showing you, has been redacted. The form of the document provided to us. Therefore, all that we can give to our consultant.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Let me ask a question before we continue. If you appeal my ruling on the redacted material that I have already ruled upon, would that dispose of the matter? If whatever the Board rules, whether they affirm my ruling or reverse me, does that dispose of this argument?

MR. McBRIDE: I think it would.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: It seems to me that we
2	are arguing about the same thing.
3	MR. COBURN: Your ruling, we obviously
4	haven't had the opportunity of reading it, but
5	certainly the briefing and presumably the ruling go to
6	one element of what we are talking about, which is the
7	cost issue, which is certainly a very highly sensitive
8	category.
9	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: This is what I have been
10	hearing.
11	MR. COBURN: This is other very highly
12	sensitive data, not necessarily costs, but
13	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Which of the other data
14	isn't included in the cost?
15	MR. COBURN: Information about bids that
16	have not been made.
17	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Take the document you
18	gave me a copy of. Is this what you are talking
19	about?
20	MR. DATZ: For example, Your Honor, the
21	rates column, I mean on the righthand side there under
22	the 50 car, the rates column has been redacted. That
03.6	

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

is a rate based on the 50 car train with the four -
I believe not a whole lot about how coal shipments

are, I gather the four and the 24 has to do with

turnaround time or the amount of time it takes the

cars to load. So assuming both of those factors with

the 50 car train, what the rate would be.

Immediately below that are the costs and the contribution columns, which as we just discussed are the subject of your order. So again, they are related in a sense to the cost and the contributions, but they aren't strictly speaking the same thing. They are every bit as sensitive to our client as the costs are.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: They aren't strictly speaking the same thing because this is a rate that didn't go into effect? Is that what you are saying?

MR. McBRIDE: No. It's because they are not the same thing, but they are close. They are all related. I think he stated it exactly right. They are not precisely the same thing. Escalation is not the same as cost. Contribution was not the same as cost. But they are all related to the net

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

*

profitability of the movement.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, one other way that they are distinguished is a cost is an actual dollar that is a real dollar figure. What has been redacted and in fact as you can see from the document that Mr. McBride has placed before you, hypothetical internal analysis that have -- they are not in the marketplace. They are things that our internal market people are playing with, trying to figure out. One is real, one is hypothetical. Costs are real. Proposed rates are hypothetical that we are dealing with and we're thinking about. That's market strategy that we think is protected. So in that way, they are different.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: They are different, but we are really dealing with the same thing. They are trying to establish a theory based upon how you reach your rate. I found that on the specific items you argued before me the last few times, that they are entitled to it because it might lead to relevant admissible evidence and it might not.

It seems to me this falls into the same

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

area. Now let me ask you this. Would it satisfy you if instead of dealing with all of your clients involved here that you pick out say two clients and go through it with two?

MR. McBRIDE: No. I'll tell you why for a couple of reasons. I understand Your Honor is trying to figure out some resolution to this. I d'n't think it is going to work, a couple of reasons. With all due respect, I am trying to work this out too.

But for one thing, some of our clients are very close to resolving matters with them and without our negotiation at the table at all. So first of all, we could end up with a couple of clients and then find out they have settled and then that's the end of our evidentiary presentation.

Secondly, the fact of the matter is, and I say it with all due respect, I am not trying to reargue your ruling either, but you can see since what we are trying to do is construct time lines, a handicap that we have got because of the ruling about what years we would get and what years we wouldn't, and we're trying to fill in from other sources as best

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4/33

*

we can.

But also I will tell you, and probably if I argued this in July 16, it might have helped Your Honor understand it a little better. But for the statisticians Mr. Prescott over here working with Mr. Crowley and Dr. Kahn and the others at the NERA firm, the more of these timelines they can lay on top of one another the better for our statistical reliability. That is what they have to do.

If I only have one sheet of paper or two sheets of paper, three sheets of paper for a few clients, and I say it proves that CSX sets its rates this way or Norfolk Southern sets its rates that way, and it turns out that there was some aberrational circumstance at this one particular plant, you know, maybe they did their arithmetic wrong or there were different market conditions or whatever, they will blow me out of the water with their reply.

If I only have a couple data points, no statistician in the world would say that two data points prove anything statistically. They may prove a lot on their own merit. If you have somebody saying

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

that's what I did or that the internal document shows that's what happened, then you don't need a statistician. Then you can make your case directly.

But you know, their pricing people are pretty good. I have deposed them all now. They know how to testify and they know what's going on. They don't come in and say, you know, I confess that's how I set my rates. You got it right, Mr. McBride. They don't do it that way. So I have to prove my case statistically.

The fewer piles I have, the less of a statistical case I am going to have. The more I have, the better. That's why I strove so hard to get more utilities than just my own clients, to get more views, and not just in destinations served by Conrail. You ruled on those matters, I am not arguing that. But I can't now limit myself even more from where you rule either. I think you have just got to stick to the rule and just tell them to produce what you previously told them to produce.

I think you are exactly right. You are on the right track. All this information is related.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

You ruled on the cost issue. I think the appeal on that ruling will dispose of this entire matter because from a legal point of view, sure we can talk costs today and escalation tomorrow and tonnage the next day and term the day after that, et cetera, et cetera. It's all the same thing.

The issue is very simple. Are they permitted to redact anything that's not privileged from the documents you ordered produced under the protective order? I submit the answer is no.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Mr. Coburn?

MR. COBURN: Your Honor, I would propose -

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Let me ask you this. If we limit this to -- I assume you are not only concerned with Mr. McBride's four clients, but you are concerned it may spread over the entire universe of people involved in this case. Is that your concern?

MR. COBURN: We certainly have some concern along those lines, although I would point out that there are dozens of parties in this case, perhaps hundreds at this point, I haven't counted. We only

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

	party that is interested in all of thi
2	information, including other utilities who ar
3	apparently are not interested in it. But yes
4	certainly we don't want the precedent out there to
5	encourage others to seek this kind of information.
6	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Well let me ask this
7	If I were to limit my ruling say to four clients that
8	Mr. McBride is representing, five, does it add every
9	day?
10	MR. McBRIDE: No, no, no. I listed five
11	to start. NYSEG and Niagara Mohawk have joined in
12	this, and Your Honor has included them you will recall
13	too.
14	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: So how many do we have
15	all together?
16	MR. McBRIDE: Seven. And Your Honor also
17	ruled by the way, that anybody else can join in this
18	by asking.
19	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: I know what I ruled.
20	MR. McBRIDE: I am not arguing with it, I
21	am just reminding you.
22	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Mr. Coburn,
. 11	

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

suppose we were to limit it say -- I started with four. Let's say to the seven parties we have now. Would that make it more palatable to you? 3 MR. COBURN: It would not, Your Honor. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: I am not going to stop 5 you from appealing. I am not saying I want you to 6 agree not to appeal. 7 MR. COBURN: What Your Honor might -- it 8 would not, Your Honor. We are reluctant to provide 9 this information even as to --10 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: But let's say I am going 11 to order you to produce the information. Does it help 12 if I limit it to seven rather than make it? Because 13 my ruling is open. Anybody who comes in can ask for 14 15 the same thing. MR. COBURN: Yes. It's better than if you 16 opened the ruling to the universe, certainly. But it 17 18 doesn't resolve our problem. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: No. I realize that. I 19 am not asking you not to appeal from any ruling that 21 I make if I rule against you. 22 How about it, Mr. McBride, suppose we

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

limit it to seven. I think your people have a pretty
fair universe to create their theory.

MR. McBRIDE: Statistically, with all due
respect, Your Honor, and I could put Mr. Prescott on
the stand if you wanted me to attest to this, it isn't
possibly enough. It depends on how much data we get,
how many destinations and what have you.

But I will tell you this. You limited me

But I will tell you this. You limited me already to my clients. Then you included NYSEG. Ms. Booth is here for Niagara Mohawk and you included them. You have ruled on those seven. I don't represent any other people who have an interest in this, and neither does Mr. Mullins, as far as I know neither does the Donelan Cleary firm. So you don't need to rule on people who are not before you.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: I do because somebody else could come in next week.

MR. McBRIDE: But look, I can't -- yes. Somebody could hire me next week and I would be back.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: I am asking you whether you would be satisfied. I am not asking you to speak for unknown possible future movants.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD 09/05/97 FD #33388 61-109

MR. McBRIDE: I'll take that today because it's all I am entitled to today. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right.

MR. COBURN: Your Honor, I have another proposal that you might wish to consider, which is that you not rule on this issue. We are going to be filing our appellate briefs, perhaps the same briefs with the Board on the cost issue. If we can have an opportunity within the next day or two to supplement those briefs to bring this issue before the Board as well at the same time, and let the Board decide without a ruling from you on this specific issue.

MR. McBRIDE: Why don't we do it this way. I have a better idea. Since they were willing to limit themselves to their brief and my reply. Let's limit ourselves to their brief and my reply and the cost issue. Let's give me the time that I need while the Board ponders that and then let Your Honor be informed by the Board's ruling.

But I ought to have these documents now without any redactions, is my position. But for them to now say now they are going to take a few more days

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and re-brief this thing, and then of course I would have to re-brief my reply and then who knows how long 2 the Board will take to rule on all of this. Now they 3 are just buying more time and we have already had too much delay already.

> I am entitled to the documents now. will promise Mr. Coburn. I'll sign anything that says this if he wants me to, even though I am already committed to it under the protective order. We will return all the material that we get in unredacted form if the Board tells us we weren't entitled to it on appeal. We'll return every bit of it, every single page. We won't keep anything.

> Of course the clients won't get it anyway, but the consultan - will get it in the interim and if the Board says we weren't entitled to it, we'll get it back from the and we'll give it back to the counsel for the applicants.

> I am under a deadline here. I can't agree to open-ended things like this.

> JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Your parties aren't going to receive this information under any

> > **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

circumstances.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. McBRIDE: Wait a minute. I thought Your Honor's thinking at the outset was just like with those 12 pages I gave back this morning, they could just give them to me. They have them. They have all this stuff in unredacted form because they went to the trouble of redacting it. So they could produce this stuff probably --

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: No. That is not what I am talking about. Under the highly confidential designation, only you and the consultant get this material. Your clients don't get it in any event.

MR. McBRIDE: Agreed. We are not arguing about that. But all I am saying is we get it --

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: I am trying to move this along for your benefit, Mr. McBride, so that we have one appeal goes up on both issues so they don't have an appeal on the order I have already issued and I issue another order today and they have another appeal on that.

I was suggesting that combine we everything and let the Board.

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

Now Mr. Coburn has suggested that I leave this up to the Board to decide in the first instance. 2 How do you feel about that, Mr. McBride? 3 MR. McBRIDE: I thought you were addressing Mr. Coburn. 5 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: 6 You have a choice between listening to me or --8 MR. McBRIDE: I apologize. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Mr. Coburn has suggested 9 10 that I let the Board decide on this issue rather than 11 my ruling and appeal. I was asking how you feel about 12 it, but you don't have to answer because I don't like it. So I don't think the Board wants to do that. I 13 mean that's why they have me here this morning, is 14 because they don't want to decide these things. They 15 will decide it on appeal because they must, but they 16 don't want to decide it initially. 17 18 I think rather than have this extended argument and go on and argue about each one of these 19 documents, why don't I make my broad ruling now. 20 Order you to supply the material in unredacted form. 21 22 You go up on appeal. I think that's the fastest way

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

to dispose of it, and I think everybody is working under an expedited -- I mean I'm not working on an expedited schedule except that I give you rulings as promptly as I can, but both parties, both sides are on an expedited schedule and I think you want to dispose of this as rapidly as you can.

MR. EDWARDS: We most certainly do want to dispose of this issue as rapidly as we can. We of course had not agreed to restricting the earlier briefs. Perhaps Mr. McBride misunderstood that we were not -- but if I understand your ruling now, we are combining everything for an order that you are issuing today which we would be able to brief and bring before the Board on an expedited basis with us agreeing to a request or to be done on an expedited basis. We would renew our request for a stay, again, going back to the question of the cat out of the bag with regard to all of this material.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: You see, considering your request for a stay provided that you go right on up to the Board. But that you do it on what you have already briefed.

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

redacted material to start with. four weeks stay.

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

Your arguments, I have heard you. I have listened to you carefully. Are exactly the same that you are making today, that you made last week or the week before, whenever we had the argument on the

If you go up today to the Board, if you appeal my rulings immediately without any further briefing time, I would consider strongly giving you a stay to the end of next week.

But if we are going to have you making your motion within three days and then having them answer within three days, you are not asking for a week's stay, you are really asking for two, three,

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, we could commit to filing the brief on Monday. Mr. McBride could commit to filing the brief on Monday. We could ask for an expedited schedule. We could have a decision by Friday.

MR. McBRIDE: That won't work first for two reasons. First of all, they do want to rewrite this. Your Honor has already understood that clearly.

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

Secondly, now they are asking me to reply to their appeal in effect before I have seen their appeal on Monday. We don't know that the Board is going to rule by next Friday. I mean I think Your Honor is right on the right track with saying well, let the appeal be decided on the basis of the brief and my reply that were filed before Your Honor. I am not agreeing to a stay. I can't agree to any period

If they want a stay, it is going to be over my objection unless they give me the same number of days that it's going to take to resolve this matter before the Board, and they won't agree to that. I think my position on that is reasonable. I am not asking for more time. I am simply saying if you are going to delay this, then you ought to be willing to delay my evidentiary presentation as well, and they won't commit to that.

But they can not bind the Board to rule by next Friday. For all we know, the Board members are going to be traveling for something, or this will be like that ARU petition and it will sit there for a

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

of time.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20 21

22

month.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Well, I take it then you don't want to go along with my proposal?

MR. COBURN: Well, Your Honor, with your proposal, with the modification that we file simultaneous briefs on Monday to inform the Board of these other issues.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Well you have to inform the Board of the new issues. I mean that's obvious.

MR. McBRIDE: And agree that they should be resolved on the same basis. They are all the same.

MR. COBURN: And frankly, at this point, the difference between today and Monday is not that great. We couldn't get the briefs down to the Board much before the end of the day anyway.

MR. McBRIDE: Sure we could.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Why do you have to brief it though? Suppose we say that you agree upon this appeal going forth on Monday. I think you are entitled to a one-page explanation adding these additional issues.

MR. COBURN: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

19 ()	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: But without further
2	briefing.
3	MR. COBURN: What I had envisioned is a
4	two to three something a little longer than that.
5	Two or three page letter in which we add the
6	additional issues and offer a little explanation as to
7	why we think the additional issues
8	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Well, let's go off the
9	record.
10	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
11	the record at 10:40 a.m. and went back on
12	the record at 10:44 a.m.)
13	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Back on the record. All
14	right, off the record I was trying to see if the
15	parties could agree on some procedure to expedite an
16	appeal from the ruling that I'll make this morning.
17	I have to say I met with complete failure.
18	All right. Do parties wish to make any
19	further arguments on the merits?
20	MR. COBURN: Just one other issue, Your
21	Honor, on the issue of the stay.
22	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Let me tell you what I
/	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

intend to do. I intend to give you a stay until next 1 Friday. MR. COBURN: Okay, Your Honor. 3 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right? 4 MR. McBRIDE: Would you add the proviso, 5 I am not arguing that point, that they be prepared to 6 turn those documents over on Friday? 8 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: That I'll rule if they appeal that to the Board. I mean so be it. If I give 9 10 them a stay until next Friday, my order said that they should furnish the material forthwith. The order tha: 11 you haven't seen yet required them to provide it 12 forthwith. I'll make the same ruling. I'm going to 13 give them a stay until next Friday and I'll make the 14 15 same ruling. MR. McBRIDE: Fine, but all I mean to say is if the stay dissolves next Friday, could you have 17 this resolved at like 4:00 so I get the documents that 18 19 day? MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, I was going to 20 ask for clarification. Are we talking about 5:00 on 21 Friday, 8:00 on Friday morning? I mean we need to 22

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

know that.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: I was talking about close of business on Friday. All right?

MR. McBRIDE: I do not agree to the stay, but I agree to that definition of things given Your Honor's ruling.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: I am going to rule that I find -- Mr. Norton, you haven't gotten into this argument.

MR. NORTON: I just wanted to clarify something. I don't think it bears on what your ruling is going to be, but I didn't want the record to be left with a possible misapprehension.

what Conrail has done or concerning redaction. In fact, as I indicated at one of the hearings in early August, we were going to do, we did redact a very limited amount of information from documents concerning Ohio Valley and Centerior which related to a rate that a competing mine was quoting to Centerior. These were redacted as I said in the hearing at the request of the utility because it didn't want its

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

competing sources to have that information. It wasn't relevant to the issues that were being presented. We did that, and I take it there has been no objection, that that question has not been raised.

We also did redact cost information as the other applicants did, but that will be governed by Your Honor's ruling.

MR. McBRIDE: appreciate the clarification. I did not realize that he had, but I don't want to ask Your Honor to rule on the first item he brought to your attention today, the other mines because he says Centerior objects. Of course it wouldn't go to our client anyway, but he has also been very candid that he redacted the cost stuff, which I frankly hadn't even realized. I had been focusing more in NS and CSX.

So obviously that would be encompassed by your ruling. But I think the one category that he identified, I don't think he had a right to redact, but I understand what he said and I don't want to get into an argument or have a ruling about that now. I am not trying to pick another fight with Centerior

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

here. So why don't we just leave that one over to the

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Very well. All right. I have heard all argument parties wish to

I am going to find that the material that we are arguing about, the redactions that we were arguing about this morning -- let me give this back to you before I forget. That the redactions we have been arguing about this morning I find fall into the same category as those that I have ruled upon in my decision which I assume will be issued today.

I am going to further limit the applicants in their appeal in that they have until Monday to appeal from this order together -- from this ruling that I am making this morning together with the ruling that I have made on the redactions that I have previously ruled upon.

Mr. McBride may have whatever time he likes to respond to the appeal, but the stay that I am giving will expire -- I am going to stay the production of the redacted material that I have

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

21

ordered furnished to Mr. McBride until close of business on Friday, September 20? MR. McBRIDE: Twelfth. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: September -- I never was good at math. My wife is a mathematician, but I'm not. To close of business on Friday, September 12. I think we have to have one more thing. I think you have to get your answer in promptly. If you want the stay to expire on Friday, you have to get your answer to whatever they file on Monday in promptly. Is Tuesday too short a time for you? MR. MCBRIDE: You see, we do have a deposition scheduled that day. But I will try to abide by this. I wonder if Your Honor would modify something just ever so slightly. Make them file their appeal by 2:00 on Monday. I can try to get mine filed, my reply filed by 2:00 on Tuesday. One of the reasons I am asking for this is in addition to a

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

deposition, I am supposed to be on an airplane to go

meet with a client on Tuesday evening. So I am going

to try to get this done in a day and having somebody

(202) 234-4433

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

else do the deposition. But if they will have it in my hands as well as filed by 2:00 on Monday, we'll try 2 to follow the reply by 2:00 on Tuesday. 3 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. So ordered. All right. Then you have -- my order is clear? My 5 ruling is clear and you have a stay until close of 6 7 business on Friday. 8 MR. McBRIDE: Would you say 5:00, Your 9 Honor, just to --JUDGE LEVENTHAL: I assume 5:00 is close 10 11 of business. It is close of business here at the 12 Commission. 13 MR. COBURN: Your Honor, just one other thing. We will commit to calling the Secretary of the 14 15 Board today and alerting him to the briefs that are about to befall the Board, and to the fact that the 16 stay would expire on Friday, in the hopes that the 17 Board would rule by Friday. 18 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. That is 20 reasonable. MR. McBRIDE: Oh sure. They can inform 21 22 the Secretary. That's fine. I gather that what Your

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

Honor is ruling then is if the appeal is not granted, at 5:00 Friday I get all these same documents 2 3 unredacted. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: That is my ruling. 5 All right. Now what's left? MR. McBRIDE: Three items. The two I 6 brought to your attention and the third Mr. Harker 7 brought to your attention. They are all sort of 8 related. That is, NS now has some tapes from the 1980 9 to 1984 period. They say they have not reviewed them. 10 CSX has some tapes from the 1980 to 1982 period. 11 Apparently they say they just found them. So I gather 12 13 they haven't reviewed them. Gosh, we're --JUDGE LEVENTHAL: What do you want me to do? MR. McBRIDE: I want you to order them to give them to me next Friday or complete their review 17 18 and give me from those tapes what I am entitled to within the scope of your prior ruling, one way or the 19 20 other. MR. HARKER: Your Honor, on behalf of CSX, 21 22 I think that we can adhere to that time schedule and

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

1 2

maybe even do a little bit better. We're not going to give Mr. McBride the 1980, 1981, 1982 tapes before we review them, and he is going to get the information that's responsive to his requests that's on those tapes. But I understand from talking to CSX that that's a process they think they can finish by next Friday.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right.

MS. BRUCE: And Your Honor, for NS, I would just like to for the record say that NS has been working diligently to try to locate these tapes, as we've said in our letter to Mr. McBride. The problem is is they are month to month. Each tape is on a month. Some of the months overlap.

I was informed by the people that are working on this, who are the IT people in Roanoke, not just the lawyers who are doing this, but we have IT people, information technology people because it is old information, that needs to be converted to a format that they can start feeding up the tapes on year to year basis. They are reviewing every year, all 12 tapes for each year. They can start to feed

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

those up to us by the beginning of next week. I think on Tuesday, Mr. McBride will be able to have 1984. Then we'll go backwards from there.

They told me they think every few days they will be able to feed up a diskette for him to review on a year to year basis. We did that to try to expedite the process, to strike accusations to the contrary.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Mr. McBride?

MR. McBRIDE: They have been vigilant. I
have said that at the outset, and I said it in my
letter. I am not impugning counsel here at all. I
appreciate what she just said. We'll live with it
precisely as she stated it.

I just want to say for the record so there is no confusion on this, please direct these materials to my secretary, Donna Mercer Jones, because Ms. Durham has two weeks of duty to her country over the next two weeks. If they go to her, they might get lost. I am doing depositions and traveling. But they will get them to my secretary, we can keep this process moving.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right.
2	MS. BRUCE: That's fine, Your Honor.
3	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Very well.
4	What else do you have, Mr. McBride?
5	MR. McBRIDE: That's it.
6	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: That's it.
7	MR. McBRIDE: I think Mr. Mullins is up
8	next.
9	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right.
10	MR. McBRIDE: Thank you, Your Honor.
11	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Sure. Anybody want a
12	recess?
13	MR. MULLINS: I'll take a five minute
14	recess.
15	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Five minute recess, all
16	right. A five minute recess.
17	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
18	the record at 10:55 a.m. and went back on
19	the record at 11:04 a.m.)
20	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. The oral
21	argument will come back to order. I am going to
22	further limit the ruling that I had just made to the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(201) 234-4433

seven shippers that have presently asked the same information. That is, Niagara Mohawk, New York State Electric and Gas, and the five shippers represented by Mr. McBride.

All right. To further clarify my ruling,

I am not now ruling out any other motion, any other

party to this proceeding may make. I am just ruling

that while my previous rulings have been universal in

nature, this ruling applies only the seven shippers

that are presently involved in this proceeding before

me now.

All right. Mr. Mullins?

MR. MULLINS: Your Honor, we had a very similar problem. However, due to discussions between myself and Mr. Edwards, at least Mr. Edwards speaking on behalf of Norfolk Southern, and quite frankly, due a lot to what you have just ruled on this morning, probably that takes care of about half or three-quarters of our concerns this morning.

The brief issue was that you had ordered that they give us everything that you had ordered for ACE. They were giving things to Mr. Crowley and the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

consultants and then putting redacted versions -well, the stuff that they were giving to Mr. Crowley had redactions in it as well, as we just learned this morning, not only cost redaction but other redactions. Then they would put that same document in the document depository, but then do further redactions.

So when we would go to get the document from the document depository, we would get the redacted redacted version. We were having a big dispute about you know, we wanted to see, consistent with your order, everything that you had given to ACE.

We have since learned though because based upon my discussions with Mr. Edwards and Mr. McBride and the discussions that went on this morning, and on top of the fact that we did go to the document depository and we reviewed all the documents that you had ordered produced for ACE, et al, we went to those document depositories to try to determine if Your Honor's order, whether those documents were going to help our cause.

If you'll recall from last week, you said Mr. Mullins, the documents I'm ordering, can't that

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

help your theory. Why don't you go, Mr. Mullins, look at the document depository, and then come back and talk to me. Let's see if that resolves your concern.

Quite frankly, it doesn't. There's a reason why that is.

That is because you ordered the documents that relate to Mr. McBride's client, NYSEG and NIMO for destinations served by Conrail, meaning that for the plants that are not destinations served by Conrail, they didn't have to produce those documents.

For NYSEG's situation, the only parties that are going to have the documents are Generally.

For NYSEG's situation, the only parties that are going to have the documents are Conrail. Conrail has I think responded they placed copies of our contracts into the document depository, unredacted versions of our contracts in the document depository which we don't object to, because it's highly confidential.

I don't care who Mr. McBride and his consultants go see it or anybody else who is a highly -- you know, outside counsel or outside consultant.

CSX has not told us whether or not they found any documents responsive to -- this is just

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

NYSEG's situation. NS says they have looked, they don't have any documents.

So our letter where you -- our first letter where you said okay, I'm going to throw NYSEG in with the ACE panel and you guys go find documents relating to NYSEG, we still haven't even got an answer from CSX on whether or not they have even got any documents.

But I am getting a little bit ahead of myself because that goes to my second thing that I want to bring up to you today, which deals with the timing and the response and when they should be ordered to actually respond.

Going back to this issue of Mr. Mullins, go look at the documents, are they responsive to what you are trying to accomplish. This is basically related to interrogatories one through five in NYSEG Three, where we are asking for them to identify the contracts, produce communications related to those contracts. We had a big debate about what you were trying to accomplish, Mr. Mullins. Then you said, go look at documents. We have done that. They don't

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

answer our concern.

If I could just take a little bit of time to walk you through why it doesn't answer our concerns, we can deal with that. For one thing, the only -- this goes to the fact that you have limited it to only destinations served by Conrail. There is only one plant that AEP, one of Mr. McBride's clients, the parent company there of one of Mr. McBride's clients, they only have one plant that would be responsive to that order that they are having to produce.

Indianapolis Power and Light only has two plants that would be responsive to that order. These are plants, not companies. These are just plants. These plants, by the way, are served by Conrail.

Then for Atlantic City Electric and Delmarva, you have the situation, I think I have drawn this diagram before, but you have it where you have CSX, NS, Conrail, and this is the plant. Now what you have ordered them to produce is documents related to this plant, but only for Mr. McBride's clients, and again for AEP and Indianapolis Power and Light, that's only one plant and two plants.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHING ON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

.

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

For Delmarva and Atlantic City Electric there is I think two plants that are involved for both of those. Mr. McBride can correct me, but we have gone and looked at all the documents. What those documents do show is how CSX and Conrail or how CSX views competition for a joint line haul between CSX and Conrail to the plant.

It also shows how NS views competition like that. So it does show them, how they consider themselves competing for this plant. But that competition is in conjunction with Conrail. That is not our situation.

I have kept trying to explain that we are not your classic one lump shipper. We are not this kind of shipper. We don't get coal right now from CSX or NS. We never have for 20 some years, ever since the creation of Conrail.

What we are concerned about and what is not included in this document is CSX comes here, there's a plant right there, of course then CSX goes there. NS comes here and there's a plant right here. This is NS. This could basically be utility company

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

number one, this is utility company number two, or they could be different plants of the same utility. It doesn't really matter because this is our situation post-transaction.

Post transaction, NYSEG is having their plants divided like this, where CSX would serve one of our plants, NYSEG and Norfolk Southern would serve our other plant. It's actually three plants. We have a plant like this. They tell us in their application and in their witness statements that we shouldn't worry because we are going to get the benefit of the fact that CSX and NS are going to compete for these plants.

They are saying don't worry about it, what are you guys complaining about. You are going to have two railroads competing for service to your plants. Well, Your Honor, that's what we want to find out. Their witnesses have said you know, Southern Company does this, plays us against each other like this all the time. Virginia Power plays us against us all the time like this. So you are going to be able to do the same thing.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

So all we are trying to ask for, Your Honor, is trying to test that. We are just trying to get into the documents to see if this is in fact the case. You know, if it is the case, if it's true and that we could do it, then maybe NYSEG would say great, we're getting two railroad competition. Let's get out of this case.

But if we can't do it, that goes right to the issue of the fact that we are going to be harmed by the competition, by the transaction.

So under the diagram, you can see, Your Honor, how this information that I am really trying to search for is not included in the information that you have requested for ACE. So what we are trying to do, and I am willing to limit this, Your Honor. I am willing to work with you and with the other side to try to limit this to their top five utility companies, you know maybe even the top three. I am willing to work with them on some sort of limitation.

I am not just trying to come in here and throw some burden on them and all that kind of stuff because this is stuff we really need. It is not in

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

as ACE. That's why I came back to you today, Your 2 3 Honor. We had all that other problem, which you resolved. Mr. Edwards and I would resolve. But that 5 has to do with redactions and all that. But this is 6 really the heart of the matter of what we were asking for. So that is why we have come back to you to 8 revisit that. 9 10 Then once we deal with this issue, we would like to deal with the sort of the timing delay, 11 lack of production, things that you have already 12 13 ordered to be produced. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: What information are you 14 15 seeking here? MR. MULLINS: Pardon me, sir? 16 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: What information are you 18 seeking here? MP. MULLINS: We want to know if it is 19 true that when CSX is trying to determine a rate for 20 this plant right here, and when NS is trying to 21 22 determine a rate for this plant right here, that CSX

the ACE stuff because we're not in the same situation

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

they say they are going to be competitors. 2 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: What documents do you 3 want them to produce? MR. MULLINS: I would like them to produce 5 the information that is related, to get the internal communications that lead up to the contract that they 7 entered into for the transportation of coal to this 8 plant or this utility company. Because that is going 9 to tell me, Your Honor, whether or not they themselves 10 view themselves as competitors in that market. 11 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Who is 12 13 replying? 14 MR. HARKER: Well, Your Honor, first of all, Mr. Mullins, despite his offer to narrow this, 15 has on the table a very broad request. That is what 16 we objected to when we filed our initial objections. 17 18 In fact, his request would go to the entire universe of coal contracts. His request number 19 one, identify and produce all contracts between or 20 among any of the applicants for delivery of coal to 21 22 any shipper whereby the amount of coal delivered

and NS do view themselves as competitors.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

exceeded or is expected to exceed 100,000 tons per year. So his request is not so narrowly defined as he has indicated there. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Well, how can we narrow it down? What are you willing to give him? MR. HARKER: Well it seems to me that we should first of all get off the table any kind of situation that doesn't fit his scenario. That is, to say one company with two different railroads serving different plants in the company, I mean as a starting Because he has already said that the top diagram, the situation described in the top diagram, his paradigm there doesn't help him, the ACE documents and so on. So to say that his discussion about or his offer to limit it to the top three or five, I'm not sure if the top three or five are going to fit into Mr. Mullins', the paradigm that Mr. Mullins is concerned about now. That is to say one company, but

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

with more than one plant being served by CSX and NS.

So I guess in order to satisfy Mr.

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Mullins, he wants information where CSX and NS have competed head to head to serve different plants within 2 3 the same company. Right? MR. MULLINS: That's absolutely. 5 MR. HARKER: And I am not in a position here to argue or to offer that for my client because 6 I do not know how burdensome that would be. I mean we 7 8 have just been dealing with Mr. Mullins' very broad requests and having tried ourselves to formulate what it is that he is looking for. We are still trying to 10 figure that out ourselves. Today is a start in that 11 12 direction. 13 So I guess in answer to your question, Your Honor, I am not in a position to offer anything 14 at this point because I have not been authorized to. 15 16 MR. EDWARDS: Additionally, Your Honor, as spelled out in our letter responding to Mr. Mullins, 17 we had understood that you had --18 JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Tell me where in your 20 letter that you are talking about. MR. EDWARDS: Yes, Your Honor. It's the 21 22 colloquy that is reproduced beginning in the middle of

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

1 2

3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

page two in which you state that "I am going to rule on NYSEG's that NYSEG is entitled to receive the same information that I have previously ruled, that ACE can receive." Then you go on briefly after that saying all right, that's number one and number two.

Then there is a series of clarifications from Mr. Mullins about that. That ruling was made several days ago. It hasn't been appealed. So it is our understanding that in fact that was off the table. In fact, only at that same hearing we have a discussion as in fact what was deferred to today. That colloquy appears in footnote number one, where Mr. Mullins points out that I think that he would be happy to go ahead and defer to questions as to three, four, and five.

With regard to number three, four, and five, those interrogatories or discovery requests deal with shippers whose rates have been decreased during a time period applicable to requests or where they could have been increased but were not. We understand that Mr. Mullins is willing to discuss limitations and I think that it might be beneficial for us to consider

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

those limitations on those requests. But with regard to interrogatory number 2 one and two, I believe that the order was issued and 3 not appealed. 5 MR. MULLINS: Your Honor, what he is saying is that one and two you have ruled on and it's 6 only three, four, and five that you have deferred and 8 allowed me to come back on. One through five though 9 are all --JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Let's see if 10 we can cut this down. 11 12 I understand that they are willing to consider your limitation. The problem is they aren't 13 14 aware exactly what it is that you want. They want 15 some time to speak to their client. Do you want to see if you can reach an agreement and then come back 16 next Thursday if you can? 17 18 MR. MULLINS: No, Your Honor. I will tell you why. We don't --JUDGE LEVENTHAL: What do you want me to 20 21 rule on is what I don't know. You are saying you are 22 willing to limit it to three shippers. They are

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

saying well, we haven't heard that before. We have to go back and speak to our client.

MR. MULLINS: It's not true that they haven't heard it before because in the conference that we were here last week on, we offered to limit it, these same exact limitations. At that point, they were just arguing that you can get those documents from the ACE documents, Mr. Mullins. In fact, we discussed all of these limitations in your transcript, these exact same limitations.

Their argument to you was you can get this from the ACE documents. You agreed. You said Mr. Mullins, go look at the ACE documents and then come back. We have done that, Your Honor. This is what the ACE documents show. But it doesn't show this.

So look, I can suggest a way right now which is in their own application. They say that Southern Company does this against them and that Virginia Power does this, you know, is able to play them off of each other for shipments. Give me the Virginia Power files and give me the Southern Company files and let me test whether or not what you said.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	That's just two right there that they themselves
2	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Are you satisfied with
3	those two?
4	MR. MULLINS: If they would commit to me
5	that yes. I am satisfied with those two. Yes,
6	absolutely, because they say that. So let's test it.
7	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right.
8	MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, it may be
9	worthwhile for us to spend five minutes off the record
10	to discuss what's on the table at the moment. We were
11	searching diligently before. We haven't seen some of
12	this, and we need to consider it. Five minutes would
13	probably help quite a bit.
14	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: You want to confer
15	amongst yourselves?
16	MR. EDWARDS: Yes, Your Honor.
17	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Fine. We'll
18	go off the record, recess. We have room for you to
19	discuss. You can discuss it here or go out into one
20	of the other rooms.
21	All right. We are in recess.
22	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
THE PARTY	NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the record at 11:26 a.m. and went back on the record at 11:33 a.m.)

4 5

3

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Are you ready to go back on the record? All right. Oral argument will come back to order.

Mr. Coburn?

7

8

MR. COBURN: Your Honor, Mr. Mullins has made a proposal with respect to the production of a

9

certain category of documents from the files of Virginia Power and Southern Company. Subject to

10 11

further discussion with our clients and further

12

refinement of the proposal with Mr. Mullins, I think

13

we can accomplish if not today, then Monday. We are

14

prepared to pursue those discussions, take it back to

15

our clients and I think perhaps we have the framework

16

for a resolution of his requests, numbers one through

17

five.

18

We are prepared also to say that in the

20

event we can't work it out with Mr. Mullins over the

21

next day or two, that we would schedule a conference for Tuesday afternoon, perhaps, Tuesday at whatever

time is convenient for you to, if we have to bring it

22

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

back to you. But I think we have the framework of some good possibilities.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Mr. Mullins?

MR. MULLINS: It sounds promising. During

the recess, I was thinking that, Your Honor, since they themselves have mentioned Virginia Power and Southern, they have obviously had some sort of peak at these files in order to be able to establish what they said in their verified statements and depositions was true.

That doesn't allow me some sort of control check. I was thinking maybe if it would be okay that we add a third shipper so that we can -- you know, somebody that they haven't vetted, you know, that they haven't -- do you see what I am trying to say though? I mean because they have already vetted Southern and Virginia, so if the files, if it's true then those files are going to say it. But what if there is some other utility company out there that doesn't, where they have said that they can't do this to.

Originally I started at five, and now I down to two. So I am thinking three is fairly

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

	walle
2	one they didn't mention, in other words.
3	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Do you have
4	a reply?
5	I was going to suggest, why don't we do
6	this. Why don't we schedule another conference for
7	Tuesday. I am available whatever time you like. If
8	you want to make it 9:30, fine. But I think maybe we
9	are better off doing it in the afternoon, say 1:30?
10	MR. McBRIDE: Could you make it just a
11	little later in case we're all trying to meet that
12	2:00 p.m. filing leadline for the replies?
13	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: What time do you want?
14	I am available all day. I'll do whatever you want me
15	to do.
16	MR. McBRIDE: Say 2:30.
17	MR. MULLINS: 2:30 is fine.
18	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: We shouldn't' need a lot
19	of time on Tuesday. I mean I can't believe there will
20	be an extended argument. We would want it so that we
21	have something on the record and a ruling.
22	So why don't we do that, 2:30 on Tuesday.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	All right. So we'll defer further consideration of
2	this until Tuesday afternoon at 2:30.
3	Ms. Reporter, will you see that your
4	company supplies a reporter at that time? So we don't
5	have to call the reporter. All right?
6	All right. That disposes of we're
7	deferring disposition of that argument until Tuesday
8	at 2:30. Off the record.
9	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went
10	briefly off the record)
11	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: That's Tuesday,
12	September 9, 1997.
13	Now with respect to timeliness of
14	responses, I generally expect material to be furnished
15	as soon as possible after I make a ruling. I don't
16	set a time limit because I think parties are operating
17	in good will. I don't believe anybody is purposely
18	delaying the furnishing of any material.
19	I don't know what kind of an order you
20	want me to make, Mr. Mullins.
21	MR. MULLINS: It is always helpful if you
22	do put in some sort of deadline.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: What do you want? Tell me. MR. MULLINS: Well let me just -- okay. I think that you know, what is happening here is we are having this pattern. They get 15 days to respond. Then they respond. Then we have a week go by while we go and argue in front of you. Then you rule that they have to produce it. Then another two weeks go by and before things are actually in place.

So what you are looking at there is a total time of seven to eight weeks before something is actually produced. This is becoming a serious problem because we only have 45 days left.

Now I filed 20 interrogatories, well, I filed the letter first. Then I filed 20 interrogatories the next day. Now this was all back in August 12 and August 13 that I filed all this. To this date, Your Honor, the only people that have responded are Conrail, by placing copies of the NYSEG contracts into the document depository, and Norfolk Southern, by producing two studies and some letters from some congressmen and senators. CSX hasn't given

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

1

me a piece of paper yet.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

22

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: What do you want me to do? I am ready to do something for you, but tell me what it is.

MR. MULLINS: I would like a ruling that they have to produce all these documents that you have already ordered previously produced by next Friday.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Any problem?

MR. HARKER: Your Honor, I don't think that would be a problem, but yes, I think that we are making diligent efforts. In Mr. Edwards' letter that he sent to Mr. Mullins last night, there was a paragraph in there describing what we were doing to find files. In fact, we made a representation that today material would be going into the depository responsive to Mr. Mullins' request.

I would only note that with respect to the material or the interrogatories and document requests which were the subject of our five day objections, as I recall, each one of those as a result of the hearing was narrowed. So we really didn't start searching for those records until -- we had no reason to begin

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

searching for those records until after last Thursday
when Your Honor held this hearing.

As I say, as it turns out at least you

found our objections to be in part meritorious. As we represented to Mr. Mullins, we are searching for records responsive to those particular document requests.

With respect to the document requests that were not objected to and which were answered last week, again, I think Mr. Edwards' letter is very clear. We said that we're not aware of any studies that are responsive to requests 13, 18 and 19. We have not been sitting on our hands. We have been looking for things. We haven't found them. But that's not to say that we're done with our search.

As I say, with respect to document request number 20, we have represented to Mullins that documents will be going in no later than the close of business today.

Let me just say one thing. With respect to the informal request of Mr. Mullins dated August 6 or August 7, something like that, that basically the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

me too request, joining onto Mr. McBride's earlier discover, CSX tells me that they have no documents nor tape information relating to NYSEG.

No surprise, because I think everybody understood that CSX didn't serve NYSEG. But in any event, it's on the record. Mr. Mullins, you just got your representation.

But I think that with that background in mind, I think that we can commit to putting material in the depository by next Friday.

But as Mr. McBride pointed out before, we have just found tapes that actually turn out to be responsive to his prior requests. I represented on the record in good faith, because I was told not by just one person, but by a number of people at CSX that in fact the company didn't have information in 1978, 1979, and 1980. Actually I guess 1978 through 1982. I believed it because I had no basis otherwise. But the company did continue to look. They found the tapes.

Now should I be criticized? Should I be penalized because I made a good faith representation

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

to Mr. McBride and my client continued to look for the tapes, and low and behold they found them? I don't think so.

Similarly, we'll make a good faith effort as we have been doing to put everything in the depository by next Friday. But you know, if we find something the following week that we hadn't anticipated, I don't want to be criticized for that. I mean I don't think that is what you have in mind.

But on that basis, I can make a representation that next Friday makes sense. That is what we will shoot for. In fact, we're going to put some material in today.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right.

MR. NORTON: Your Honor, if I might just add another perspective. I was involved in UP SP proceedings for the applicants. We responded to 1,200 discovery requests there, which I thought set a mark that would not be approached in modern history. Last night, Mr. McBride served his seventh or eighth request on behalf of another one or anther of his clients which took us over the 1,000 mark. We're not

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

nearly done with discovery. We have been responding to an enormous volume of discovery right along, diligently and as timely as I think can reasonably be expected given the volume and the scope. I think that has to be kept in mind, that there is an awful lot that's been going on that you are not seeing because we're getting a lot of requests, we're responding to them. People don't have problems, but it keeps everyone very busy. JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Mr. Mullins, are you satisfied? MR. MULLINS: I am satisfied. Just for

the record, again, CSX hasn't given me one piece of paper. They say well they are going to put something in today. It's only responsive to one interrogatory. That interrogatory was give me copies of the letters you have sent to governors and senators and congressmen. So you know, this --

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: But you see, you are raising a problem that I really don't know the solution to. I mean I can make -- the guidelines don't provide for any time limit on producing

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

information after I make a ruling. I expect parties to operate in good faith. I expect them to furnish material as fast as they can. But I keep in mind that we are all only human and if they can't do it, they can't do it. I would think that after I make a ruling, parties should be able to produce material within a week. MR. MULLINS: That is basically all I am

asking too. I think that's fair and reasonable.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. Well that's our understanding. Of course if a party finds that they can't, they just simply can't find the material though they have made a good faith search, you don't want me to sanction them, do you?

MR. MULLINS: Not for that.

JUDGE LEVENTHAL: No. Of course not. So I think we are on the right track. If you have a specific problem, you bring it before me again. We meet virtually, well, I think we have been meeting every single week. I am here, available to settle disputes. If you need conferences other than our

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

1	previously scheduled conference, I certainly will try
2	to
3	MR. MULLINS: We may have to start taking
4	advantage of that.
5	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: I'll certainly try to
6	accommodate you in so far as my schedule permits. But
7	as I told you, we can always arrange time things.
8	So I don't think we have a problem. But
9	right now you have a commitment they will do their
10	very best to furnish all the information I have
11	ordered by next Friday.
12	MR. MULLINS: That is all I wanted, Your
13	Honor. Thank you.
14	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right.
15	MR. McBRIDE: May I just say that I hope
16	Mr. Harker understood that I was praising him earlier
17	for his continuing efforts to find those tapes and not
18	being critical.
19	On the point of perspective, I just
20	somehow had a feeling that this was going to get snuck
21	in here. So I brought along what I served last night.
22	I don't want you to think somehow that I am

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

-	responsible for the hounding discovery requests.
2	MR. NORTON: That's not the one.
3	MR. McBRIDE: One interrogatory and one
4	document request.
5	MR. NORTON: That wasn't the one that took
6	us over the top.
7	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: Well you know, you say
8	that each time the responses grow. I remember when a
9	four minute mile was a big accomplishment. Now today,
10	I almost do it. All right. Anything else before us?
11	MR. McBRIDE: Thank you.
12	JUDGE LEVENTHAL: All right. We stand
13	closed.
14	(Whereupon, at 11:47 a.m., the proceedings
15	were concluded.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
1-1 3/3/	

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in the matter of: CSX Corporation and CSX Transportation, Inc., et al., Finance Docket No. 33388

Before: Surface Transportation Board
The Honorable Jacob Leventhal
Administrative Law Judge

Date: Friday, September 5, 1997

Place: Hearing Room 3

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, N.E. Washington, D.C.

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

Clrene Gray

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

(202) 234-4433