ORIGINAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE: TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE, UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS
BY NORFOLK SOUTHERN RAILROAD

MAIN CAPITOL SENATE ROOM 8 E-A HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 2001, 10:08 A.M.

PAMELA S. SULLIVAN
REPORTER-NOTARY PUBLIC



ARCHIVE REPORTING SERVICE

2336 N. Second Street (717) 234-5922 Harrisburg, PA 17110 FAX (717) 234-6190

1	BEFORE:	
2	HON.	RICHARD GEIST, CHAIRMAN
3	HON.	MIKE VEON
4	HON.	PAUL PARSELLS
5	HON.	DICK HESS
6	HON.	JOHN MAHER
7	HON.	JERE STRITTMATTER
8	HON.	DANTE SANTONI
9	HON.	JOHN PIPPY
10	HON.	FRANK DERMODY
11	HON.	KATE HARPER
12	HON.	RUSS FAIRCHILD
13	HON.	ELLEN BARD
14	HON.	RONALD MARSICO
15	HON.	DAVID LEVDANSKY
16	HON.	JOSEPH MARKOSEK
17	HON.	STANLEY SAYLOR
18	HON.	ERIC BUGAILE
19	HON.	GENE McGILL
20	HON.	JOSEPH PETRACA
21	HON.	LEANNA WASHINGTON
22	HON.	STEPHEN STETLER
23	HON.	JESS STAIRS
24		
25		

1	INDEX	
2	WITNESS	PAGE
3	HON. SAMUEL H. SMITH	6
4	HON. MICHAEL R. VEON	16
5	RICHARD F. TIMMONS	20
6	MICHAEL R. MCCLELLAN	26
7	RONALD G. LUTTON, JR.	82
8	TOM LUTTON	98
9	RICHARD EDELMAN	98
10	FRAN HORVATH	134
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 CHAIRMAN GEIST: A quorum being present, 2 we'll start the meeting. We're going to go right 3 into the testimony. First of all before we do the testimony, what I'd like to do is show the film clips that we used to open the meeting in Altoona. And I 5 think they're very explanatory and can do a much 6 7 better job than I can. This Committee held hearings before the 8 We took testimony all over the state. 9 10 Norfolk Southern, we summarized their commitments to 1.1 We put those commitments in writing. They're us. 12 part of the Surface Transportation Board agreement, 13 and I think that the black and white part of that 14 issue is pretty much covered. To the railroad, it's all in black and white. 15 16 So, Eric, if you would run the tape and 17 then we'll get started. 18 (The videotape was shown.) 19 (The videotape will be put in the file.) 20 CHAIRMAN GEIST: I think that tape can do 21 one heck of a lot better job than I ever could 22 summing up David Goode and Norfolk Southern's 23 comments about our part of the state. 24 What were their comments to this 25 Committee when we did our testimony? We were told

that the rail supply industry in Pennsylvania would be kept whole. We were told that it would be an unprecedented public/private partnership with the State of Pennsylvania. We were told that the short lines in Pennsylvania would have the best working agreements and the best relationships that they've ever had, better than Conrail.

We were told that the efficiencies were going to be great and that we would be taking a million trucks off the road and off our interstates and what a great partnership that was going to be and we can go on and on.

At our hearing in Altoona, we had testimony that was presented by Norfolk Southern.

And in there, I was mystified. I went out and got Jeff Foxworthy's book on how to speak southern because I'm trying to find out when you make written promises and commitments to a state, how you can call them projections. How do you tell the people that work at the Hollidaysburg car shop, how do you tell the people at Juniata that that \$67 million and those jobs up there, they were merely projections?

In the State of Pennsylvania -- we're the largest state of the 21 states in the Norfolk Southern system. The relationship with the Norfolk

Southern Corporation is so good that the Governor, the Administration of Pennsylvania along with rail labor is in front of the Surface Transportation Board fighting for the promises that were made by Norfolk Southern to the State of Pennsylvania.

We have some testifiers today who are going to bring some things out and -- Rudy, welcome to the hearing. And I hope that by the time we get done we can summarize more information. And our Committee needs to take a look at working with our leadership, and we have two of the members of leadership who are testifying today -- what actions our General Assembly will take in an unprecedented public/private partnership.

The most telling statement in the testimony in Altoona, the heart of the Norfolk Southern system, was that they didn't even pay their Chamber of Commerce dues from the day they hit town. I'm one Chairman who's very disappointed, and I think that you'll hear from the testimony statewide and from testimony that you won't hear because people were afraid to testify.

Yesterday, I met with Phil McFerron, who runs the Short Line Association. And I think that it's a shame that when we have that kind of

relationship with our corporate entities in the State of Pennsylvania.

So I'm not going to say anything else. I think what we'll do is we'll call Sam Smith now, and then we'll let the members of the Committee ask questions when people are testifying. Sam, it's all yours.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman, and all the members of the Committee. And to the Democratic Chairman, if you're being able to watch this today, God bless you, and I hope you have continued strength and perseverance.

It's my pleasure to be with you. I've got to admit that I'm a little nervous. I presented a bill before a Senate committee one day in this room, but this is the first time I ever testified before a House committee. So I hope you guys will be gentle with me. I'm not used to being on this side of the table, you know.

I think the tape that was presented, Mr. Chairman, was an excellent portrayal of the hope and, you know, the good feelings that people had and the potential of this merger with Norfolk Southern coming into Pennsylvania. But, you know, as it focused on Altoona, the example that I would like to bring to

you folks today is one off to the side of Altoona. I come from Punxsutawney, which was at one time the heart of the B&O Line. We had a pretty big railroad operation there. But over the years it became a short line, and it's now just one of the fingers that feed into the main lines.

And the testimony that I would like to present to you doesn't have to do just with my district but certainly it has affected that short line all the way up through Clearfield, Jefferson, Elk, McKean and Warren County, several counties up through the North and West Central Region of Pennsylvania.

And what's important about this is just as the tape showed the importance of Norfolk Southern being centered in Altoona and those jobs that were talked about there -- what's important to this, as I see it, is the spin-off jobs and the related industry, not just the railroad jobs, but the coal and aggregate and timber industries that can use the short line railroads that actually feed into the main lines. And I did think that we had a promise given to us that there would be a cooperation. And as the Chairman noted, these railroads are very, very concerned about their current relationship.

And I'd like to just put on the record that my interest in this was not spurred or asked -- I wasn't asked by any of the short lines to do this. I was concerned because of just some local things that I saw going on in my region.

I'd also say, just as a quick observation, given my position within the House, particularly with the Republican Caucus, it's my perception, Mr. Chairman, that under the current situation the way things are working or not working, it would be my observation that the folks at Norfolk Southern really are not in good favor within the legislature, from where I sit anyhow.

And that's something that I think we need to work to mend, and I think that they need to come to the table in that regard because there is still a lot of potential here. But we need to work together to maintain what the interests are, particularly and specifically in Altoona, but also the spin-offs that I'm going to give you one example of.

My specific example pertains to a Norfolk Southern proposed expansion and reconstruction project in Southern Indiana County. They're looking at about 5.4 miles of track expansion from Saltsburg to Clarksburg and about an 11.8-mile track

reconstruction from Clarksburg into the Keystone

Generating Station. The proposed cost is about \$28

million.

Now, I'm not sure if Norfolk Southern proposes to spend that out of their own pocket or if they're going to plan to come to the State for some capital assistance, redevelopment assistance-type program moneys, rail freight assistance-type moneys. I'm not sure how they plan to fund that projected \$28 million. The bottom line is, Norfolk Southern will be coming to the State or wanting more development funds as they had been part of the original deal.

And my concern is that it's all one big pot of money really. I mean, let's say that they have a -- just for the sake of arbitrary numbers, let's say they have \$100 million of their money that they want to invest in rail improvements in Pennsylvania.

They're going to try to use that \$100 million to leverage maybe another \$100 million of taxpayers' money, and wherever that fits into the system to me is irrelevant. You know, you put it where it's best used and where it works. And so I look at that \$28 million project that they're proposing there as, you know, related to the whole

system, it's kind of a zero sum game.

Over the past few months as I've been checking into this, I've been inquiring into the necessity of this project and the impact on the local community. Clearly when you're talking about building 5.4 miles of brand new track -- I mean, we're talking no track here. We're not talking an abandoned railroad. We're talking, you know, virgin ground. You're talking about a major impact on a local community.

But what's really bothersome to me is that currently the Norfolk Southern is running new coal into the Keystone Station on the short line, which runs kind of up from Butler and across to Punxsutawney and back down to Indiana. Granted, it's a longer route and it's somewhat circuitous. But it's not an inefficient route in that sense.

And, well, Norfolk could say that the line they're proposing is more efficient. But the key thing that it will do for the \$28 million is it will kind of shut off a lot of the bloodline to this track that supports a greater area of rural Pennsylvania and actually is, you know, a big part of that short line system.

For about half of that money,

approximately \$15 million, that short line could do the renovations to make that a more efficient track -- the slightly more circuitous, admittedly more circuitous route, not as direct. The direct route that Norfolk's proposing would only help them, only them. The other way, for half the money, would benefit them adequately and would, you know, sustain a whole other community for other spin-offs and industries that might be affected by that.

So I really think that when we look at those things that we have to look at that balance and getting the best bang for the buck and how we can work with not only Norfolk Southern but also with the short lines.

And so my main concern and the point that I'm trying to make is that I'm very concerned about what they're asking for or what they may be asking for. I don't know. I want to see the short lines be able to work with and thrive in conjunction with the main lines.

I mean, it's just like, Okay, maybe this project doesn't go. They get it the way they want it. That's maybe just lopping off one finger of your hand. But, eventually, as a short line dwindles here and another one there, pretty soon you may still have

the hand, but it won't be near as effective if it doesn't have the fingers on it. And I think that's important for us to recognize, and I know the Chairman and many of the Committee members share that view. And I just wanted to put it on the record.

One point that I need to make in full disclosure because it could be used either way against my statements today, on this very short line extension from Punxsy to Indiana just about a week or so ago, there was a bridge that collapsed. And it demonstrates the need of the improvement on that short line.

And the other folks could say, Well, that's proof that we should build our own line. It will be more efficient and more direct. I would argue -- and that's a fair argument. I'll give them that one. But I would argue that the fact that the short line already has the steel -- in less than a week, they have the steel in there. It's probably sitting -- the bridge is probably half reconstructed in less than two weeks, which you all recognize more than any of us that that's an amazing turnaround.

Their commitment to doing the job as a short line is tremendous, and I'm really, really proud of the work they've been able to accomplish.

```
1
    And so, you know, there are problems on this
 2
     railroad. But that's why that short line route needs
 3
     its share of reconstruction. And with the commitment
     from the Norfolk Southern, I think it would make the
     whole short line system more viable.
 5
                 And as we get into the capital budget
 6
 7
    projects and all -- I'm going to be honest -- I'm
    going to have real problems being supportive of
 8
    projects that don't enhance and cooperate with the
 9
     short lines.
10
11
                 I'll stop my testimony there, Mr.
     Chairman, and I'll be glad to answer any questions.
12
13
                 CHAIRMAN GEIST: Thank you. Anybody have
    any questions? Thank you very much, Sam.
14
15
                 REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Mr. Fairchild
16
     wants to --
                 CHAIRMAN GEIST:
17
                                  Russ.
18
                 REPRESENTATIVE FAIRCHILD: Thank you.
     Representative Smith, just for clarification, I quess
19
     Norfolk Southern thinks that the short line is
20
21
     ripping them off. Is that the bottom line?
                 REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: I don't know that
22
     they think they're being ripped off. My guess is
23
24
     they just feel -- in this particular case?
                 REPRESENTATIVE FAIRCHILD:
25
                                            Yes.
```

money by running this short track and not have to pay, you know, the short line for the haulage across their lines. I imagine it just looks better for their bottom line over the short term. I think that's a shortsighted view if that is the case because as the short lines dwindle and die off, I think those feeder routes that provide other traffic on the main lines and provide that expansion of the communities.

2.3

I mean, you know, that the railroads are important to us. Even though they're not the dominant force that they were years ago, they're still very important to us. And as we lose those short lines through the rural areas, that's the long-term view that Norfolk isn't looking at.

REPRESENTATIVE FAIRCHILD: Yeah. Well, my second follow-up question that I think you've answered part of is that with the \$13 million difference, has Norfolk Southern made any projections as far as when they could recapitalize that cost? I mean, that's certainly not going to be recapitalized over the short term.

And then my final thing is, you know, I agree with you. It seems to me I can remember when

```
the railroads were encouraging, absolutely
 1
 2
     encouraging, short line. In fact, they were the ones
     that were selling and hoping, trying to find short
 3
     lines to pick their lines up. Now, it seems that
 4
     we're going into an age of, perhaps, reversal.
 5
                                                      And I
     agree with you. I think it's take a -- it's going to
 6
 7
     take a hard look by all of us.
                 REPRESENTATIVE SMITH:
                                         I appreciate that.
 9
     I am truly disappointed because I was hopeful kind of
     like the tape was for those jobs in Altoona.
10
     hopeful that our short lines would be able to thrive
11
     in this new atmosphere, and I'm disappointed and very
12
13
     concerned because it's a critical transportation
14
     artery in Pennsylvania and in particularly with the
15
     short lines in some of the more rural areas.
16
                                  Thank you, Sam.
                 CHAIRMAN GEIST:
                                         Thank you, Mr.
17
                 REPRESENTATIVE SMITH:
18
     Chairman.
                I appreciate the opportunity.
19
                 CHAIRMAN GEIST:
                                  From one Whip to
20
     another, from the Republican Whip to the Democratic
21
     Whip, Representative Mike Veon.
22
                 REPRESENTATIVE VEON:
                                       Thank you, Mr.
     Chairman.
23
                 Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to
24
25
     join Sam Smith and best wishes for the Democratic
```

Chair of this Committee. We certainly miss him in Harrisburg, and we appreciate his efforts over all the years. And we wish him the very best for a recovery so he can sit here in this spot to your left or to your right.

Number two, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the efforts that you've made on this issue in particular, for your leadership on rail issues in general. Really there's no one in the legislature that has done -- no single legislator that has done more for rail labor, for rail companies, for rail production, for rail travel, for rail carrying in the State of Pennsylvania than you have. And I really appreciate those efforts over so many years, Chairman Geist.

Thank you also for making sure that we have testimony and hearings on this very important issue, and I know firsthand how it's affected your area directly. But as you know, it has had impact all across the State of Pennsylvania.

I'm from Beaver County. We had a significant Conrail presence for years. We have a very significant railyard in Beaver County, Conway Yards. So this issue is not only important to Chairman Geist. But he's provided the opportunity

for members like me, a very significant presence in my home county, to make the points that I'd like to make here today.

I also agree, Mr. Chairman, that the tape that you showed here this morning was more compelling than any testimony from any member of the House would be on this issue. Comment after comment, position after position stated on that tape clearly demonstrates what we're dealing with right now with this company, Norfolk Southern.

Based on that tape and based on the experience and based on my observation and based on what has happened over the last few months, this is the most blatant, arrogant and shameful act by a company in the 17 years that I've been in the legislature. In my judgement, they've slapped the Governor in the face, they've slapped this legislature in the face, they've thumbed their nose at state government and said they're going to do what they want no matter what the state government thinks.

Everybody in this panel knows that this state government invested a significant amount of political capital in making sure that Norfolk Southern was successful in their acquisition of Conrail. The Governor of Pennsylvania, I think, did

a very good job in making sure that the federal government responded to the needs of Pennsylvania in that acquisition process.

This company, Norfolk Southern, made very clear, very direct promises to the Governor, to the state legislature, to the people of Pennsylvania, to the workers of this rail company on what would happen in Pennsylvania if they were successful in acquiring Conrail in this state.

And again, Mr. Chairman, the tape was compelling. The action since those promises were made are clear. They have lied to the people of Pennsylvania. They've lied to the Governor of this state. They've lied to the state legislature. And, frankly, they've done it in a very blatant, arrogant and shameful way.

Chairman, that I appreciate the testimony that you're getting across the State of Pennsylvania on this issue. I want you to know that, in a very bipartisan way, we stand ready on the Democratic side to join with you and other members of this Committee, that once this testimony is provided, we stand ready to join you in whatever action that you deem appropriate that this Committee ought to take, this legislature

ought to take and this state government ought to take in dealing with Norfolk Southern in the State of Pennsylvania.

Again, I appreciate your effort and look forward to working with you. I think that we need to stand up for what we believe in, what's right and what they did and make sure that it's clear from us, the state legislators involved in this process, that what they did is wrong. We need to hold them accountable in this process, and we look forward to working with you to do just that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Thank you. Any questions? Thank you very much, Michael.

The next testifier is Michael McClellan,
Vice President Intermodal Marketing, Norfolk Southern
Railroad, accompanied by General Richard Timmons.

Rudy, do you want to come up?

MR. TIMMONS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee. This is the second time I have appeared before you in as many weeks, and I thank you for the opportunity to provide additional information concerning Norfolk Southern and its presence in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania over the past 22 months.

This morning I have with me Mr. Mike

McClellan, Vice President of Intermodal Operations

for Norfolk Southern, who in just a few moments will

provide you with information concerning

intermarketing and intermodal operations in the

Commonwealth.

Before that, however, let me bring you up to date on several issues and clarify others that were part of the testimony that some of you heard on the 12th of April in Altoona. And as all of you know, under separate cover, I provided copies of that testimony which outlined in some detail the investments that Norfolk Southern has made in the state.

At the time that I testified on the 12th, I mentioned that we had committed \$342.8 million into the Commonwealth in a 22-month period across the state in a variety of projects, and I outlined those projects and those investments in some detail. Now, I'm pleased to report this morning that that number's being revised upward as a result of a decision last week by Norfolk Southern to invest \$1.9 million into the enhancement of the Enola freight yards. We'll increase the switching capacity in the yards from 125 cars a day to 600 cars a day, and that's a very

significant advance as far as ensuring that this region is a solid transportation hub.

Now, this 344.7 million total along with an additional 30 million commitment in the coming years to the Commonwealth is a clear indication of Norfolk Southern's commitment to the rail network in Pennsylvania and our belief in the future of the system that we're building here.

Now, our investment priorities have been established with the intention of building a railroad in Pennsylvania and in the Northeast that is competitive, service oriented and adaptable to the fast-moving market conditions in the freight shipping world. Our expenditures in this region of the state, in the Rutherford intermodal yards, the Enola yards and the Harrisburg intermodal yards, our Northern Region headquarters and dispatching center along with the renewed Triple Crown roadrailer operation in Swatara Township are all long-term investments developed with an eye to handling the well documented freight increases expected in the future.

Now, let me also reemphasize the Norfolk

Southern commitment to safety across our system. The
record is admirable by any measure and clearly is the
focus of the Pennsylvania Public Utilities

Commission, the Federal Railway Administration and Norfolk Southern management. For ten consecutive years, Norfolk Southern has won the industry safety award for the Class I railroads, the Harriman Award.

And in the year 2000 in just the

Harrisburg Division, which is roughly half of the

state, the eastern half of the state, we spent \$26.7

million on road bed and bridge maintenance and \$13.5

million in signal projects. We're proud of our

safety record, and these investments are intended to

sustain our safety tradition.

And, Mr. Chairman, with your permission,

I'd like to clarify just a couple of points that were

of interest both to labor representatives as well as

the Committee members following my testimony in

Altoona. Is that okay with you, sir?

I was asked about future job opportunities for the 330 Norfolk Southern employees working in the Hollidaysburg shops. And my response was at that time that all would be offered jobs at Norfolk Southern facilities following the closure on 1 September of this year. This statement is accurate, and it is correct notwithstanding other testimony provided to the Committee.

Also following my testimony in Altoona,

there were questions concerning the provisions of the New York Dock for the Hollidaysburg employees. The New York Dock is a labor protective agreement extending from the Penn Central merger of many years ago.

Let me say that this is a New York Dock transaction and the relocation benefits have been programmed for employees that are offered jobs distant from Altoona. As a matter of fact, these benefits far exceed the New York Dock standard requirements.

As you may not be aware as was not clear in that last hearing, the New York Dock benefits are not purely a railroad decision but are an agreed-upon position that can go to arbitration if employees are not satisfied. And now, of course, everyone responds to the arbitration results.

And, lastly, is pertaining to the New York Dock, there were some comments concerning the railroad's willingness to pay New York Dock. From Norfolk Southern's standpoint, we pay an average of one and a half million dollars monthly to former Conrail employees in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania alone. Last month, it happened to be two million. But on average month to month, it's about a million

and a half dollars.

I testified previously that our service had dramatically improved from the summer and fall of 1999 and that the Norfolk Southern performance metrics provided to the Surface Transportation Board in Washington each week reflect that upturn. To highlight this change in service efficiency, I would point out that Norfolk Southern has received laudatory letters from PP&L, U.S. Steel and short line operators thanking us for the improved service, the cooperation and the commitment that Norfolk Southern has shown in working through the problems and shortcomings since we've been up here.

I'd also point out that Pennsylvania has the strongest short line association of any in the nation. Norfolk Southern is a part of that. It's a healthy organization. Mr. David Goode led the railroad industry fight to establish a short line Class I railroad marketing arrangement called the Railroad Agreement. He led that. It's in effect, and we're working effectively with short lines across the state.

We're proud of that relationship.

Despite testimony to the contrary a little earlier,
we think that the statistics, our working

relationships and our marketing agreements will validate that.

Now, at this time, I'd like to introduce Mr. Mike McClellan, Vice President Intermodal Marketing, for comments that he has for your use and information. And following his comments, we will certainly be prepared to answer any questions that you may have of us. Mike.

MR. McCLELLAN: Well, good morning, Mr. Chairman and Committee members. My name is Mike McClellan. I'm Vice President of Intermodal Marketing for Norfolk Southern.

My responsibilities cover all shipments on the Norfolk Southern, moving trailers, containers and roadrailers. I handle the pricing, product development and investment decisions associated with these businesses. Triple Crown, our trucking company in Fort Wayne, and Thoroughbred Direct, our postal logistics company in Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania, both report to me as well.

I'd also like to note that I started my railroad career at Conrail and spent ten years with that company. And during some of that time, I had the pleasure of living in the state of Pennsylvania.

Today I would like to talk about NS's

perspective on the commercial impacts that these investments and transactions as a whole have had on our business in Pennsylvania. As you know from Mr. Timmons' testimonies, Norfolk Southern has invested or launched investments of over 342 million in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania over the past two years.

This unprecedented commitment underlines Norfolk Southern's belief in the franchise that we have acquired and our preparation for the future. The size of this investment and the investments that are forthcoming, however, are largely irrelevant if they do not serve the shippers, namely the shippers in Pennsylvania, more effectively and with a higher value product. In turn, without a higher a higher value product, the NS will not grow.

The Conrail transaction, and this underlying investment, were ultimately designed to ensure that the NS grows its rail business, whether that is through taking share off the highway or participating in the economic growth and success of its businesses here in Pennsylvania.

The Conrail transaction and these investments have supported and will support Norfolk Southern's growth effort in three very important ways: improving the quality of rail service,

stimulating the demand for rail services and improving the options and services available to rail shippers.

One of the most basic ways to retain business and stimulate demand for rail service is very simply to improve the quality and reliability of rail service. NS stumbled in this effort, admittedly, in 1999, but we have made considerable strides with supporting investment to turn around this and in many cases, excel beyond Conrail levels now. Of the \$342 million invested in Pennsylvania, the majority or \$208 million, has gone to improving the quality of the services that Norfolk Southern provides in this state.

This includes: \$108 million in basic railway infrastructure investment; 34 million in capacity expansion and de-bottlenecking projects such as the double tracking that we did right outside here in Harrisburg; \$19 million in improvements in shops, primarily Juniata; \$32 million in improvements in public related infrastructure, most notably the relocation of our main line from the streets of Erie up to the CSX main line; and \$15 million in other miscellaneous investments.

Norfolk Southern did this to ensure that

the business remained with the railroads and to meet the more stringent business demands of today's shipper. As I said earlier, none of this investment makes sense if it does not serve the shipper better. But this investment has.

And I'd like you to consider the total cars on line, a measure of congestion, has improved by over 15 percent since June of 1999. Average train speed has improved by 20 percent in the same period. Terminal dwell time, another measure of velocity and fluidity has improved by 20 percent since 1999.

The performance in my business unit, intermodal, which is probably one of the most service-sensitive, has improved by 100 percent in this period. And while the performance in the north rivals that of Conrail, who had a very service tradition in intermodal, the performance in the former NS territory is better than it ever has been.

Are the shippers happy? I'd like to say that they were, but I know that this would be wishful thinking. Are they getting better value for their shipping dollars? I believe the answer to that is absolutely.

Consider, as Mr. Timmons addressed earlier, the endorsements offered by two of the

largest shippers in Pennsylvania, PP&L and U.S.

Steel, of the improvements that Norfolk Southern has made for their business. We have also had comments from our short line partners, of whom there are over 60 in the Commonwealth, noting the improvements in service levels and overall improvements in the level

of communications that they have day-to-day with our company.

The investment in service improvement does not end here. Mr. Timmons stated that the NS is planning on spending almost \$2 million to rehabilitate parts of Enola yard outside of Harrisburg. This is actually part of a much larger initiative to fundamentally change the way the NS runs the majority of its business.

NS, with its consulting partner

Multimodal, is developing a new rail service plan

that moves significantly closer to the concept of a

scheduled railroad. Enola is just one of the pieces

of this rather complex initiative. But the end

result is simple, to provide greater speed and more

predictability to the rail shippers using Norfolk

Southern.

The second thing this investment does is improve the demand for rail services. Service is the

shotgun approach to improving business levels. When you improve service, it rises the tide to all modes. But some businesses require more direct investments to improve the efficiency of their rail operations, launch or expand their businesses on the NS, or expand their rail handling capacity.

In this regard, the NS has invested over \$92 million in Pennsylvania for incentives to expand or locate a business on the Norfolk Southern in the Commonwealth.

Some of the most notable of these include the following: NS will be investing about a half a million dollars to expand the rail siding capacity at three Pennsylvania industries including Novalog in Fairless, Filmtech in Allentown and Schmalbach Plastics in Chapman, Pennsylvania. This will allow these businesses to expand in the Commonwealth and provide increased rail shipments to the NS.

Also, as was discussed earlier today, NS is investing in a new rail line to better serve the Keystone power plant owned by Key-Con in Shelocta, PA. This will provide a more efficient means for this customer -- for the customer to move coal, will remove up to 43,000 truck trips annually from the roads in Indiana County, and will eliminate almost a

train move per day from over 70 Pennsylvania grade crossings.

Other incentives for growth have included adding a rail-to-truck transload facility at Midwest Generation's Homer City power plant to reduce the costs of Pennsylvania Coal for this customer, increasing the loading capacity at Consol's Bailey mine in Southwest Pennsylvania so that they can increase total production and meet the rising demand for energy in this state, and assisting RR Donnelly with an expansion of their rail siding so they could increase the amount of rail shipping that they do at their Lancaster facility.

Another significant investment made by
Norfolk Southern in Pennsylvania is in its new fiber
optic network through Thoroughbred Technology and
Telecommunications, or T-Cubed. By the end of 2001,
Norfolk Southern will have invested \$52 million in
conduits and fiber optics from the Pennsylvania-Ohio
border through Harrisburg to Alexandria, Virginia.

While this investment does not necessarily lure any rail shippers to Pennsylvania, it does create a new telecommunications infrastructure in the Commonwealth that could benefit existing companies and organizations and perhaps draw

others to the region. We also believe that this is very complementary to Governor Ridge's technology focus and initiatives.

These growth efforts, admittedly, are not purely altruistic. They are designed to keep rail freight and expand the demand for rail freight here in Pennsylvania. Consider how unique the rail industry is. When a business picks up and leaves a location, the motor carrier industry simply takes their assets and follows that customer.

The Norfolk Southern has 2200 miles of rail lines and associated facilities in Pennsylvania.

And if a customer picks up and leaves to a non-NS point, the NS likely loses the business for good.

We have every incentive to work and ensure that businesses stay in and expand or relocate in Pennsylvania. We are all on the same team in this effort, and we have committed significant resources to help foster and ensure companies stay and expand on the Norfolk Southern.

The final thing that this investment has done is expanding the service options available to shippers. The final contribution that the Conrail transaction and the subsequent investment that has been made -- has made to the shipping public, within

and outside the Commonwealth, is the expansion of shipping options. At its very basic level, the split of Conrail unleashed a new competitive rail environment that Conrail simply did not provide. The most notable examples of this include the following:

First, before the transaction, Conrail owned the Northeast in terms of intermodal. Norfolk Southern and CSX were also-rans. Now, CSX and NS trains race from the Midwest to the East and vie for speed and consistency. Intermodal traffic between the Midwest and the East that in the past could only realistically be handled by Conrail is now regularly bid out to two very aggressive competitors.

Second, before the transaction, little rail competition existed in the Mon Valley -- Mon Valley Coal. Now both the CSX and the NS with their very expansive networks, access to ports and to utilities throughout the Eastern United States, regularly bid for traffic that formerly moved solely on Conrail.

Third, before the transaction, most shippers in the Philadelphia and South Jersey areas were beholden to Conrail. Now, many customers in this area, served by the Shared Asset Area around Philadelphia, have rail options that have not been

seen since the Reading and the Pennsylvania Railroads duked it out on their way to bankruptcy.

The list of expanded shipper options does not end here. Norfolk Southern has invested or caused to be invested \$50 million that has given shippers expanded shipping options.

Consider this: Norfolk Southern invested over \$30 million for a new intermodal facility in Rutherford, Pennsylvania, right outside of Harrisburg. This investment, combined with a massive intermodal operation in Harrisburg, has evolved into the second largest intermodal hub for the Norfolk Southern.

The opening of Rutherford allowed the NS to offer expanded intermodal services to Pennsylvania, including our recently launched transcontinental stack product from California to the East. This is the fastest transcontinental double-stack train service available, either now or when Conrail existed.

When NS opens its new \$100 million intermodal facility in Atlanta, Georgia, a new portfolio of North/South services will be launched providing new Southeast Pennsylvania intermodal services that have not existed with the NS, the CSX

or with Conrail. This new service, by the way, will be launched in September.

With the opening of Rutherford, NS runs two to four more intermodal services per day over the Pennsylvania line now than Conrail did prior to its split-up. Trains that used to move through New York, Virginia and Tennessee now have been routed through Pennsylvania, providing new origins and destinations for shippers in the Commonwealth.

This project has solidified Harrisburg's and Eastern Pennsylvania's position as a logistics hub for the Eastern United States. Consider also that NS caused a new intermodal facility to be built in Bethlehem, PA.

With the opening of Rutherford and Bethlehem, Norfolk Southern has increased its intermodal capacity in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by 250,000 units. That's a thousand loads a day that we can take off the highway every business day. We serve eight intermodal terminals in Pennsylvania. This is two more than Conrail served, and Norfolk Southern now serves more intermodal terminals in Pennsylvania than in any of the other 22 states that it serves.

Despite losing our largest intermodal

customer, APL, which left our terminals here in Pennsylvania, we handle about 10 percent more intermodal business in the Commonwealth than Conrail did in its last full year of operation. Intermodal operations are very important for commerce in this state. It is a low-cost alternative for over-the-road shipping. And with more intermodal options, Pennsylvania shippers have access to lower cost logistics. You have a premier intermodal network that's been invested in highly here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I'd also like to note that the Canadian Pacific and the NS teamed up to rebuild the Sunbury line to launch improved North/South services.

These options that I've just talked about are real options. And combined with the incentives that we're offering for expansion, NS expects important gains to be made, not only in Pennsylvania, but throughout its network.

Final comments here. These investments and their impact, both within and outside the Commonwealth, are compelling. However, there are some more market forces at work now, and market forces we expect going forward that are fundamentally changing the way that the Norfolk Southern and the

railroads look at their operations and their costs.

First, the Norfolk Southern is going through some profound shifts in its business mix that are merely a reflection of the shifts going on in industrial America. Our business is shifting from the movement of traditional carloads of business, such as boxcars and gondolas and covered hoppers, to more containerized shipments and more movements or vehicles in specialized multi-levels.

This shift was punctuated in our first quarter results that some of you may have seen and that were released yesterday. While our coal and intermodal loads were up modestly, our merchandise business; gons, boxcars, covered hoppers, which moves in these conventional types of equipment, was down over 75,000 units in the first quarter -- versus the first quarter of 2000. And the first quarter of 2000 was not one of the great quarters in the history of our business.

This business shift has resulted in newer equipment and requires fewer railroad-owned assets and more assets owned by other parties. Even in the coal business, which has ebbed and flowed over the past few years, more of the car responsibility industrywide is going to the customers and not the

railroads.

Even with less railroad-owned equipment, improvements in velocity and train performance that I talked about earlier and that NS has achieved thus far and will continue to achieve, have resulted in better use of that equipment reducing overall fleet demand.

The second major shift going on in our business is that we are in one of the most difficult financial environments -- transportation as a whole is in one of the most difficult financial situations that we've been in in the past six years. Capacity in the motor carrier industry significantly outstrips the demand for shipping. And as a result, price pressure on the motor carriers, and by default the railroads, is extreme.

At the same time, the cost of operating any transportation company -- any transportation company is going up. Increases in fuel costs by as much as 30 percent last year, rising labor costs, rising benefit costs, soaring insurance costs and decreasing asset valuations -- and this is the motor carrier industry, by the way -- are putting extreme pressure on this industry resulting in a record number of failures or buyouts of trucking companies

in the fourth quarter of 2000.

While these pricing pressures may abate to some degree, the cost pressures will not. Labor wages and demands for benefits continue to increase faster than inflation. Fuel and other material costs remain largely unstable. And the returns demanded by investors -- they're the ones funding these investments we make -- put increasing pressure on the cost of capital.

This is a real dilemma. The shipping marketplace cannot, in my opinion, absorb all of these costs. And the NS cannot meet the demands of the marketplace without continually upgrading key routes, and at the same time, supporting underutilized infrastructure that it has on its books.

This cost/price squeeze is the rail -it's happening to the rails themselves. The NS and
the CSX battle for Conrail's business. And as they
continue to battle for business, prices remain
constrained and costs increase. Although rail prices
have rebounded to some degree with the improvements
in service, the softness in trucking prices has put a
lid on our pricing flexibility.

This pricing situation is generally good

for shippers. The prices are stable. It's generally good for Pennsylvania. It's terrible for transportation companies, and the earnings disappointments for the railroads and for the motor carriers over the past two quarters is a stark reminder of how bad it is.

To counteract this squeeze, NS and CSX are going to behave like any other company in a capitalistic economy. We are going to seek ways to streamline our operations and make our companies more efficient. By doing so, we can continue the investment cycle. To do otherwise would have a predictable and unpalatable result.

The cost/price squeeze is real, and it is unabating. Prompted by this fact and the changes in the business mix, Norfolk Southern reduced its dividend by 70 percent and is quickly progressing with its plans to reduce its costs.

My closing remarks. Despite these dark clouds, the NS remains not only optimistic, but enthusiastic about its strategic commercial position. Rail transportation, although not the fastest, can often be the lowest cost form of ground transportation, especially in longer hauls. This reality, combined with the incredible franchise that

we've assembled, is the reason that NS is making these investments.

NS has invested an incredible amount of money in the Commonwealth to improve service, foster growth and provide new shipping options. As this investment yields results, it will encourage more investment on the part of the NS. And I believe that Pennsylvania will continue to be a significant benefactor of this.

NS will meet the demands of its shippers and its investors. And I expect that the result will be very positive, not only for Norfolk Southern, but for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I thank you for your time today.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Thank you very much. I have a couple questions. The first one is, would you define unprecedented public/private partnership for this Committee as Norfolk Southern defined it three years ago?

MR. TIMMONS: I think our commitments at the time were for investments and an enhanced rail system in the Commonwealth. We fully expected, based on the economic factors from 1995 to the period when we acquired the system in June of 1999, to meet the obligations and the expectations that we held out for

ourselves.

Those economic forces that Mr. McClellan has just mentioned in some detail have driven the company to look very, very seriously at how it conducts its business, how it's structured to do its business and how it goes after revenues. That partnership with the state, I think, is a solid one.

I'm not sure many people are aware of the scale of the investment that we have provided to the state in a host of areas from one border to another. A number of senior officials in the administration have said most recently we had no idea that the magnitude of the investment that you had made touched so many different areas across so many fronts, both facilities and infrastructure.

As you are all fully aware, much of what we have done has got a direct bearing on the communications system in the Commonwealth, the electrical energy system in the Commonwealth, safety factors and environmental.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Next question. When we held our hearings before, one of my large concerns and the concerns of the Committee was the supply industry in Pennsylvania for rail which is huge. At that time, we were told Norfolk Southern would keep

that industry whole, that if you were a supplier for Conrail, you would be a supplier for Norfolk Southern.

Now, would you please provide for this

Committee a report of all the suppliers and all the

buying that Conrail did from all the

Pennsylvania-based companies and what you're buying

and spending in supplies with those companies today?

MR. TIMMONS: We will give that -- we will give that a try. But as a case in point,

Norfolk Southern buys an enormous quantity of steel from Pennsylvania Steel Technologies down here in Steelton, Pennsylvania. In the year 1999 alone, we spent \$57 million in purchases from Bethlehem Steel. Smaller organizations have also felt the results of our buying.

But you must know that as a standard procedure, Norfolk Southern bids out almost everything that we acquire in the rail industry. And as a consequence, we take the value of the product. If it meets our needs and the pricing is the lowest, then we take it. And now in that 57 million purchased from Bethlehem Steel, that was only about half of what we purchased that year. The other half came from other entities in the Continental US.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Let's go back to that for a second, unprecedented public/private partnership. Rutherford yard, Pennsylvania Technologies has their plant four miles down the track, a company that this General Assembly has worked very hard to keep in business.

I couldn't believe it when I got a telephone call and they said, Rick, you've got to go down there. You won't believe they're putting French rail in that yard. And we went down, and we took photographs. And we tracked that rail right through Canada right back to France.

We call it dumping. You call it partnership with Pennsylvania?

MR. TIMMONS: Now, Mr. Chairman, you know the story on that.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Yeah, I do know.

MR. TIMMONS: You're well aware of that

-- that we were doing in Pennsylvania. And our

people have French rail, Austrailian rail, Japanese

rail, Korean rail and American rail in inventory in

Atlanta. They do not pay any attention to source of

origin. When a project comes up, that stuff is

pulled out, it's welded into rivets and transported

on the system to the location where it's needed.

Unfortunately, through no particular effort to work against the Commonwealth, that rail was delivered up here. The same problem happened a month or two earlier at Chambersburg, and we quickly -- as soon as we found out about that, that rail was removed and replaced with rail out of inventory that happened to be Bethlehem rail.

That was not a design by any Norfolk

Southern management entity. It was just a simple oversight, and it was unfortunate. And we apologized for that and made amends for it.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: In your testimony, you said \$18 million in the Juniata shops. What happened to the rest of the money? Now that -- once again now, we're back to this difference between projections and promises. Was the 67 million a written promise?

MR. TIMMONS: I don't know that. I have heard that.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Congressman Shuster said he has written documentation. We have the documentation. Your testimony from Norfolk Southern said projections. Is it a projection, or was it a promise?

MR. TIMMONS: I can't answer the

question. I heard that \$67 million were expected to be invested. You certainly cannot fault us for the amount of money that we have invested in the Altoona region in the past 22 months. That's a fairly sizable amount of money. It's almost \$18 million into Juniata and Hollidaysburg and 17 million in fiber optic cable in that same general region. So that's not an inconsequential amount of money.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: All I want to know is the difference between promise and projection.

That's the question. This is the State of Pennsylvania now. This is overall, the promises and commitments and the testimony that we took, that we gave the Surface Transportation Board, that the Federal Railway Administration is supposed to oversee and the Surface Transportation Board is supposed to administer.

MR. TIMMONS: I don't think either one of us --

CHAIRMAN GEIST: The agreement with the Surface Transportation Board, is that a projection, a promise or a contract?

MR. TIMMONS: Now, our intent is not to get into Surface Transportation Board matters because as you well know, both the Commonwealth, labor unions

and Norfolk Southern have filed comments with the boards in the adjudication of differences of outlook on where both parties stand on that will be taken care of by that agency, which is their proper role.

And we'll stand by the results, obviously.

But the semantic distinction between promise and projection and who said it is something that I don't think I can speculate on.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: All right. Questions from the Committee? Russel.

REPRESENTATIVE FAIRCHILD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I apologize for not being at the prior hearing concerning this matter. But after reviewing the tape and after listening to the Chairman's questions concerning the written promise, I guess I'm concerned when I hear and see a US Congressman state, publicly state, that we have these agreements in writing and there seems to be some discourse and some confusion about whether these things were actually in writing.

And I am respectfully requesting that you forward to this Committee any commitments made to anyone in the state of Pennsylvania, any Congressional delegation or anyone else that would

have written commitments contained therein so that we can get to the bottom and find out whether commitments were indeed made in writing.

To you, it may seem, Well, they don't mean anything. To many of us who run for office that are elected leaders, many of us come from business backgrounds and many of us are aware that certainly written comments or written commitments do mean something. So in all fairness to Norfolk Southern, I'm respectfully making that request of you today.

Thank you.

Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Anyone else? Joe.

REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK: Thank you, Mr.

Gentlemen, I was unable to make the meeting in Altoona unfortunately. But I know your Mr. Goode there talked about commitments, and you certainly mentioned the word commitment many times today in your testimony. And, obviously, you have a credibility problem not only with us here in the General Assembly but with the people of Pennsylvania and our Administration.

And I guess my very simple question to you is, In light of what has transpired here so far, why should we believe anything that you tell us here

today since we've had so much, if you want to use the word, bad information or misinformation in the past?

We're hearing today that things are being explained away as just simply things that for business reasons that you had to do certain things.

We all understand that there is certain things that you have to do because you are, in fact, a business for profit.

I think this rail issue, for example, you know, this Committee toured the rail mill last year in Bethlehem and down in Steelton. And to find out that we have French rails in Rutherford, which is literally several miles away, is really appalling. You're expanding your facility in Enola. Are we going to see French rails there?

Very simply, you know, I think the frustration is coming out here with all the members. And why should we believe anything that you tell us here today?

MR. TIMMONS: Sir, let me make one observation. There is no French rail from Norfolk Southern in the Rutherford yards. I thought I explained that, but apparently I did not. It was rail delivered and never installed. And it was taken up, and PST rail was put down.

I'm very disappointed and sorry that you feel that we have not been forthright and candid with you. In my appearances before this Committee in the past and in other documentation that we have provided, I thought we were being frank and forthright.

The problem at Hollidaysburg clearly is something that is a very painful thing for us to consider. I would ask you though, in a larger context, to consider the larger implications to the Commonwealth to say that we had, one, lied to the officials of the state; that we had misled the citizenry of the Commonwealth; and that our credibility is no good because on a business destination we looked at closing a shop in one location.

That, in light of the investments and the expansion and the commitments across the Commonwealth, seems to me to be out of balance. I take what you say to heart. I'm sorry about that and pledge to you that the company will try to work hard to provide you the information that you feel is necessary to enhance our credibility and our reputation.

REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. 1 2 CHAIRMAN GEIST: Ellen. 3 REPRESENTATIVE BARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 4 I would just like in the interest of 5 background information -- I'm not clear. 6 Has any 7 public money been invested since the origination of this project? 8 9 MR. TIMMONS: Which project is that, 10 Representative Bard? 11 REPRESENTATIVE BARD: Norfolk Southern's move to take over Conrail and commence those 12 13 operations. MR. TIMMONS: Public money, I suppose you 14 15 mean state money? REPRESENTATIVE BARD: 16 Yes. 17 MR. TIMMONS: To my knowledge, we have 18 not received any state funding for any projects in the Commonwealth. 19 20 Now, as you know, there are grade 21 crossings across the state. And there's a 22 combination of priorities established by the 23 Pennsylvania Department of Transportation for federal and state and railroad matching moneys to enhance 24 25 grade crossings as appropriate, and that's an ongoing program.

There was federal money applied to the relocation of tracks in the state -- or in Erie, the 19th Street track relocation project. And there was federal money applied in Chambersburg for relocation of the tracks and the elimination of nongrade crossings.

The Norfolk Southern matching amounts for those two projects totaled \$8 million. I don't know of any other projects that we have received any money on that have anything to do with our commercial activities or track upgrades.

REPRESENTATIVE BARD: Thank you very much.

MR. TIMMONS: Yes, ma'am.

REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: Thank you for coming in. I missed the hearing in Altoona, but I did review your testimony that you've provided to us. And I've listened to you carefully this morning.

I appreciate that it is difficult for an industry like yours to be nimble in the face of business changes in such a scope and a magnitude that they've been coming at you. But what I didn't hear this morning and what I didn't see in your testimony before was your answer to why Hollidaysburg, why this

decision, why these workers. Can you enlighten us on that?

MR. TIMMONS: Let me just basically say in a very simple way that we lost money there. That's the bottom line. Now, notwithstanding the testimony on insourcing that was provided to this body on the 12th of April, there is a difference of opinion on the amounts of money. And Norfolk Southern does not disagree that there were benefits derived from the insourcing program that was under way. That's only one portion of that job's operation.

In the main, we lost more than \$6 million at Hollidaysburg. Those points are in dispute. We know that. And both sides have submitted that information, their points of view, their numbers to the Surface Transportation Board, and they will adjudicate that.

But I must reemphasize that Norfolk
Southern has the right as a private corporation to
make business decisions that are in its own best
interest in the long term. We obviously have a very
important investment here. We've got 5500 workers in
the state. If the railroad does not do well up here,
we put at risk another very, very large segment of

rail employees in this important region.

REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: Just one follow-up please, if I might.

Based on that however, if those figures are in dispute and since Norfolk Southern made significant promises to the people of that area -- this can't be the first time you've had ups and downs at a particular shop or at a particular location -- why won't you reconsider that decision and give those folks another chance?

MR. TIMMONS: We did. As you may recall, we announced the closure in last November. And based on efforts from officials in the Commonwealth, we deferred closing that shop and tried to find either buyers or additional insourcing that could offset the losses that we had experienced and we anticipate.

And we spent another 90 to 120 days trying to find out if we could make that happen. We worked very, very hard and very conscientiously. If you look at the public documents that we filed with the Surface Transportation Board, I think you will see the extent of the effort that we applied to try to make that happen. In the end, it just did not play out.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Frank.

1 REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2 3 I also want to apologize for missing the hearing in Altoona. So you may have already answered 4 these questions, but I'll ask them anyway. I noticed 5 in your testimony that you're going to promise or 6 7 you're going to offer jobs to the 330 people that will lose their jobs at Hollidaysburg. I just want 8 to ask you, What does that mean? 9 10 MR. TIMMONS: That means in our six other 11 shops that are in the Northeastern area -- for the 12 most part, they are primarily in Ohio -- we will offer similar jobs to those employees, all of those 13 14 330 people. 15 REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: Most of them are in Ohio? 16 17 Well, I may have a list MR. TIMMONS: Bellevue, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio; Decatur, 18 here:

Illinois; Macon, Georgia; Lynwood, North Carolina. All of those are for trades and crafts, the same for clerical. One additional clerical is Atlanta. you probably know, the seniority roster is in effect at Juniata for these workers.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: Does that include relocation costs for these workers?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. TIMMONS: Indeed it does. The New York Dock provisions establish a relocation cost, and 2 the negotiating cost for this particular move for all 3 those workers exceed the Dock minimum requirements. REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: Well, I guess my 5 question is, Does that mean they get the move paid 6 7 for or not? I don't know what the New York Dock 8 provides, but does it mean they get the move paid for? 9 MR. TIMMONS: 10 Yes. REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: In full? 11 12 MR. TIMMONS: Yes, to the best of my 13 knowledge. 14 REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: I noticed on the 15 tape -- just one more, Mr. Chairman -- there were 16 tremendous comments made about part of the reason you 17 were so happy to be in Altoona and Hollidaysburg was the quality of the work force, the long history that 18 19 you have there. Most of these workers are probably 20 second and third generation railroad workers. that right? 21 22 MR. TIMMONS: I would assume so. REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: 23 And the previous 24 question, you mentioned that you did reconsider 25 because of the quality of the work force you have

1 there, correct? 2 MR. TIMMONS: Because of the capability 3 of the shop, because of the quality of the work force, it was clearly something that was worth reconsidering. 5 REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: What is the 6 7 likelihood -- you said that many of those people have lived in Altoona for two and three generations will 8 leave there and move to Decatur, Illinois or Alabama? 9 10 MR. TIMMONS: I'm not in a position to 11 speculate on that, sir. 12 REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: Thank you, Mr. 13 Chairman. Mike. 14 CHAIRMAN GEIST: 15 REPRESENTATIVE VEON: Thank you, Mr. 16 And, gentlemen, thank you for being here. Chairman. 17 Thank you for taking the time, and I appreciate your testimony. 18 19 I just wanted to comment because you had 20 mentioned to the question posed by Representative 21 Markosek for the comments that he made, that you were 22 concerned that our comments and our position and our representation here today was somewhat out of 23 24 balance, I think, was the way you put it.

I just want to say to you, and I know I

25

speak for other members, certainly in the Democratic Caucus. I want to remind you that when Norfolk Southern went in front of the various federal government agencies, they asked for our support. They asked for our support from the Governor on down through the legislators.

Many legislators very publicly supported your position in acquiring Conrail. I stood in front of several hundred people in Beaver County and said, This is the right thing to do. We have assurances from this company on this, this and this. And we ought to support this for the good of Pennsylvania and for the long-term benefit of rail transportation in Pennsylvania, etc., etc., etc.

So I hope it gives you some perspective of where we're coming from when you can do what happened to Bud Shuster -- I'll speak for myself on this issue -- I'm waiting for the next shoe to drop. And if it can happen to Bud Shuster, it can happen to anybody that has any kind of presence in their district. That's my fear. No one is more powerful on transportation issues than Bud Shuster.

So when you observe that as a politician, as a representative, when you've made public presentations to people about what's the right thing

```
to do -- and that we all stepped up, as you know, at
 1
 2
     your request, at this company's request. We all
     stepped up and said, We should support this at the
 3
     federal government level. And we invested some
 4
 5
     political capital in helping that process go
 6
     smoothly. We, meaning the legislators, the Governor
 7
     and the State of Pennsylvania.
 8
                 So just to give you some perspective, you
     say it's out of balance. I would strongly and
 9
10
     respectfully disagree with that. I think it's very
11
     much in balance for the job that we have to do.
1.2
                 And, again, the bottom line is we're
13
     concerned as to where does the next shoe drop?
     the credibility issue, therefore, becomes very
14
15
     important as we try to deal with this company from
     now through, hopefully, what's a long and productive
16
17
     future.
18
                 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19
                 MR. TIMMONS:
                               Thank you, sir, for those
                I understand.
20
     comments.
21
                 REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Thank you, Mr.
22
     Chairman.
                 I did have the benefit of your testimony,
23
```

24 Mr. Timmons, from Altoona. And I just want to cite a 25 couple numbers for you and maybe you could explain this for me because -- I mean, I listened to your presentation and now Mr. McClellan's testimony. And I still am no closer to gaining an understanding of how and why this corporation made a decision to close this particular facility. Based on your testimony today and previously, I'm even more perplexed than I was when I began this process.

According to your figures from 1995 to 2000, your steel shipments -- you lost shipments of about 34 and a half million dollar revenue, according to your testimony. But you replaced that with about another 72.1 million gained in revenue. So you've had a net gain of 37.6 million in revenue and still shipments over that five-year period.

On chemicals, you lost about 23 million

-- and this is just Pennsylvania numbers, I presume.

You lost 23 million, but you gained 21.4 million. So that's a net loss of 1.6 million. And over that same time period of '95 to 2000, you lost about \$10 million revenue in coal shipments.

If you look at steel, chemicals and coal in Pennsylvania in a five-year period, you experienced a net increase in revenue of \$26 million. So your revenues are going up. And during this time period you make these, seemingly, commitments to

investments in a particular community not just to the entire Commonwealth.

MR. TIMMONS: Can I comment on that, sir?

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Well, let me
ask the question. So what happened when all these
commitments were made a net increase in revenue over
a five-year period? Something happened between June
of 2000, when these commitments were made, and
January of this year. What happened to cause you to
decide not to make those investments and honor those
commitments to the Blair County area?

MR. TIMMONS: Those numbers -- if you recall, those numbers were on the front end of that testimony and outlined the general rationale for why we were so optimistic about the economy and our entry into the Northeast.

Those are not purely Pennsylvania numbers. Those were examples -- extracted examples on coal and on steel and on chemicals that highlighted the volatility of our industry. It pointed out the fact that, as Mr. McClellan said earlier, that if an industry goes out of business, truckers pick up and move with it. The rails are stuck with their facilities and infrastructure.

And even though we offset with additional

steel facilities, additional chemical facilities, etc., we still had large, very large investments in order to capitalize on that, large capital investments in new plants, new facilities and that sort of thing.

So that was the point of those examples that I cited, and those were not related specifically to Pennsylvania. There are maybe some Pennsylvania facilities in those numbers. But, generally, that was not meant to be an aggregate of steel, chemical and coal for the Commonwealth.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Okay, so it was more than just Pennsylvania. It was the general Northeast. But the point still stands that it shows a net increase of \$26 million in revenue over that time frame. I mean, it shows at least three significant markets of your shipments that there's actually a net increase in revenue.

So, again, back to the question, Was this seemingly growing business environment -- what happens in a seven-month period between June of 2000 and January of 2001?

MR. TIMMONS: Well, you might recall some of the other numbers in that testimony that suggested the extreme economic difficulties that the railroad

experienced. We may have generated some revenues during that time period, but really our revenue concerns started in June of 1999.

The company was pretty healthy up until, like, the takeover. At takeover, we started experiencing a variety of problems that have plagued us up until the last year when the system started to clean up a little bit. We lost customers. Our stock was reduced by about 70 percent in value. Dividends, bonuses, any number of things befell us and caused us to go into deep difficulty, not the least of which was the acquisition of a host of new equipment in order to try to cope with the problems that we were experiencing here in the Northeast.

We are still -- this first quarter is -we're optimistic about the first quarter. But it
does not suggest that we have turned the corner. We
benefitted this first quarter primarily as a result
of coal and cold weather. This first month in April
is not particularly good. So our economic situation
and our servicing of our debt has kept us in check in
terms of economic growth.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Are you losing money on those Blair County facilities? I mean, just in terms of finances and economics, are you losing

money? Is that why you're closing --

MR. TIMMONS: Hollidaysburg, yes, in excess of 6 million last year.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: I mean, I would certainly -- at least as one member of this Committee, I would certainly appreciate if you could provide us, or at least me, with detailed financial information about why, you know, what economic and financial considerations have led you to take the position you have and make the decision you've made relative to those Blair County facilities. I would certainly appreciate it.

I mean, if there's some economic and financial reason for doing this, you know, I could maybe understand that. But I am still left to wonder how you make a commitment and seven months later -- I mean, how your projections and numbers lead you to conclude that it's wise to make a significant investment in these two facilities and then seven months later, you decide that the economics and the finances have so changed that you're not going to make investments there.

I mean, I'm just wondering whether your initial decision to invest and the commitments to the facility -- I'm just wondering if that decision was

made based on economic reasons or for political considerations. Did you make these commitments to Blair County just because you wanted to get the support of Congressman Shuster and the legislative delegation and you needed to get their support because you needed to get the final approval from the Surface Transportation Board for the merger? Is that why you did this?

MR. TIMMONS: Well, postacquisition, as you know, we put at least 17 and a half million dollars into those two facilities in hard improvements and then invested another \$17 million in fiber optic cable in that region. So I would not say those are inconsequential numbers that were -- that undercut our original commitments.

We believed that we were going to be able to use and capitalize on those facilities, and we put money into those facilities to take advantage of that. It's just turned out over the past 22 months that it has not turned out the way we expected.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Again, I'm going to drop it at this point. But, again, I don't know whether this was just a purely financial, economic decision-making process that led you to commit and then not commit or if there was some

larger political considerations going on here as well. I'm still confused because I don't understand. But to the extent that you provide me with detailed financial explanation or an economic projection or stuff like that, I'd welcome that.

you.

MR. TIMMONS: Respectfully, sir, the only thing that is available in writing that we would be willing to offer up is our previously submitted filing to the Surface Transportation Board. All of those matters are under consideration, and we do not want to influence that or engage in any additional information until they have ruled on the position.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Okay, thank

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Jere.

REPRESENTATIVE STRITTMATTER: Thanks

I have a series of questions just as a follow-up. Maybe if you could provide -- it might be good for the Committee if you could show -- you probably in your projections, you figured what the quality of the work was going to be, you know, what the output that you were going to have from those shops.

If there was some downturn in seven months, you know, to show where you weren't getting

the productivity or that the union work rules or whatever it was that might enlighten us to know why it is in Pennsylvania that we're not able to compete with Ohio and Illinois and Georgia and I forget, you know, the other places where you say you are able to make money. And, obviously, you keep those facilities open, but you don't keep them open in Pennsylvania.

So if we could see what the work rules are here, you know, then maybe that would help us save some of the other existing jobs.

A couple of the other questions I have -when you talked about the investment by the State
looking into the double stack capacity, I'm happy to
see that we're working on that in order to lighten
the load, you know, on the highways. To have a
complete transportation system, you know, we need to
have all of them working well, you know, from the
airports and the airlines to the rails to the
highways to the ports and canals.

We invested in Pennsylvania, before the merger, a lot of money in the Port of Philadelphia for double stack capacity, you know, for containers. We then have had the Port of Philadelphia coming before us, you know, asking for additional funds.

I understand that there's been a lot of investment in the Port of Wilmington where a lot of traffic in the Port of Wilmington which then has caused a lot of truck traffic coming from the Port of Wilmington up to the Harrisburg area whether it be the Rutherford line or other Harrisburg yards. I'm not exactly sure where they're coming from.

Rut can you explain to the Committee, you know, what your relationships are with this double stacked capacity? Are you going to be using the Port of Philadelphia? Should we be putting any dollars into the Port of Philadelphia, or should we abandon that idea and you're just going to use the Port of Wilmington and truck everything through Lancaster?

MR. McCLELLAN: As far as the economics for ports go in shipping, the railroads are not really that big an impact on when a shipper decides to use Wilmington over Philadelphia over New York over Baltimore or whatever the ports might be. You know, our price or whatever to go to Chicago is 500 bucks, but the stevedoring costs can be 500 bucks.

Certainly, the vessel economics are the biggest factors that determine which port is there. We offer daily service to the Port of Philadelphia, St. Louis, Kansas City and Chicago, the places that

the customers want to go. Between the CSX and the Norfolk Southern, I believe, the intermodal traffic in Philadelphia has indeed grown.

I know that our intermodal traffic is less than what Conrail had, but that's simply because the CSX and the Norfolk Southern split what we had. But what we have found and what I have found, very profoundly, in my career here is that we very often don't drive which port of call shippers use.

REPRESENTATIVE STRITTMATTER: Are you able to or have you worked out agreements that would take freight, you know, from Harrisburg to the Port of Wilmington? Or is it the fact that if it comes to the Port of Wilmington that you can't get it to Harrisburg and that's why you might take all the bananas, you know, and drive them up through Lancaster or why you have at the Chrysler plant in Newark, Delaware, that you'd be driving trucks from Harrisburg down there rather than being able to keep them on the rail, keep them on the double stack and keep them off the highways?

MR. McCLELLAN: Well, I know that in the Wilmington and Newark, Delaware area, there really is not -- there's not an intermodal option available down in Delaware. And my understanding of the motor

carrier economics is that it is more efficient to truck or ship between Delaware and Harrisburg than it is between Philadelphia and Harrisburg. Also, we serve more points out of Harrisburg than we do out of the port facility.

REPRESENTATIVE STRITTMATTER: On the NS trucks, you know, from the Port of Wilmington to Rutherford yard or Harrisburg yard, how many trucks would you say over the past two years and what are your projections for the, you know, future years of the number of trucks that will be going through Lancaster County, for instance?

MR. McCLELLAN: I would like to clarify that the Norfolk Southern doesn't make those trucking decisions. We're a wholesaler of transportation between terminals, and then folks such as HUB or those folks actually make the final decisions on how and where and what terminals they're going to use, what ports they're going to use, etc., etc., etc. So we really don't have any data on that -- that type of relationship.

REPRESENTATIVE STRITTMATTER: But you do know how many trucks, don't you, that are running, you know, with -- they say NS on them? You know, they have your logo on them.

MR. McCLELLAN: Are you talking about the roadrailer trucks, the Triple Crown trucks?

REPRESENTATIVE STRITTMATTER: Yeah.

MR. McCLELLAN: Yeah, those trucks --

REPRESENTATIVE STRITTMATTER: How many of those in the past two years? Is it increasing? Are you going to be trying to keep the freight on the rail, or are you going to be seeing it come on the highways?

MR. McCLELLAN: That freight -- Triple
Crown's business has been stable over the past two
years. It has not grown. Their business that goes
down to Newark is directly tied into the fate of the
production levels at the Chrysler plant down in
Newark. That's where the business that is going down
there is coming to and from. And I couldn't really
tell you off the top of my head whether that's grown
or declined, that particular piece of business nor
exactly what the Rutherford terminal here has done
with regard to shipments in and out of Wilmington.

REPRESENTATIVE STRITTMATTER: I guess I would appreciate it if you could, you know, check with the people that would know -- to the Committee through the Chairman if you could get that to me because we have really helped with your

infrastructure, you know, with your NS trucks. And the fact that we're investing a lot of money into the highways.

But we didn't, you know, in our planning, plan on having these thousands of trucks that are on the road. And, also, we weren't planning on for safety considerations. And I think, you know, Mr. Timmons knows that because he's been very helpful in contacting with many of your truck drivers who were speeding and driving recklessly. They shift lanes recklessly at 80, 85, 90 miles an hour, and I've reported some of those in the past to you.

And I would like to know and we're concerned with how many more we're going to be expecting. But I do appreciate the help that I've gotten from the office from the fact that you're trying to cut down -- and I presume because I really didn't ask. I thought that was probably an internal matter as to what's happened to those drivers that had been reported. But, you know, we are concerned with that, with what we're going to do with the highways.

With passenger rail and Amtrak is another thing we have a concern with having an intermodal hub transportation service. And all of us in the

Committee are trying to increase Amtrak service, you know, trying to hope that -- you know, just like yourselves. We want you to be successful. We want Amtrak to be successful. Just like yourselves, you said you're having trouble. Now Amtrak is having trouble.

So we want to make sure we're making wise decisions. But when we're doing that, understand that in order to increase the frequency, you know, that we would then be rubbing up against their right of way.

And maybe you're not prepared to talk about it now, but I would like to, you know, through the Chairman, to know how we can anticipate, you know, to make the right decisions because we're investing money again at the state level with Amtrak to get additional service. But if we can't, you know, get additional -- then we're up against the frequency level of being able to get more trips with what's happening with your plans, with that.

And so I'm very concerned with working together. If these other members are concerned about what, you know, what's been happening, that's another thing that if you could help us, you know, with better information on that, I would appreciate that.

MR. TIMMONS: We'll be happy to do that.

As you may know across the Commonwealth there are, by rough estimate, five very significant commuter passenger rail initiatives and studies under way that I think are very important for the future. We're working hard with PennDOT on those, with Amtrak on those. And we'd be happy to come forward and talk to the Committee or a subcommittee on this matter at your call.

REPRESENTATIVE STRITTMATTER: Thanks.

And then another point to raise and then we can move on is ways to streamline the regulations while ensuring safety to reduce cost with the building and the rebuilding of the bridges, you know, over and under your lines. I know we have -- in Lancaster County right now so your NS trucks can run, you know, fast, we're replacing 18 bridges at this time. And several of them are over or under your facilities.

And I understand that it's very costly, you know, in order to try to coordinate that. And I'd like to work with you and have our Committee work with you to see where it is that we can improve because, you know, we're competing with the rest of the world.

And I want to make sure that we don't,

you know, waste your money and waste our money with not being able to, you know, do this in the best way, as I say, making sure that we ensure safety. But there's got to be a better way to reduce, you know, the amount of dollars that it costs in order to repair these bridges on your lines.

Thank you.

MR. TIMMONS: We'd be happy to work with you, meet with you and with the state and federal officials, all of whom are involved in below grade and above grade structures.

REPRESENTATIVE STRITTMATTER: Thanks. If you could, maybe just start it and give your ideas through the Chairman so, you know, we're aware of that. On all these points if, through the Chairman, you could, you know, take a first crack at those and then we could, you know, develop that at your convenience and at the Chairman's convenience.

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: Mr. McClellan and Mr. Timmons, I was surprised to hear both of you indicate that your service improvements, which you made sound like in contrast to Conrail, are so notable that you were referring to some of the applause that you received from U.S. Steel.

And I will be honest with you that I was very surprised to hear that since at a rail conference at just about this time a year ago, I was -- witnessed a very unusual step where a representative of U.S. Steel addressed the entire conference lamenting the absolute abysmal service, lost shipments, delayed shipments and the deleterious effect it had on their ability to conduct business, either on goods coming in or goods going out.

So while I'm happy to hear that you have some applause from them now. I must say that if I had not had this contact from another experience, it would have sounded like you had good service. And from what I hear, this is sort of like going from a low F to a high F.

But that also -- and the reason I visit on that is because it caused me -- I came in here today with a pretty open mind on this whole circumstance. But just the way that your testimony was framed and presented insofar as it relates to that causes me to have a considerable skepticism about the voracity of the overall picture that you're painting.

I would also say that I'm a free market guy. I'm a big supporter of the free market. At the

same time, your rails involve a public accommodation that creates a public duty. When you have public investments that you're beneficiaries of, that fosters a public duty.

But most of all, when you make public promises -- just as we saw on this tape earlier today, there were no caveats. There were no commas. There was no fine print. When you make public promises, it creates a public duty.

And I am astonished that through both of your testimonies today, the word Hollidaysburg never came up. I cannot express to you fully how much I must really wonder about if a public promise where your spokesperson was talking about a hundred years into the future here in Altoona, which I appreciate is hyperbole. But for heaven's sakes, gentlemen, we didn't get a hundred months. We didn't even get a hundred weeks into the future before that promise about making an investment was abandoned.

And I for one do not believe that a promise that's made should not be kept, and you can offer that from your internal financial analysis you need to deal with market conditions. And, again, I'm a free market guy, and that generally is what I would agree to. But once you have crossed the threshold of

```
1
     making a public commitment in connection with a
     public decision, you have forfeited, in my mind, the
 2
     right to a year later sit down and say, Oh, well, we
 3
     didn't really mean it. We need to deal with the
 4
     market as it is.
 5
 6
                 Well, if you didn't believe it, you
 7
     shouldn't have said it. If you did believe it, it's
     time to fulfill it.
 8
 9
                 MR. TIMMONS: Do you even want a
     response, sir?
10
11
                 REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: I would be happy
12
     to have one if it was -- but I'm not really
13
     anticipating much of a --
14
                 MR. McCLELLAN: I'd like to respond on
15
     the customer side of it, and I hope that nobody up
16
     there thought that we were thrilled by the level of
17
     service that we are providing right now. I would not
18
     describe it as an F minus to an F plus.
                                               I would
     describe it as an F to a B, quite honestly. I would
19
20
     not --
21
                 REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: You must have gone
22
     someplace where they had pretty easy grading.
                 MR. McCLELLAN: I'll keep away from my
23
     educational background on this one. But the fact of
24
```

the matter is that Norfolk Southern is not 100

25

percent pleased with where it is in the service side, and our discussion today was very simply to show what we're doing to improve the services that we offer.

And I've got to tell you, as I've said -I've said it, Are the customers happy? I don't think
they are all happy. Are they pleased with the
progress that we've made? I think a lot of them are.
That was a year ago that USS said that, and we're
well aware of that. And they weren't the only ones
saying it.

I think people are kind of stunned how far we have come. They're also beating us to go further, and that's the right thing to do. That's the way that we're going to get more business, and I think that that's sort of the nature of that discussion.

MR. TIMMONS: I don't think there's any question in that first year that our performance was abysmal. My office was besieged 24 hours a day with service complaints and problems. And we committed at the time, that we were going to try to invest and work our way out of it. I can tell you very candidly that in the space of the last ten months, we have received two service customer problems, both very, very minor, both easily fixed because they were

computer problems, fixed within a matter of six hours.

Your observation is correct. It was terrible. The letters that are part of the testimony that I submitted from PP&L and U.S. Steel are indications that things have changed and that we've worked hard to make those turn around. I hope that our credibility has not been undercut by the framework in which we tout what we had done to make things better.

And the metrics that are provided each week, which are very, very measurable and go to the Federal Surface Transportation Board and tell you how fast the trains run, what the car loadings are, etc., etc., are all very, very positive. The railroad has not -- has not run better for several years. There's plenty of capacity on it.

So I'm sorry. We'll work hard to shore up our credibility with you, sir, and provide you any information that will help in that connection.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Thank you very much. I would like to ask you guys if you would please stay to be called back after the three of the presenters are finished. I think there will be some additional questions that we'd like to ask.

At this time, we're going to take a 15-minute recess. Eric said I'm to make it 10, which will mean it will be 15. It will be a 10-minute recess. The late Stanley Saylor has to grab a sandwich, and then we'll be right back to work.

(A break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN GEIST: All right. If we could get moving, 10 minutes is up.

REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: Twenty minutes is up, but who's counting?

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Tom Lutton's brother,

Ronald -- the Lutton brother -- I think that's pretty

neat. Ron Lutton, the Norfolk Southern Safety

Assurance Compliance Program Project Manager for the

Federal Railway Administration. And anybody who saw

the tapes, the short little blond lady was Jolene

Molitoris, the former FRA Chairman. And the remarks

that she has made in public are the tracking that FRA

is doing of the merger, and with us today is Ron

Lutton to offer testimony.

MR. RONALD LUTTON: Thank you Mr.

Chairman. I guess my role here today is to change

from the business side over to the safety side since

that's what FRA does is safety, and that's what I do

in the safety department.

A little background on myself since this is my first time here. Prior to me hiring out on the railroad in 1969, I did have three uncles, a grandfather and a father all proceed me at the same railroad yards. So I do come from a railroad family. And this year, I will have 32 years in the railroad industry working on the railroad and with the FRA.

And I've worked in numerous positions within the FRA from field inspector to director of training through deputy regional administrator and now on this newly created position established in October of 2000 as the SACP program manager, which I am permanently assigned to Norfolk Southern. One hundred percent of my time now is Norfolk Southern.

So what I'd like to do today is talk a little bit just about a little background on the FRA, what we've got and a couple of the major programs that we have in place, which we call SACP and SIP and explain what those are and then talk about the safety record as FRA sees it right now and then some of the things we have going on.

So, again, good morning, Mr. Chairman and other distinguished members of the Committee. I want to thank you for extending the opportunity to the FRA to appear at this meeting. I wasn't aware that there

was one in Altoona. And as one of the first individuals, I think, this morning said, first time sitting here. This is my first time sitting here, in fact, my first time in the Capitol from that standpoint.

1.0

So I would like to start off by talking about the FRA organization to give you an idea of who we are and what we're comprised of because sometimes there's misconceptions as to what we really do. The FRA itself, there are 400 safety inspectors in 47 offices nationwide. We are supplemented by 155 state safety inspectors that are FRA-certified to actually help us in our objectives with overall safety.

The magnitude of what we do is we monitor roughly 675 railroads, 220,000 employees, 265,000 miles of track, 1.3 million freight cars, 20,000 freight locomotives and about 8,000 passenger-type locomotives and coaches. So as you can see, that's a pretty tall order for roughly 550 individuals.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is within Region 2 of the FRA, which is -- headquarters for that FRA office is in the Philadelphia area.

The rapid growth of new railroads and traffic gains in the recent years has increased our demands on monitoring railroad safety and compliance

with the federal regulations. The FRA looks at five different parts of safety, looks at track, motive power and equipment, operating practices, hazardous materials, signal and train control.

The efficient use of our resources is very critical as you can see by the amount of work that's out there and the number of people that we have. The agency traditionally relied upon site-specific inspections that focused on regulatory compliance as our means of oversight.

While the railroad safety programs have improved since 1978, the FRA has been concerned with some of the progress we have seen. In addition, freight traffic has grown more than 50 percent nationwide since 1986. In 1994, we responded to President Clinton's directive to reinvent the government. And that's what we came across with a program, a new way of doing business which we call the Safety Assurance and Compliance Program, better known in the industry as SACP.

The initial SACP used a team of inspectors, headquarters and field, under the direction of a project manager, like myself, conducted coordinated safety audits of a particular railroad, looking at trends and other historical

avenues just to see how that railroad was. Listening sessions were also held with railroad employees, labor and management.

To foster cooperation during this SACP effort, FRA does exercise their enforcement discretion regarding safety violations that are voluntarily found through this process. So what that basically means is we use some discretion as to whether we will file a violation or not for a particular deficiency of a regulation.

From the information gathered, we identify systemic issues that may be occurring on a particular railroad. And some cases, they may not involve federal regulations. That was one of the most notable things about the SACP. The FRA's authority is somewhat guided by the federal regulations. The SACP has permitted us now to enter into areas that we really don't have legislative jurisdiction, but we have cooperative efforts between labor and the management to get in these areas.

We present those recommendations and any of our findings during the senior management meetings on that railroad, and then we look for them to tell us how they are going to make those corrections that we have found and we think need to be done in regards

to safety.

an evolutionary change as we see with our best practices on the railroads across the country. As you can see, going from an East Coast Norfolk Southern to CSX to a West Coast BNUP, the structures of the railroads are quite a bit different. You can go out West and run 4 or 500 miles and not really have any industry in between. Whereas here in the East Coast, there's a lot of industry within a few miles. So the makeup of the SACP is guided by the makeup of the railroad.

The SACP process has several elements: communication, system safety reviews, root cause and analysis just to name a few. But one of the principal elements I'd like to talk about and shed some light on is that of the partnerships that are developed between labor, management and FRA.

The identification and developing of solutions to the safety problems through a cooperative effort is the goal. Through the fostering of the partnerships, we have also been permitted to address safety-critical issues where we lack the authority. And that's one of the most important things which I'm going to get to now.

One of the successes of the SACP -- and we've seen it here, we've seen it here in Pennsylvania -- is what we call a Switching Operations Fatality Analysis Committee. I don't know if anyone here has heard of it. It's called SOFA. Leave it to, I guess, FRA to come up with the term SOFA from that standpoint.

What it is is an analysis of employee fatality over several years to find what might be some root causes of those fatalities, why were employees getting killed on the railroad, were there some common elements that could be applied. So they did that, and basically they came up with recommendations. This was a working cooperative effort between FRA, labor and management all siting in the same room looking through the same files that are usually internal to railroad occupations. So it was somewhat of a first.

When the trends were developed which was narrowed down to basically five rules nationwide that were causing or played a major role in employee fatalities. Those rules were recommended as a -- to the railroad industry that they need to start targeting these general areas of safety. Every railroad in the country today now has the SOFA rules

as part of their safety program.

2.1

Now, I will say -- I use the term SOFA rules, but they're really SOFA recommendations.

They're not cast in stone as a rule, but there are usually railroad operating rules that are applicable to each recommendation.

While there have been several successful partnerships over the years, another success story involving the Norfolk Southern was they were the first railroad ever to initiate an Employee Fatality Analysis Committee on their railroad. This was sort of taking what the SOFA was for nationwide, Norfolk Southern decided just to do it just for their railroad. They were the first railroad to enter into this partnership and open up their files for review.

While the investigation of employee fatality is not an easy task, the effectiveness of the Committee and the resulting recommendations have now, no doubt, made the workplace safer.

Has our idea of partnerships worked at all times? No. When we look at what were some of the common causes behind the failures, there usually was a breakdown of communication or a lack of goal. But I firmly believe that the communication and partnerships, from an FRA standpoint to the

railroads, are better than we had before.

Probably the issue that's most important to you today is the FRA's involvement in the Conrail acquisition. About everywhere I go, I get asked about that. As I said, I'm the permanent program manager for SACP. But for the last two and a half years, I've also been the responsible team leader for the Conrail acquisition portion that went to NS.

So I've been involved with the SIP from the beginning, from the first meetings to now. The SIPs still continue even though there's a lot of, I guess, rumors out there that FRA has eliminated the SIP process. That's not true. We're still doing it. We don't do it in the same format that we did before. The SIP and SACP are now combined entities, where they used to be separate.

While mergers and acquisitions have been an historical part of the railroad industry, FRA did become concerned that the recent acquisitions for Class I -- resulting in the creation of mega-railroads. They posed new and challenging trends, not only to labor and management, but to FRA on how to enforce compliance with the regulations, how do we deal with these size of operations. So the size and the complexity did pose some, needless to

say, some interest.

So what FRA did was looked at responding to the assessments of the BN and the Union Pacific --both the Santa Fe and the Union Pacific Railroads in the West. As everyone is well aware after the Union Pacific got together out there with the BN and a few other railroads, we started seeing some fatalities and some train accidents that should not have been occurring, which were directly related to the mega-railroads and the safety trends being of concern. We did not want that to happen with the Conrail acquisition.

So, basically, the FRA developed the initiative for the SIP. We recommended to the STB that in order to let the Conrail acquisition go through there should be a safety integration plan to be developed by the railroads that will tell FRA exactly how we pull off this Conrail acquisition and still maintain the safe posture that we have. So that was one of our first important recommendations to the STB.

On September 4th of 1998 is when FRA initiated the formal long-term monitoring team, the team that Administrator Molitoris mentioned in the video. They were permanent staff that would do

nothing but work on Norfolk Southern and CSX during the acquisition. They would report all their findings. They would monitor the SIPs. They would monitor safety. They would look at the operational criteria, how were the shippers doing, things like that. Even where we didn't have jurisdiction, we were looking because we had to keep a pulse, from an FRA standpoint, on where was safety going to go.

As a SIP grew, state managers and inspectors became involved in part of the process.

And, again, I have to say that without the state inspectors, FRA would not have been able to pull off obtaining some of their goals that they did. They are a true asset to the FRA safety program.

The SIPs, I think, are somewhat misunderstood. The SIPs were a living safety document. They were not cast in stone. They were -- I know I heard the term recommendations and promises and things. When they came to the FRA, when we sat down and developed the safety profiles, these were the projections that we thought were needed based on what we knew at the time.

As the SIPs continued on month after month, there were some things that FRA and the railroad saw that maybe weren't going to be needed,

maybe there were some things we had to add. And so we refined them as we went from meeting to meeting.

Like the SACP, we learned over time that refinements make the process better.

This was a first for FRA. This was a first for the railroad industry to have a SIP. No one had ever had to do one of these before. As you are aware, we are currently under rulemaking that will make the SIP a permanent fixture in any future regulation -- or mergers.

While everyone expected some glitches, we had a fairly smooth transition on June 1st, 1999. As we are all aware, our expectations quickly evaporated. We thought for sure based on the two and a half years of meeting with the railroads and going through the criteria and looking at what we could or could not do, that we would come up with somewhat of a smooth transition. We figured we wouldn't have all the angles covered, but it would be somewhat smooth.

I guess what could be further from the truth? We had computer shutdowns. We had trains standing. We had crews in the wrong place.

Basically, anything that could go wrong really went wrong. And a lot of it was related right back to the IT issues.

So now I'll just talk about the Norfolk Southern. Even though we had these problems, labor and management rose to the occasion and formed the partnerships that were needed to ensure the prime directive that came from FRA: Safety would not be compromised. If trains had to stand all day while we figured out who was safe and who wasn't, that's what FRA was expecting. We weren't going to be running trains and doing things needlessly and putting employees' lives in jeopardy.

so while not all the issues have been resolved to satisfaction even to this day, the FRA does commend labor and management for their efforts. Since June 1st with all the distractions of getting the railroad back to smooth operation, there's not been one employee fatality related to the Conrail acquisition. If you remember when this Conrail acquisition came to be, there was a lot of comments made that safety was going to be the first thing to go.

I think regardless of everything else that has happened in the business end or the economy or whatever the case might be, I think they have shown that safety was maintained and labor and management were able to pull this off. I think

that's a remarkable achievement and one to be proud of.

To further expand upon the safety record of the industry of Norfolk Southern in regards to employee injuries for the year 2000, the Northern Region which comprises Harrisburg, Pittsburgh and Dearborn Divisions experienced some of the safest monthly and quarterly records in their history since June 1st.

In fact, for the first quarter of this

year -- I just got the figures yesterday. First

quarter of this year versus the first quarter of last

year, FRA reportable injuries are down 46 percent

with overall injuries down 23 percent. Again, this

achievement could not have occurred without the

exceptional efforts of labor and management

regardless of what's been happening on the business

side of the coin.

I would also like to briefly cover track-related accidents in Pennsylvania. I'm sure this is probably one of the concerns. We see it in the paper all the time. I did do some analysis on previous Conrail versus NS today, and we have not seen a spike. In 1998, there were 22 yard-related accidents. In 1999, there was 19. And in 2000,

there was 20. So you can see we didn't see a jump in track-related accidents, but we did see a spike in main line accidents over the three years of about another additional 23 percent on the main lines from 1998 to the year 2000.

One of the things that FRA is doing is we are going to be looking at the track structure. The production season is starting on the Norfolk

Southern. And as it does every year, we do look at what we need to see. When I talked about the reductions in injuries, employee injuries that covered all crafts; mechanical, track, the train and engine service people, the signal maintainers.

So when I said it was down 46 percent in this total last year that was taking in all shops, Hollidaysburg, you know, Conway, the whole nine yards. So that was everything. The counties that we found from a track standpoint having the most each year were Beaver and Philadelphia, as far as Pennsylvania is concerned. They seem to be popping up the last three years as the most.

I want to emphasize, since there are some reporters here, that these accidents are what we were saying -- we're saying there's accidents there. But some of these are nothing more than just a fender

bender, a couple cars on the ground. FRA's reporting threshold is \$6600. As you can see with that type of equipment, it doesn't take much to cause a damage of \$6600. One turnout is roughly 10 to 15,000. And if a car derails on a turnout and switches a switch, then we're going to meet threshold.

So when I say that Beaver and Philadelphia had the most accidents based on our data, that doesn't mean that they're serious accidents. That just seems to be where they're popping up. So what we are going to do -- and most of those are in the yard environment -- Beaver County, which has Conway yard for the most part and, of course, Philadelphia which is basically a terminal operation.

Mr. Chairman and members of the

Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to talk about

FRA with you today. FRA realizes that even with the

best intentions, there have been problems since June

1st, and we still have issues to resolve. FRA is

committed to ensuring that the railroad industry is

the safest.

And my sincere thanks for listening to me this morning. And I'll be happy to answer any questions you have, which I'm sure you may have on

1 other issues I didn't cover.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Thank you very much.

It's reassuring to know that rail safety is doing very well in Pennsylvania, and we certainly

5 appreciate your testimony.

from Altoona.

Next up will be the other Lutton, Tom.

And will you bring your crew up and introduce them?

I always have to introduce Tom Lutton because he's

MR. TOM LUTTON: Thank you, Rick. The only two of the crew that's coming up is myself and our attorney, Rich Edelman. And Rich will be doing the testifying for us.

MR. EDELMAN: Thank you, Tom, and thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee.

I'm Richard Edelman with the law firm of O'Donnell, Schwartz & Anderson in Washington D.C. I appreciate the opportunity to be heard on behalf of various unions in the matter of this Committee's inquiry into the plan of Norfolk Southern to close the Hollidaysburg car shop.

I've represented various unions in proceedings before the United States Surface

Transportation Board. In the Hollidaysburg shop joint petition of the unions and the Commonwealth of

Pennsylvania, I represent the machinists union, the boilermakers, the electrical workers, the refinement oilers, the sheet metal workers, Transportation Communications International Union and Transport Workers Union, of which Mr. Lutton is an officer of.

I've represented these unions and many others in Surface Transportation Board proceedings including other major consolidations since 1986 back when it was called the Interstate Commerce Commission. I represented many of these unions and others in the STB proceedings on the CSX/NS acquisition and division of Conrail. So I'm fully familiar with what was said there and what was done there.

what the union representatives said at the last hearing in Altoona. I will elaborate on a few points and address the attempted defects by Norfolk Southern of its actions. I have provided the Chairman with a full copy of the joint petition of the unions and the Commonwealth. And I won't -- again not review that, but there is some points that I will go over just to highlight some key -- key items.

My primary focus today will be to respond to NSR's attempted defense of itself both in Altoona

and before the STB. And I do note, as members of the Committee already have, that frankly nothing was said by NS today about Hollidaysburg, although that was one of the basic reasons for calling this hearing.

They've talked more about what they say they will do in the future, but not about what they said they would do because they don't want to talk about what they said they would do. They want to talk more about, again, what they say they'll do even in the face of not doing what they said they would do. I will also discuss what's happening at the STB and raise some questions for this Committee to consider.

What is the position of the unions and the Commonwealth at the STB? The position is that NSR made repeated representations to the STB, to the Commonwealth, to officials of the State of Pennsylvania, to communities in Pennsylvania, to Conrail employees and the public at large that they would retain the Hollidaysburg car shop, consolidate work there and bring new work there, expand employment there and invest \$4 million there.

These representations were made in the context of a vigorous campaign for approval of the transaction, first, in the context with CSX to

acquire Conrail and then as part of the joint CSX/Norfolk Southern application.

We submit and the Commonwealth submits that Norfolk Southern is bound by those commitments and representations, especially in view of the Surface Transportation Board's order binding it to the representations it made during that proceeding.

With respect to the nature and scope of NSR's representations, they are laid out in full in the petition and were discussed at the last hearing. Many of you are fully aware of what was said. Some of it was said to you, and we all saw the video today.

There are a few items I just want to highlight. They are in our joint petition. But just because of the attempted wiggling by NS to dumb down their commitment to an expectation or a hope or an aspiration or a thought on their part, it is important to recognize, not only what was said in the video on Day One, but to recognize that as a culmination of a campaign by NS for years.

We start with what is Exhibit 4 in our joint petition, a newspaper ad. This one is from the New York Times. But it was in Philadelphia, I believe, and it was in Pittsburgh. The Altoona and

Hollidaysburg shops, Norfolk Southern is committed to continuing to operate the Hollidaysburg car shop and its Juniata locomotive shop at Altoona and will promote employment there.

You can't say it any more clearly than that. This is to all Conrail constituencies. You don't have to be a Conrail shareholder to benefit from Norfolk Southern's offer. They want to wiggle around with words like intent and aspiration, but there is the word commitment published for everybody to see.

Conrail -- Norfolk Southern's Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Goode, whom you saw on the videotape, testified at a United States Senate hearing under questioning from Senator Specter of this Commonwealth and he gave him assurances that they would retain the shops.

Mr. Goode said -- this is Exhibit 6 to the joint petition -- since Norfolk Southern will be the likely beneficiary of the lines and of those shops, we do not have nearby shop facilities as CSX did in Cumberland. So we are in the position of not only being able to give assurances that we will keep those shops and keep them operating, we are going to need them.

That's the CEO of NS. And after further colloquy, Senator Specter says, Okay, that answer will be well received in Blair County. Thank you. I would like just to note that Senator Specter has just submitted comments to the STB in support of the joint petition and of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the unions in large part because of what Mr. Goode said to him in the United States Senate.

Then a verified statement -- verified statement sworn under oath by Mr. Goode to the Surface Transportation Board as part of the application -- I want to point out they're fond of saying, Operating plans are just sort of aspirations we talk about the kinds of things we're going to do. And they could tell you, Yes, an application sometimes looks about this big. And then an operating plan can contain about 500 pages.

Mr. Goode gave a statement, a verified statement, about 16 pages long, only. And when he talked about things, one of the things he talked about in that short summary was, Conrail has excellent, excellent locomotive and car repair facilities in Altoona and Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania.

While NS's comparable facilities are in

Roanoke, Virginia, it's explained in the operating plan and the verified statement of Michael Molhan, your operating plan witness, important efficiencies can be gained by concentrating different kinds of mechanical work at each location. Then, insourcing provides another opportunity to maximize utilization of the system shops at Altoona, Hollidaysburg and Roanoke.

2.2

Then -- and this I took off NS's website.

This was Exhibit 10 to our petition. This was a press release contemporaneous with the filing of the application: New Norfolk Southern, Best Choice for Pennsylvania. Now, here's a funny thing. After we included this in our petition, if you go to NS's Web page, this isn't there anymore. It's slightly Stalinesque, I would suggest.

In this paper it says, Norfolk Southern is committed to operate Conrail's Hollidaysburg car shop and Juniata locomotive shop and will promote employment there. This is it on NS paper. You can't get it anymore, but it's in the petition.

And just to show all the continuation in time. We have our Exhibit 18 is -- you've heard about the New York Dock arbitration. And I'd like to talk about that a little later, but it's a process of

negotiating an agreement for implementation of the transaction. We went to arbitration. The TWU, and the TCU and NS went to arbitration in hope of getting an agreement.

And one of the things that was going on there is NS said, We need our collective bargaining agreements in place at Hollidaysburg and Juniata, not the Conrail ones. We're moving work there. This is going to be part of a consolidated NS system. This is our plant, and we are going to get it through this. And we are moving all work there. We are consolidating the work there.

We are now -- this statement is now six months after the approval from the STB. That's where they're still going. That's what they're still saying, and then it culminates in Mr. Goode's statement that we all saw and heard today.

I submit that it is clear to all, obviously, it is to Committee members as it is to us, what NS said, why it said it and that those things constituted commitments which they're obliged to fulfill.

Now, if I may, I'll move on to what NS is trying to say to defend itself. And I'll first address the remarks of General Timmons at the Altoona

hearing and some of them today. I'll then address some of what they've said in their filing at the STB.

Initially, I want to say that I submit, as some of the members have already suggested, that the Committee should not attach much weight to what NSR has said. The fact is they are now flat contradicting what they previously say in sworn statements. They have no credibility, as correctly observed.

I'm not here to cast aspersions on General Timmons' personally. He can only tell you what he was given by NS headquarters in Norfolk, but I submit that NS Corporation and its entities and its high-level officers have no credibility on this issue.

They say they're concerned about the appearance that they lack credibility, and that it shouldn't be lost over a business decision. But there was a commitment made, and that's the point. They made a commitment. And what they're trying to do is wiggle out of it by saying, Now, we've made a different business decision.

Another point initially, to the extent that NS relies on its failure to meet its revenue expectations, one, we feel it is irrelevant because

the commitment wasn't tied to certain levels of business. As Mr. Maher noted, that's a different scenario. They made that promise.

This is not a question of a reduction of force as a result of declining business. Instead, they are talking about the complete closing of the shop forever while work is still available to be done there and movement of potential work to other places.

We did not challenge NS for a breach of its commitment when it laid off a whole lot of workers last year, but the closing of the Hollidaysburg car shop is of an entirely different order. And in the circumstances, it cannot be justified by their current financial problems, much of which is their own fault for their incompetent implementation of the merger. So we feel it should not matter, but we will address them because they rely so heavily on it.

Now, with respect to General Timmons's statement that NS should be excused from its representations because it relied on 1995 data and some shippers changed their plans, I think it needs to be recognized -- what he's talking about is when you do these applications for the STB, there's a whole bunch of financial analyses that have to be

done. And they have to provide all these statements as part of the application and traffic tapes, and a variety of things are used. And they use the base year of the last full year reported before the application.

That's for that purpose. That's not for their operating plan. They don't design their operating plan based upon the data that they have to use for that level of analysis, and I submit no rational corporation would do that. That's not what they were planning on.

The plans of shippers as to routings and total car loads is irrelevant to the decisions about where program and heavy car repair work might be done. Well, perhaps it might be relevant to a running repair facility on a line if that line is no longer being used, but not for the usage of a centralized heavy repair shop.

NS -- and I've heard them. I heard them at the recent Surface Transportation Board hearings on major consolidation saying, Well, look, you know, sometimes things happen, shippers move. We put in our operating plan. We're going to run a certain number of trains per day out to Shipper A, and Shipper A moves. Well, I understand that with

respect to operations, as to train runs. But that doesn't, again, affect your plans as to a centralized repair facility particularly as we're saying barely a year out.

Mr. McClellan made the point that, Well, when a shipper leaves an area, the trucker can go with it. We've got this whole physical plant involved. Again, that may run to the question of train operations, not to a centralized car repair facility. That argument is simply specious in the context of the problem that you're considering.

General Timmons said that Norfolk

Southern based its plans on the expectations of the business levels in 1997-1998, and now they need to adjust. And that's on Page 2 of his statement.

Well, that's astounding, if it's true. Surely the whole plan wasn't developed of a fine line of a continued steep economic growth of a type that was unprecedented.

I submit it would have been an entirely different STB hearing if NS came in and said, Here is all the things we're going to do, but it depends upon growth being off the scale. That wouldn't have happened. Surely the first economic bump in the road shouldn't be enough to derail the entire plan. I

would submit that if that statement is true, then NS engaged in material misrepresentation to this body and to the Surface Transportation Board.

General Timmons cited a loss of business attributable to the downturn in the economy over the last eight months as explaining the general retrenchment and specifically what they did in Hollidaysburg. But let's remember, NS originally proposed to close the Hollidaysburg car shop last November before anyone was talking about an economic downturn here. They were going to go in in November.

And this silly talk about them reconsidering because maybe something else would go on there with selling something is ridiculous. They reconsidered because Congressman Shuster was going to hold hearings. So the point was a year and a half out, that's when they were going to go do it before any of this talk was going on.

They also ignored the rather significant contribution to the problem of loss of business.

General Timmons has acknowledged and Mr. McClellan has acknowledged that they had implementation problems. But as usual, they understate the case and they seem to minimize their own role. In fact, their implementation was a disaster for almost a year

largely due to their incompetence and arrogance.

NSR's actions contributed mightily to its own financial circumstances as it had to spend large outlays to dig out, and it lost business. Some have described NS as effectively running off business. I've provided you just two articles. This is just something that I had at my office when I read this. A couple of shippers who said we would like to ship by rail, but we're afraid to. We can't rely on it.

So they ran up tremendous losses because of their own failures. They laid off a lot of the work force already, a significant portion of it, because of the expenses that had to run out there.

And by the way, they're avoiding paying benefits to the people. I'll get to that.

So the point is to the extent that they claim their actions are justified by a loss of business, I submit it's irrelevant, that most of the losses are self-inflicted and that to the extent that there are losses due to a general economic slowdown, they're not really a factor in this position because they planned to do it beforehand. In short, they suggested they've acted in good faith. But the arguments that NS has given them to make are irrelevant or factually incorrect.

Now, let me go to -- a little bit to their response to the joint petition. They filed their reply on April 17th. I don't know if they provided a full copy to the Committee, but I'll summarize some of what they've got to say and respond. They obviously were unwilling to send somebody here to talk about the Hollidaysburg car shop. I concur with the analysis that it was arrogant and shameful.

I would submit that there was nothing improper about them presenting their position that they gave to the STB. There's nothing inconsistent with the STB proceedings for them to sit in front of you and tell you and explain their situation. The problem is they're embarrassed to because their position at the STB is false as you know from everything you saw.

In their STB filing, they began with three material misrepresentations, one of which you've already heard repeated here today.

First, it's asserted that they made a good faith effort to follow through on their commitments regarding the car shop. And that was shown, they say, by operating the car shop for almost two years in a manner consistent with the STB

filings.

Second, they said that 300-plus employees that are currently working at the shops were being given the opportunity to follow their work.

Third, they said they're acting in good faith in closing the shops based on objective need because their marketing efforts were not sufficiently successful.

These assertions are all false. As to supposed two years of good faith effort to follow through with the plan, we note that Day One was June 1, 1999. NSR sought to close the shop in November of 2000. Anyone other than that railroad would realize that's a year and a half.

Also, NSR admits that they essentially lost a full year because of their service problems. That was a lost year. Their own papers, their own published remarks essentially say they think they returned to normalcy sometime last spring. If so, they basically gave the shop a mere six to eight months after service returned to normal to show where them where they were.

I don't know how they can say that their marketing efforts were not sufficiently successful for insourcing because our information that we showed

```
you shows that insourcing was actually up about 20
1
2
    percent over pretransaction work.
                                       In fact, they
3
    turned work away. I can't believe that their
    expectations were predicated on doing better than 20
4
    percent increase.
5
                                 Excuse me, when you say
                CHAIRMAN GEIST:
6
7
    turned work away, is that the CSX stuff that they
8
    were supposed to do and they pulled out?
```

MR. EDELMAN: That and more. Mr. Lutton could be --

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Could you provide us with a little bit of written numbers and who they were?

MR. EDELMAN: Mr. Lutton will provide that.

Now, as to the claim of good faith in dealing with employees and the assertion of 300-plus employees being offered the opportunity to follow their work, in the back of this document, Exhibit 21, is their notice to the unions about abolishing their jobs. Now, this part only deals with the shop craft workers and not the clerks. Because at the time this was filed for the shop craft unions, the clerks made their own filing. There are problems there too.

As to the shop workers, there are 275

jobs being abolished in their notice. In their notice, they cite 142 jobs being created at the other locations. So that is at least a misrepresentation to suggest -- yes, they're going to say any one of you 300 people is offered a job over there. I guess you could say you're offering jobs to 300 people, but the reality is they've only got 142 jobs to offer.

What's that really about? What's this really about? And, again, I can get into this a little bit more with New York Dock. But here's the deal. Under New York Dock, if you have the opportunity to move and you don't, you lose your protective benefits.

So here's the scam. They tell everybody, Look, here's jobs over there. You have an opportunity to move to them. And if people say, Well, you know, I've lived here all my life. My family is here, and I don't want to move there. Or people say, You're asking me to move, uproot my family, go to Ohio, go to North Carolina. When we read stuff that says your company is an extremist, when we hear the possibility that your company may be bought out by the Burlington Northern and Santa Fe, how do I know what my future is going to be in those places?

So maybe some people say, Well, I'm not going to take that offer. I'm sorry. They lose their benefits. Well, that works great for them because we never get to the point of paying benefits because they put everybody in that quandary, and they can't do it.

But so -- as far as I'm concerned, their offers are essentially a scam to get them out of paying protective benefits. But even if you accepted in good faith, there's only 142 jobs. And to tell the STB and to tell you that they're offering 300-plus jobs is just false.

Third, as to the claim of good faith in closing the shops, again, we note that they tried to close them last November, a mere six to eight months until they returned to normalcy. They claimed -- they also have an interesting remark that the closing is a cost-cutting move because this shop is redundant because there are others shops -- these other shops do similar repair work.

Now, there are differences as to the type of work. But beyond everything else, this so-called redundancy existed at the time that they filed the application and made the commitments that they made. They can't sit there and say, All of a sudden, we've

discovered that these shops do the same work as those so we're going to take the work there.

They said, These two shops do the same thing. This is the finest shop in the world. This is the heart of the system. We're taking the work here. To sit here and tell you now that they're redundant is, again, misrepresentation.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Isn't in the total STB agreement the only shop named, Hollidaysburg?

MR. EDELMAN: No.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: No?

MR. EDELMAN: No. They also named the Juniata shop, and they talked about the Roanoke shops. There are a few others. But the one that's prominent clearly are the two shops in Altoona.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Thank you.

MR. EDELMAN: Another thing I just heard this morning, an interesting question, Mr. McClellan talked about the idea that there was a move to privately own cars. So they say, we don't need that. Well, that's kind of an odd rationale for what's going on here since what they're talking about is insourcing at the Hollidaysburg car shops.

If NS is saying that a lot of their customers are owning their own cars, Well, you know

what? A lot of those customers aren't in a situation to repair their cars. It seems to me that's a rationale for keeping this shop and not sending it to shops that are capable of doing that.

Second, infrastructure being underutilized. Well, infrastructure here -- that's what he says, we don't want to spend money on underutilized infrastructure. They're the ones who have done the cutbacks. They're the ones who have reduced the work force from over 400 down to 300-something. They're making those choices.

The main argument they've made and what you tried to get your hands on and what they won't talk to you about is that what they said wasn't really on the order of commitment. It was more like an aspiration, illustrative examples of what they might do rather than an actual plan on which people might rely.

As I read that, I was sort of thinking they're sort of saying this is like one of those futuristic car shows you go to where they have concept cars. Nobody expects them to be built, and they would like you to accept that that's really what this is about. Their tone is sort of like, Well, gee, you guys weren't naive enough to think that we

were really going to go through with that. That's the tone.

Look at the record. As we've shown before and reiterated today, they repeatedly and explicitly said they would consolidate the car heavy repair work at the shop, they would invest \$47 million. It was not a stray remark. It was not a vague projection. I heard the reference to the semantic difference between a promise and a projection. That's not semantics. Those are differences, and we all know what they are.

There are also assertions of, Well, this was just in our operating plan. But it was also in the sworn statement of Mr. Goode and all the other places that we've referred to and you're familiar with. And, again, it went on and on from the very first day they began their campaign until Day One and past.

Again, as some of you have recognized, these statements were made as part of a political campaign that they sought to gain support or at least minimize opposition from Pennsylvania and its elected officials. And they did so by these representations, not only to them indirectly but in all filings to the STB, in general media effort here to this Committee

and in Harrisburg and on Capitol Hill.

And they were successful. Pennsylvania and its officials supported the transaction based on the representations made to them, and now they say they want your expressions of good faith in them.

That is to negate all that they said to gain the support now that they no longer need it.

Representative Levdansky said, What happened to make this change? Why did this occur? Well, two changes I can look at here are, one, they got the approval they were looking for. And, two, Congressman Shuster is no longer in charge of that committee. They were concerned about Congressman Shuster and his place on the committee. That was part of the reason the commitment was the commitment they had. But, again, they made it on the record.

They moved first when it became apparent that Congressman Shuster might not retain that chairmanship. Then they pulled it back once he called hearings. Once he resigned, they moved immediately. Now, if the commitment was merely a promise, something they said to Congressman Shuster between Mr. Goode and Mr. Shuster, Well, then maybe the commitment only lasts that long.

But they were part of a formal record

made in the administrative agency. They were part of a public relations campaign of newspapers published everywhere, of statements made to you, of statements made in Altoona.

They became part of the STB order that the representations they made during the course of the proceeding were binding. If at the time, they said, Well, all these things we're saying are mere aspirations, I submit that the position of the State of Pennsylvania and its elected officials would not be what it was.

NS has focused -- this is the tricky lawyer argument -- on the fact that, Well, the commitment appears to be open-ended. And so they infer that the unions and the Commonwealth are saying, Oh, well, under their interpretation, we'd be bound in perpetuity to keep the Hollidaysburg car shops. And then here to make it interesting, Well, that means we have no commitment whatsoever. Well, that is a crafty lawyer's argument, but it is a false one.

Under NS's view, if you look at it that way, since there's no end date to the commitment, they could have closed the car shop on Day Two because it's not really a commitment. Oddly, if they

made one commitment for two years, that would be better than an open-end commitment.

2.2

2.3

But beyond that, the unions don't think, and I doubt the Commonwealth does, that NS must maintain the shops in perpetuity, perhaps a hundred years as we heard Mr. Goode. But that's not the point. Obviously, again, that's somewhat rhetorical. But it's certainly not Day Two or a mere year later.

There must be a reasonable time period that they have to make a decision like that. And I'd submit they'd have to go to the STB affirmatively to get relief from the commitments they made not act unilaterally.

Now, as to the assertions that NS must be free to change to react to new circumstances like any business. I submit that they have ignored the basic nature of the STB proceedings and the unique form of authorization they received. And this goes also to a question that was asked apparently at the last hearing about how is this different from the closing of a steel mill or the United/US Air merger.

For this type of transaction the Norfolk Southern was required to obtain STB approval, affirmative approval, or they could not do it. It's not like other industries where's there no federal

agency approval involved or even ones where there's just a question of whether or not the Department of Justice is going to oppose the transaction on antitrust grounds.

The STB can approve, reject or approve with conditions. If there is approval, the railroad obtains immunity from other laws in carrying out the transaction. It is a very broad, powerful override of the law. And it is self-executing by action of the parties receiving the approval.

That's pretty powerful what they get.

They get to go to the federal government. They get to do approval of a transaction that would never pass antitrust muster under any other regime. They get immunity from antitrust law. They get immunity from other law. They get approval. And that's how they've run over our collective bargaining agreements, using this immunity.

So when General Timmons says, We need to be free to make a business decision -- let's look at environment. They're not any other business.

They're a heavily regulated business that has obtained the benefit of government approval and a get-out-of-jail-free card. And to sit there and act like free market principles apply when they are using

this immunity to negate the rights of labor, to negate the rights of community, to negate the rights of shippers and then get pious about their free enterprise, I submit that's misplaced.

Now, they have also made arguments that these sorts of things under operating plans are not binding under STB precedent. I don't want to debate that point here with you. Our position is they are. We will show they are to the STB.

I have provided you with reprints of the ordering sections of the last several mergers starting with the Union Pacific/Chicago Northwestern, the Burlington Northern/Santa Fe, the Union Pacific/Southern Pacific and the most recent, CSX/NS/Conrail. The one thing you will note on those ordering sections is that the three orders prior to the CSX/NS/Conrail transaction do not have the language binding the applicants to the representations that they made during the course of the proceedings.

Finally, as to the claim that they're losing a lot of money, first of all, I think this is primarily a certain amount of accounting trickery.

We're analyzing that, and I'm not in a position to respond to that right now. But I would suggest that

when you consider this, you consider the credibility of everything else you've been told.

But here's an interesting question. Have they shown a loss or decline in the amount of work at the car shops from the time when they made the commitment and now? I mean, in essence the predicate of the argument is, Well, we made those commitments. And there was a certain of work, and now there isn't.

In their STB filings, there's a sworn statement from an individual who refers to the fact that there was 13,000 car repairs done in 1977 and 1978. But over time, Conrail's use of the shops dwindled. Well, now we don't have anything specific about how much work was done in '77-'78. But it just dwindled. We don't know in the next 20 years -- we don't know. They don't provide us with the numbers.

On the next page, during 2000, NS worked on approximately 4,040 cars in the shops. So they would like you to compare -- they would like the STB and everybody else to compare the 4,000 cars with the 13,000 cars. But there were three times as many employees in the shops in '78. So that's a false comparison, once again.

So the question is, What were the circumstances in '97-'98 when they made this

commitment? Our belief is that that did not materially change. And if their interesting accounting produces a loss on the amount of cars now, then it shows a loss back then, if you were to do that. And those circumstances haven't changed, and I think they ought be to required to tell us that information.

Again, this goes to the question, What changed? What changed wasn't the finances and the shops. What changed is that they got the benefit of the approval and Congressman Shuster is no longer in a position to control, not only their situation, but the industry in general.

Final point, what is going on at the STB?

We filed our joint petition. NS filed a reply. We

and the Commonwealth will be filing a response to

that probably toward the end of next week. The

matter will then be ripe for decision by the STB.

As to this Committee, I -- we respectfully submit it's clear that what's going on here is a renege on a commitment. And the Committee could perhaps find that NS is -- make a finding and submit that they've misrepresented the facts, that they've acted in bad faith.

I think it is important to review and

reevaluate current dealings with NS. They're asking for more money. How, and why is it going to be used? Or to consider the recent disclosure that they're now going to spend money in Enola yard, why and can you rely on that given what they've said? They've provided a whole list of things they say they're going to do. Why should you believe that?

2.2

And consider the impact of all of this on future transactions. There's a lot of talk about a potential Burlington Northern/Santa Fe takeover of Norfolk Southern. What does that mean for Pennsylvania, and how do you deal with Norfolk Southern?

Let me just address a couple of quick points about New York Dock -- you had questions. And rather than go through an extended history, I'll make a few. And if you have any, I'd be glad to answer them.

First of all, the New York Dock conditions did not arise out of the Penn Central merger. That's incorrect. The New York Dock conditions run back to an agreement negotiated by the labor unions and the major carriers in 1936 called the Washington Job Protective Agreement.

It's a negotiated agreement. There was

quid pro quo given there. Eighty-five percent of the country's railroads at the time were participants in that agreement. Sometime later, the ICC made those conditions a part of its standard orders. It then became enacted into law as a requirement that they do so.

The New York Dock conditions are a product of the conditions imposed by the ICC in the late '60s, early '70s, and the conditions that are devised under the Rail Passenger Service Act for covering Amtrak. And they were combined. Congress mandated in 1976 that essentially the higher level of both be put together, and that was done in the New York Dock conditions. That's the origin of them.

As to the notion of whether or not NS

pays New York Dock benefits, Yeah, I guess they can

say they pay people. There's also a lot of people

they don't pay. I've spent a lot of time with them,

dealing with the fact that they're not paying people.

And to sit there and say, Well, that's controlled by

an arbitrator.

But you know what? If you agree to pay people who are entitled to be paid, you don't have to go to an arbitrator. You don't have to do that, to say you're willing to be bound by somebody creating a

dispute that you're creating.

When they furloughed people last spring in these shops and when they furloughed hundreds of maintenance employees last spring, they said none of those people were affected by the New York -- by the transaction and were not entitled to New York Dock benefits.

Then, even though they were publishing reports, they were saying things in their SCC filings that said we need to cut costs here, we are going to engage in a buyout of a railroad and were going to reduce forces because of the expenses we incurred in digging out of the mess we made. They said, But those layoffs didn't have anything to do with that. I would suggest to you that that shows you the sort of good faith you can have in dealing with NS.

That concludes my prepared remarks. I'd be glad to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Before we do, Tom, do you want to say anything?

MR. TOM LUTTON: No.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: All right, Dick.

REPRESENTATIVE HESS: Just one question,
Mr. Edelman, referring to the tape that Chairman
Geist played concerning Mr. Goode's statements and

Congressman Shuster's statements, do you have any documentation or correspondence as to concerning the commitments that were made to Congressman Shuster from Mr. Goode or from Norfolk Southern in writing?

MR. EDELMAN: I certainly don't have anything between NS and Mr. Goode, and we have not relied on that nor has the Commonwealth. We've

anything between NS and Mr. Goode, and we have no relied on that nor has the Commonwealth. We've relied on the documents that are in our joint petition that are ample in and of themselves to demonstrate the level of the commitment.

But if -- I would suspect. And by the way, I would suspect that if you asked the question to Norfolk Southern to produce documents that show a commitment, NS, in its interesting description of the word commitment, probably will produce nothing because they will tell you that none of it wasn't a commitment.

So I would suggest that the request might be broadened a little bit to cover there the potential for their definition of it.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: I just want to speak a point of good humor here quickly that Senator Craig Lewis was only here for rebuttal.

MR. EDELMAN: Sorry, it's lost on me.

REPRESENTATIVE HESS: Just one more

question, would you have subpoena power to subpoena such documents if they existed?

MR. EDELMAN: We don't. The STB would.

A request could be made to the STB in connection with this to compel production. The STB, although it has that power, oftentimes has not used it of late. The other potential troubling matter in that regard is this: We are looking at a closing date at the end of August here.

Yeah, what I, you know -- in the best of all worlds, I would say to the STB, Bring Mr. Goode down here and make him explain what's going on.

Don't send flacks up for him. Make him explain himself. I would say, Bring the operating people down here and produce contemporaneous documents and produce materials about why they're closing the Hollidaysburg car shop and what they thought at the time.

My problem is, very simply, that the STB is not the fastest-moving agency in the world. And we have people whose lives are going to be affected, but they would be the ones who would be able to order that.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Thank you.

I don't know where to start, but I'm

certainly glad that you presented the testimony today. I think that the testimony that was presented by the TWU in Altoona was excellent. I think that your testimony was excellent, and I think the people that are out there watching on the PCN Network certainly got an earful today.

What we would like to do -- and, Tom, if that's okay with you -- is reserve the right to come in and have some meetings down the track so to speak. I know there's stuff that our Committee did that Attorney Wilson wrote for us after our hearings as part of the Surface Transportation Agreement, and we're very much interested in following this and making sure that we get our "day in court."

And that leads me to the question: If you get an order from the Surface Transportation

Board that you don't agree with, what regress do you have? And is this -- if you want to say a little bit about the Dupont case, that would be okay also.

MR. EDELMAN: I'm not all that familiar with the Dupont case, per se. I am familiar with a lot of problems at the Surface Transportation Board. Let me say two things, one, as a technical matter, if we get a decision we don't like, we can appeal to a US Court of Appeals.

Two, this is another issue here, I think, and it's why we wrote the petition the way we did and where we started with. It's time for the Board to hold applicants in major rail consolidations accountable for the solemnly undertaken commitments that they make in seeking and obtaining STB approval of their transactions.

I would submit that this case presents an interesting test of whether that agency can do the job that it's supposed to be. And beyond the question of the court of appeals, there's the question of Congressional oversight committees, people that have to be concerned about whether or not this agency is actually doing its job. And I would think that were they not to do what needs to be done here, they would not be doing their job.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: We thank you very much.

MR. EDELMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Next up is Fran Horvath,
District Chairman, TCU.

Before you testify, I'd just like to say that Don Dunlevy that works this Committee pretty hard was to testify. And he got called to Washington D.C. today, and he'll be submitting his testimony in writing. Don is one my favorite Democrats because he

looks more Republican than a Republican.

So, Fran, you're on.

MR. HORVATH: Okay, this is very brief.

I want to thank you for allowing us to testify. This is going to be a hard act to follow because this statement is very brief.

I'm representing Division Chairman Dave
Bender, who works in the Altoona shop and he's
working today. This is a statement by our General
Chairman Tony Santoro.

The Transportation Communication Union actively participated in the Surface Transportation Board proceedings in the acquisition of Conrail.

Norfolk Southern began to work the Hollidaysburg shops on June the 1st, 1999. It is now clear that Norfolk Southern will not retain the shop in spite of what it represented to the Surface Transportation Board in seeking approval of the transaction.

Was it a coincidence that Congressman Bud Shuster resigned in January of 2001 and Norfolk Southern sprang into action in February of 2001? It's pretty plain that Norfolk Southern planned to do this even as it was saying otherwise at the Surface Transportation Board proceedings. I urge you to hold the Norfolk Southern Railroad to their word.

General Chairman Santoro is meeting in Washington. Vice General Chairman Larry Jones is meeting with Norfolk Southern in Norfolk today. And due to the sensitivity of many of the issues, I'd appreciate no questions because a lot would be speculation on my part. But I want to thank you sincerely for the hearings that you're holding.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: We certainly appreciate you and Dave Bender and everybody's help with this issue. In conclusion for the hearing today, I don't know where Dave Hoover's guy is that he had testify at the last minute in Altoona. I certainly miss him.

I think we've had a good day today. I think we brought a lot out, and I think that the public has learned this Committee's feelings on both sides of the aisle when it concerns what's happening. And we want to do the very best job that we can to ensure that Norfolk Southern keeps its promises. And its projections are a different thing, but we want to hold them to their promises.

And we want to thank everybody who has testified. If we need a third hearing, we plan on having it. I know that some of the people who have contacted this Committee who were queasy about testifying have come to me.

And if we find the need, then we will convene for a third time. If not, we will do everything we can to work with the Administration and those in front of the STB. And if that effort fails, then we have some efforts in Pennsylvania that we would like to try. We want to thank everybody, and this meeting is adjourned. (The hearing concluded at 1:25 p.m.)

1	I hereby certify that the proceedings and
2	evidence are contained fully and accurately in the
3	notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that
4	this is a correct transcript of the same.
5	
6	
7	Pamela S. Sullivan
8	Pamela S. /Sullivan Reporter-Notary Public
9	
10	NOTARIAL SEAL PAMELA S. SULLIVAN, Notary Public
11	PAMELA S. SULLIVAN, Notary Public Swatara Twp., Dauphin County My Commission Expires Jan. 31, 2005
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

\$	[2] 23:22 113:12	2
\$1.9	1.3	2
[1] 21:22	[1] 84:16 1.6	2 [2] 84:21 109:15
\$10	[1] 61:18	20
[1] 61:19	10	[7] 3:5 29:9 29:11 96:1 114:1 114:4
\$100 [4] 10:16 10:19 10:20 35:21	[5] 37:2 82:2 82:8 97:4 104.10	125:15 20,000
\$108	10-minute	[1] 84:16
[1] 28:15	[1] 82:3 100	2000
\$13	[2] 29:14 79:25	[14] 23:5 38:17 38:17 40:1 61:9 61: 19 62:8 63:21 83:12 95:5 95:25 96:5
[1] 15:19	10:08	113:13 125:17
\$13.5 [1] 23:8	[1] 1:13	2001
\$15	11.8-mile [1] 9:25	[5] 1:13 32.17 63:22 134:20 134:21
[2] 12:1 28:23	120	21 [2] 5:24 114:19
\$17	[1] 55:17	21.4
[1] 66:12 \$18	125	[1] 61:17
[2] 46:13 47:5	[1] 21:24 12th	22
\$19	[3] 21:10 21:15 54:7	[5] 20:25 36:23 47:4 66.19 95:24 22-month
[1] 28:19	13,000	[1] 21:17
\$2	[2] 125:11 125:21	220,000
[1] 30:11 \$208	134	[1] 84:15
[1] 28:12	[1] 3:10 142	2200 [1] 33:11
\$26	142 [3] 115:2 115:7 116:10	23
[2] 61:23 63:15	15	[4] 61:15 61:17 95.14 96:4
\$26.7	[2] 29:8 82:3	24
[1] 23.7 \$28	15,000	[1] 80:19 250,000
[4] 10:2 10:9 10:24 11:20	[1] 97:4 15-minute	[1] 36:18
\$30	[1] 82:2	26
[1] 35.8	155	[2] 1:13 3:6
\$32 [1] 28:20	[1] 84:11	265,000 [1] 84:15
\$342	16 [2] 3.4 103:19	275
[1] 28:11	17	[1] 114:25
\$4	[3] 18:15 47:6 66:10	3
[1] 100:22 \$47	17th	30
[1] 119:6	[1] 112:3 18	[2] 22:4 39:20
\$50	[2] 75:17 104:23	300
[1] 35:5	19	[2] 115:5 115:6
\$52 [1] 32:18	[1] 95:25	300-plus [3] 113:2 114:17 116:12
\$57	1936	300-something
[1] 44:14	[1] 127:23 1969	[1] 118:11
\$6	[1] 83:3	32
[1] 54:13	1976	[1] 83:6 330
\$6600 [2] 97:2 97:4	[1] 128:12	[3] 23:18 56:7 56:14
\$67	1977	34
[2] 5:21 47:1	[1] 125:11 1978	[2] 28:16 61:10
\$8	[2] 85:12 125:12	342 [1] 27:5
[1] 53:9 \$92	1986	342.8
192 [1] 31:8	[2] 85:15 99:8	[1] 21:16
	1994 [1] 85:15	344.7
'60s	1995	[1] 22:3 37.6
[1] 128:9	[3] 42:23 61:8 107:21	37.0 [1] 61:13
'70s	1997-1998	4
[1] 128:9	[1] 109:14 1998	
'77-'78 [1] 125:14	[3] 91:22 95:24 96:5	4 [2] 87:8 101:22
178	1999	4,000
[1] 125:22	[11] 25:4 28:8 29:8 29:11 42:24 44:	[1] 125:20
'95	13 64:3 93.12 95:25 113:12 134:15 19th	4,040 [1] 125:18
' [1] 61:19 '97-'98	[1] 53:4	400
[1] 125:25	1:25	[2] 84:10 118:10
1	[1] 136:9	43,000
	1st [5] 93:12 94:14 95:9 97:20 134:15	[1] 31:24 46
1	[0] 00.12 07.17 00.0 01.20 107.10	500 \$4 0 to 46

			WOLG THEOR (0) OF (20)
[6] 5:6 26:1 48:18	70:11 105 7 123:	[2] 15:19 56:4	86:18 86:20 88:24
18		Anticipate	Argue
Air		[2] 55:16 74.14	[2] 13:16 13:17
[1] 122:21		Anticipating	Argument
Airlines		[1] 79:13	[6] 13:16 109:10 118.12 121:13 121:
[1] 68:19	J	Antitrust	20 125:7
Airports		[3] 123:4 123:14 123:15	Arguments
[1] 68:19		Anyhow	[2] 111:24 124:5
Aisle		[1] 9:13	Arise
[1] 135:16		= =	[1] 127:20
Alabama		Anyway	
[1] 58:9		[1] 56:5	Arrangement
Alexandria		APL	[1] 25:19
		[1] 37:1	Arrogance
[1] 32:20		Apologize	[1] 111:1
Allentown		[2] 48:13 56:3	Arrogant
[1]_31:15		Apologized	[3] 18:14 19:15 112:9
Al low		[1] 46:10	Artery
[1] 31:16		Appalling	[1] 16:14
Allowed	l	[1] 50:13	Articles
[1] 35:14	ł	Apparent	[1] 111:6
Allowing			Aspersions
[1] 134.4		[1] 120:17	[1] 106:10
Almost		Appeal	
[6] 30:11 31:25 44	18 47:5 110:25	[1] 132:24	Aspiration
112:24		Appeals	[3] 101:18 102:9 118:16
Alone		[2] 132:25 133:11	Aspirations
[2] 24:24 44:13		Appear	[2] 103:13 121:9
	ì	[1] 83:25	Assembled
Also-rans	ł	Appearance	[1] 42:1
[1] 34:8		[1] 106:17	Assembly
Alternative		Appearances	[3] 6:13 45:5 49:21
[1] 37:6		[1] 51·3	Asserted
Altoona			[1] 112:21
[34] 4:5 5·13 6:16 19 16:10 21:10 23:	7:25 8.1 8.16 9	Appeared	Assertion
19 16:10 21:10 23:	16 23.25 24.9 47.	[1] 20.21	[1] 114:17
3 49:16 53.17 56:4		Applause	
78:15 84:1 98:9 99		[2] 76:25 77:11	Assertions
102:3 103:23 104:7		Applicable	[3] 113:9 119:12 122:14
121:4 132:3 134:8	135:12	[1] 89:5	Assessments
Altruistic		Applicants	[1] 91:3
[1] 33:5		[2] 124.18 133:4	Asset
Amazing	l	Application	[3] 34:24 39:22 92:14
[1] 13:22		[7] 101:2 103:12 103:15 104:12 108:	Assets
Amends		2 108:5 116:24	[3] 33:10 38:21 38:22
[1] 46:11		Applications	Assigned
America		[1] 107:24	[1] 83:13
[1] 38:5		Applied	Assistance
American	ŀ	[4] 53:2 53·5 55:22 88:12	[3] 10:7 10:8
[1] 45:21			1 [3] 10:7 10:7 10.8
Amount		Apply	Assistance-type
[11] 18:22 32:12 4	2.2 47.2 47.5 47.	[1] 123:25	[2] 10:7 10:8
8 76:5 85:6 124:23		Appreciate	Assisting
	123.4 120.3	[19] 16:8 16:18 17:2 17:14 19:18 20:	[1] 32:10
Amounts		4 53:20 58:17 65:6 65:12 72:22 73:	Associated
[2] 53:8 54:8		15 74:25 78:15 97:17 98:5 98:18 135:	[2] 26:16 33:12
Ample _		5 135:8	Association
[1] 130:9		Approach	[2] 6:24 25:15
Amtrak	1	[1] 31:1	Assume
[7] 73:23 74:1 74:	4 74:5 74:16 75:6	Appropriate	[1] 57:22
128:11	ł	[2] 19.24 52:25	Assurance
Analyses		Approval	
[1] 107:25		[15] 66.6 100.24 105:14 120:11 122:	[2] 82:14 85:19
Analysis		23 122:24 123:1 123:6 123:10 123:13	Assurances
[8] 78:22 87:15 88	:4 88:8 89:11 95:	123:16 123:23 126:11 133:6 134:18	[3] 59:10 102:16 102:23
22 108:9 112:8	†	Approve	Astonished
Analyzing	!	[2] 123:5 123:5	[1] 78:10
[1] 124:24		April	Astounding
Anderson		[5] 1:13 21:10 54:7 64:19 112:3	[1] 109:16
[1] 98:17	I	Arbitrary	Atlanta
Angles	1	[1] 10:15	[3] 35:22 45:22 56:21
[1] 93:19		Arbitration	Atmosphere
1 - 1		[5] 24:15 24:17 104.24 105.2 105:3	[1] 16:12
Announced		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Attach
[1] 55:12	I	Arbitrator	
Annually	i	[2] 128:21 128:24	[1] 106:5
[1] 31:24		Area	Attempted
Answer	<u> </u>	[11] 11:22 17:19 34:24 34:24 55:6	[3] 99:18 99:25 101:16
	22 46:25 53:25 97:	56:11 62:11 69:5 70:23 84:22 109:6	Attention
24 103:2 127:17 12	9.18	Areas	[1] 45:22
Answered		[8] 15:15 16:15 34:22 43:10 43:14	Attorney
	•		
			From Agreements to Attornev

[2] 98:12 132:11 **Attributable** [1] 110:5 Audits [1] 85:24 August [1] 131:9 Austrailian [1] 45:20 Authority [2] 86:16 87:24 Authorization [1] 122:18 **Available** [6] 28:2 33:22 35:19 67:7 70:24 107: Avenues [1] 86:1 Average [3] 24:21 24:25 29:8 **Avoiding** [1] 111:14 Award [2] 23:4 23:4 Aware [12] 24:12 43:8 43:16 45:18 49:7 76: 14 80:9 83:25 91:5 93:8 93:13 101:11

B&O [1] 8:3 **Background** [4] 52:6 79.24 83:1 83:16 **Backgrounds** [1] 49:7 Bad [3] 41:6 50:2 126:24 **Bailey** [1] 32:7 **Balance [5] 12:11 51:19 58:24 60:9 60:11 Baltimore** [1] 69:19 **Bananas** [1] 70:16 Bang [1] 12:12 **Bankruptcy** [1] 35:2 Bard [6] 2:13 52:3 52:10 52:11 52:16 53: 13 **Barely** [1] 109:3 Bargaining [2] 105:6 123:17 Base [1] 108:3 Based [17] 18:11 18:11 18:12 18:12 42:22 44:7 55:4 55:12 61:5 66:1 92:21 93: 14 97:8 108:8 109:13 113:6 120:3 Basic [5] 28:4 28:15 34:2 100:4 122:16 Battle [2] 40:19 40:20 Bearing [1] 43:17 Beating [1] 80:12 Beaver [6] 17:21 17:23 59:9 96:19 97:7 97: Became [5] 8:4 92:10 120:17 121:5 128:5

Become

[1] 90:19 **Becomes** [1] 60:14 Bed [1] 23:8 Befell [1] 64:10 Beforehand [1] 111:22 Began [4] 61:7 112:18 119:17 134:14 Beginning [1] 90:10 Behal f [1] 98:18 Behave [1] 41:8 Behind [1] 89:22 Beho1den [1] 34:23 **Belief** [3] 22:7 27:8 126:1 Bellevue [1] 56:18 Be low [1] 76:10 Bender [3] 97:1 134:8 135:9 Benefactor [1] 42:9 **Beneficiaries** [1] 78:3 Beneficiary [1] 102:20 Benefit [8] 12:7 32:24 39:21 59:13 60:23 102:7 123:23 126:10 **Benefits** [12] 24:7 24:10 24:13 40:4 54.9 111: 14 115:13 116:3 116:4 116:9 128:16 129:7 Benefitted [1] 64:18 **Besieged** [1] 80:19 Best [14] 5:5 5:6 10:23 12:12 16:25 17:3 54:21 57:12 76:2 87:3 97:19 104:12 131:10 135:17 Bethlehem [6] 36:14 36:16 44:14 44:23 46:7 50: Better [18] 4:7 4:21 5:7 15:4 29:4 29:18 29:21 31:20 39:6 74:25 76:4 81:10 81:16 85:19 90:1 93:4 114:4 122:2 [17] 34:10 46:15 47:10 48:6 62:7 63: 21 70:1 71:2 71:3 71:16 86:19 87:9 87:18 88:15 119:9 120:23 130:6 Beyond [4] 28:10 116:22 122:3 133:10 Bid [2] 34:13 34:19 **Bids** [1] 44:18 Big [6] 8:3 10:13 11:23 69:17 77:25 103: 16 Biggest [1] 69:23 Bi11 [1] 7:15 Binding

[4] 101:6 121:7 124:7 124.18

Bipartisan

[1] 19:20 Bit [8] 64:8 83:16 87:7 112:1 114:12 115:10 130:19 132:18 B1ack [2] 4:13 4:15 Blair [5] 62:11 64:24 65:11 66:3 103:3 **Blatant** [2] 18:14 19:15 B1ess [1] 7:11 B1 ond [1] 82:16 Bloodline [1] 11:21 BN [2] 91:3 91:6 **BNUP** [1] 87:6 Board [23] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: 21 47:24 54:17 55:21 66:7 67:9 81: 13 98:24 99:7 103:11 108:20 110:3 132:17 132:22 133:3 134:13 134:18 134:24 Board's [1] 101:6 **Boards** [1] 48:2 Body [2] 54:7 110:2 **Boilermakers** [1] 99:2 **Bonuses** [1] 64:10 Book [1] 5:16 **Books** [1] 40:16 Border [2] 32:20 43:10 **Bothersome** [1] 11:11 Bottom [6] 10:10 14:21 15:5 49:2 54:5 60:12 Bought [1] 115:23 Bound [3] 101:4 121:17 128:25 **Boxcars** [2] 38:7 38:14 Brand [1] 11:6 Breach [1] 107:9 Break [1] 82:6 Breakdown [1] 89:23 Bridge [3] 13:10 13:20 23:8 Bridges [3] 75:14 75:17 76:6 Brief [2] 134:3 134:6 Briefly [1] 95:19 **Bring** [7] 6:7 7:25 21:7 98:7 100:21 131: 11 131:14 **Broad** [1] 123:8 **Broadened** [1] 130:19 **Brother**

[2] 82:11 82:12

Cana1s

[1] 68:20

Candid

[1] 51:2

Candidly

Capability

[5] 40:11 40:12 47:2 78:12 107:13

[1] 80:22

Cannot

[1] 58:2

Capable

[1] 118:4

Capacity

Chain

ı	[2] 82:11 82:12	[11] 21:24 28:17 31:6 31:13 32.7 36:	Chair
ı	Brought	17 39:12 68:14 68:23 69:10 81:17	[1] 17:1
I	[1] 135:14	Capital	Chair m an
ı	Buck	[6] 10:7 14:6 18:23 40:9 60:5 63:3	[87] 2:2 4:1 4:20
ı	[1] 12:12	Capitalistic	21 8:24 9:9 13:4
•	Bucks	[1] 41:9	16:16 16:18 16:19
	[2] 69:21 69:21	Capitalize	17:14 17:25 18:4 20:13 20:19 23:12
	Bud	[2] 63:3 66:17	45:1 45:15 45:17
ı	[4] 59:17 59:19 59·22 134.19	Capitol	47.20 48:9 48:12
ı	Budget	[3] 1:9 84:4 120.1	52:2 52:4 55:25 5
I	[1] 14.6	Car	14 58:16 60:18 60
ł	BUGAILE	[25] 5:20 38.24 81:14 97:5 98:21	14 76:14 76:15 76
ı	[1] 2:18	100:20 102.2 103:22 104:18 107:12	11 82:17 82:22 83 15 99:19 114:6 11
ı	Build	108:13 108:14 109:9 110:9 112:7 112: 23 112:24 117:23 118:21 119:5 121:	117:16 129:19 129
۱	[1] 13:14	17 121:24 125:5 125:11 131:17	131:24 133:17 133
ı	Building	Card	134:10 135:1 135:
ı	[4] 11:6 22:8 22:10 75:13	[1] 123:24	Chairman's
ı	Built	Care	[2] 48:15 76:18
1	[2] 36.13 118:22	[1] 48·4	Chairmanship
ı	Bump	Career	[1] 120:19
ı	[1] 109:24	[2] 26:22 70.8	Challenge Challenge
ı	Bunch	Carefully	[1] 107:9
I	[1] 107:25	[1] 53:19	Challenging
l	Burlington	Carloads	[1] 90:21
ı	[3] 115:23 124:13 127:10	[1] 38:6	Chamber
ı	Business	Carolina	[1] 6:18
l	[60] 27:3 27:18 28:5 29:1 29:2 29.	[2] 56:19 115:20	Chambersburg
ł	12 30:3 30:15 31:1 31:9 33:8 33.14	Carrier	[2] 46:4 53:5
l	36:20 37:3 38:3 38:5 38:6 38:14 38:	[4] 33:9 39:13 39:23 71:1	Chance
ı	19 38:20 38:23 39:9 40:19 40:20 41 16 43:5 43:6 45:6 49:6 50:5 50:7 51:	Carriers	[1] 55:10
ı	14 53:22 54:21 62:22 63:20 72.11 72.	[3] 39:15 41:5 127:23	Change
I	12 72:15 72:18 77:8 80:14 82:23 85:	= = _	[7] 25:7 30:14 82
ı	18 94.22 95.17 106:18 106·22 107:2	Carrying	15 126:2
ı	107:5 109:14 110:4 110:20 111:4 111.	[2] 17:12 123.7	Changed
ı	5 111:18 122:16 123:20 123:21 123:22	Cars	[7] 65:21 81:6 10
ı	Businesses	[13] 21:25 21:25 29.7 84.16 97:1 117:20 117.25 118:2 118:22 125:18	126 9 126:10
ı	[6] 26:17 27:21 31:3 31:5 31.17 33:	125:20 125:21 126:3	Changes
ł		Case	[3] 41:15 53:22 1
	Butler	[8] 14:24 15:6 44:10 94.23 110:23	Changing
	[1] 11:14	132:19 132:21 133:8	[1] 37:25
ı	Buyers	Cases	Chapman
ı	[1] 55:15 Province	[2] 28:10 86:13	[1] 31:16
I	Buying [3] 44:6 44:7 44:16	Cast	Charge
İ	<u> </u>	[3] 89:4 92:17 106:10	[1] 120:12
l	Buyout	Caucus	Check
į	[1] 129:11	[2] 9:8 59:2	[2] 64:21 72:22
Į	Buyouts	Caused	Checking
l	[1] 39:25	[5] 35:5 36:13 64:10 69:4 77:17	[1] 11:3
l	Buys	Causes	Chemical
۱	[1] 44:11	[3] 77:21 88:10 89:22	[2] 63:1 63:10
l	С	Causing	Chemicals
ŧ		[1] 88.21	[3] 61:15 61:21 6
ł	Cable	Caveats	Chicago
ı	[2] 47:7 66:13	[1] 78:7	[2] 69:20 69:25
ı	California	Center	Chief
ı	[1] 35:17	[1] 22:17	[1] 102:12
ı	Campaign	Contoned	Choice
ı	[5] 100:24 101:21 119:17 119:21 121:	[1] 8:16	[1] 104:12
ı	2	Central	Choices
ı	Canada		[1] 118:11
ı	[1] 45:12	[3] 8.12 24:4 127:20	Chrysler
	Canadian	Centralized	[2] 70:17 72:14
	[1] 37:12	[3] 108:18 109:2 109:9	
1	Canale	l CEO	Circuitous

125:8

[1] 103:1

Certain

Certainly

Certified

[1] 84:12

Certify

[1] 137:1

[6] 50:5 50:6 107:1 108:23 124:23

[19] 8:9 15:22 17:1 26:7 47:2 49:7 49:18 59:1 65.5 65:6 65:12 69:22 98: 4 122:8 130:5 132:1 132:6 135:8 135:

[11] 21·24 28·17 31·6 31·13 32·7 36·

20 6:19 7:9 7:10 7: 4 14:12 14:13 14:17 19 16:23 16:24 17:6 4 19:10 19:18 20:12 12 26:10 42:15 43:21 7 46:12 46:20 47:9 2 49:12 49:14 52.1 56:2 57:15 58:13 58: 60:22 67:15 72:24 74: 76:19 81:21 82:7 82: 83:22 97:16 98:2 98: 114:11 117:8 117:11 29:22 129:24 130:21 33:19 133:20 134:7 5:2 135:8 р 82:22 87.3 120:9 122: 107:22 126:5 126:9 120:10 62:19 Circuitous [3] 11:16 12:3 12:4 Circumstance [1] 77:19 Circumstances [5] 107:13 111:3 122:15 125:25 126:5 Cite [2] 60:24 115:2 Cited [2] 63:7 110:4 Citizenry [1] 51:13 City

case	Compress
	[2] 32:5 69:25
	Claim [4] 111:17 114:16 116:13 124:21
	Claimed
	[1] 116:16
	Clarification
	[1] 14:19
	Clarify
	[3] 21:8 23:13 71:13
	Clarksburg
	[2] 9:25 10:1 Class
	[3] 23.4 25:19 90:20
	Clean
	[1] 64:8
	Clear
	[9] 19:5 19:12 20:7 22:5 24:12 52.6 105:18 126:20 134:15
	Clearfield
	[1] 8:10
	Clearly
	[7] 11.5 18:8 22:24 51:7 58:4 102:5
	117:15
	Clerical [2] 56:21 56:21
	[2] 56:21 56:21 Clerks
	[2] 114:22 114:23
	Clinton's
	[1] 85:16
	Clips
	[1] 4:4
	Close
	[5] 61:4 98:20 110:9 113:12 116:15 Closed
	[1] 121:24
	Closer
	[2] 30:18 61:3
	Closing
	[12] 41:19 51:15 55:14 65:1 107.6 107:11 113:6 116:14 116:17 122:20
	131:8 131:16
	Closure
	[2] 23:21 55:12
	C1ouds
	[1] 41:20
	Coaches [1] 84:18
	Coal
	[12] 8:19 11:13 31:23 32:6 34:16 38:
	12 38:23 61:20 61.21 62:19 63:11 64:
	19 Cooot
	Coast [3] 87:5 87:6 87:10
	Coin
	[1] 95:18
	Coincidence
	[1]_134:19
	Cold
	[1] 64:19
	Collapsed [1] 13:10
	Collective
	[2] 105:6 123:17
	Colloquy
	[1]_103:2
	Columbus
	[1] 56:18
	Combination [1] 52:22
	Combined
	[5] 35:10 37:16 41:25 90:15 128:11
	Coming
	[13] 7:23 10:11 22:4 50:17 53:17 53:
	23 59:16 68:24 69:4 69:7 72:16 77:9 98:11
	Commas

[1] 78:7
Commence
[1] 52:12
Commend
[1] 94:13
Comment
[4] 18:7 18:7 58:19 62:3
Comments
[15] 4:23 4:24 24:19 26:5 26:6 30:3
37:20 48:1 49:8 57:16 58:21 58:22
60:20 94:18 103:5
Commerce
+
[3] 6:18 37:5 99:9
Commercial
[3] 27:1 41:21 53:11
Commission
[2] 23:1 99:10
Commit
[2] 66:25 66:25
Commitment
[34] 13:23 14:3 22:4 22:6 22:23 25:
11 27:7 49:18 65:16 79:1 101:17 102
10 106:19 106:20 107:1 107:10 118:
15 120:15 120:15 120:21 120:24 121:
14 121:19 121:23 121:25 122:1 122:2
125:6 126:1 126:21 130:10 130:14
130:15 130:17
Commitments
[27] 1:5 4:10 4:11 5:18 42:20 47:13
48:23 49:1 49:3 49:8 49:17 51:18 61
25 62:6 62:8 62:11 65:24 66:2 66:15
101:4 105:21 112:23 116:24 122:12
125:7 130:3 133:5
Committed
[6] 21:16 33:18 80:20 97:21 102:1
104:18
Committee
[49] 1:5 4:8 4:25 6:10 7.5 7:9 7:15
7:17 13:4 17:1 19:22 19:25 20:20 23:
15 23:24 26:10 42:18 43:23 44:5 48:
10 48:23 50:10 51:3 65:6 67:19 69:8
72:23 74:1 75:8 75.21 83:23 88:4 89:
11 89:18 97:17 98:15 100:2 100:12
105:19 106:5 112:4 119:25 120:13
120:14 126:19 126:21 132:10 133:22
135:24
Committee's
[2] 98:19 135:15
Committees
[1] 133:12
Common
[2] 88:12 89:22
Commonwealth
[44] 1:2 20:24 21:6 21:17 22:5 24:
23 27:6 30:5 31:10 31:17 32:24 34:1
36:9 36:17 37:3 37:11 37:22 42:4 42
13 42:22 43:18 43:19 46:2 47:25 51:
11 51.13 51.19 52:19 55:13 62:2 63:
11 75:2 84:20 98:25 99:21 100:15
100:17 101:3 102:16 103:6 121:15
122:4 126:16 130:7
Communication
[4] 87:14 89:23 89:24 134:11
Communications
[3] 30:7 43:18 99:4
Communities
+ + +
[2] 15:10 100:18
Community
[5] 11:5 11:10 12:8 62:1 124:2
Commuter
[1] 75:3
Companies
[8] 17:11 32:25 33:19 39:25 41:3 41
10 44:7 44:8
Company
[19] 18:10 18:15 19:4 19:7 26:17 26
19 26:23 30:8 39:18 39:19 41:8 43:4
45:5 51:21 59:11 60:15 64:4 115:21
115:22
Company's
 - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

```
[1] 60:2
Comparable
[1] 103:25
Compare [2] 125:19 125:20
Comparison
[1] 125:23
Compe1
[1] 131:5
Compelling
[3] 18:5 19:11 37:22
Compete
[1] 68:3
Competing
[1] 75:23
Competition
[1] 34:15
Competitive
[2] 22:12 34:3
Competitors
[1] 34:13
Complaints
[1] 80:20
Complementary
[1] 33:2
Complete
[2] 68:17 107:6
Complex
[1] 30:20
Complexity
[1] 90:25
Compliance
[5] 82:14 84:25 85:10 85:19 90:23
Comprised
[1] 84:8
Comprises
[1] 95:6
Compromised
[1] 94:6
Computer
[2] 81:1 93:21
Con
[1] 31:21
Concentrating
[1] 104:4
Concept
[2] 30:18 118:22
Concern
[4] 10:13 12:15 73:24 91:11
Concerned
[18] 8:25 9:4 12:16 16:13 48:17 58:
22 60:13 73:14 73:20 74:21 74:22 85:
12 90:19 96:20 106:16 116:7 120:13
133:13
Concerning [8] 20:23 21:4 24:1 24.19 48:14 48:
16 129:25 130:2
Concerns
[5] 43:22 43:23 64:3 95:21 135:16
Conclude 1
[1] 65:18
Concluded
[1] 136:9
Concludes 5
[1] 129:17
Conclusion
[1] 135:10
Concur
[1] 112:8
Conditions
[10] 22:13 78:23 123:6 127:20 127:
22 128:4 128:7 128:8 128:9 128:14
Conduct
[1] 77:8
Conducted
[1] 85:24
```

[1] 105:9 Consolidating [1] 105:12 **Consolidation**

[1] 108:21

[1] 102:6

[1] 105:21

[1] 40:21

Consolidations 5 4 1

Constituencies

[2] 99:8 133:4

Constituted

Constrained

Consulting

[1] 30:16 Contact [1] 77:12 Contacted [1] 135:24 Contacting [1] 73:9 Contain [1] 103:17 Contained [2] 49:1 137:2 Containerized [1] 38:8 Containers [2] 26:14 68:23 Contemporaneous [2] 104:11 131:15 Context [4] 51:10 100:24 100:25 109:11 Continental [1] 44:25 Continually [1] 40:13 Continuation [1] 104:22 Continue [6] 39:5 40:4 40:20 41:11 42:8 90:11 Continued [3] 7:12 92:23 109:18 Continuing [1] 102:2 Contract [1] 47:22 Contradicting [1] 106:7 Contrary [1] 25:24 Contrast [1] 76:23 Contributed [1] 111:2 Contribution [2] 33:23 110:20 Control [2] 85:4 126:12 Controlled [1] 128:20

Convene

[1] 136:2

[1] 38:15

Conway

[1] 14:9

Cooperate

Cooperation

Cooperative

Coordinate

Coordinated

[2] 99:20 112:4

[1] 75:20

[1] 85:24

[1] 64:13

Copies

[1] 21:11

Corner

[1] 64:17

[1] 7:1

Corporate

Cope

Copy

[3] 8:23 25:11 86:4

[3] 86:19 87:21 88:14

Convenience

[2] 76:18 76:18

Conventional

[3] 17:23 96:16 97:13

Corporation [5] 6:1 54:20 61:4 106:13 108:10 Correct [4] 23:23 58:1 81:3 137:4 Corrections [1] 86:24 Correctly [1] 106:8 Correspondence [1] 130:2 Cost [11] 10:2 15:21 37:9 39:17 40:3 40: 9 41:23 57:2 57:3 75:13 116:18 Cost-cutting [1] 116:18 Cost/price [2] 40:17 41:14 Costly [1] 75:19 Costs [14] 32:6 38:1 39:19 39:20 39:21 39: 21 40:5 40:12 40:21 41:18 56:25 69: 21 76:5 129:10 Counteract [1] 41:7 Counties [2] 8:11 96:17 Counting [1] 82:10 Country [2] 87:4 88:25 Country's [1] 128:2 County [15] 8:11 9:23 17:21 17:23 18:2 31: **25** 59:9 62:11 64:24 65:11 66:3 71: 12 75:16 97:13 103:3 Couple [8] 23:13 42:16 60:25 68:12 83:17 97:1 111:8 127:14 Course [4] 24:16 97:14 121:6 124:19 Court [3] 132:14 132:25 133:11 Cover [5] 21:11 26:13 95:19 98:1 130:19 Covered [5] 4:14 38:7 38:14 93:19 96:12 Covering [1] 128:11 Crack [1] 76:16 Craft [2] 114:21 114:23 Crafts [2] 56:20 96:12 Crafty [1] 121:20 Craig [1] 130:22 Create [1] 32:23 Created [2] 83:11 115:2 Creates [2] 78:2 78:9 Creating [2] 128:25 129:1 Creation [1] 90:20 **Credibility** [10] 49:20 51:14 51:23 60:14 81:8 81:19 106:8 106:14 106:17 125:1 Crew

Word Index (7) of (29)

[2] 98:7 98:11

Crews

 		WOI'U 211UOX (0) 01 (20)
[1] 93:22	Dealing	[1] 40:6
Criteria	[5] 18:9 20:2 114:17 128:19 129:16	Demands
[2] 92:5 93:16	Dealings	[5] 29:2 40:4 40:12 42:10 84:25
Critical		Democratic
	[1] 127:1	
[3] 16:13 85:6 87:23	Deals	[5] 7:10 16:20 16:25 19:21 59:1
Crossed	[1] 114:21	Democrats
[1] 78:25	Dearborn	[1] 133:25
Crossings	[1] 95:7	Demonstrate
[4] 32:2 52.21 52:25 53.7		[1] 130:10
Crown	Debate	
	[1] 124:7	Demonstrates
[3] 22:18 26:17 72:2	Debt	[2] 13:11 18:9
Crown's	[1] 64:21	Department
[1] 72:11	Decatur	[3] 52:23 82:25 123:2
CSX		
	[2] 56:18 58:9	Deputy
[14] 28:23 34:8 34:8 34:16 35.25 40:	Decide	[1] 83:10
19 41:7 70:1 70:6 87:6 92:1 100:25	[2] 62:10 65:20	Derail
102:21 114:7	Decided	[1] 109:25
CSX/Norfolk		Derails
[1] 101:2	[1] 89:13	
CSX/NS	Decides	[1] 97:5
	[1] 69:17	Derived
[1] 99:11	Decision	[1] 54:10
CSX/NS/Conrail	[18] 21:21 24:14 54:1 55:0 81:4 85:	DERMODY
[2] 124:15 124:17	[16] 21:21 24:14 54·1 55:9 61:4 65: 10 65:24 65:25 66:24 79:2 106:18	[10] 2:10 56:1 56:15 56:24 57:5 57
Cubed	106:22 122:10 123:20 126:18 132:24	11 57:14 57:23 58:6 58:12
[1] 32:17		
	Decision-making	Describe
Culminates	[1] 66:24	[2] 79:18 79:19
[1] 105:16	Decisions	Described
Culmination	[7] 26:16 54:21 71:15 71:17 74:8 74:	[1] 111:5
[1] 101:21	15 108:13	Description
Cumberland	Decline	
	3	[1] 130:14
[1] 102:22	[1] 125:4	Design
Current	Declined	[2] 46:8 108.7
[4] 8:25 9:9 107:14 127:1	[1] 72:18	Designed
Customer	Declining	[2] 27:17 33:5
[8] 31:23 31:23 32:6 33:10 33:13 37:	[1] 107:5	
1 79:15 80:24		Despite
	Decreasing	[3] 25:24 36:25 41:19
Customers	[1] 39:22	Destination
[7] 34:23 38:25 64:8 70:1 80:5 117	Deem	[1] 51:15
25 118:1	[1] 19:24	Destinations
Cut	<u> </u>	
[2] 73:17 129:10	Deep	[1] 36:8
Cutbacks	[1] 64:11	Detail
	Default	[4] 21:12 21:19 43:3 99:15
[1] 118.9	[1] 39:15	Detailed
Cutting	Defects	[2] 65:7 67:3
[1] 116:18		
Cycle	[1] 99:18	Determine
[1] 41:12	Defend	[1] 69:23
[1] 41:12	[1] 105:24	Develop
D	Defense	[1] 76:17
	[1] 99:25	
D.C.		Developed
[2] 98:17 133:24	Deferred	[7] 22:20 87:18 88:19 91:13 91:17
Daily	[1] 55:14	92:20 109:17
	Deficiency	Developing
[1] 69:24	[1] 86:10	[2] 30:17 87:19
Damage	Define	Development
[1] 97:3		
DANTE	[1] 42:17	[2] 10:11 26:16
[1] 2:8	Defined	Devised
	[1] 42:18	[1] 128:10
Dark	Definition	Dick
[1] 41:19	[1] 130:20	[2] 2:5 129:22
B - 4 -	I	
Data		Die
	Degree	
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8	Degree [2] 40:3 40:22	[1] 15:7
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date	Degree [2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware	[1] 15:7
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware	[1] 15:7 Difference
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8 Dave	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2 Delayed	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9 Differences
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8 Dave [3] 134:7 135:9 135:11	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2 Delayed [1] 77:7	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9 Differences [3] 48:2 116:21 119:11
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8 Dave [3] 134:7 135:9 135:11 David	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2 Delayed [1] 77:7	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9 Differences [3] 48:2 116:21 119:11 Different
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8 Dave [3] 134:7 135:9 135:11 David [3] 2:15 4:22 25:17	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2 Delayed [1] 77:7 Delegation	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9 Differences [3] 48:2 116:21 119:11 Different [10] 43:14 85:2 87:7 104:4 106:22
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8 Dave [3] 134:7 135:9 135:11 David [3] 2:15 4:22 25:17 Day-to-day	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2 Delayed [1] 77:7 Delegation [2] 48:25 66:5	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9 Differences [3] 48:2 116:21 119:11 Different [10] 43:14 85:2 87:7 104:4 106:22
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8 Dave [3] 134:7 135:9 135:11 David [3] 2:15 4:22 25:17	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2 Delayed [1] 77:7 Delegation [2] 48:25 66:5 Deleterious	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9 Differences [3] 48:2 116:21 119:11 Different [10] 43:14 85:2 87:7 104:4 106:22 107:2 107:12 109:21 122:20 135:19
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8 Dave [3] 134:7 135:9 135:11 David [3] 2:15 4:22 25:17 Day-to-day [1] 30:7	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2 Delayed [1] 77:7 Delegation [2] 48:25 66:5 Deleterious [1] 77:7	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9 Differences [3] 48:2 116:21 119:11 Different [10] 43:14 85:2 87:7 104:4 106:22 107:2 107:12 109:21 122:20 135:19 Difficult
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8 Dave [3] 134:7 135:9 135:11 David [3] 2:15 4:22 25:17 Day-to-day [1] 30:7 Days	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2 Delayed [1] 77:7 Delegation [2] 48:25 66:5 Deleterious [1] 77:7 Delivered	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9 Differences [3] 48:2 116:21 119:11 Different [10] 43:14 85:2 87:7 104:4 106:22 107:2 107:12 109:21 122:20 135:19 Difficult [3] 39:9 39:11 53:20
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8 Dave [3] 134:7 135:9 135:11 David [3] 2:15 4:22 25:17 Day-to-day [1] 30:7 Days [1] 55:17	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2 Delayed [1] 77:7 Delegation [2] 48:25 66:5 Deleterious [1] 77:7	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9 Differences [3] 48:2 116:21 119:11 Different [10] 43:14 85:2 87:7 104:4 106:22 107:2 107:12 109:21 122:20 135:19 Difficult [3] 39:9 39:11 53:20 Difficulties
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8 Dave [3] 134:7 135:9 135:11 David [3] 2:15 4:22 25:17 Day-to-day [1] 30:7 Days [1] 55:17 De-bottlenecking	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2 Delayed [1] 77:7 Delegation [2] 48:25 66:5 Deleterious [1] 77:7 Delivered [2] 46:3 50:24	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9 Differences [3] 48:2 116:21 119:11 Different [10] 43:14 85:2 87:7 104:4 106:22 107:2 107:12 109:21 122:20 135:19 Difficult [3] 39:9 39:11 53:20
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8 Dave [3] 134:7 135:9 135:11 David [3] 2:15 4:22 25:17 Day-to-day [1] 30:7 Days [1] 55:17 De-bottlenecking [1] 28:17	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2 Delayed [1] 77:7 Delegation [2] 48:25 66:5 Deleterious [1] 77:7 Delivered [2] 46:3 50:24 Demand	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9 Differences [3] 48:2 116:21 119:11 Different [10] 43:14 85:2 87:7 104:4 106:22 107:2 107:12 109:21 122:20 135:19 Difficult [3] 39:9 39:11 53:20 Difficulties [1] 63:25
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8 Dave [3] 134:7 135:9 135:11 David [3] 2:15 4:22 25:17 Day-to-day [1] 30:7 Days [1] 55:17 De-bottlenecking [1] 28:17 Deal	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2 Delayed [1] 77:7 Delegation [2] 48:25 66:5 Deleterious [1] 77:7 Delivered [2] 46:3 50:24 Demand [7] 28:1 28:5 30:25 32:9 33:6 39:7	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9 Differences [3] 48:2 116:21 119:11 Different [10] 43:14 85:2 87:7 104:4 106:22 107:2 107:12 109:21 122:20 135:19 Difficult [3] 39:9 39:11 53:20 Difficulties [1] 63:25 Difficulty
[4] 71:20 97:9 107:21 108:8 Date [3] 21:8 121:23 131:8 Dave [3] 134:7 135:9 135:11 David [3] 2:15 4:22 25:17 Day-to-day [1] 30:7 Days [1] 55:17 De-bottlenecking [1] 28:17	[2] 40:3 40:22 Delaware [4] 70:18 70:23 70:25 71:2 Delayed [1] 77:7 Delegation [2] 48:25 66:5 Deleterious [1] 77:7 Delivered [2] 46:3 50:24 Demand	[1] 15:7 Difference [5] 15:20 46:15 47:10 54:7 119:9 Differences [3] 48:2 116:21 119:11 Different [10] 43:14 85:2 87:7 104:4 106:22 107:2 107:12 109:21 122:20 135:19 Difficult [3] 39:9 39:11 53:20 Difficulties [1] 63:25

Oddo Gompi Goo		WOT & THOOK (0) OT (20)
[1] 111:4 Digatas	[7] 24:22 25:1 29:22 31:13 66:11 69:	[1] 128:9
Digging [1] 129:13	Dominant	Earnings [1] 41:3
Dilemma	[1] 15:13	Easily
[1] 40.10	Don	[1] 80:25
Direct	[2] 133:22 133:25	East
[7] 12:4 12:4 13:15 19:5 26:18 31:3	Done	[5] 34:9 34:11 35:18 87:5 87:10
43:17	[18] 6.9 17:10 17:10 19:15 33:22 43: 17 72:19 81:9 86:25 99:13 107:7 108:	Eastern
Direction [1] 85:23	1 108:15 118:9 125:11 125:14 128.13	[4] 23:7 34:18 36:11 36:12
Directive	133:15	Easy {21 79:22 89:17
[2] 85:16 94:5	Donnelly	[2] 79:22 89:17 Ebbed
Directly	[1] 32:10	[1] 38:23
[3] 17:19 72:13 91:9	Double [5] 28.18 68:14 68:23 69:9 70:20	Economic
Director	Double-stack	[15] 27:20 42:23 43:2 63:25 64:20
[1] 83:9	[1] 35:19	64:22 65.8 65:13 66:1 66:24 67:4
Disagree	Doubt	109:18 109:24 110:10 111:20 Economics
[2] 54:9 60:10 Disappointed	[2] 89:19 122:4	[5] 64:25 65:20 69:15 69:22 71:1
[4] 6:19 16:9 16·12 51:1	Down	Economy
Disappointments	[26] 11:15 38:15 44:12 45:4 45:9 45:	[4] 41:9 62:15 94:22 110:5
[1] 41.4	10 50:11 50.25 59:5 70:19 70:25 72: 13 72:14 72.15 73:17 79:3 88.20 92:	Edelman
Disaster	20 95:13 95.14 96:14 101:16 118:10	[15] 3:9 98:12 98:14 98:16 114:9 114:14 117:10 117:12 117:17 129:24
[1] 110:25	131:12 131:15 132:9	114:14 117:10 117:12 117:17 129:24 130:5 130:24 131:3 132:20 133:18
Disclosure	Downs	Educational
[2] 13:7 127:3	[1] 55:7 Downturn	[1] 79:24
Discourse [1] 48:19	[3] 67:24 110:5 110:11	Effect
Discovered	Dramatically	[3] 25:20 56:22 77:8
[1] 117:1	[1] 25:3	Effective
Discretion	Draw	[1] 13:1
[2] 86:6 86:8	[1] 32 25	Effectively
Discuss	Drive	[3] 25:21 27:13 111:5
[1] 100:11	[2] 70:9 70:16	Effectiveness [1] 89.17
Discussed	Driven [1] 43:3	Efficiencies
[2] 31:19 101:10 Discussion	Drivers	[2] 5:8 104:3
[2] 80:2 80:16	[2] 73:9 73:19	Efficiency
Dispatching	Driving	[2] 25.7 31:4
[1] 22:17	[2] 70:18 73:10	Efficient
Dispute	Drop	[7] 11:19 12:2 13:15 31:22 41:11 71: 1 85:5
[3] 54:14 55:5 129:1	[3] 59:18 60:13 66:22	Effort
Distant	Due [3] 111:1 111.20 135:4	[13] 20:4 27:24 28:7 33:18 46:2 55:
[1] 24:9 Distinction	Dues	22 86:5 87:21 88:15 112:22 113:10
[1] 48:6	[1] 6:18	119:25 136:4
Distinguished	Duked	Efforts [11] 17:2 17:7 17:14 33:4 55:13 86:
[1] 83.23	[1] 35:2	19 94:13 95:16 113:7 113:24 136:5
Distractions	Dumb	Eight
[1] 94.14	[1] 101:16	[4] 36:20 110:6 113:20 116:15
District	Dumping	Eighty-five
[3] 8:9 59:21 133:20 Dividend	[1] 45.13 Dunlevy	[1] 128:1
[1] 41:17	[1] 133:22	Either [5] 13:7 35:19 47:18 55:14 77:9
Dividends	Dupont	Elaborate
[1] 64:9	[2] 132:19 132:21	[1] 99:17
Division	During	Elected
[3] 23:6 99 12 134:7	[10] 26:23 61:24 64:2 86.4 86:22 92:	[3] 49:6 119:22 121:10
Divisions	1 101:7 121:6 124:19 125:17 Duty	Electrical
[1] 95:7 Dock	[3] 78:2 78:4 78:9	[2] 43:19 99:2
[20] 24:2 24·3 24:6 24.10 24:13 24:	Dwe11	Elements
19 24:20 57:2 57.4 57:7 104:24 115:	[1] 29:10	[3] 87:13 87:16 88:12 Eliminate
10 115:11 127:15 127:19 127:21 128:	Dwindle	[1] 31:25
7 128:14 128:16 129:6	[1] 15:7	Eliminated
Document [2] 92:17 114:19	Dwindled	[1] 90:12
Documentation	[2] 125:13 125:15 Dwindles	Élimination
[4] 46:21 46:22 51:4 130:2	[1] 12:24	[1] 53:6
Documented		E1k
[1] 22:20	E	[1] 8:11
Documents	E-A	Ellen
[5] 55:20 130:8 130:13 131:2 131:15	[1] 1.10	[2] 2:13 52:2 Embarrassed
Dollar [1] 61:10	Earful	[1] 112:15
Dollars	[1] 132:6 Early	Emphasize
5011413	Luity	
		From Dig to Emphasize

Case	Compress
	[1] 96:22
	Employee
	[7] 88:8 88:21 89:10 89:16 94·16 95:
	Employees
	[16] 23:18 24:2 24:8 24:15 24:23 55:
	1 56:13 84:15 86:2 88:11 100:19 113:
	2 114:17 114:18 125:22 129:4
	Employees'
	[1] 94:10 Employment
	[3] 100:22 102:4 104:20
	Enacted
	[1] 128.5
	Encourage
	[1] 42:6
	Encouraging
	[2] 16:1 16:2
	End [11] 30:10 30:20 32:17 35:4 55:23
	62:13 94:22 121:23 122:2 126:17 131:
	8
	Ended
	[1] 121:14
	Endorsements [1] 29.25
	Energy
	[2] 32:10 43:19
	Enforce
	[1] 90:23
	Enforcement
	[1] 86:5
	Engage [2] 67:11 129:11
	Engaged
	[1] 110:2
	Engine
	[1] 96:13
	Enhance [3] 14:9 51:23 52:24
	Enhanced
	[1] 42:21
	Enhancement
	[1]_21:23
	Enlighten
	[2] 54:1 68:2 Enola
	[6] 21:23 22:15 30:12 30:19 50:14
	127:4
	Enormous
	[1] 44:11 Engure
	Ensure [7] 27:18 28:25 33:16 33:19 76:3 94:
	4 135:18
	Ensuring
	[3] 22:1 75:13 97:21
	Enter [2] 86:17 89:14
	Enterprise
	[1] 124:4
	Enthusiastic
	[1] 41:21
	Entire
	[3] 62:2 77:5 109:25 Entirely
	[2] 107:12 109:20
	Entities
	[4] 7:1 44:25 90:15 106:13
	Entitled
	[2] 128:23 129:6
l	Entity
	[1] 46:9 Entry
1	[1] 62:15
	Environment
	[4] 34:4 63:20 97:12 123:21

```
[1] 43:20
Environments
[1] 39:10
Equipment
[7] 38:15 38:21 39:2 39:6 64:12 85:
3 97:3
Eric
[3] 2:18 4.16 82:2
Erie
[2] 28:22 53:3
Especially
[2] 41:24 101:5
Essence
[1] 125:6
Essentially
[4] 113:15 113:18 116:8 128:12
Establish
[2] 25:18 57:2
Established
[3] 22.10 52:22 83:11
Estimate
[1] 75:3
Etc
[10] 59:14 59:14 59:14 63:2 71:19
71:19 71:19 81:14 81:15 81:15
Evaporated
[1] 93:14
Eventually
[1] 12:24
Everywhere
[2] 90:4 121:3
Evidence
[1] 137:2
Evolutionary
[1] 87:3
Evolved
[1] 35:11
Exactly
[3] 69:7 72:19 91:18
Example
[4] 7:25 9:20 9:21 50:9
Examples
[5] 34:5 62:18 62:18 63:6 118:16
Exceed
[2] 24:10 57:4
Exce1
[1] 28:10
Excellent
[5] 7:21 103:22 103:22 132:3 132:4
Exceptional
[1] 95:16
Excess
[1] 65:3
Excuse
[1] 114:6
Excused
[1] 107:20
Executing
[1] 123:9
Executive
[1] 102:13
Exercise
[1] 86:5
Exhibit
[5] 101:22 102:18 104:10 104:23 114:
[5] 34:15 35:20 35:25 116:23 131:2
Existing
[2] 32:25 68:11
Expand
[10] 31:5 31:6 31:8 31:13 31:17 33:
6 33:16 33:19 95:3 100:21
Expanded
```

Environmental

```
[3] 35:3 35:6 35:15
Expanding
[2] 33:22 50:14
Expansion
[8] 9:22 9:24 15:9 28:17 32:11 34:1 37:17 51:18
Expansive
[1] 34:17
Expect
[2] 37:24 42:11
Expectation
[1] 101:17
Expectations
[5] 42:25 93:13 106:25 109:13 114:4
Expected
[5] 22:21 42:22 47:1 66:20 93:11
Expecting
[2] 73:15 94:8
Expects
[2] 37:17 118:22
Expenditures
[1] 22:14
Expenses
[2] 111:13 129:12
Experience
[2] 18:12 77:12
Experienced
[4] 55:16 61:23 64:1 95:7
Experiencing
[2] 64:6 64:14
Explain
[6] 60:25 69:8 83:19 112:14 131:12
131:13
Explained
[3] 50:4 50:23 104:1
Explaining
[1] 110:6
Explanation
[1] 67:4
Explanatory |
[1] 4:6
Explicitly
[1] 119:5
Express
[1] 78:12
Expressions
[1] 120:5
Extended
[1] 127:16
Extending
[2] 24:4 83:24
Extension
[1] 13:9
Extent
[5] 55:22 67:3 106:23 111:16 111:19
Extracted
[1] 62:18
Extreme
[3] 39:16 39:23 63:25
Extremist
[1] 115:21
Eye
[1] 22:20
                F
Face
[4] 18:17 18:18 53:21 100:10
```

```
[4] 18:17 18:18 53:21 100:10

Facilitles
[19] 23:21 33:12 43:15 62:24 63:1
63:1 63:4 63:9 64:24 65:11 65:19 66:
11 66:17 66:18 68:7 75:18 102:21
103:23 103:25

Facility
[12] 32:4 32:13 35:8 35:22 36:13 50:
14 61:5 65:25 71:5 108:16 109:3 109:
```

		MOTO BINGON (11) OT (20)
Fact	[16] 19:1 23:1 47:15 52:23 53:2 53:	84:1 84:2 84:3 84:4 88:18 89:10 89:
	5 59:3 60:4 76:9 81:13 82:15 85:1	14 90:10 91:20 93:5 93:6 94:19 95:
[18] 13:17 16:2 24:9 41:15 50:7 62: 21 70:13 73:2 73:16 79:24 84:4 95:	86:14 86:16 122:25 123:12	10 95:11 95:12 100:25 105:24 109:24
21 /0:13 /3:2 /3:16 /9:24 64:4 95:		112:21 119:17 120:17 124:22 127:19
10 106:6 110:24 114:2 121:13 125:10	Feed	
128:19	[2] 8:6 8:21	Firsthand
Factor	- -	[1] 17:18
	Feeder	
[1] 111:21	[1] 15:8	Fits
Factors		[1] 10:21
	Feelings	
[3] 42:23 43:20 69:23	[2] 7:22 135:15	Five
Facts	Felt	[6] 61:14 61:22 62:7 75:3 85:1 88:20
[1] 126:23	[1] 44:15	Five-year
Factually i	Fender	[3] 61:14 61:22 62:7
1 40 444.00		Fixed
[1] 111:25	[1] 96:25	
Fails	Few	[2] 80:25 81:1
		Fixture
[1] 136:4	[11] 11:2 18:13 21:3 38:24 87:10 87: 15 91:6 99:17 101:14 117:14 127:17	
I Failure	15 91:6 99:17 101:14 117:14 127:17	[1] 93:9
		Flacks
[1] 106:24	Fewer	
I Failures	[1] 38:21	[1] 131:13
[3] 39:25 89:22 111.11		Flat
	Fiber	
l Fair	[4] 32.15 32:19 47:7 66:13	[1] 106:6
[1] 13:16	Field	Fleet
Fairchild	[2] 83:9 85:22	[1] 39:6
[6] 2:12 14:15 14:18 14:25 15:17 48:		Flexibility
	Fight	
11	[1] 25:18	[1] 40:24
Fairless		Flowed
[1] 31:15	Fighting	[1] 38:23
	[1] 6:4	
Fairly		Fluidity
[2] 47:4 93:12	Figured	[1] 29:11
	[3] 67:20 93:18 94:7	<u> </u>
Fairness		Focus
[1] 49:9	Figures	[3] 22:25 33:3 99:24
	[3] 55:4 61:8 95:11	
l Faith I	File	Focused
[10] 111.23 112:22 113:6 113:10 114:	ן דוופ	[3] 7:24 85:9 121:12
[10] 111.23 112:22 113:0 113:10 114:]	[2] 4:19 86:9	
16 116:10 116:13 120:5 126:24 129:16	Filed	Folks
i Fall i		[6] 8:1 9:11 13:13 55:10 71:16 71:17
	[7] 48:1 55:20 112:2 114:23 116:23	
[1] 25:3	126:15 126:15	Follow
l False I		[7] 55:3 67:18 112:22 113:4 113:10
	Files	114:18 134:5
[5] 112:16 113:9 116.12 121·20 125:	[2] 88.16 89:15	
22		Follow-up
Familiar	Filing	[3] 15:18 55:3 67:18
	[6] 67:9 104:11 106:2 112:18 114:24	
[4] 99:13 119:15 132:20 132:21		Following
Family	126:16	[7] 23:15 23:21 23:25 26:6 31:12 34:
	Filings	[/] 23:13 23:21 23:23 20:0 31:12 34:
[3] 83:5 115:18 115:20	[4] 113:1 119:24 125:9 129:9	5 132:13
l Far		Follows
	Film !	
[9] 15:21 22:1 24:10 39:5 49:24 69:	[1] 4:4	[1] 33:10
15 80:12 96.19 116:7		Fond
l Fast	Filmtech	
	[1] 31:15	[1] 103:12
[3] 22:13 75:17 81:14		Force
Fast-moving	Final	[7] 15:13 57:18 57:25 58:4 107:5
	[7] 15:24 33:21 33:23 37:20 66:6 71:	
[1] 22:13		111:12 118:10
Faster	17 126:14	Forces
	Finally	
[1] 40:5		[4] 37:23 37:24 43:2 129:12
Fastest	[1] 124:21	Forever
	Finances	
[3] 35:18 41:22 131:20		[1] 107:7
Fastest-moving	[3] 64:25 65:21 126:9	Forfeited
	Financial	
[1] 131:20		[1] 79:2
Fatalities	[11] 39:10 39:11 65:7 65:9 65:14 66:	Forget
	23 67:4 78:22 107:14 107:25 111:3	
[3] 88:10 88:22 91:7	Findings	[1] 68:4
Fatality		Form
	[2] 86:22 92:3	
[5] 88:4 88:9 89:10 89:17 94:16		[2] 41:23 122:17
Fate	Fine	Formal
	[2] 78:8 109:17	
[1] 72:13		[2] 91:23 120:25
Father	Finest	Format
	[1] 117:4	
[1] 83:4		[1] 90:14
i Fault	Finger	Formed
	[1] 12:23	
[2] 47:2 107:15		<u>[</u> 1] 94:3
Favor	Fingers	Former
	[2] 8:5 13:2	[3] 24:22 29:18 82:17
[1] 9:12	Finished	
Favorite		Formerly
[1] 133:25	[1] 81:24	[1] 34:19
	Firm	
i Fe		Fort
[4] 91:4 115:23 124:13 127:10	[1] 98:16	[1] 26:18
·	Firmly	
Fear		Forthcoming
[1] 59:21	[1] 89:24	[1] 27:11
	First	
ı February		Forthright
[1] 134:21	[41] 4:3 7:16 16:24 34:6 38:2 38:10	[2] 51:2 51:6
	38:16 38:17 38:17 42:16 55:7 64:15	
Federal	64:16 64:18 64:19 76:16 80:18 83:2	Forward
	04.10 04:10 04:13 /0:10 0U:10 03:2	<u> </u>
		From Fact to Forward

	Compress	
	[5] 20:5 20:10 37:24 48:23 75:7	[1] 104:13
1	Foster [3] 33:19 42:4 86.4	Furloughed [2] 129:2 129
	Fostering	Future
1	[1] 87:22 Fosters	[13] 22:7 22: 10 75:5 78:15
	[1] 78:4	24 127:9
	Four	Futuristic
	[2] 36:4 45:4 Fourth	[1] 118:21
Í	[1] 40:1	Code
	Foxworthy's	Gain [3] 61:13 119
	[1] 5:16 FRA	Gained
	[41] 82:17 82:18 82:24 83.7 83:9 83:	[3] 61:12 61:
	16 83:20 83:24 84:7 84:10 84:12 84: 21 84:22 85:1 85:12 86:5 87:18 88:6	Gaining [1] 61:3
	88:15 89:25 90:12 90:18 90:22 91:2	Gains
	91:13 91:17 91:22 92:8 92:12 92.14 92.19 92:24 93:5 94.5 94.8 94.12 95:	[2] 37:18 84: Game
1	13 96:6 97:18 97:18 97:20	[1] 11:1
	FRA's [3] 86:15 90:3 97:1	Gathered
	FRA-certified	[1] 86:11 Gee
	[1] 84:12	[1] 118:25
	Frame [1] 63:16	Geist
	Framed	[41] 2:2 4:1 16:19 17:15 1
1	[1] 77:20 Framework	45:1 45:17 46 48:9 49:12 52
1	[1] 81:9	81:21 82:7 82
	Fran	117:8 117:11 129:25 130:21
1	[3] 3:10 133:19 134:2 France	135:8
	[1] 45:12	GENE [1] 2:19
1	Franchise	Genera1
	[2] 27:8 41:25 Frank	[23] 6·13 17: 21 62:14 63:1
J	[3] 2:10 51:5 55:25	107:19 109:12
	Frankly [2] 19:15 100:2	111:20 119:25 135:1 135:2
1	Free	Generally
	[7] 77:24 77:25 78.24 122:15 123:20 123:25 124:3	[5] 40:25 41: Generated
1	Freight	[1] 64:1
	[12] 10:8 21:23 22:13 22:21 33:6 33:	Generating
1	6 70:12 72:7 72:10 84:16 84:17 85·14 French	[1] 10:2 Generation
	[5] 45:9 45:20 50:12 50:15 50:21	[1] 57:20
1	Frequency [2] 74:9 74:19	Generation
	Front	[1] 32:5 Generation
	[6] 6:3 59:3 59:8 62:13 112:13 136:4	[1] 58:8
i	Fronts [1] 43:14	Gentle [1] 7:18
	Frustration	Gent1emen
	[1] 50:17	[3] 49·15 58:
ł	Fuel [2] 39:19 40.5	Georgia [3] 35:22 56:
	Fulfill	Get-out-of
ŀ	[2] 79:8 105:22 Full	[1] 123:24
ł	[8] 13:6 37:4 57:11 99:20 101:9 108:	Given [8] 8:22 9:7
	4 112:4 113:16	4 127:5 128.1
1	Fully [6] 42:22 43:16 78:12 99:12 101:11	Glad [4] 14:12 127
1	137:2	Glitches
1	Fund [1] 10:9	[1] 93:11 Gool
1	Fundamentally	Goal [2] 87:21 89:
1	[2] 30:14 37:24	Goals
	Funding [2] 40:7 52:18	[1] 92:13 God
ı	Funds	God [1] 7:11
	[2] 10:12 68:25	Gondolas
	Funny	[1] 38:7

```
9:3
:21 23:17 27.9 60.17 71:
5 78:18 93:9 100:6 115:
     G
9:21 120:6
17 104:4
24
4:20 14.13 14:17 16:16
17:25 20:13 42:15 43:21
6:12 46:20 47:9 47.20
2:2 55:25 58:14 67:15
2:11 98:2 114:6 114:11
117:16 129:19 129:22
1 131:24 133:17 133:19
:9 20·17 45:5 47:7 49:
13 88·24 105:25 106:11
2 110:4 110:6 110:21
5 123.19 126:13 134:9
1 63:9 78:24 99:15
g
n
n's
ns
:16 78:16
:19 68:4
f-jail-free
35:5 106:12 111:24 113:
7.17 129:18 132:1
:23
```

```
Word Index (12) of (29)
Gons
[1] 38:14
Goode
[14] 4:22 25:17 49:17 102:13 102:18
103:7 103:10 103:18 119:14 120:23 122:6 130:4 130:6 131:11
Goode's
[2] 105:16 129:25
Goods
[2] 77:9 77:9
Government
[10] 18:19 18:20 18:22 19:2 20:1 59:
4 60:4 85:17 123:12 123:23
Governor
[8] 6:1 18:17 18:25 19:5 19:13 33.2
59:5 60:6
Grab
[1] 82:4
Grade
[5] 32:1 52:20 52:25 76:10 76:11
Gradina
[1] 79:22
Grandfather
[1] 83:4
Granted
[1] 11:15
Great
[4] 5.9 5:11 38:18 116:3
Greater
[2] 11:22 30:21
Grew
[1] 92:9
Ground
[3] 11:9 41:23 97:1
Grounds
[1] 123:4
Grow
[1] 27:15
Growing
[1] 63:20
Grown
[4] 70:3 72:12 72:17 85:14
Grows
[1] 27:18
Growth
[9] 27:20 27:24 32:3 33:4 42:5 64:
22 84:23 109:18 109:23
Guess
[12] 14:19 14:23 48:16 49:23 57:5
72:21 82:22 88:6 90:12 93:20 115:5
128:16
Guided
[2] 86:16 87:11
Guy
[3] 77:25 78:24 135:11
Guys
[3] 7:17 81:22 118:25
                   Н
Half
[16] 11:25 12:6 13:20 23:6 23:7 24:
22 25:1 31:12 44:24 44:24 61:10 66:
10 90:6 93:15 110:16 113:14
Hand
```

[11] 29:19 57:17 68:14 75:1 75:7 76: 8 77:10 79:11 80:5 80:6 97:24

[2] 12:24 13:1 Handle

[2] 26:15 37:2 Handled [1] 34:12 Hand1ing

[2] 22:20 31:6 Hands [1] 118:13 Нарру

Hard

[1] 129:3

Case	Compress
	[10] 16:7 45:6 51:21 55:19 66:11 75: 6 81:7 81:18 133:23 134:5
	HARPER
	[4] 2:11 53:16 55:2 82:9 Harriman
	[1] 23:4
	Harrisburg
	[20] 1:10 17:2 22:16 23:6 28:19 30: 13 32:20 35.10 35:11 69:5 69:6 70
	12 70:15 70:19 71:2 71.3 71:4 71:8 95:6 120:1
	Harrisburg's
	[1] 36:10
	Haulage [1] 15:3
	Hauls
	[1] 41:24 Hazardous
	[1] 85:3
	Head [1] 72:17
	Headquarters
	[4] 22:17 84:21 85:22 106:12 Healthy
	[2] 25:17 64:4
	Hear
	[9] 6:20 6:21 48:17 53:23 76:21 77: 2 77:10 77:14 115:22
	Heard
	[14] 21:9 46:19 47:1 88:5 92:18 98: 18 104:23 105:17 108:19 108:19 112:
	20 117:17 119:8 122:6
	Hearing [17] 5:13 6:8 24:13 48:14 50:3 53:
	17 56:4 99:17 100:4 101:10 102:15 106:1 109:21 122:20 135:10 135:22
	136:9
	Hearings [8] 4:8 17:17 43:22 108:20 110:16
	120:20 132:11 135:7
	Heart [4] 6:16 8:3 51:20 117:5
	Heaven's
	[1] 78:16 Heavily
	[2] 107:18 123:22
	Heavy [3] 108:14 108:18 119:5
	Heck
	[1] 4:21
	Held [4] 4:8 42:25 43:22 86:2
	Help [8] 12:5 33:19 68:10 73:15 74:24 81.
	20 84:13 135:9
	Helped
	[1] 72:25 Helpful
	[1] 73:8
	Helping [1] 60:5
ı	Hereby
	[1] 137:1 HESS
	[3] 2:5 129:23 130:25
	High [1] 77:15
	High-level
	[1] 106:14
	Higher [4] 27:13 27:14 27.14 128:12
	High1ight
	[3] 25:7 99:23 101:15 Highlighted
	[1] 62:20
	Highly [1] 37:10

Highway [2] 27:19 36:19
Highways
[6] 68:16 68:20 70:21 72:9 73:3 73:
22 Hill
[1] 120:1
Himself [1] 131:14
Hiring
[1] 83:2 Historical
[2] 85:25 90:18
History [4] 38:18 57:18 95:8 127:16
Hit
[1] 6:18
Hold [5] 20:9 110:16 133:4 134:24 135:20
Holding
[1] 135:7 Hollidaysburg
[31] 5:20 23:19 24:2 47:6 51:7 53:
25 54:14 56:8 57:17 65:2 78:11 96: 16 98:21 98:24 100:3 100:20 102:1
102:2 103:23 104:7 104:18 105:7 107: 12 110:8 110:9 112:7 117:9 117:23
121:17 131:17 134:14
Home [1] 18:2
Homer
[1] 32:5
HON [24] 2:2 2:3 2:4 2:5 2:6 2:7 2:8 2:
9 2:10 2:11 2:12 2:13 2:14 2:15 2: 16 2:17 2:18 2:19 2:20 2:21 2:22 2:
23 3:3 3:4
Honest [2] 14:7 77:1
Honestly
[1] 79:19
Honor [1] 62:10
Hoover's
[1] 135:11 Hope
[10] 6:8 7:11 7:17 7:21 59:15 74:2
79:15 81:7 101:17 105:3 Hopeful
[2] 16:9 16:11
Hopefully [1] 60:16
Hoping
[1] 16:3
Hoppers [2] 38:7 38:14
Horvath
[3] 3:10 133:19 134:3 Host
[2] 43:10 64:12
Hour [1] 73:11
Hours
[2] 80:19 81:2 House
пои se [4] 1:2 7:17 9:7 18:6
Hub
[5] 22:2 35:12 36:12 71:16 73:24 Huge
[1] 43:24
Humor [1] 130:22
Hundred
[6] 59:9 78:14 78:17 78:18 83:14 122:5
Hundrada

Hundreds

```
Hvperbole
[1] 78:16
                 Ι
ICC
 [2] 128:3 128:8
 Idea
 [5] 43:12 69:13 84:7 89:20 117:19
 Ideas
 [1] 76:13
 Identification
 [1] 87:19
 Identify
 [1] 86:12
 Ianored
 [2] 110:19 122:16
Illinois
 [3] 56:19 58:9 68:4
 Illustrative
 [1] 118:16
 Imagine
 [1] 15:4
 Immediately
 [1] 120:21
 Immunity
 [5] 123:7 123:15 123:15 123:18 124:1
 Impact
 [6] 11:4 11:9 17:19 37:21 69:17 127:
 Impacts
 [1] 27:1
 Implementation
 [4] 105:1 107:16 110:22 110:25
 Implications
 [1] 51:10
 Importance
 [1] 8:15
 Important
[20] 8:14 8:17 13:3 15:12 15:14 17:
17 17:24 27:24 37:5 37:18 54:23 55:
 1 60:15 75:5 87:25 90:2 91:20 101:
 19 104:3 126:25
 Imposed
 [1] 128:8
 Improper
 [1] 112:11
 Improve
 [7] 28:6 30:25 31:2 31:4 42:4 75:22
 80:3
 Improved
 [8] 25:3 25:10 29:7 29:9 29:11 29:
 14 37:14 85:12
 Improvement
 [2] 13:11 30:9
 Improvements
 [10] 10:17 28:19 28:20 30:2 30:5 30:
6 39:3 40:22 66:12 76:22
 Improving
 [4] 27:25 28:2 28:12 31:1
 Incentive
 [1] 33:15
 Incentives
 [3] 31:8 32:3 37:16
 Include
 [3] 31:11 34:5 56:25
 Included
 [2] 32:3 104:14
 Includes
 [1] 28:15
 Including
 [3] 31:14 35:16 99:8
 Incompetence
 [1] 111:1
 Incompetent
 [1] 107:15
```

```
Inconsequential
[21 47:8 66:14
Inconsistent
[1] 112:12
Incorrect
[2] 111:25 127:21
Increase
[12] 21:24 32:9 32:12 40:4 40:21 61:
23 62:6 63:15 63:18 74.1 74:9 114:5
Increased
[3] 31:18 36:16 84:24
Increases
[2] 22:21 39:19
Increasing
[3] 32.7 40:8 72.6
Incredible
[2] 41:25 42:3
Incurred
[1] 129:12
Indeed
[3] 49:3 57:1 70:3
Indiana
[4] 9.23 11:15 13:9 31:25
Indicate
[1] 76:22
Indication
[1] 22:5
Indications
[1] 81:6
Indirectly
[1] 119:24
Individual
[1] 125:10
Individuals
[2] 84:2 84:19
Industrial
T11 38:5
Industries
[4] 8:20 12:9 31:14 122:25
Industry
[25] 5:1 8:19 23:3 25:18 33:8 33:9
39:13 39:23 39:24 43:24 44.1 44:19
53:21 62:20 62:22 83:7 85:20 87:9
87:10 88:23 90:18 93:6 95:4 97:21
126:13
Industrywide
[1] 38:25
Inefficient
[1] 11:17
Infer
[1] 121:15
Inflation
[1] 40:5
Inflicted
[1] 111:19
Influence
[1] 67:11
Information
[15] 6:9 20:23 21:4 26:6 50.2 51:22
52:6 54:16 65:8 67:12 74:25 81:20
86:11 113:25 126:7
Infrastructure
[10] 28:16 28:21 32:24 40:15 43:15 62:24 73:1 118.5 118:6 118:8
Initial
[2] 65:24 85:21
Initiate
[1] 89:10
Initiated
[1] 91:23
Initiative
[3] 30:14 30:20 91:14
Initiatives
[2] 33:3 75:4
Injuries
[5] 95:5 95:13 95:14 96:11 96:11
```

```
Inquiring
[1] 11:3
Inquiry
[1] 98:20
Insofar
[1] 77:20
Insourcing
[7] 54:6 54:10 55:15 104:5 113:25
114:1 117:23
Inspections
[1] 85:9
Inspector
[1] 83:9
Inspectors
[5] 84:10 84:12 85:22 92:10 92:12
Installed
[1] 50:24
Instance
[1] 71:12
Instead
[1] 107:5
Insurance
T11 39:21
Integration
[1] 91:16
Intended
[1] 23:10
Intent
[2] 47:23 102:9
Intention
[1] 22:10
Intentions
[1] 97:19
Interest
[5] 9.2 23:14 52.5 54:22 91:1
Interested
[1] 132:13
Interesting
[7] 116:17 117:18 121:18 125:3 126:
2 130:14 133:9
Interests
[1] 9:18
Intermarketing
[1] 21:5
Intermodal
[32] 20:16 21:2 21:5 22:15 22:16 26:
4 26:11 29:13 29:17 34:7 34:10 35:8
35:11 35:12 35:15 35:22 35:24 36:4
36:13 36:17 36:20 36:22 36:25 37:3
37:4 37:7 37:9 38:13 70:2 70:4 70:
24 73 24
Internal
[3] 73:18 78.22 88:17
International
[1] 99:4
Interpretation
[1] 121:16
Interstate
[1] 99:9
Interstates
[1] 5:10
Introduce
[3] 26:3 98:7 98:8
Inventory
[2] 45:21 46:6
Invest
[6] 10:17 21:22 65:24 80:21 100:22
119:6
Invested
[16] 18:22 27:4 28:11 31:7 32:18 35:
4 35:5 35:7 37:10 42:3 47:2 47:3 52:
7 60:4 66:12 68:21
Investigation
[1] 89:16
Investing
[4] 31:12 31:20 73:2 74:16
```

```
Word Index (14) of (29)
Investment
[25] 22:9 26:16 27:10 27:17 28:9 28:
16 29:3 29:5 30:9 30:24 32:14 32:21 33:21 33:24 35:10 41:12 42:6 42:7
43:9 43:13 54:23 65:19 68:13 69:2
78:19
Investments
[21] 21:13 21:19 22:19 23:10 27:2
27:5 27:10 27:23 28:24 31:3 37:20
40:8 42 2 42:21 51:17 62:1 62:10 63:
2 63:4 65:22 78:3
Investors
[2] 40:7 42:11
Involve
[2] 78:1 86:14
Involved
[61 20:8 76:10 90:9 92:10 109:8 123
Involvement
[1] 90:3
Involvina
[1] 89:9
Irrelevant
[6] 10:22 27:11 106:25 108:13 111:
18 111:25
Issue
[13] 4:14 17:7 17:18 17:24 18:7 19:
20 50:9 59:18 60:14 90:2 106:15 133:
1 135:10
[10] 17:8 21:8 59:22 86:12 87:23 93:
25 94:11 97:20 98:1 135:4
Items
[2] 99:23 101:14
Itself
[3] 84:10 99:25 105:24
January
[3] 62:9 63:22 134:20
Japanese
```

```
[1] 45:20
Jeff
[1] 5:16
Jefferson
[1] 8:10
Jeopardy
[1] 94:10
Jere
[2] 2:7 67:15
Jersey
[1] 34:22
JESS
[1] 2:23
Job
[12] 4:7 4:21 13:23 19:1 23:17 60:
11 115:5 127:24 133:10 133:14 133:
16 135:17
Job's
[1] 54:11
Jobs
[19] 5:22 8:16 8:18 8:19 16:10 23:
20 24:8 56:7 56:8 56:13 68:11 114:
21 115:1 115:2 115:6 115:7 115:15
116:10 116:12
Joe
[1] 49:12
JOHN
[2] 2:6 2:9
Join
[3] 16:25 19:21 19:24
Joint
[10] 98:25 99:20 101:1 101:15 101:
23 102:19 103:5 112:2 126:15 130:8
Jolene.
[1] 82:16
Jones
[1] 135:2
```

[1] 88:11

20 80:11 117:21

[2] 103:14 104:4

[2] 52:17 57:13

[2] 18:21 73.8

Knowledge

[8] 6:25 11:1 11:14 11:21 16:9 59:

[18] 6:3 17:11 23:14 24:3 39:20 40:

22 94:2 94:13 94:24 95:16 124:1 127:

3 47:25 86:3 86:20 87:18 88:15 90:

[5] 32:13 69:14 70:17 71:12 75:15

[3] 87:24 89:23 106:17

[3] 101:9 107:10 111:11

Kind

Kinds

Known

Knows

Korean

[1] 45:21

23

Lack

Lady

Laid

[1] 82:16

[1] 77:6

Lanes

[1] 73:10

Lamenting

Lancaster

[1] 85:20

[8] 43:22 54:25 63:2 63:2 63:3 100: [3] 27:11 40:6 111:1 [4] 30:13 51:9 51:10 67:1 [4] 5:24 30:1 35:12 36:25 [28] 18:13 21:21 24:13 24:24 37:4 39:20 50:10 55:12 64:7 65:3 80:23 90:6 95:12 96:15 96:21 99:16 101:10 107:11 108:4 110:6 110:9 113:19 116: 15 122:19 124:11 129:2 129:4 135:12 [3] 82:4 128:9 131:6 [4] 27:5 35:16 35:23 36:2 [5] 98:16 123:9 123:15 123.16 128:5 Leader [1] 90:7 Leaders [1] 49:6 Leadership [3] 6:11 6:12 17:8 Leads [1] 132:15 **LEANNA** [1] 2:21 Learned [2] 93:3 135:15 Least [7] 63:16 64:11 65:5 65:7 66:10 115: 3 119:21 Leave [2] 58:9 88:6 Leaves [3] 33:8 33:13 109:6 Led [4] 25:17 25:20 65:9 66:24 Left [3] 17:4 37.1 65:15 Legislative [2] 66:4 86:18 Legislator [1] 17:10 **Legislators** [4] 20:8 59:6 59:7 60:6 Legislature [7] 9:13 17.9 18:16 18:18 19:6 19: 14 19:25

Less

[4] 13:18 13:21 39:2 70:5 Letters [2] 25:9 81:4 Levdansky [9] 2:15 60:21 62:4 63:12 64:23 65: 4 66:21 67:13 120:8 [9] 30:6 34:2 60:4 74:16 74:19 79: 16 108:9 128:12 130:10 Levels [7] 28:10 30:6 31:1 38:9 72:14 107: 1 109:14 Leverage [1] 10:20 Lewis [1] 130:23 Lid [1] 40:24 Lied [4] 19:12 19:13 19:14 51:11 Life [1] 115:17 Light [3] 49:24 51:17 87:17 Lighten [1] 68:15 Likelihood [1] 58:7 Likely [2] 33:14 102:20 Line [40] 6:24 8:3 8:5 8:10 8:21 10:10 11:13 11:19 11:24 12:1 12:24 13:8 13:12 13:14 13:18 13:24 14:2 14:5 14:20 14:21 15:3 15:5 16:2 25:10 25: 15 25:18 28:22 28:23 29:7 30:4 31: 20 36:5 37:14 54:5 60:12 69:6 96:3 108:16 108:16 109:17 Lines [22] 5:5 8:6 8:22 9:3 12:14 12:18 12:20 14:10 15:4 15:7 15:9 15:15 16: 4 16:4 16:11 16:15 25:21 33:12 75: 15 76:6 96:4 102:20 List [3] 35:3 56:17 127:6 Listened [2] 53:19 61:1 Listening [3] 48:15 86:1 97:23 Literally [1] 50:13 Lived [2] 58:8 115:17 Lives [2] 94:10 131:21 Living [2] 26:24 92:16 Load [1] 68:16 Loading [1] 32:7 Loadings [1] 81:14 Loads [3] 36:19 38:13 108:13 Local [3] 9:4 11:4 11:10 Locate [1] 31:9 Location [5] 33:9 45:25 51:16 55:8 104:5 Locations [1] 115:3 Locomotive [3] 102:3 103:22 104:19 Locomotives [2] 84:17 84:18

Word Index (15) of (29)

Logistics [3] 26:19 36:11 37:9 Logo [1] 71:25 Long-term [4] 15:16 22:19 59:13 91:23 [21] 6:10 10:24 12:10 12:11 16:7 20: 4 20:10 38:1 43:4 55:20 61:21 86:23 89:21 92:4 96:9 108:21 115:15 119:3 120:10 121:22 123:20 Looked [2] 51:15 91.2 Looking [10] 9:23 15:16 68:14 85:25 88:16 92:7 93:16 96:7 120:11 131:8 Looks [5] 15:4 85:1 85:2 103:16 134.1 Lopping [1] 12:23 Lose [4] 15:14 56:8 115:12 116:2 Loses [1] 33:14 Losing [4] 36:25 64:23 64:25 124:22 Loss [7] 61:18 110:4 110:20 111:17 125:4 126:3 126:4 Losses [4] 55:16 111:10 111:19 111:20 Lost [13] 54:4 54:13 61:9 61:15 61:17 61: 19 64:8 77:7 106:18 111:4 113:16 113:17 130:24 Louis [1] 69:25 Low [1] 77:15 Low-cost [1] 37:6 Lower [1] 37:8 Lowest [2] 41:23 44:21 Lure [1] 32:22 Lutton [13] 3:7 3:8 82:12 82:13 82:20 82: 21 98:6 98:8 98:10 99:5 114:9 114: 14 129:21 Lutton's [1] 82:11 Lvnwood [1] 56:19

M

Ma'am [1] 53:15 **Machinists** [1] 99:1 Macon [1] 56:19 Magni tude [3] 43:13 53:22 84:14 Maher [5] 2:6 76:20 79:11 79:21 107:2 Main [12] 1:9 8:6 8:21 12:15 12:20 15:9 28:22 28:23 54:13 96:3 96:4 118:12 Maintain [3] 9:18 91:19 122:5 Maintained [1] 94:24 **Maintainers** [1] 96:13 Maintenance

[2] 23:8 129:4 Major [8] 11:9 39:8 83:17 88:21 99:8 108: 21 127:23 133:4 Majority [2] 28:12 30:15 Makeup [2] 87:11 87:12 Management [12] 23:2 46:9 86:3 86:20 86:22 87: 18 88:15 90:22 94:3 94:13 94:25 95: 16 Manager [4] 82:14 83:12 85:23 90:6 Managers [1] 92:9 **Mandated** [1] 128:12 Manner [1] 112:25 Market [9] 22:13 37:23 37:23 77:24 77:25 78:23 78:24 79:5 123:25 Marketing [7] 20:16 25:19 26:1 26:5 26:12 113: 7 113:24 Marketplace [2] 40:11 40:13 Markets [1] 63:17 Markosek [4] 2:16 49:13 51:25 58:21 MARSICO [1] 2:14 Massive [1] 35:10 Matching [2] 52:24 53:8 Material [3] 40:5 110:2 112:19 Materially [1] 126:2 **Materials** [2] 85:4 131:16 Matter [12] 18:20 24:9 48:14 73:19 75:8 79: 25 81:1 98:19 107:17 126:18 131:7 132:23 **Matters** [2] 47:24 67:10 Maximize [1] 104.6 McClellan [20] 3:6 20:15 21:2 26:4 26:9 26:11 43:2 62:21 69:15 70:22 71:13 72:1 72:4 72:10 76:20 79:14 79:23 109:5 110:21 117:18 McClellan's [1] 61:2 McFerron [1] 6:23 McGILL [1] 2:19 McKean [1] 8:11 Mean [23] 10:14 11:6 12:21 15:11 15:22 49:5 49:8 52:15 56:9 57:6 57:8 61:1 63:16 64:24 65:4 65:13 65:17 65:23 79:4 82:3 97:9 125.6 127:11 Meaning [1] 60.6 Means [5] 31:22 56:10 85:10 86.8 121:19 Meant [1] 63:10 Measurable

[1] 81:12 Measure [3] 22:24 29:7 29:10 Mechanica1 [2] 96:12 104:5 Media [1] 119:25 Meet [8] 29:1 32:9 40:12 42.10 42:24 76: 9 97:6 106:24 Meeting [11] 4:2 4:5 26:19 49:16 83:25 93:2 93:2 93:15 135:1 135:3 136:8 Meetings [3] 86:22 90:10 132:9 Meets [1] 44:21 Mega [1] 90:21 Mega-railroads [2] 90:21 91:10 Member [2] 18:6 65:5 Members [18] 6:11 7:5 7:9 13:4 18:1 19:22 20:20 23:15 26:10 50:17 59:1 74:22 83:23 97:16 98:15 100:1 105:19 106:4 Mend [1] 9:15 Mentioned [6] 21:16 43:3 49:18 57:24 58:20 91: Merchandise [1] 38:13 Mere [4] 113:20 116:15 121:8 122:8 Merely [3] 5:22 38:4 120:21 Merger [9] 4:9 7:23 24:4 66:7 68:22 82:19 107:16 122:21 127:21 Mergers [3] 90:17 93:10 124:11 Mess [1] 129:13 Met [1] 6:23 Metal [1] 99:3 Metrics [2] 25:5 81:11 Michael [5] 3:4 3:6 20:14 20:15 104:2 Midwest [3] 32:4 34:9 34:11 Might [15] 12:9 55:3 63:23 67:18 68:2 69: 19 70:15 88:9 94:23 108:14 108:15 118:17 118:18 120:18 130:18 Mightily [1] 111:2 Mike [7] 2:3 16:21 21:1 26:4 26:8 26:10 58:14 Miles [9] 9:24 11:6 33:11 45:4 50:13 73: 11 84:16 87:8 87:11 Mill [21 50:10 122:21 Million . [60] 5:10 5:21 10:3 10:10 10:16 10: 20 10:20 10:24 11:20 12:1 15:19 21: 16 21:22 22:3 22:4 23:8 23:9 24:22 24:24 24:25 27:5 28:11 28:12 28:15 28:16 28:19 28:20 28:23 30:11 31:8 31:13 32:18 35:5 35:8 35:21 44.14 44:22 46:13 46:16 47:1 47:5 47:6 53:

9 54:13 61:10 61:12 61:13 61:15 61: 17 61:17 61:18 61:20 61:23 63:15 65: 3 66.10 66:12 84:16 100:22 119:7 [2] 77:18 79:2 Mine [1] 32:8 Minimize [2] 110:24 119:22 Minimum [1] 57:4 Minor [1] 80:25 Minus [1] 79:18 Minute [1] 135:12 Minutes [2] 82:8 82:9 **Miscellaneous** [1] 28:24 Misconceptions [1] 84:9 Misinformation [1] 50:2 Misled [1] 51:12 Misplaced [1] 124:4 Misrepresentation [3] 110:2 115:3 117:7 Misrepresentations [1] 112:19 Misrepresented [1] 126:23 Miss [2] 17:1 135:12 Missed [1] 53:17 Missing [1] 56:3 Misunderstood [1] 92:16 Mix [2] 38:3 41:16 Modes [1] 31:2 Modestly [1] 38:13 Molhan Γ11 104:2 **Molitoris** [2] 82:17 91:24 **Moments** [1] 21:3 Mon [2] 34:15 34:15 [32] 10:14 10:16 10:21 11:25 12:6 15:2 42:4 46:14 47:3 47:5 47:8 52:7 52:14 52:15 53:2 53:5 53:10 54:4 54: 8 64:24 65:1 66:18 68:6 68:22 73:2 74:16 76:1 76:1 118:7 124:22 127.2 127:4 Moneys [3] 10:8 10:8 52:24 **Monitor** [3] 84:14 92:3 92:4 Monitoring [2] 84:25 91:23 Month [8] 24:24 24:25 24:25 46:4 63:21 64: 19 92:23 92:24 Monthly [2] 24:22 95:8 Months

[14] 11:2 18:13 20:25 47:4 65:16 65: 20 66:19 67:25 78:17 80:23 105:14 110:6 113:21 116:15 [11] 18:5 20:19 21:1 21:20 26:9 53: 19 53:24 83:22 84:2 97:24 117:18 Most [25] 6:15 18:14 28:4 28:21 29:13 31: 11 34:5 34:21 39:9 39:11 43:12 56: 12 56:15 57:19 78:5 86:15 87.24 90: 2 96:18 96:21 97:8 97:11 97:13 111: 18 124:14 Motive [1] 85:2 Motor [6] 33:9 39:13 39:15 39:22 41.4 70: Move [18] 31:23 32:1 36:6 52:12 57:3 57: 6 57:8 58:9 62:23 75:11 105:23 108: 22 115:12 115:16 115:18 115:19 116: 18 117:19 Moved [3] 34:19 120:17 120:20 Movement [2] 38:6 107:8 **Movements** [1] 38:8 Moves [3] 30:18 38:14 108:25 Moving [6] 22:13 26:14 82:8 105:8 105:11 131:20 Multi [1] 38:9 Multi-levels [1] 38.9 Multimodal [1] 30:17 [8] 44:17 54:19 77:11 78:13 79:21 122:4 122:9 122:14 Mustar [1] 123:14 Mystified [1] 5:15

N

Naive [1] 118:25 Name [2] 26:10 87:15 Named [2] 117:9 117:12 Namely [1] 27:12 Narrowed [1] 88:20 Nation [1] 25:16 Nationwide [4] 84:11 85:15 88:20 89:12 Nature [3] 80:15 101:8 122:17 Near [1] 13:1 Nearby [1] 102:21 Neat [1] 82:13 Necessarily [1] 32:22 Necessary [1] 51:23 Necessity [1] 11:4

Need

Word Index (17) of (29) [23] 9:14 9:15 9:17 13:6 13:11 20:5 20:9 68:17 78:23 79:4 86:25 88:23 96:10 102:25 105:6 109:14 113:6 117: 20 120:7 123:19 129:10 135:22 136:1 [6] 45:25 66:5 66:6 92:21 92:25 94:4 Need1ess [1] 90:25 Needlessly [1] 94:9 Needs [6] 6:10 14:2 19:2 44:21 107:22 133: Negate [4] 120:6 124:1 124:2 124:2 Negotiated [2] 127:22 127:25 Negotiating [2] 57:3 105:1 Nervous [1] 7:14 Net [6] 61:13 61:18 61:23 62:6 63:15 63: Network [5] 22:6 32:16 37:10 37:19 132:5 Networks [1] 34:17 Never [4] 50:24 78:11 116:4 123:13 New [48] 11:6 11:12 16:12 24:2 24:3 24: 6 24:10 24:13 24:18 24:20 30:17 31: 20 32:15 32:23 34:3 35:8 35:21 35: 22 35:24 36:1 36:6 36:8 36:13 42:5 57:1 57:7 63:4 63:4 64:12 69:18 84: 23 85:18 90:21 100:21 101:24 104:12 104:24 115:10 115:11 122:15 127:15 127:19 127:21 128:7 128:13 128:16 129:5 129:6 Newark [4] 70:18 70:23 72:13 72:15 Newer [1] 38:20 New1y [1] 83:11 Newspaper [1] 101:23 Newspapers [1] 121:2 Next [9] 20:15 43:21 59:18 60:13 98:6 125:15 125:17 126:17 133:19 Nimble [1] 53:21 Nine [1] 96:16 Nobody [2] 79:15 118:22 Non-NS [1] 33:13 None [3] 29:3 129:4 130:16 Nongrade [1] 53:6 Norfolk [119] 1:6 4:10 4:22 5:14 5:24 5:25 6:4 6:16 7:23 8:15 9:11 9:21 10:4 10:10 11:12 11:18 12:13 14:4 14:20 15:16 15:20 18:10 18:23 19:4 20:2 20:16 20:23 21:3 21:13 21:22 22:6

22:22 23:2 23:3 23:18 23.21 24:21 25:4 25:8 25:11 25:16 26:12 26:14

27:4 27:8 27:23 28:13 28:25 30:2 30:

22 31:9 32:15 32:18 33:11 33:20 34:

7 35:4 35:7 35:12 36:16 36:22 37:25

44:11 44:18 46:8 46:22 48:1 49:9 50:

38:2 41:16 42:12 42:18 43:25 44:2

70:2 70:6 71:14 79:25 82:13 83:13 83:14 87:5 89:9 89:12 92:1 94:1 95: 4 96:8 98:20 99:18 101:4 102:1 102: 8 102:12 102:19 104:12 104:17 106: 12 109:12 122:22 127:11 127:12 130: 4 130:13 134:14 134:16 134:20 134: 22 134:25 135:3 135:3 135:18 Norfolk's [1] 12:5 Norma₁ [1] 113:21 Normalcy [2] 113:19 116:16 North [4] 8:12 29:15 56:19 115:20 North/South [2] 35:23 37:14 Northeast [5] 22:11 34:7 62:16 63:14 64:14 Northeastern [1] 56:11 Northern [3] 22:16 95:5 115.23 Northern/Santa [2] 124:13 127:10 Northwestern [1] 124:12 Nose [1] 18:18 Notable [4] 31:11 34:5 76:24 86:15 Notably [1] 28:21 Note [7] 26:21 37:12 100:1 103:4 113:11 116:14 124:15 Noted [2] 8:24 107:2 Notes [1] 137:3 Nothing [6] 92:1 96:25 100:2 112:10 112:12 130:15 Notice [3] 114:20 115:1 115:2 Noticed [2] 56:5 57:14 Noting [1] 30:5 Notion [1] 128:15 **Notwithstanding** [2] 23:23 54:5 Novalog [1] 31:14 November [5] 55:12 110:10 110:11 113:12 116: [70] 27:15 27:18 28:7 29:18 30:10 30:14 30:16 31:5 31:7 31:12 31:18 31:19 33:14 34:8 34.16 35:14 35:21 35:25 36:3 36:13 37:13 37:17 39:4 40:12 40:18 41:7 41:20 42:1 42:3 42: 7 42:10 71:6 71:24 73:1 75:16 90:8 95:23 100:3 101:16 101:21 103:1 104: 20 105:3 105:6 105.9 105:20 105:23 106:12 106:13 106:24 107:9 107:20 108:19 109:21 110:1 110:8 111:5 111: 24 117:24 121:12 122:4 122:14 125: 17 126:15 126:22 127:1 128:15 129: 16 130:6 130:14 NS's [5] 26:25 103:25 104:9 104:14 121:22 NSR [4] 100:16 106:6 113:12 113:15 NSR's [3] 99:25 101:9 111:2

Number
[7] 17:6 39:25 43:11 64:10 71:11 85: 7 108:24
Number's
[1] 21:20
Numbers
[13] 10:15 54:16 60:25 61:16 62:12 62:13 62:18 63:9 63:24 65:17 66:14 114:12 125:16
Numerous
[1] 83:8

O'Donnell
[1] 98:17
Oath
[1] 103:10

Objective [1] 113:6 Objectives [1] 84:13 **Obligations** [1] 42:25 **Obliged** [1] 105:21 **Observation** [5] 9:7 9:11 18:12 50:21 81:3 **Observe** [1] 59:23 **Observed** [1] 106:9 **Obtain** [1] 122:23 Obtained [1] 123:23 **Obtaining** [2] 92:13 133:6 **Obtains** [1] 123:7 Obviously [7] 48.5 49:19 54:22 68:6 105:19 112:6 122:7 Occasion [1] 94:3 Occupations [1] 88:17 0ccur [1] 120:9 **Occurred** [1] 95:15 **Occurring** [2] 86:12 91:9 **October** [1] 83:12 Odd [1] 117:21 Odd1y [1] 121:25 Offer Property of the Contract [11] 35:15 56:7 56:13 67:8 69:24 78: 22 80:3 82:20 102:8 115:7 116:2 **Offered** [5] 23:20 24:8 29:25 114:18 115:5 Offering [3] 37:17 115:6 116:11 Offers [1] 116:8 Office [5] 49:5 73:16 80:19 84:22 111:7 Officer [2] 99:5 102:13 **Officers** [1] 106:14

Offices |

[1] 84:11

Officials

[8] 43:11 51:12 55:13 76:10 100:17 119:23 120:3 121:10 **Offset** [2] 55:15 62:25 **Often** [2] 41:23 70:8 Oftentimes [1] 131:6 Ohio [6] 56:12 56:16 56:18 56:18 68:4 115:20 Oilers [1] 99:3 **Once** [6] 19:23 46:14 78:25 120:19 120:20 125:23 One [73] 4:21 6:19 7:15 8:1 8:2 8:5 9: 20 10:13 12:23 12:25 13:6 13:17 16: 19 17:9 24:22 28:4 29:13 30:19 38: 18 39:9 39:11 42:16 43:7 43:10 43: 22 47:18 50:20 51:11 51:15 54:11 55 2 56:21 57:15 59:21 65:5 78:20 79: 12 79:24 83:13 84:1 84:1 86:14 87: 15 87:24 88:1 91:20 93:7 93:7 94:16 95:1 95:21 96:6 97:4 100:4 101:20 101:23 103:20 105:5 106:25 112:19 113:11 115:4 117:14 118:20 119:17 120:10 121:21 122:1 124:15 129:23 130:25 132:23 133:25 **Ones** [8] 16:2 40:7 80:9 105:8 118:8 118: 9 123:1 131:22 **Ongoing** [1] 52:25 **Open** [7] 4:5 68:7 68:7 77:18 89:15 121: 14 122:2 Open-end [1] 122:2 Open-ended [1] 121:14 Open i na [3] 35:14 36:3 36:15 **Opens** [1] 35:21 Operate [2] 102:2 104:18 Operating [15] 39:17 85:3 89:5 102:24 103:13 103:17 104:1 104:3 108:7 108:8 108: 23 112:24 119:13 124:6 131:14 Operation [7] 8:4 22:18 35:11 37:4 54:12 94: 15 97:15 Operational [1] 92:4 Operations [11] 21:2 21:5 31:4 37:5 38:1 41:10 52:13 88:4 90:24 109:1 109:9 Operators [1] 25:10 **Opinion** [2] 40:11 54:8 Opportunities [1] 23:18 **Opportunity** [11] 16:18 17:25 20:22 83:24 97:17 98:18 104:6 113:4 114:18 115:12 115: Oppose [1] 123:3 Opposition [1] 119:22 **Optic** [3] 32:16 47:7 66:13 Optics [1] 32:19 **Optimistic**

	case compress	
Γ	[3] 41:20 62:15 64:16	[4] 3:2 104:
ı	Option	Pages
ı	[1] 70:24 Options	[2] 103:17 1 Paid
ı	[10] 28:2 33:22 34:2 34:25 35:3 35:	[3] 57:6 57:
j	6 37:8 37:15 37:16 42:5	Painful
	Order	[1] 51:8
	[14] 63:3 64:13 68:15 74:9 75:20 76:	Painting
ı	5 84:19 91.15 101:6 107:13 118.15 121:5 131:22 132:16	[1] 77:23
ł	Ordering	Pame 1a
ı	[2] 124:11 124:16	[2] 1:17 137
1	Orders	Pane1 [1] 18:21
ı	[2] 124:16 128:4	Paper
l	Organization	[3] 95:22 10
Į	[2] 25:17 84:7	Papers
ı	Organizations [2] 32:25 44:15	[1] 113:17
ı	Oriented	PARSELLS
ı	[1] 22:12	[1] 2:4
1	Origin	Part [32] 4:12 4:
ı	[2] 45:23 128:14	19 21:9 25:1
1	Original	16 81:4 89:1
ł	[2] 10:12 66:15	1 101:18 103 114:21 119:2
ı	Originally	121:5 128:4
ı	[1] 110:8 Origination	Participa
ı	[1] 52:7	[1] 128:2
ı	Origins	Participa
١	[1] 36:8	[1] 134:12
ı	Otherwise	Participa (4) 27.20
ı	[2] 41:12 134:23	[1] 27:20 Particula
ı	Ought	[12] 14:24 1
I	[5] 19:25 20:1 20:1 59:12 126:6	61:5 62:1 72
ı	Ourselves [1] 43:1	Particula
ı	Outlays	[5] 9·8 9:18
ı	[1] 111:4	Parties [3] 38:22 48
	Outlined	Partner
	[3] 21:12 21:18 62:14	[1] 30:16
1	Outlook	Partners
ı	[1] 48:2 Output	[1] 30:4
1	[1] 67:22	Partnersh
ł	Outside	[8] 5:3 5:11 45:14 89:15
ł	[5] 28:18 30:12 34:1 35:9 37:21	Partnersh
Į	Outstrips	[6] 87:17 87
1	[1] 39:13	4
1	Over-the-road	Parts
ì	[1] 37:7 Overall	[2] 30:12 85 Pass
ì	[6] 30:6 39:6 47:12 77:22 84:13 95:	[1] 123:13
ì	14	Passenger
1	Override	[3] 73:23 75
ŀ	[1] 123:8	Passenger
ı	Oversee	[1] 84:17
ł	[1] 47:15	Past
ł	Oversight [3] 46:10 85:10 133:12	[16] 11:2 20 12 41:5 47:4
ł	Own	72:6 72:11 7
ı	[12] 10:5 13:14 54:21 107:15 110:24	PAUL
	111:3 111:11 113:17 113:17 114:24	[1] 2:4
ŀ	117:20 117:25	Pay
	Owned [3] 31:21 34:7 38:22	[8] 6:17 15: 17 128:18 12
	Owning	Paying
	[1] 117:25	[4] 111:14 1
	P	Pays
		[1] 128:16
	Pacific	PCN
-	[5] 37:13 91:3 91:4 91:6 124:14	[1] 132:5 Penn
	Pacific/Chicago [1] 124:12	[2] 24:4 127
1	Pacific/Southern	PennDOT
1	1 40 1 1 1 4 1 4 4 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	[1] 75·8

[1] 124:14

Page

```
:15 109:15 125:17
            103:19
            :8 128:23
           7:7
            04:17 104:20
            :13 4:23 10:12 11:23 15:
           16 30:13 42:7 56:12 57:
1 90:18 92:10 97:13 101:
           3:7 103:11 105:9 108:2
            20 120:15 120:25 121:1
            132:12 135:6
           ants
           ated
            ating
           17:8 46:1 55:8 55:8 57:3
           2:18 85:24 86:10 86:13
           arlv
           8 16:14 64·20 109:3
           8:3 123:10
           hip
           1 6:14 42:17 43:7 45:3
           hips
            7:22 89:8 89:20 89:25 94:
           5:2
           5:4 128:10
            r-type
           0:25 27:6 34:11 38:24 39:
            4 50:2 51:4 66:19 71:9
            73:12 119:18
           :3 24:20 24:21 45:22 128:
            28:22
           116:4 116:9 128:19
           7:20
[1] 75:6
Pennsylvania
```

```
[103] 1:2 1:10 5:1 5:4 5:5 5:23 6:2
6:5 7:2 7:24 8:13 10:18 11:23 16:14
17:13 17:20 18:25 19:2 19:6 19:8 19:
13 19:19 20:3 20:24 22:7 22:11 22:
25 24:23 25:14 26:19 26:24 27:3 27:
6 27:13 27:21 28:11 30:1 31:8 31:14
31:16 32:1 32:6 32:8 32:15 32:22 33
7 33:12 33:17 35:1 35:9 35:16 35:24
36:5 36:8 36:18 36:21 36:23 37:2 37
8 37:11 37:18 41:2 42:8 42:13 43:24
44:7 44:12 44:13 45:3 45:14 45:19
47:12 48:24 49:21 52:23 59:12 59:14
60:7 61:16 61:22 62:17 63:8 63:8 63
13 68:3 68:8 68:21 84:20 88:3 95:20
96:20 98:4 99:1 100:18 100:18 103:6
103:24 104:13 119:22 120:2 121:10 127:12 136:5
Pennsylvania's
[1] 36:11
Pennsylvania-based
[1] 44:7
Pennsylvania-Ohio
[1] 32:19
People
[38] 5:19 5:21 6:21 7:6 7:22 19:6
19:12 43:8 45:20 49:21 55:6 56:7 56:
14 58:7 59:9 59:25 72:23 80:11 85:7 96:13 111:15 115:5 115:6 115:16 115:
19 116:1 118:17 128:17 128:17 128:
19 128:23 129:2 129:5 131:14 131:21
132:4 133:13 135:23
Per
[4] 32:1 36:4 108:24 132:21
Percent
[18] 29:8 29:9 29:11 29:14 37:2 39:
20 41:17 64:9 80:1 83:14 85:14 95:
13 95:14 96:4 96:14 114:2 114:5 128:
Perception
[1] 9:9
Performance
[6] 25:4 29:12 29:15 29:17 39:3 80:
Perhaps
[5] 16:5 32:25 108:15 122:5 126:22
Period
[12] 21:17 29:9 29:15 42:23 61:14
61:19 61:22 61:25 62:7 63:21 64:2
122:9
Permanent
[3] 90:5 91:25 93:9
Permanently
[1] 83:13
Permission
[1] 23:12
Permitted
[2] 86:17 87:23
Perpetuity
[2] 121:17 122:5
Perplexed
[1] 61:6
Perseverance
[1] 7:12
Personally
[1] 106:11
Perspective
[3] 27:1 59:15 60:8
Pertaining
[1] 24:18
Pertains
[1] 9:21
Petition
[14] 98:25 99:20 101:10 101:15 101:
23 102:19 103:6 104:10 104:14 104:
21 112:2 126:15 130:9 133:2
PETRACA
[1] 2:20
Phi1
[1] 6:23
Philadelphia Philadelphia
```

Case	Compress
_	[15] 34:22 34:25 68:22 68:24 69.11 69:12 69:18 69:24 70:3 71:3 84:22
	96:19 97:8 97:14 101:24
	Photographs [1] 45:11
	Physical
	[1] 109:7 Pick
	[2] 16:4 62:23 Picks
	[2] 33:8 33:13
	Picture [1] 77:22
	Piece
	[1] 72:18 Pieces
	[1] 30:19
	Pious [1] 124:3
	PIPPY
	[1] 2:9 Pittsburgh
	[2] 95:6 101:25
	Place [4] 83:18 93:22 105:7 120:14
	Places
	[5] 68:5 69:25 107:8 115:25 119:15 Plagued
	[1] 64:6
	Plain [1] 134:22
	Plan
	[18] 10:6 10:9 30:17 73:5 91:16 98: 20 103:17 104:2 104:3 108:7 108:8
	108:23 109:17 109:25 113:11 118:17 119:13 135:22
	Planned
	[2] 111:22 134:22 Planning
	[4] 30:11 73:4 73:6 108:11
	Plans [8] 41:18 74:20 103:13 107:22 108:
	12 109:2 109:13 124:6
	Plant [7] 31:21 32:5 45:4 70:17 72:14 105:
	10 109:7 Plants
	[1] 63:4
	Plastics [1] 31:16
	Play
	[1] 55:24 Played
	[2] 88:21 129:25
	Pleased [3] 21:20 80:1 80:6
	Pleasure
	[2] 7:13 26:24 Pledge
	[1] 51:21
	Plenty [1] 81:17
	Plus
	[1] 79:18 Plymouth
	[1] 26:19
	PM [1] 136:9
	Pocket
	[1] 10:5 Point
	[21] 12:15 13:6 25:8 25:14 33:14 44:
	10 63:6 63:14 66:22 75:11 103:12 106:19 106:23 109:5 110:16 111:16
	116.4 122:7 124:8 126:14 130:22 Pointed
	1 VIII COU

```
[1] 62:21
Points
[9] 18:2 23:13 54:14 54:16 71:4 76:
15 99:17 99:22 127:15
Political
[5] 18:23 60:5 66:1 67:1 119:20
Politician
[1] 59:23
Popping
[2] 96:20 97:11
Port
[15] 68:22 68:24 69:2 69:3 69:4 69:
10 69.12 69:13 69:23 69:24 70:9 70:
12 70:14 71:5 71:7
Portfolio |
[1] 35:23
Portion
[3] 54:11 90:8 111:12
Portraya1
[1] 7:21
Ports
[5] 34:17 68:20 69:16 69:19 71:19
Pose
[1] 90:25
Posed
[2] 58:20 90:21
Position
[22] 9:7 18:7 18:8 24:15 36:11 41:
21 58:10 58:22 59:8 65:10 67:12 83:
11 100:14 100:15 102:22 111:21 112:
11 112:16 121:9 124:8 124:24 126:12
Positions
[1] 83:8
Positive
[2] 42:12 81:15
Possibility
[1] 115:22
Postacquisition
[1] 66:9
Postal
[1] 26:18
Posture
[1] 91:19
Pot
[1] 10:14
Potential
[6] 7:23 9:17 107:8 127:10 130:20
131:7
Power
[5] 31:21 32:5 85:3 131.1 131:6
Powerful
[3] 59:21 123:8 123:11
PP&L
[3] 25:9 30:1 81:5
Practices
[2] 85:3 87:4
Precedent
[1] 124:7
Predicate
[1] 125:6
Predicated
[1] 114:4
Predictability
[1] 30:22
Predictable
[1] 41:13
Premier
[1] 37.9
Preparation
[1] 27:9
Prepared
[3] 26:7 74:12 129:17
Presence
[4] 17:22 18:1 20:24 59:20
Present
[3] 4:1 8:8 86:21
```

Presentation [1] 61:2 **Presentations** [1] 59:25 Presented [6] 5:14 7:14 7:20 77:20 132:1 132:2 Presenters [1] 81:23 Presenting [1] 112:11 **Presents** [1] 133:8 President [5] 20:16 21:2 26:4 26:11 85:16 Press [1] 104:11 Pressure [3] 39:15 39:24 40:8 **Pressures** [2] 40:2 40:3 Presume [2] 61:16 73:17 Pretransaction [1] 114:2 Pretty [11] 4:14 8:3 12:25 64:4 77:18 79: 22 82:12 84:19 123:11 133:22 134:22 **Previous** [2] 57:23 95:23 Previously [4] 25:2 61:6 67:8 106:7 Price [2] 39:14 69:20 Prices [4] 40:20 40:21 40:23 41:1 Pricing [5] 26:15 40:2 40:24 40:25 44:21 Primarily [4] 28:20 56:12 64:18 124:23 Primary [1] 99:24 Prime [1] 94:4 Principal [1] 87:16 **Principles** [1] 123:25 Print [1] 78:8 **Priorities** [2] 22:9 52:22 Private [1] 54:20 Privately [1] 117:20 Pro [1] 128:1 **Problem** [7] 46:3 49:20 51:7 109:11 110:20 112:15 131:19 Problems [16] 14:1 14:8 25:12 64:6 64:13 80: 20 80:24 81:1 87:20 94:2 97:19 107: 14 110:23 113:16 114:24 132:22 Procedure [1] 44:18 Proceed [1] 83:4 Proceeding [2] 101:7 121:7 Proceedings [10] 98:23 99:7 99:11 112:13 122:17 124:20 134:13 134:24 137:1 137:3 **Process** [13] 19:3 20:8 20:10 60:5 61:7 66: 24 86:7 87:2 87:13 90:13 92:10 93:4

104:25 **Produce** [4] 130.13 130:15 131:15 131.16 Produces [1] 126:3 Product [6] 26:15 27:14 27:15 35:17 44:20 128 · R Production [5] 17:12 32:9 72:14 96:8 131:5 **Productive** [1] 60:16 Productivity [1] 68:1 **Profiles** [1] 92:20 Profit [1] 50:8 **Profound** [1] 38:3 Profound1v [1] 70:8 **Program** [11] 10:8 53:1 54:10 82:14 83:12 85: 18 85:19 89:1 90:5 92.14 108:14 **Programmed** [1] 24:8 **Programs** [2] 83.17 85:11 **Progress** [2] 80:7 85:13 Progressing [1] 41:17 Project [11] 9:23 10:24 11.4 12:22 36:10 45: 23 52:8 52:9 53.4 82:14 85:23 **Projected** [1] 10:9 Projection [7] 46:23 47:10 47.21 48:7 67:4 119: 8 119:10 **Projections** [10] 5:19 5:22 15:20 46:16 46.23 65: 17 67:20 71:10 92:21 135:19 **Projects** [9] 14:7 14:9 21:18 21:19 23:9 28: 17 52:18 53:9 53:10 **Prominent** [1] 117:15 Promise [14] 8:22 46:17 46:24 47:10 47.22 48:7 48:16 56:6 78:13 78:18 78.21 107:3 119:9 120:22 **Promises** [12] 5:18 6:4 19:5 19:11 46.16 47: 12 55:6 78:6 78:9 92:18 135:18 135: 20 Promote [2] 102:4 104:19 Prompted [1] 41:15 Proof [1] 13.14 Proper [1] 48:4 Proposed [3] 9:22 10:2 110:9 **Proposes** [1] 10:5 Proposing [3] 10:25 11:19 12:5 **Protective** [4] 24:3 115:13 116:9 127.24 Proud [4] 13:25 23:9 25:23 95:1 Provide

[19] 15:8 15:9 20:22 21:4 30:21 31: 18 31:22 34:4 42:5 44:4 51:22 65:7 67:3 67:18 81:19 108:1 114:11 114: 14 125:16 **Provided** [15] 17:25 19:23 21:11 23:24 25:5 43:9 51:5 53:18 54:6 81:11 99:19 111:6 112:4 124:10 127:6 **Provides** [3] 28:14 57:8 104.6 Providina [3] 35:24 36:8 79.17 **Provisions** [2] 24.1 57:2 **PST** [1] 50:25 Public Public [23] 1:18 22:25 28:21 33:25 52:7 52: 14 55:20 59:24 78.1 78:2 78:2 78:4 78:5 78:8 78:9 78:13 79:1 79:2 82: 18 100:19 121:2 135:15 137:8 Public/private [4] 5:3 6:14 42:17 45:2 **Publicly** [2] 48.18 59:7 Published [3] 102:10 113:18 121:2 **Publishing** [1] 129.8 Pu11 [3] 91:18 92:12 94:25 Pulled [3] 45:24 114.8 120:19 **Pulse** [1] 92:7 **Punctuated** [1] 38:10 **Punxsutawney** [2] 8:2 11:15 Punxsv [1] 13:9 **Purchased** [2] 44:23 44:24 **Purchases** [1] 44:14 Purely [4] 24:14 33:5 62:17 66:23 Purpose [1] 108:6 Put [15] 4:11 4:19 9:1 10:22 13:5 40:8 40:23 50.25 54:25 58:24 66:10 66:17 108.22 116:5 128:13 Putting [4] 39:23 45:9 69:11 94:9

Q

Quality [7] 27:25 28:6 28:13 57:18 57:25 58: Quandary [1] 116:5 Quantity [1] 44:11 Quarter [11] 38:11 38:16 38:17 38:17 40:1 64:15 64:16 64:18 95:10 95:12 95:12 **Quarterly** [1] 95:8 Quarters [2] 38:18 41:5 Queasy [1] 135.24 Questioning [1] 102:15 Questions [18] 7.6 14:12 14:14 20:14 24:1 26:

7 42:16 48:9 48:16 56:5 67:17 68:12 81:25 97:25 100:12 127:15 129:18 135.5 Quick [2] 9:6 127:14 Quickly
[4] 41:17 46.4 93:13 130:22 Quid [1] 128:1 Quite [2] 79:19 87:7 Quo [1] 128:1 Quorum [1] 4:1

R

Race [1] 34:9 Rail [69] 5:1 6:2 10:8 10:17 17:8 17:11 17:11 17:11 17:12 17:12 19:7 22:6 27:18 27:25 28:1 28:2 28:5 28:7 30: 17 30:22 30:25 31:4 31:6 31:13 31: 18 31:20 32:11 32:12 32:22 33:5 33: 6 33:7 33:12 34.3 34:15 34:25 40:17 40:21 41:22 42:21 43:24 44:19 45:10 45:11 45:20 45:20 45:21 45:21 45:21 46:2 46:5 46:6 46:7 50:9 50:10 50: 21 50:24 50:25 55:1 59:13 70:20 72: 8 73:23 75:4 77:2 98:3 111:9 128:10 133:4 Rail-to-truck [1] 32:4 Railroad [50] 1:6 4:14 8:3 8:19 11:8 14:2 20: 17 22:10 24:14 25:18 25:19 25:20 26: 22 30:19 52:24 54:24 57:20 63:25 81: 16 83:3 83:5 83:5 83:6 83:7 84:25 85:11 85:25 86:1 86:2 86:13 86:23 87:12 88:11 88:17 88:23 88:25 89:5 89:10 89:11 89:14 89:14 90:18 92:25 93:6 94:15 97:21 113:13 123:6 129: 11 134:25 Railroad's [1] 24:20 Railroad-owned [2] 38:21 39:2 Railroads [23] 8:21 8:24 15:11 16:1 23:4 29:1 35:1 38:1 39:1 39:16 41:4 69:16 84: 15 84:23 87:4 87:7 90:1 90:21 91:4 91:7 91:17 93:15 128:2 Rails [6] 40:18 50:12 50:15 62:23 68:19 Railway [4] 23:1 28:16 47:15 82:15 Railyard [1] 17:23 Raise [2] 75:11 100:12 Ran [1] 111:10 Rans [1] 34:8 Rapid [1] 84:23 Rather [5] 30:20 70:19 110:19 118:17 127:16 Rational [1] 108:10 Rationale [3] 62:14 117:21 118:3 RE [1] 1:5 React [1] 122:15 Read

501 444 B 44B 04 440 40		1101 d 211d0x (22) 01 (20)
[3] 111:7 115:21 118:19	Record	[1] 85:16
Reading	[10] 9:1 13:5 22:24 23:10 39:24 83:	Reiterated
[1] 35:1	20 95 3 119:3 120 16 120:25	[1] 119:4
Ready	Records	Reject
[2] 19:21 19:23		
	<u>[</u> 1] 95:8	[1] 123:5
Real	Recovery	Related
[4] 14:8 37:16 40:10 41:14	[1] 17:4	[8] 8:18 10:25 28:21 63:7 91:9 93: 24 94:16 95:24
Realistically	Redevelopment	24 94:16 95:24
[1] 34:12	[1] 10:7	Relates
		[1] 77:20
Reality	Reduce	- -
[2] 41:25 115:7	[5] 32:5 41:18 75:13 76:4 129:12	Relations
Realize	Reduced	[1] 121:2
[1] 113:13	[3] 41:16 64:9 118:10	Relationship
Realizes		[5] 5:25 7:1 8:25 25:23 71:21
	Reducing	
[1] 97:18	[1] 39:6	Relationships
Really	Reduction	[3] 5:6 26:1 69:9
[31] 9:12 10:14 11:11 12:10 13:24	[1] 107:4	Relative
13:24 17:9 17:13 50:13 64:2 69:17	Reductions	[1] 65:11
70:23 71:20 72:16 72:25 73:17 78:13		
79:4 79:12 84.9 86:18 87:8 89.3 93:	[1] 96:11	Release
23 111:21 115:8 115:9 118:15 118:23	Redundancy	[1] 104:11
119:1 121:25	[1] 116:23	Released
	Redundant	[1] 38:12
Reason		
[5] 42:1 57:16 65.14 77:16 120:15	[2] 116:18 117:7	Relevant
Reasonable	Reemphasize	[1] 108:15
	[2] 22:22 54:19	Reliability
[1] 122:9	Reevaluate	[1] 28:6
Reasons		
[3] 50:5 66:1 100:4	[1] 127:1	Relied
Reassuring	Reference	[4] 85:8 107:21 130:7 130:8
[1] 98:3	[1] 119:8	Relief
_ 	Referred	[1] 122:12
Rebounded		
[1] 40:22	[1] 119:15	Relies
Rebuild	Referring	[1] 106:24
[1] 37:13	[2] 76:24 129:24	Relocate
	Refers	[1] 33:16
Rebuilding		Relocation
[1] 75:14	[1] 125:10	
Rebutta1	Refined	[7] 24:7 28:22 53:3 53:4 53:5 56:25
[1] 130:23	[1] 93:2	57:2
	Refinement	Rely
Recapitalize		[4] 107:18 111:9 118:18 127:5
[1] 15:21	[1] 99:2	Remain
Recapitalized	Refinements	
[1] 15:22	[1] 93:3	[2] 40:6 40:20
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Reflect	Remained
Received		[1] 29:1
[7] 25:8 52:18 53:10 76.25 80:24	[1] 25:6	` _ ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` `
103:3 122:18	Reflection	Remains
Receiving	[1] 38:4	[1] 41:20
[1] 123:10	Regard	Remark
Recent	[4] 9:16 31:7 72:20 131:7	[2] 116:17 119:7
		Remarkable
[5] 84:24 90:19 108:20 124:14 127:3	Regarding	
Recently	[2] 86:6 112:23	[1] 95:1
[2] 35:16 43:12	Regardless	Remarks
Recess	[2] 94:21 95:17	[5] 41:19 82:17 105:25 113:18 129:17
		Remember
[2] 82:2 82:4	Regards	
Recklessly	[2] 86:25 95:4	[3] 15:25 94:17 110:8
[2] 73:10 73:11	Regime	Remind
Recognize	[1] 123:14	[1] 59:2
[4] 13:3 13:21 101:19 101:20	Region	Reminder
Recognized	[12] 8:12 9:5 22:2 22:14 22:17 33:1	[1] 41:6
[2] 107:23 119:19	47:4 47:7 55:1 66:13 84:21 95:6	Remove
Recommendation	Regional I	[1] 31:24
[1] 89:6	[1] 83:10	Removed
	<u> </u>	[1] 46:6
Recommendations	Regress	<u> </u>
[6] 86:21 88:14 89:3 89:18 91:20 92:	[1] 132:17	Renege
18	Regularly	[1] 126:21
Recommended	[2] 34:12 34:19	Renewed
[2] 88:22 91:14	Regulated	[1] 22:18
	[1] 123:22	
Reconsider		Renovations
[2] 55:9 57:24	Regulation	[1] 12:2
Reconsidered	[2] 86:10 93:10	Repair
[1] 110:15	Regulations	[10] 76:6 103:22 108:14 108:16 108:
	[5] 75:12 85:1 86:14 86:17 90:23	18 109:3 109:9 116:20 118:2 119:6
Reconsidering		
[2] 58:5 110:13	Regulatory	Repairs
Reconstructed	[1] 85:9	[1] 125:11
[1] 13:20	Rehabilitate	Repeat
Reconstruction	[1] 30:12	[1] 99:15
[3] 9:22 10:1 14:3	Reinvent	Repeated
[0] 8.22 [0.1 14.3	VA IIIAAIIF	
		From Pood to Poposted

Case Compress	
[2] 100:16 112:20 Repeatedly	[2] 33:18 Respect
[1] 119:4	[3] 101:8
Replaced	Respect
[2] 46:6 61:11 Replacing	[5] 48:22 Respond
[1] 75:17	[4] 79:14
Reply [2] 112·3 126:15	Responde [2] 19:2 8
Report	Respond
[4] 21:20 26:20 44:5 92:2	[1] 91·2
Reportable [1] 95:13	Respond: [1] 24:16
Reported	Respons
[3] 73:12 73:20 108:4 Reporter-Notary	[4] 23:19 Respons
[2] 1:18 137:8	[1] 26:13
Reporters	Respons
[1] 96:23 Reporting	[1] 38:24 Respons
[1] 97:1	[1] 90:7
Reports [1] 129:9	Rest [2] 46:14
Represent	Result
[1] 99:1	[7] 21·21 64:18 107:
Representation [1] 58:23	Resulte
Representations	[2] 38:20
[10] 100:16 100:23 101:5 101.7 101: 9 107:21 119:23 120:4 121:6 124:19	Resulti: [3] 39:24
Representative	Results
[58] 7:8 14:15 14:18 14:19 14.22 14: 25 15:1 15:17 16:8 16:17 16:21 16:	[5] 24:17 Retain
22 48:11 49:13 51:25 52:3 52:10 52:	[5] 28:4 1
11 52:16 53:13 53.16 55:2 56:1 56: 15 56:24 57:5 57:11 57:14 57:23 58:	Retrencl
6 58:12 58:15 58:20 59:24 60:21 62: 4 63:12 64:23 65:4 66:21 67:13 67:	[1] 110.7 Returne
16 70:10 71:6 71:22 72:3 72:5 72:21	[3] 113:19
75:10 76:12 76:20 77:5 79·11 79:21 82:9 120:8 129:23 130:25	Returns [1] 40:6
Representatives	Revenue
[3] 1:2 23:14 99:16 Represented	[10] 61:10 62:6 63:15
[4] 98:22 99:6 99:10 134:17	Revenue
Representing	[3] 43:6 6
[1] 134:7 Reprints	Reversa ` [1] 16:5
[1] 124:10	Review
Republican [4] 9:8 16:20 134:1 134:1	[4] 53:18
Reputation	Reviewi: [1] 48:14
[1] 51:24	Reviews
Request [5] 49:10 60:2 60:2 130:18 131:4	[1] 87:14 Revised
Requesting	[1] 21:21
[1] 48:22	Rhetori
Require [1] 31:3	[1] 122:7 Rich
Required	[2] 98:12
[2] 122:23 126:6 Requirement	Richard [5] 2:2 3:
[1] 128:5	Rick
Requirements	[2] 45:8 9
[2] 24:11 57:4 Reguires	Ridge's [1] 33.2
[1] 38:21	Ridicul
Reserve	[1] 110:14
[1] 132:8 Resigned	Rights [3] 124:1
[2] 120:20 134:20	Ripe
Resolve [1] 97:20	[1] 126:18 Ripped
Resolved	[1] 14.23
[1] 94:12	Ripping
Resources	[1] 14:21

```
18 85:5
ct
:8 107:19 109:1
ctfully
22 49:10 60:10 67:6 126:20
14 99:24 112:6 124:25
nded
2 85:15
nd i na
onds
16
nse
19 79:10 112:2 126:16
nsibilities
13
nsibility
24
nsible
14 75:23
21 30:21 39:14 41:13 42:11
07:5
ted
20 39:5
ting
24 89.18 90:20
ts
17 38:11 42:6 44:15 48:5
n
4 100:20 102:17 120:18 134:16
enchment
0.7
ned
3:19 113:21 116:16
'ns
6
ue
:10 61:12 61:13 61:20 61:23
1:15 63:18 64:2 106:24
lues
6 61:24 64:1
`sa1
18 89:15 99:21 126:25
wing
14
WS
14
ed
21
rical
2:7
12 98:12
rd
2 3:5 3:9 20:17 98:16
8 98:10
's
2
:ulous
0:14
4:1 124:2 124:2
6:18
d
. 23
ng
```

Rises [1] 31:2 Rising [3] 32:9 39:20 39:21 Risk [1] 54:25 Rivals [1] 29:16 Rivets [1] 45:24 Road [4] 5:10 23:8 73:6 109:24 Roadrailer [2] 22:18 72:2 Roadrailers [1] 26:15 Roads [1] 31:25 Roanoke [3] 104:1 104:8 117:13 Ro1e [4] 48:4 82:22 88:21 110:24 Ron [2] 82:13 82:19 Ronald [4] 2:14 3:7 82:12 82:21 Room [3] 1:10 7:16 88:16 Root [2] 87:14 88:10 Rose [1] 94:3 Roster [1] 56:22 Rough [1] 75:3 Roughly [4] 23:6 84:15 84:19 97:4 Route [5] 11:16 11:17 12:4 12:4 14:2 Routed [1] 36:7 Routes [2] 15:8 40:14 Routings [1] 108:12 RR [1] 32:10 Rubbina [1] 74:10 Rudy [2] 6:7 20:18 Ru1e [1] 89:4 **Ruled** [1] 67:12 Rulemaking [1] 93:8 Rules [7] 68:1 68:9 88:20 88:22 88:25 89: 3 89:5 Rumors [1] 90:12 Run [11] 4:16 49:5 75:16 81:14 81:16 87: 8 108:23 109:8 111:13 123:17 127:22 Running [6] 11:12 15:2 71:23 94:8 108:16 111:5 Runs [5] 6:24 11:14 30:15 36:3 109:1 Rura1 [3] 11:22 15:15 16:15 Russ [2] 2:12 14:17

[1] 96:8 77:6 77:13 79:17 80:1 80:20 80:24 Russe1 96:13 113:16 113:21 128:10 Second [1] 48:10 Service-sensitive [10] 15:18 20:20 30:24 34:14 35:12 Rutherford 39:8 45:2 57:20 113:2 118:5 [1] 29:14 [11] 22:15 35:9 35:14 36:3 36:15 45: Sections Services 3 50:12 50:22 69:6 71:8 72:19 [10] 28:1 28:2 28:13 30:25 35:15 35: [2] 124:11 124:16 23 35:25 36:4 37:14 80:3 See Servicina SACP [21] 8:18 12:18 48:17 50:15 53:24 55:22 68:9 68:15 75:22 84:18 85:6 [1] 64:21 [14] 83:12 83:18 85:20 85:21 86:4 86:1 87:3 87:5 95:21 96:1 96:1 96:2 86:15 86:17 87:2 87:11 87:13 88:1 Sessions 96:10 97:2 102:11 90:6 90.15 93:3 [1] 86:2 Seeina Safe Seven [2] 91:19 94:7 [2] 72:8 91:7 [4] 63:21 65:16 65:19 67:24 Safer Seek Seven-month [1] 89:19 [1] 41:9 [1] 63:21 Seeking Safest Severa1 [2] 133:6 134:18 [2] 95:7 97:22 [10] 8:11 21:8 50:13 59:9 75:18 81: Safety Seem 16 87:13 88:9 89:7 124:11 [3] 49:4 96:20 110:24 [40] 22:23 23:3 23:10 23:11 43:19 73:7 75:13 76:3 82:13 82:23 82:24 Shame Seemingly [1] 6:25 82:25 83:19 84:10 84:12 84:13 84:25 [2] 61:25 63.20 Shameful 1 85:2 85:11 85:19 85:24 86.6 87:1 87. Sees [3] 18:14 19:16 112:9 14 87:20 87.23 88:24 89:1 91:10 91: [1] 83:20 Share 16 92:4 92:8 92:14 92:16 92:20 94:5 Segment 94:19 94:24 95:3 98:3 [3] 13:4 14:3 27:19 [1] 54:25 Safety-critical Shared [1] 87:23 Self [1] 34:24 [2] 111:19 123:9 Sake Shareholder [1] 10:15 Self-executing [1] 102:7 Sakes [1] 123:9 Shed Self-inflicted [1] 78:16 [1] 87:16 [1] 111:19 Saltsburg Sheet Selling [1] 9:24 [1] 99:3 [2] 16:3 110:14 Sam Shelocta 5 4 1 [5] 7:4 7:6 14:14 16:16 16:25 Semantic [1] 31:21 SAMUEL [2] 48:6 119:9 Shift Semantics [1] 3:3 [4] 38:10 38:20 39:8 73:10 [1] 119:10 Sandwich Shifting [1] 82.5 Senate [1] 38:5 Santa [4] 1:10 7:15 102:14 103:8 Shifts [2] 91:4 115:23 Senator [21 38:3 38:4 SANTONI [4] 102:15 103:2 103:4 130:22 Ship [1] 2:8 Send [2] 71:2 111:8 Santoro [2] 112:6 131:13 Shipments [2] 134:10 135:1 Sendina [11] 26:13 31:18 38:8 61:9 61:9 61: 14 61:20 63:17 72:20 77:7 77:7 Sat [1] 118:3 [1] 92:19 Senior [7] 29:3 29:4 35:3 69:17 108:24 108: 25 109:6 [2] 43:11 86:22 Satisfaction [1] 94:12 Seniority Satisfied [1] 56:22 **Shippers** [1] 24:16 Sense [21] 27:12 27:12 28.3 29:19 30:1 30: 22 32:22 33:23 34:22 35:6 36:9 37:8 Save [2] 11:17 29:4 41:1 42:10 70:9 92:5 107:22 108:12 [1] 68:11 Sensitive 108:22 111:8 124:3 Saw [1] 29:14 Shipping [8] 9:5 78:6 82:15 92:25 101:12 102: Sensitivity [11] 22:13 29:22 32:12 33:25 34:2 35:6 37:7 39:14 40:10 42:5 69:16 13 105:17 112:17 [1] 135:4 Saylor Separate Shoe [2] 2:17 82:4 [2] 21:11 90:16 [2] 59:18 60:13 Scale September Shop [2] 43:9 109:23 [3] 23:22 36:2 91:22 [35] 5:20 51:15 55:8 55:14 58:3 98: Scam Series 21 98:24 100:20 102:2 102:3 102:21 [2] 115:14 116:8 [1] 67:17 104:19 104:19 107:7 107:12 108:18 SCC 110:9 112:8 112:23 112:24 113:12 Serious [1] 129:9 113:20 114:21 114:23 114:25 116:18 [1] 97:9 117:4 117:9 117:13 118:3 119:6 121: Scenario Seriously 24 131:17 134:8 134:16 [1] 107:3 [1] 43:4 Shops Scheduled Serve [31] 23:19 28:19 46:13 56:11 67:23 [1] 30:19 [5] 27:12 29:4 31:20 36.20 71:4 96:15 102:1 102:17 102:21 102:24 Schmal bach Served 104:7 113:3 113:6 116:14 116:19 116: [1] 31:15 [2] 34:24 36:21 19 117:1 117:3 117:14 117:15 117:23 Schwartz 118:4 121:18 122:5 125:5 125:12 125: Serves [1] 98:17 18 125:22 126:10 129:3 134:15 [2] 36:22 36:24 Scope Shore Service [2] 53:22 101:8 [1] 81:18 [34] 22:12 25:2 25:7 25:10 27:25 28: Sa 5 28:7 29:14 29:16 30:6 30:9 30:17 Short [38] 5:4 6:24 8:5 8:9 8:21 9:3 11: 30:25 31:2 33:22 35:19 36:1 40:23 42:4 69:24 73:25 74:1 74:17 76:22 [1] 132:21 13 11:24 12:1 12:14 12:18 12:24 13: Season

Oubc Compress	
8 13:12 13:18 13:24 14:2 14:5 14:10	13
14:20 15:2 15:3 15:5 15:7 15:15 15:	ļ S
23 16:2 16:3 16:11 16:15 25:9 25:15 25:18 25:21 30:4 82:16 103.21 111·22	['
Shortcomings	j S
[1] 25:13	ļ [c
	1 1
Shortsighted [1] 15:6	S
ı Shotgun	Ţ.
[1] 31:1	S
Show	<u> </u>
[8] 4:4 67·19 67:25 80:2 104:22 113:	j S
21 124:9 130:13	[.
Showed	S
[3] 8:15 18:5 113:25	Į į
Shown	Į S
[6] 4:18 25:12 94:24 112:24 119:3	[2
125:4	S
Shows	[
[6] 63:14 63:16 114:1 118:21 126:4	l S
129:15	ַ <u></u>
Shuster	l S
[14] 46:20 59:17 59:19 59:22 66:4	ָן <u>יַ</u>
110:15 120:12 120:14 120:18 120:22	15
120:23 126:11 130:3 134:20	S
Shuster's	[4
[1] 130:1	S
Shut	[
[1] 11:21	S
Shutdowns	[,
[1] 93:21	S
Side	[1
[8] 7:18 8:1 19:21 79:15 80:1 82:23	S
82:23 95:18	ן [
Sides	S
[2] 54:15 135:16	[1
Siding	S
[2] 31:13 32:11	[1
i Signal	S
[3] 23:9 85:4 96:13	[¹ S
Significant	3
[14] 17:22 17:23 18:1 18:22 22:1 32: 14 33:18 42:8 55:6 63:17 65:18 75:3	l s
110:19 111:12	_
Significantly	[[1
[2] 30:18 39:13	
Silly	['
[1] 110:12	S
1 15	ַ <u></u>
Similar	S
[2] 56:13 116:20	[2
Simple	<u>\$</u>
[4] 30:21 46:9 49:23 54:4	[3
Simply	j s
[9] 28:6 33:9 34.4 50.4 50:16 70:5 80:2 109:10 131:19	9:
Sincere	l s
[1] 97:23	[
Sincerely	l s
[1] 135:7	[S
Single	S
[1] 17:10	1 1
SIP	
[8] 83:18 90:9 90:13 90:15 91:14 92:	l s
9 93:6 93:9	ľ
SIPs	l š
[5] 90:11 92:3 92:15 92:16 92:23	l č
Sit	l s
[8] 9:13 17:4 79:3 112:13 116:25	ī
117:6 123:24 128:20	Š
Site-specific	Ĭ
[1] 85:9	l s
Siting	آ ا
[1] 88:15	l s
Sitting	l ĭ
[3] 13:20 84:3 84:3	İs
Situation	Ĭ
[6] 9:10 40:25 64:20 112:14 118:1	İŠ
	·

```
26:12
Situations
1] 39:11
Y i?
[6] 39:12 56:10 81:1 105:13 113:20
16:15
Sizable
11 47:5
Size
31 27:10 90:24 90:25
Skepticism
1] 77:21
Slapped
[2] 18.16 18:17
Slightly
2] 12:3 104:15
31 owdown
1] 111:20
Smaller
11 44:15
Smith
[10] 3:3 7:4 7:8 14:15 14:19 14:22
|5:1 16:8 16:17 16:25
Smooth
[4] 93:12 93:18 93:19 94.15
moothly
1] 60:6
So-called
1] 116:22
Soaring
11 39:21
SOFA
6] 88:5 88:7 88:25 89:2 89:3 89:12
oftness
1] 40:23
Solely
1] 34:19
Solemnly
1] 133:5
3o1id
2] 22:2 43:7
Solidified
1] 36:10
Solutions
[1] 87:20
Someplace
1] 79:22
Sometime
[2] 113:19 128:3
Sometimes
31 84:8 103:16 108:22
Somewhat
[8] 11:16 58:23 86:16 88:18 92:15
93:17 93:19 122:7
Soon
[2] 12:25 46:5
orry
[5] 51:1 51:20 81:18 116:2 130:24
Sort
9] 63:5 77:14 80:15 89:11 103:13
18:19 118:20 118:24 129:15
Sorts
[1] 124:6
Sought
[2] 113:12 119:21
Sound
1] 76:23
Sounded
1] 77:13
Source
1] 45:22
South
1] 34:22
Southeast
1] 35:24
Southern
```

[110] 1:6 4.10 5:14 5:16 5:25 6:1 6: 5 6:17 7:23 8:15 9:12 9:22 9:23 10: 4 10:10 11:12 12:13 14:4 14:20 15: 20 18:10 18.24 19:4 20:2 20:16 20: 23 21:3 21:13 21:22 22:23 23:2 23:3 23:18 23:21 25:4 25:8 25:12 25:16 26:12 26:14 27:4 28:13 28:25 30:2 30:23 31:9 32:15 32:18 33:11 33:20 34:8 35:4 35:7 35:13 36:16 36:22 37 25 38:2 41.16 42:12 42:18 43:25 44: 3 44:11 44:18 46:9 46:22 48:1 49:9 50:22 53:8 54:9 54:20 55:5 59:3 70: 2 70:6 71:14 79:25 82:13 83:13 83: 14 87:6 89:9 89:13 92:1 94:2 95:4 96:9 98:20 99:18 101:2 101:4 102:1 102:19 104:12 104:17 109:13 122:23 127:11 127:13 130:4 130:13 134:14 134:16 134:21 134:22 134:25 135:3 135:18 Southern's [8] 4:22 22:6 24:21 27:8 27:24 52: 11 102:8 102:12 Southwest [1] 32:8 Space [1] 80:23 Specialized [1] 38:9 Specific [2] 9:21 125:13 Specifically [3] 9:19 63:7 110:7 Specious [1] 109:10 Specter [3] 102:15 103:2 103:4 **Speculate** [2] 48:8 58:11 Speculation [1] 135:6 Speed [3] 29:9 30:21 34:10 Speeding [1] 73:10 Spend [4] 10:5 111:3 118:7 127:4 Spending [2] 30:11 44:8 Spent [5] 23:7 26:22 44:14 55:17 128:18 Spike [2] 95:24 96:2 Spin-off [1] 8:18 Spin-offs [2] 9:19 12:8 Spite [1] 134:16 Split [3] 34:2 36:6 70:6 Split-up [1] 36:6 **Spokesperson** [1] 78:14 Spot [1] 17:4 **Sprang** [1] 134:21 Spring [3] 113:19 129:2 129:4 Spurred [1] 9:2 Saueeze [3] 40:17 41:7 41:14 St [1] 69:25 Stable [2] 41:1 72:11

(1) 33-17 30-14 40-123 70-20		Stack	[1] 77:4	[4] 54:15 67:8 81:5 103:5
Stacked () (1 80:10 Starff () (2	l			
Cit Size				9
Starf (1) e125 STAIRS (2) six1 sast (2) six1 sast (1)			1 17 1	I 7.
Till 1912				
(i) e128 STELER (i) 2.22 2.22 2.22 2.22 2.22 2.22 2.23	ľ	Staff		[2] 131:1 131:1
STAIRS (1) 2:223 Stall inseque Standing (9) 19:24 19:23 20:8 48:3 48.5 94:6 Standing (9) 19:24 19:23 20:8 48:3 48.5 94:6 Standing (9) 19:24 19:23 20:8 48:3 48.5 94:6 Standing (9) 19:24 19:23 20:8 48:3 48.5 94:6 Standing (1) 22:17 82.4 Standing (1) 22:17 82.4 Standing (1) 22:17 82.4 Standing (1) 4:25	l	[1] 91:25		Subsequent
Till 2023 Statimesque Till 1024			[1] 2:22	[1] 33:24
Stand				
Stand [0] 19:21 19:22 20:8 48:3 48.5 94:6 Standard [1] 20:40 44:17 128:4 Standard [2] 24:0 44:17 128:4 Standard [2] 24:0 44:17 128:4 Standard [2] 24:0 44:17 128:4 Standard [2] 24:0 44:17 128:4 Standard [2] 24:12 48:15 80:7 80:25 92:8 80:18 Standard [2] 24:12 18:24 58:17 80:25 92:8 80:18 Standard [2] 24:12 18:24 58:17 80:25 92:8 80:18 Standard [2] 24:12 18:24 58:17 80:25 92:8 80:18 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.4 Standard [2] 24:17 82.2 Standard [2] 24:17 82:10 82:24 82:18 82:24 82:24 82:18 82:18				<u> </u>
Fig. 18-23 19-23 20-24 40-13 41-15	l .	[1] 104:16		
Standard [3] 34.0 44.17 129.4 Standing [1] 93.22 Standpoint [0] 24.32 84.56 88.7 89.25 82.8 98.19 Standipoint [1] 83.24 Standing [1] 93.22 Standpoint [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.4 Standing [2] 24.17 82.17 Standing [2] 24.17 82.17 Standing [2] 24.17 82.17 Standing [2] 24.17 82.17 Standing [2] 24.17 82.17 Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.8 82.23 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 82.23 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 82.23 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 82.23 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 82.23 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 82.23 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 82.23 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 82.23 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 82.23 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 42.28 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 42.28 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 42.28 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 42.28 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 42.28 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 42.28 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 42.28 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 42.28 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 42.28 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 42.28 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 42.28 101.22 131: Standing [2] 34.18 42.28 48.18 42.28 12.28		Stand		[1] 88:1
Stimulate 11 12 13 13 13 13 13 13	1	[6] 19:21 19:23 20:6 48:3 48.5 94:6		Successful
California Cal		Standard		[8] 18:24 19:8 74:3 74:4 89:7 113:8
Standing			Stimulate	113:24 120:2
C1 39-328 Standpoint [0] 24:21		1.7 I	[1] 28:5	Sudden
Standpoint			Stimulating	
Steeling Steeling	ł			
(1) 24:27 86:28 82:29 19:18 Stone	ł	Standpoint		
Steams Store Sto		[6] 24:21 84:5 88:7 89:25 92:8 96:18	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	I T
Till	Ì			Suggest
Stanley Stood St				[6] 64:17 104:16 115:4 124:25 129:
E3 24.77 22.44 Stark C1 44:15 Story C1 44:16 C1 C3 C3 C3 C3 C3 C3 C3			[2] 89:4 92:17	15 [°] 130:18
Stark Stark Start Star			l Stood l	Suggested
Stark [1] 44:5 Start [2] 44:7 Start [3] 41:7 Start [4] 41:7 Start [5] 41:7 Start [5] 41:7 Start [6] 41:7 Start [6] 41:7 Start [7] 41:7 Start [8] Started [7] 41:7 Start [8] Startin [8] Startin [8] Startin [8] Startin [8] Startin [8] Startin [8] Start [8] St		17 1	[11 59:8	
11 4:17 13:17 13:17 13:18	1		1 2 7	
Start 10 14:2 75:13 84:6 88:23 101:22 131: Startad	1	[1] 41:5		
Started Started Started Started Started Started Startegic (7) 4:17 36:21 64:3 64:5 64.7 91:7 Start (2) 96: 124:12 Start Start (2) 96: 124:12 Start Start (1) 96: 124:12 Start (1) 119: 7 Start	ł	Start		1 -
Started (7) 4:17 26:12 64:3 64:5 64:7 91:7 (1) 41:21 (1) 41:21 (1) 4:17 20:10 61:3 64:5 64:7 91:7 (1) 41:21 (1) 41:21 (1) 41:21 (1) 41:21 (1) 41:21 (1) 41:21 (1) 41:20 (1) 41:2	i			
Started	l			[1] 11:1
17 17 17 18 12 18 18 18 18 18 18	Ĭ		Strategic	Summarize
153:3 Starting Fig. 1 Fig. 2			[1] 41:21	
Starting 13 169:7 Stream line 13 169:7 Stream line 1591 41:9 51:4			l 1.7	
State State Streamline				
State				1 T
Cast Assistance Assistanc		[2] 96:8 124:12		Summary
1		State	l 15	[1] 103:21
18:20 18:22 19:8 19:9 19:14 19:14 19:14 19:14 19:14 20:1 20:2 20:20:8 21:14 21:18 22:14 23:7 23:7 23:22 26:24 28:14 32:10 37:6 43:7 43:17 43		[55] 4:9 4:23 5:4 5:18 5:23 5:24 6:	Street	Summer
18:20 18:22 19:8 19:9 19:14 19:14 19:19 20:1 20:2 20:18 21:14 21:18 22:14 19:19 20:1 20:2 20:20 82:14 21:18 22:14 19:37 23:7 23:22 22:22 28:14 32:1 19:38 23:7 23:22 22:22 28:14 32:1 19:38 23:16 23:16 23:16 23:21 23:17 23:17 23:16 23:16 23:21 24:17 25:19 23:16 23:16 23:21 25:19 25:19 23:16 23:16 23:21 25:19 25:19 25:19 25:12 25:19 25:14 25:22 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:23 25:14 25:25 25:14 25:25 25:14 25:25 25:14 25:25 25:1		5 7.1 10:6 10:11 17:13 17:20 18:19	[1] 53:4	[1] 25:3
19:19 20:1 20:2 20:8 21:14 21:16 22: 14 23:7 23:7 23:7 23:2 22:2 26:24 28:14 22: 10 37:6 43:7 43:10 47:11 48:17 48:17 48:17 18:12: 10 48:24 51:12 52:16 52:16 52:16 52:26 52: 22: 25:33:36:22:65:05:16 52:26 52: 26: 22: 25:33:36:22:65:05:16 52:26 52: 26: 22: 25:33:36:22:65:05:16 52:26 52: 26: 22: 25: 25:33:36:22:65:05:10 100:17 100:17 120: 9 15 10 10 11:10 100:17 121: 9 15 10 11:11:11:11:10:17 121: 9 15 10 11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:		18:20 18:22 19:6 19:9 19:14 19:14	Streets	
14 23:7 23:7 23:22 28:24 28:14 32: 10 37:6 43:7 43:7 25:22 28:24 28:14 32: 10 37:6 43:7 43:7 28:12 28:16 52:16 52:26 82:48 18 18 18 48:24 51:12 52:16 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:26 52:18 52:26 52:26 52:18 52:26	ı			
1	l	14 23:7 23:7 25:22 26:24 28:14 32:	1 - 1	
## 84:19 ## 92:9 ## 92:11 100:17 121:9 ## 84:19 ## 92:9 ## 92:11 100:17 121:9 Statement		10 37:6 43:7 43:10 47:11 48:17 48.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Statement		18 48:24 51:12 52:15 52:18 52:21 52:		[1] 37:13
Satiff 92:9 92:11 100:17 121:9 [1] 28:9 [1] 28:19 [1] 28:11			Strides	Supplemented
Statement		84:11 92:9 92:11 100:17 121:9	[1] 28:9	
[1] 6:16 23:22 103:9 103:10 103:18 103:9 104:2 105:13 105:17 107:20 109:15 110:1 119:14 125:10 134:6 134:9		Statement	Stringent	
103:19 104:2 105:13 105:17 107:20 109:15 110:1 119:14 125:10 134:6 134:9 134:9 134:6 108:8 108:8 108:8 108:1 119:20 121:3 12:3 120:25 130:1 Strongest 1] 25:15 Strongest 1] 25:15 Strongly 1] 80:9 Statewide 1] 80:9 Structure 1] 90:7 Structured 1] 90:7 Structured 1] 90:7 Structured 1] 90:7 Structures 1] 25:15 Structures 1] 25:25 Stuck 1] 80:24 Studies 1] 75:4 Studies	1	[16] 6:15 23:22 103:9 103:10 103:18	[11 29:2	
100:15 110:1 119:14 125:10 134:6 101 2:7 87:16 70:10 71:8 71:22 72: 3 72:5 72:21 75:10 76:12 75:10 76:12 5 14:5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	l			
134:9 Statements 101.2: 67:16 716: 712 72: 73: 76: 72: 72: 75: 76 76: 76: 76: 76: 76: 76: 76: 76: 76:				
Statements				[1] 44:5
Strongest 13 13 10 10 12 12 13 13 12 12 13 13		Statements	_	Supplies
121:3 129:25 130:1	ł			• •
States				
Total	l		Strongly	
1 1 1 1 2 3 3 3 1 3 3	1			
Statewide	1		1 2 5	
Station				[10] 27:23 59:4 59:5 59:12 60:3 66:
Station [2] 10:2 11:13 Structures [2] 76:11 87:6 Structures [3] 27:23 59:7 120:3 Supporter [1] 25:25 Stuck [1] 62:24 Studies [1] 62:24 Studies [1] 75:4 Studies [1] 75:4 Supports Supporting [2] 28:9 40:14 Supports [1] 14:8 Supports Supporting [2] 28:9 40:14 Supporting [2] 28:9 40:14 Supportive [1] 14:8 Supports Supports [1] 14:8 Suppose [1] 14:8		Statewide	1 2.7	4 66:5 103:5 119:21 120:7
Station [2] 10:2 11:13 Structures [2] 76:11 87:6 Supporter Stuck Supporting [2] 28:9 40:14 Supportive STB [3] 33:16 33:19 81:22 Studies [1] 75:4 Stuff Supportive Stuff Supports Stuff Supports Stupholed Supports Stupholed Supholed Supports Supholed Suppose Supholed Supholed Suppose Supholed Supholed Supholed Supholed Suppose Supholed Supholed Supholed Supholed Supholed Suph		[1] 6:20		Supported
Calculation Calculation		Station	[1] 43:5	[3] 27:23 59:7 120:3
Statistics			Structures	그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그
The state of the	ŀ		[2] 76:11 87:6	
Stay	ļ		Stuck	
Studies Stud	l			
STB [38] 91:14 91:21 99:11 100:11 100:11 100:15 100:16 103:5 105:14 106:2 107:24 109:21 112:12 112:13 112:16 112:18 112:25 116:11 117:8 119:25 121:5 122:11 122:17 122:23 123:5 124:7 124:9 125:9 125:19 126:14 126: 18 131:3 131:4 131:5 131:11 131:19 133:6 136:4 Steel [17] 13:18 13:19 25:9 30:2 44:11 44: 12 44:14 44:23 61:9 61:21 62:19 63: 1 63:10 76:25 77:5 81:5 122:21 Steelton [2] 44:3 50:11 Steep [1] 109:18 Step [1] 109:18 Submitted [1] 101:3 Submitted [1] 101:3 Submitted [2] 76:21 77:2	1			
[1] 14:18 11:21 99:11 100:11 100:11 100:15 100:16 103:5 105:14 106:2 107:24 109:21 112:13 112:16 112:18 112:25 116:11 117:8 119:25 121:15 122:11 122:17 122:23 123:5 124:7 124:9 125:9 125:19 126:14 126: 18 131:3 131:4 131:5 131:11 131:19 133:6 136:4 Stumbled [1] 80:11 Subcommittee [1] 75:8 Submit [16] 101:3 105:18 106:3 106:13 108: 16 3:10 76:25 77:5 81:5 122:21 Submit 122:11 122:16 124:4 126:20 126:23 133:8 Submits [1] 109:18 Steep [1] 109:18 Submitted [2] 44:13 50:11 Submitted [2] 76:21 77:2				Supportive
100:15 100:16 103:5 105:14 106:2 [5] 45:23 67:5 114:7 115:21 132:10 [1] 11:22 [1] 11:22 [1] 11:22 [1] 11:22 [1] 11:23 [1] 11:23 [1] 11:24 [1] 11:25 [1]		STB		[1] 14:8
100:15 100:16 103:5 105:14 106:2 107:24 109:21 112:12 112:13 112:16 112:18 112:25 116:11 117:8 119:25 121:5 122:11 122:17 122:23 123:5 124:7 124:9 125:9 125:19 126:14 126: 133:6 136:4 133:6 136:4 124:41 44:23 61:9 61:21 62:19 63: 163:10 76:25 77:5 81:5 122:21 122:11 122:11 122:11 122:11 122:11 122:11 122:16 124:4 126:20 126:23 133:8 13:18 13:19 25:9 30:2 44:11 44: 163:10 76:25 77:5 81:5 122:21 122:11 122:16 124:4 126:20 126:23 133:8 13 98:23 99:7 101:6 103:11 108:20 109:18 10	ļ	[38] 91:14 91:21 99:11 100:1 100:11	1	Supports
107:24 109:21 112:12 112:13 112:16 112:18 119:25 116:11 117:8 119:25 121:15 122:11 122:17 122:23 123:5 124:7 124:9 125:9 125:19 126:14 126: 18 131:3 131:4 131:5 131:11 131:19 133:6 136:4 Steel			[5] 45:23 67:5 114:7 115:21 132:10	
112:15 112:25 116:11 17:6 113:25 123:5 122:21 122:21 122:21 223:5 122:21 122:21 122:21 122:21 122:22 122:31 122:23 132:25 123:5 122:21 123:5 122:21 123:5 123:5 123:5 133:8 131:4 131:5 131:11 131:19 133:6 136:4 133:18 13:19 25:9 30:2 44:11 44:		107:24 109:21 112:12 112:13 112:16	Stumbled Stumbled	
121:5 122:11 122:17 122:23 123:5 124:7 124:9 125:9 125:19 126:14 126:		112:18 112:25 116:11 117:8 119:25	[1] 28:7	
124:7 124:9 125:19 125:19 126:14 126: 18 131:3 131:4 131:5 131:11 131:19 133:6 136:4 Steel [17] 13:18 13:19 25:9 30:2 44:11 44: 12 44:14 44:23 61:9 61:21 62:19 63: 163:10 76:25 77:5 81:5 122:21 Steelton [2] 44:13 50:11 Steep [1] 109:18 Step S	Į.	121:5 122:11 122:17 122:23 123:5		
Subcommittee Subcommittee Subcommittee Subcommittee Subcommittee Subcommittee Subcommittee Subcommittee Subcommittee Submit S	Į.			
Steel [17] 13:18 13:19 25:9 30:2 44:11 44: [18] 14:14 44:23 61:9 61:21 62:19 63: [19] 163:10 76:25 77:5 81:5 122:21 [20] 109:16 109:24 [21] 109:16 109:24 [22] 109:16 109:24 [23] 109:16 109:24 [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [25] 109:16 109:24 [26] 109:16 109:24 [27] 109:16 109:24 [28] 109:16 109:24 [29] 109:16 109:24 [20] 109:16 109:24 [20] 109:16 109:24 [21] 109:16 109:24 [22] 109:16 109:24 [23] 109:16 109:24 [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [25] 109:16 109:24 [27] 109:16 109:24 [28] 109:16 109:24 [28] 109:16 109:24 [29] 109:16 109:24 [20] 109:16 109:24 [21] 109:16 109:24 [22] 109:16 109:24 [23] 109:16 109:24 [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [25] 109:16 109:24 [27] 109:16 109:24 [28] 109:16 109:24 [28] 109:16 109:24 [29] 109:16 109:24 [20] 109:16 109:24 [20] 109:16 109:24 [21] 109:16 109:24 [22] 109:16 109:24 [23] 109:16 109:24 [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [25] 109:16 109:24 [27] 109:16 109:24 [28] 109:16 109:24 [28] 109:16 109:24 [29] 109:16 109:24 [20] 109:16 109:24 [21] 109:16 109:24 [22] 109:16 109:24 [22] 109:16 109:24 [23] 109:16 109:24 [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [25] 109:16 109:24 [26] 109:16 109:24 [27] 109:16 109:24 [28] 109:16 109:24 [28] 109:16 109:24 [29] 109:16 109:24 [20] 109:16 109:24 [21] 109:16 109:24 [22] 109:16 109:24 [22] 109:16 109:24 [23] 109:16 109:24 [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [24] 4:12 6:3 25:5 47:14 47:16 47: [25] 109:16 109:24 [26] 109:16 109:24 [27] 109:16	1			[5] 47:15 47:16 113:10 114:8 133:10
Steel [17] 13:18 13:19 25:9 30:2 44:11 44: Submit [2] 109:16 109:24 12 44:14 44:23 61:9 61:21 62:19 63: 50:10 76:25 77:5 81:5 122:21 50:10 76:25 7	ł			Surelv
[17] 13:18 13:19 25:9 30:2 44:11 44: 12 44:14 44:23 61:9 61:21 62:19 63: 1 63:10 76:25 77:5 81:5 122:21 Steelton [2] 44:13 50:11 Steep [1] 109:18 Step Step Step Step Step Step Step Step	I	Stee1	5 5	[2] 109:16 109:24
12 44:14 44:23 61:9 61:21 62:19 63: [16] 101:3 105:18 106:3 106:13 108: 1 63:10 76:25 77:5 81:5 122:21 9 109:20 110:1 111:18 112:10 121:9 Steel ton 122:11 122:16 124:4 126:20 126:23 [2] 44:13 50:11 133:8 Steep Submits [1] 109:18 [1] 101:3 Step Submitted	I			
1 63:10 76:25 77:5 81:5 122:21	1		[16] 101:3 105:18 106:3 106:13 108:	T
Steelton 122:11 122.16 124:4 126:20 126:23 13 98:23 99:7 101:6 103:11 108:20 [2] 44:13 50:11 Submits 110:3 132:12 132:16 132:22 134:12 Steep [1] 109:18 Submitted Supprised Step [2] 76:21 77:2	l		9 109:20 110:1 111:18 112:10 121:9	[44] 4:14 0:3 25:5 4/:14 4/:16 4/: 94 47:24 84:47 88:54 88:7 87:6 84:
[2] 44:13 50:11			122:11 122.16 124:4 126:20 126:23	
Steep Submits 134:17 134:23 [1] 109:18 [1] 101:3 Surprised Step Submitted [2] 76:21 77:2		+ - + - · - + · ·	133:8	
[1] 109:18 [1] 101:3 Surprised [2] 76:21 77:2			Submits	
Step Submitted [2] 76:21 77:2	1			
	1			
		Step	Varii i Ced	[2] 76:21 77:2
				From Stack to Surprised

Suspect [2] 130:11 130:12 Sustain [2] 12:7 23:11 Swatara [1] 22:19 Switch [1] 97:5 **Switches** [1] 97:5 Switching [2] 21:24 88:3 Sworn [4] 103:10 106:7 119:14 125:9 System [19] 5:25 6:17 10:22 11:1 11:24 14: 5 22:8 22:23 42:22 42:24 43:18 43: 19 45:25 64:7 68:17 87:14 104:7 105: 9 117:5 **Systemic** [1] 86:12

T-Cubed [1] 32:17 Table [2] 7:19 9:16 Takeover [3] 64:5 64:5 127:10 Tall [1] 84:19 Tane [13] 4:16 4.20 7.20 8:15 16:10 18:4 18:8 18:11 19:10 48:15 57:15 78:6 Tapes [2] 82:16 108:2 Targeting [1] 88:24 Task [1] 89:17 Taxpayers' [1] 10:21 TCU [2] 105:3 133:20 Team [5] 33:17 85:21 90:7 91:23 91:24 Teamed [1] 37:13 Technical [1] 132:23 Technologies [2] 44:12 45:4 Technology [2] 32:16 33:2 Telecommunications [2] 32:17 32:23 Telephone [1] 45:8 Ten [3] 23:2 26:22 80:23 Tennessee [1] 36:7 Term [10] 15:5 15:16 15:23 22:19 54:22 59:13 88:6 89:2 91:23 92:18 Terminal [3] 29:10 72:19 97:14 Terminals [5] 36:20 36:23 37:1 71:16 71:18 Terms [3] 34:7 64:22 64:25 Terrible [2] 41:2 81:4

Territory

[1] 29:18

Test [1] 133:9 Testified [5] 7:16 21:15 25:2 102:14 135:22 Testifier [1] 20:15 Testifiers [1] 6:6 Testify [5] 6:22 133:21 133:23 134:4 135:11 **Testifying** [4] 6:12 7:6 98:13 135:25 Testimonies [2] 27:4 78:11 **Testimony** [43] 4:3 4:4 4:9 4:25 5:14 6:16 6: 20 6:21 8:7 14:11 17:17 18:6 19:18 19:23 21:9 21:12 23:15 23:24 23:25 25:24 46:12 46:22 47:13 49.19 53:18 53:24 54:6 56:6 58:18 60.23 61:2 61: 5 61:11 62:14 63:24 77:19 81:4 82: 20 98:5 132:1 132:2 132:4 133:24 Thanking [1] 25:10 Themselves [2] 40:18 130:9 Therefore [1] 60:14 Therein [1] 49.1 They've [20] 5.6 13:25 18:16 18:17 18:18 19: Ī3 Ī9:14 19:15 53:23 100:5 106:2 111:23 112:5 115:7 118:12 123:17 126:23 126:24 127:5 127:5 Thinking [2] 29:21 118:19 Thinks [2] 14:20 18:20 Third [6] 34:21 57:20 113:5 116:13 135:22 136:2 **Thoroughbred** [21 26:18 32:16 **Thousand** [1] 36:18 Thousands [1] 73:5 Three [12] 27:24 31:14 42:18 58:8 63:16 81:23 83:3 96:3 96:21 112:19 124:16 125:21 Threshold. [3] 78:25 97:2 97:6 Thrilled [1] 79:16 Thrive [2] 12:19 16:11 Throughout [2] 34:18 37:19 Thumbed [1] 18:18 THURSDAY [1] 1:13 Tide [1] 31:2 Tied [2] 72:13 107:1 Timber [1] 8:20 Timmons [47] 3:5 20:17 20:19 29:24 30:10 42: 20 44:9 45:15 45:18 46:18 46:25 47: 18 47:23 50:20 52:9 52:14 52:17 53: 15 54:3 55:11 56:10 56:17 57:1 57: 10 57:12 57:22 58:2 58:10 60:19 60: 24 62:3 62:12 63:23 65:2 66:9 67:6

73:8 75:1 76:8 76:21 79:9 80:17 105: 25 109:12 110:4 110:21 123:19 Timmons' [2] 27:4 106:11 Timmons's [1] 107:19 Today [42] 6:6 6:12 7:11 8:1 13:8 18:3 26: 25 31:19 42:14 44:8 49:10 49:19 50: 1 50:3 50:19 58:23 61:6 77:18 78:7 78:11 80:2 82:19 82:22 83:15 88:25 90:3 95:23 97:18 99:24 100:3 101:13 105:17 106:1 112:20 119:4 132:2 132: 6 133:24 134:9 135:3 135:10 135:13 Today's [1] 29:2 Together [4] 9:17 74:22 91:6 128:13 [9] 3:8 82:11 98:6 98:8 98:10 98:14 129:19 129:21 132:7 Tone [2] 118:24 119:2 Tony [1] 134:10 Took [4] 4:9 45:10 47:13 104:9 Top [1] 72:17 Total [6] 22:3 29:6 32:9 96:15 108:13 117: Totaled [1] 53:9 Touched [1] 43:13 Toured [1] 50:10 Tout [1] 81:9 Toward [1] 126:17 Town [1] 6:18 Township [1] 22:19 Track [16] 9:24 9:25 11:6 11:7 11:22 12:2 15:2 45:5 53:4 53:12 84:16 85:2 96: 7 96:12 96:18 132:9 Track-related [2] 95:20 96:2 Tracked [1] 45:11 Tracking [2] 28:18 82:18 Tracks [2] 53:3 53:6 Trades [1] 56:20 Tradition [2] 23:11 29:17 Traditional [1] 38:6 Traditionally [1] 85:8 Traffic [10] 15:8 34:10 34:19 69:3 69:4 70: 2 70:4 84:24 85:14 108:2 **Trailers** [1] 26:14 Train [9] 29:8 32:1 35:19 39:3 85:4 91:8 96:12 109:1 109:9 Training [1] 83:10 Trains

[7] 34:9 36.6 81:14 93:21 94:6 94:9 108:24 Transaction [17] 24:7 27:16 27:22 33:24 34.6 34: 14 34:21 100:25 105:2 120:3 122:22 123:3 123:8 123:13 124:17 129:6 134: **Transactions** [3] 27:2 127:9 133:7 Transcontinental [2] 35:17 35:18 **Transcript** [1] 137:4 Transition [2] 93:12 93:18 Transload [1] 32:4 Transpired [1] 49:24 **Transport** [1] 99:4 **Transportation** [41] 1:5 4:12 6:3 16:13 22:2 25:5 39:10 39:18 39:18 41:3 41:22 41:24 47:14 47:16 47:21 47:24 52:23 54:17 55:21 59:13 59:22 66:7 67:9 68:17 71:15 73:25 81:13 98:24 99:3 99:7 101:6 103:11 108:20 110:3 132:12 132:16 132:22 134:11 134:12 134:17 134:24 Transported [1] 45:24 Travel [1] 17:12 Tremendous [3] 13:24 57:16 111:10 **Trends** [4] 85:25 88:19 90:22 91:10 Trickery [1] 124:23 Tricky [1] 121:12 Tried [3] 55:14 116:14 118:13 Triple [4] 22:18 26:17 72:2 72:10 Trips [2] 31:24 74:19 Trouble [2] 74:5 74:6 Troubling [1] 131:7 Truck [5] 31:24 69.4 69:14 71:2 73:9 Trucker [1] 109:6 **Truckers** [1] 62:23 Trucking [4] 26:17 39:25 40:23 71:14 Trucks [12] 5:10 70:18 71:7 71:8 71:11 71: 23 72:2 72:2 72:4 73:1 73:5 75:16 True [4] 90:13 92:14 109:16 110:1 Truly [1] 16:9 Truth [1] 93:21 Try [9] 10:19 44:10 51:21 55:22 60:15 64:13 75:20 80:21 136:6 Trying [10] 5:17 12:16 16:3 55:18 72:7 73: 17 74:1 74:2 105:24 106:20 Turn [3] 27:14 28:9 81:7

Turnaround [1] 13:22 Turned [5] 64:17 66:19 66:20 114:3 114:7 Turnout [2] 97:4 97:5 Twenty [1] 82:9 Two [34] 6:11 13:21 17:6 24:24 27:6 29: 25 34:13 36:4 36:21 41:5 46:4 53:9 58:8 65:19 66:11 71:9 72:6 72:11 80: 24 90:6 93:14 98:11 111:6 112:25 113:10 117:3 117:15 120:10 120:11 121:24 122:1 122:8 132:23 133:1 TWU [2] 105:2 132:3 Type [7] 10:7 10:8 71:20 97:2 109:18 116: 21 122:22 **Types** [1] 38:15 U

U.S. [5] 25:9 30:1 76:25 77:5 81:5 **Ultimately** [1] 27:17 Unabating [1] 41.15 Unable [1] 49:15 Uncles [1] 83:3 Under [18] 9:9 21:11 54:10 67:10 75:4 75: 15 75:18 85.22 93:8 102:15 103:10 115:11 121:16 121:22 123:14 124:6 124:7 128:10 Undercut [2] 66:15 81:8 **Underlines** [1] 27:7 Underlying [1] 27:17 **Understate** [1] 110:23 Undertaken [1] 133:5 Underutilized [3] 40:15 118:6 118:8 Unfortunate [1] 46:10 Unfortunately [2] 46:1 49:16 UNFULFILLED [1] 1:5 Unilaterally [1] 122:13 Union [11] 68:1 91:3 91:4 91:5 99:1 99:4 99:5 99:16 124:12 124:13 134:11 Unions [14] 47:25 98:19 98:22 98:25 99:6 99:10 99:20 100:14 103:7 114:20 114: 23 121:15 122:3 127:23 Unique [2] 33:7 122:17 Unit [1] 29:12 **United** [5] 34:18 36:12 98:23 102:14 103:8 United/US [1] 122:21 Units [2] 36:18 38:16 Unleashed

[1] 34:3 Unpalatable [1] 41:13 Unprecedented [6] 5:3 6:13 27:7 42:17 45:2 109:19 [1] 40:6 Unusua₁ [1] 77:4 **Unwilling** [1] 112:6 Up [54] 4:22 5:22 8:10 8:11 11:14 16:4 20:6 20:18 21:7 25:13 28:23 31:24 33:8 33:13 36:6 37:13 38:13 39:19 45:23 46:3 50:25 54:24 55:3 60:1 60: 3 61:24 62:23 64:4 64:7 64:8 67:8 67:18 69:5 70:16 74:10 74:18 78:12 79:15 81:19 82:8 82:10 88:6 88:13 89:15 93:17 96:21 97:11 98:6 98:7 98:11 111:10 114:1 131:13 133:19 Upgrades [1] 53:12 Upgrading [1] 40:13 Uproot [1] 115:19 Ups [1] 55:7 Upturn [1] 25:6 Upward [1] 21:21 Urge [1] 134:24 Usage [1] 108:17 USS [1] 80:8 Usua1 [1] 110:23 Utilities [2] 22:25 34:18 **Utilization** [1] 104:6

V Vague [1] 119:8 Validate [1] 26:2 **Valley** [2] 34:15 34:16 **Valuations** [1] 39:22 Value [5] 27:14 27:15 29:21 44:20 64:9 Variety [3] 21:18 64:6 108:3 **Various** [3] 59:3 98:19 98:22 **Vehicles** [1] 38:9 Velocity [2] 29:10 39:3 Veon [5] 2:3 3:4 16:21 16:22 58:15 Verified [4] 103:9 103:9 103:18 104:2 Versus [3] 38:16 95:12 95:23 Vessel [1] 69:22 Viable [1] 14:5 Vice

[5] 20:16 21:2 26.4 26:11 135:2 Video [3] 91:25 101:12 101:20 Videotape [3] 4:18 4:19 102:14 [1] 34:9 View [6] 13:5 15:6 15:16 54:16 101:5 121: **Vigorous** [1] 100.24 Violation [1] 86:9 **Violations** [1] 86.6 Virgin [1] 11:8 Virginia [3] 32:20 36:7 104:1 Visit [1] 77:16 **Volatility** [1] 62:20 Voluntarily [1] 86:7 Voracity [1] 77:22 W

Wages [1] 40:4 Waiting [1] 59:18 Wants [1] 14:16 Warren [1] 8:11 Washington [6] 2:21 25:6 98:17 127:24 133:23 135:2 Waste [2] 76:1 76:1 Watch [1] 7:11 Watching [1] 132:5 Wayne [1] 26:18 Ways [4] 27:25 28:4 41:9 75:12 Weather [1] 64:19 Web [1] 104:14 Website [1] 104:9 Week [6] 13:9 13:19 21:22 25:6 81:12 126: Weeks [3] 13:21 20:21 78:18 Weight [1] 106:5 We1come [2] 6:7 67:5 We1ded [1] 45:24 West [4] 8:12 87:6 87:8 91:5 Whatsoever [1] 121:19

Whereas

[1] 87:9

Whip

[3] 16:19 16:20 16:21 White [2] 4:13 4:15 Whole [14] 5:2 10:25 12:8 14:5 27:2 39:10 44:1 77:18 96:16 107:10 107:25 109: 7 109:17 127:6 Wholesaler [1] 71:15 Wiggle [2] 102:8 106:21 Wiggling [1] 101:16 Willing. [2] 67.8 128:25 Willingness [1] 24:20 Wilmington [10] 69:2 69:3 69:5 69:14 69:18 70: 13 70:14 70:23 71:7 72:20 Wilson [1] 132:11 Wise [2] 65:18 74:7 Wish [1] 17:3 Wishes [1] 16:25 Wishful [1] 29:20 Wi tness [2] 3:2 104:3 Witnessed [1] 77:4 Won [1] 23:3 Wonder [2] 65:15 78:13 Wondering [2] 65:23 65:25 Word [6] 49:18 50:2 78:11 102:10 130:15 Words [1] 102:9 Workers [14] 19.7 54:1 54:23 56:23 56:25 57: 4 57:19 57:20 99:2 99:3 99:5 107:11 114:22 114:25 Workplace [1] 89:19 Works [4] 10:23 116:3 133:22 134:8 World [4] 22:14 75:24 117:4 131:20 Worlds [1] 131:11 Worth [1] 58:4 Writing [7] 4:11 48:19 48:21 49:3 67:7 130: 4 133:25 Written

Y

[8] 5:17 46:17 46:21 48:16 49:1 49:

8 49:8 114:12

[2] 132:11 133:2

Wrote

Yard
[9] 30:12 45:3 45:10 71:8 71:8 95:
24 97:12 97:13 127:4
Yard-related
[1] 95:24
Yards
[10] 17:24 21:23 21:24 22:15 22:15
22:16 50:22 69:6 83:5 96:17

Year

[36] 23:5 23:22 37:4 39:20 44:13 44: 24 50:10 61:14 61:22 62:7 62:9 64:7 65:3 77:3 79:3 80:8 80:18 83:6 95:5 95:11 95:12 95:13 96:5 96:9 96:15 96:19 107:11 108:4 108:4 109:4 110: 16 110:25 113:14 113:16 113:17 122:8

Years

[35] 8:4 15:13 17:3 17:14 17:22 18: 15 22:5 23:3 24:4 26:22 27:6 38:24 39:12 42:19 71:9 71:10 72:6 72:12 78:14 81:17 83:6 84:24 87:2 88:9 89: 8 90:7 93:15 96:3 96:21 101:21 112: 25 113:10 122:1 122:6 125:15

Yesterday

[3] 6:23 38:12 95:11

Yields [1] 42:6

[1] 42:

York

[23] 24:2 24:3 24:6 24:10 24:13 24:19 24:20 36:6 57:2 57:7 69:18 101: 24 104:24 115:10 115:11 127:15 127: 19 127:21 128:7 128:14 128:16 129:5 129:6

Yourselves

[2] 74:3 74:4

Ζ

Zero [1] 11:1