Quarterly Status Report of Rate Complaint Cases Before the STB -2ND QUARTER 2018

Docket No:	NOR 42142
Case Name:	Consumers Energy Co. v. CSX Transportation, Inc.
Commodities:	Coal

Rate Review Type (SAC, SSAC, 3-Benchmark or Other):	SAC and Revenue Adequacy
Origin(s):	Interchange with BNSF in the vicinity of Chicago, IL
Destination(s):	Campbell Generating Station near West Olive, MI

Procedural Schedule:	
Date on Which Proceeding Began:	January 13, 2015
*Discovery Completed:	July 1, 2015
Opening Evidence:	November 2, 2015 / January 23, 2017 (supplemental)
Reply Evidence:	March 7, 2016 / March 6, 2017 (supplemental)
Rebuttal Evidence:	May 20, 2016 / April 13, 2017 (supplemental)
Closing Briefs:	June 24, 2016

Merits Decision:	January 11, 2018
Petitions for Reconsideration or Reopening / Petitions for Technical Corrections	February 20, 2018
Replies to Petitions for Reconsideration or Reopening	March 12, 2018
Decision Making Technical Corrections	TBD
Merits Decision on Reconsideration or Reopening	TBD

Italics indicate dates of future events, which are subject to change.

Brief Description of the Final Decisions:	
	The merits decision found that (1) CSXT has market dominance over the issue traffic;
	(2) the rate was shown to be unreasonably high under the SAC constraint; and (3)
	CSXT was not shown to be revenue adequate under the revenue adequacy constraint.
	Rate relief was prescribed under the SAC constraint.

* Parties often set the schedule for discovery and do not necessarily inform the Board. This date is based on the information in the Board's possession, but may have changed.

CONSUMERS ENERGY CO. v. CSX TRANSPORTATION, Docket No. NOR 42142

is Only)	Complete Timeline (Significant Filings and D
Consumers Complaint January 13, 2015	
CSXT Answer February 2, 2015	
to Dismiss Revenue Adequacy Claim March 24, 2015	CSXT M
rs Reply to CSXT Motion to Dismiss April 13, 2015	Co
Discovery Conference April 21, 2015	
Motion to Dismiss Rev. Adeq. Claim June 15, 2015	STB Decision Denying
Technical Conference June 23, 2015	
Close of Discovery* July 1, 2015	
Decedures for Formatting of Evidence July 15, 2015	STB Decision Adopt
Discovery Conference July 20, 2015 Consumers Opening Evidence November 2, 2015	
Consumers Opening Evidence November 2, 2015 CSXT Reply Evidence March 7, 2016	
CSXT Reply March 7, 2016	
CSXT Workpapers March 7, 2016	
CSXT Errata Sheet March 8, 2016	
CSXT Errata Sheet March 8, 2016	
s Petition for Technical Conference March 14, 2016	Co
e Response to Technical Conference March 16, 2016	
to Consumers Technical Conference March 21, 2016	
g Request for Technical Conference April 6, 2016	STB Decision
papers in Response to STB Decision April 8, 2016	CSXT Reply and Submission of
tion to Modify Procedural Schedule April 13, 2016	Consum
otion to Modify Procedural Schedule April 15, 2016	CSXT Reply to Consum
otion to Modify Procedural Schedule April 20, 2016	STB Decision Granting in Part Consum
Consumers Workpapers May 20, 2016	
Consumers Rebuttal May 20, 2016	
Consumers Rebuttal May 20, 2016	
nfidential Errata to Reply Evidence May 26, 2016	CS
CSXT Errata Sheet May 26, 2016	
ers Reply to CSXT Errata Evidence May 27, 2016	
g the Board Accept Its Errata Sheet June 1, 2016	
ng Parties to Prepare Closing Briefs June 3, 2016	STB Decision I
Consumers Errata Sheet June 3, 2016 Consumers Errata Sheet June 3, 2016	
Consumers Errata Sheet June 3, 2016 CSXT Motion to Strike June 24, 2016	
CSXT Motion to Strike June 24, 2016	
CSXT Final Brief June 24, 2016	
CSXT Final Brief June 24, 2016	
Consumers Final Brief June 24, 2016	
Consumers Final Brief June 24, 2016	
n to Remove CSXT Motion to Strike June 27, 2016	Consumers
ers Reply to CSXT Motion to Strike July 14, 2016	
ion for Leave to Supplement Record July 14, 2016	Consumer
ion for Leave to Supplement Record July 26, 2016	
	STB Decision Ruling on Consumers Petition for Leave to Suppleme
arties to File Supplemental Evidence December 9, 2016	
ers Supplemental Opening Evidence January 23, 2017	
CSXT Supplemental Reply Evidence March 6, 2017	
ers Supplemental Rebuttal Evidence April 13, 2017 CSXT Motion to Strike May 3, 2017	
ers Reply to CSXT Motion to Strike May 23, 2017	
STB Decision on the Merits January 11, 2018	
XT Motion for an Extension of Time January 18, 2018	
XT Motion for an Extension of Time January 19, 2018	STB Decision Grant
Joint Petition for Technical Changes February 20, 2018	
mers Petition for Technical Changes February 20, 2018	
sumers Petition for Reconsideration February 20, 2018	
CSXT Petition for Reconsideration February 20, 2018	
mers Petition for Technical Changes March 12, 2018	CSXT Reply to
sumers Petition for Reconsideration March 12, 2018	CSXT Reply
CSXT Petition for Reconsideration March 12, 2018	Consumers R
sion of Market Dominance Appendix March 14, 2018	STB Updated Merits Decision to Include Publ
CSXT Letter March 19, 2018	
Consumers Response to CSXT Letter March 20, 2018	

* Parties often set the schedule for discovery and do not necessarily inform the Board. This date is based on the information in the Board's possession, but may have changed

		(1006 to Bro+)	- Last Updated 06/29/2018		
Docket No	Case Name	(1996 to Present) Commodity	- Last Updated 06/29/2018 Guidelines Used	Date of Decision	Decision
1191	West Texas v. BNSF	Coal	SAC	5/3/1996	Rates Unreasonable
7809	McCarty Farms v. BN	Grain	SAC	8/20/1997	Rates Reasonable
1185	APS v. ATSF	Coal	SAC	4/17/1998	Rates Unreasonable
1989	Pepco v. CSX	Coal	SAC	6/18/1998	Settlement
2012	Sierra Pacific v. UP	Coal	SAC	7/17/1998	Settlement
1670	Shell Chemical v. NS	Chemical	Simplified	3/12/1999	Settlement
	PPL v. Conrail	Coal	SAC	5/13/1999	Settlement
1295					
12034	PSI Energy v. Soo FMC v. UP	Coal	SAC	5/13/1999	Settlement
2022		Minerals	SAC	5/12/2000	Rates Unreasonable
2038	MN Power v. DMIR	Coal	Stipulated R/VC	1/5/2001	Settlement
2051	WPL v. UP	Coal	SAC	5/14/2002	Rates Unreasonable
12054	PPL v. BNSF	Coal	SAC	8/20/2002	Rates Reasonable
2059	Northern States v. UP	Coal	Stipulated R/VC	8/7/2003	Settlement
2077	APS v. BNSF	Coal	SAC	12/31/2003	Withdrawn
2056	TMPA v. BNSF	Coal	SAC	9/27/2004	Rates Unreasonable
2069	Duke v. NS	Coal	SAC	10/20/2004	Rates Reasonable
42070	Duke v. CSXT	Coal	SAC	10/20/2004	Rates Reasonable
42072	Carolina Power v. NS	Coal	SAC	10/20/2004	Rates Reasonable
2057	Xcel v. BNSF	Coal	SAC	12/14/2004	Rates Unreasonable
2058	AEPCO v. BNSF	Coal	SAC	3/15/2005	Rates Reasonable
2093	BP Amoco v. NS	Chemical	Simplified	6/28/2005	Settlement
2071	Otter Tail v.BNSF	Coal	SAC	1/27/2006	Rates Reasonable
42091	APS v. BNSF	Coal	SAC	2/10/2006	Settlement
2097	Albemarle v. LNW	Chemical	SAC	11/14/2006	Settlement
2098	Williams Olefins v. GTC	Chemical	Simplified	2/15/2007	Settlement
2095	KCPL v. UP	Coal	Stipulated R/VC	5/19/2008	Rates Unreasonable
2088	Western Fuels v. BNSF	Coal	SAC	2/18/2009	Rates Unreasonable
2112	E.I. Dupont v. CSX	Chemical	SAC	5/11/2009	Settlement
41191 (S1)	AEP Texas v. BNSF	Coal	SAC	5/15/2009	Rates Reasonable
42111	Oklahoma Gas v. UP	Coal	Stipulated R/VC	7/24/2009	Rates Unreasonable
42099	DuPont v. CSXT	Chemical	Three-Benchmark	9/1/2009	Settlement
	DuPont v. CSXT	Chemical			
2100			Three-Benchmark	9/1/2009	Settlement
2101	DuPont v. CSXT	Chemical	Three-Benchmark	9/1/2009	Settlement
42114	U.S. Magnesium v. UP	Chemical	Three-Benchmark	1/28/2010	Rates Unreasonable
42115	U.S. Magnesium v. UP	Chemical	Simplified SAC	4/2/2010	Settlement
2116	U.S. Magnesium v. UP	Chemical	Simplified SAC	4/2/2010	Settlement
2122	NRG v. CSXT	Coal	SAC	7/8/2010	Settlement
2110	Seminole Electric v. CSXT	Coal	SAC	9/27/2010	Settlement
2113 (S1)	AEPCO v. UP	Coal	SAC	4/15/2011	Settlement
2128	SMEPA v. NS	Coal	SAC	8/31/2011	Settlement
1191 (S1)	AEP Texas v. BNSF	Coal	SAC-Remand	10/26/2011	Settlement
2113	AEPCO v. BNSF & UP	Coal	SAC	11/22/2011	Rates Unreasonable
2132	Canexus v. BNSF	Chemical	Three-Benchmark	7/20/2012	Settlement
2127	IPA v. UP	Coal	SAC	11/2/2012	Withdrawn
2123	M&G Polymers v. CSXT	Chemicals	SAC	1/7/2013	Settlement
2125	DuPont v. NS	Chemicals	SAC	3/24/2014	Rates Reasonable
2130	SunBelt v. NS	Chemical	SAC	6/20/2014	Rates Reasonable
2136	IPA v. UP	Coal	SAC	10/8/2014	Settlement
2088	Western Fuels v. BNSF	Coal	SAC	6/15/2015	Settlement
2121	TPI v. CSXT	Chemicals	SAC	9/14/2016	Rates Reasonable
12142	Consumers v. CSXT	Coal	SAC & Revenue Adequacy	1/11/2018	Rates Unreasonable
		Pendin	g before the STB		
Docket No	Case Name	Commodity	Guidelines Used	Date of Decision	Decision

Notes to Table:

1. SAC = Stand-Alone Cost Methodology Applied for a Hypothetical Railroad.

2. Simplified = Using a Simplified, Rather than Full-SAC, Methodology for Determining the Reasonableness

of Rates as Set Forth in Coal Rate Guidelines, Nationwide, 1 I.C.C.2d 520 (1985) (<u>Guidelines</u>).

3. Stipulated R/VC = Parties Agreed to Use Revenue to Variable Cost (R/VC) Ratios @ 180% Level,

in Lieu of Using SAC.

4. Three-Benchmark Methodology = Methodology of Seeking Relief Pursuant to the Revised Simplified Procedures as Set Forth in Simplified Standards for Rail Rate Cases , STB Ex Parte No. 646 (Sub-No. 1) (STB served Sept. 5, 2007) and any additional Sub-No. decisions.

5. Revenue Adequacy = Revenue Adequacy Constraint, as Described in <u>Guidelines</u>.