


STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1795

Telephone 202.429.3000
Facsimile 202.429.3902
www.step toe.com

Cynthia L. Quarterman
202.429.6272
cquarterm@step toe.com



May 9, 2003

BY HAND DELIVERY

The Honorable Vernon A. Williams
Secretary
Surface Transportation Board
1925 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20423

207789

ENTERED
Office of Proceedings

MAY 12 2003

Part of
Public Record

Re: Docket No. 42054, *PPL Montana, LLC v. The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company*

Dear Secretary Williams:

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced proceeding is the original and ten copies of the parties' Joint Motion to Amend the Protective Order in this proceeding in response to the Board's Decision served April 25, 2003, in Ex Parte No. 638 and embraced rail rate proceedings.

Sincerely,

Cynthia L. Quarterman

Enclosure

cc: John Cutler

WASHINGTON

PHOENIX

LOS ANGELES

LONDON

BRUSSELS

ENTERED
Office of Proceedings

MAY 12 2003

Part of
Public Record


BEFORE THE
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Docket No. 42054

PPL MONTANA, LLC

v.

THE BURLINGTON NORTHERN AND SANTA FE RAILWAY COMPANY



JOINT MOTION TO AMEND PROTECTIVE ORDER

On April 25, 2003, the Board served an order in STB Ex Parte No. 638, embracing this proceeding among others, that required the parties to review and jointly propose, by May 9, 2003, any modifications of the protective orders governing this proceeding needed to comply with the Board's Decision served April 3, 2003 in Ex Parte No. 638, *Procedures to Expedite Resolution of Rail Rate Challenges to Be Considered Under the Stand-Alone Cost Methodology* ("April 3 Decision"). The Board indicated that if the parties were unable to reach agreement on such modifications by that time, the Board would revise the protective orders itself. The parties in this proceeding have agreed on certain modifications to the existing protective orders that they believe are appropriate to comply with the spirit, if not the letter, of the Board's April 3 Decision. In the April 3 Decision, the Board found that the public interest requires parties to file a public version of SAC submissions and to prepare a partially redacted ("Confidential") version of each submission that contains its own "Highly Confidential" material. April 3 Decision at 7-10. That Decision contemplated contemporaneous filing and/or service of public and "Confidential" versions of SAC submissions with the "Highly Confidential" version. The parties here have agreed to a modest change to that schedule and respectfully request the Board to adopt the parties' proposal.

Specifically, the parties propose that filing of public versions be deferred by three days. During that three day period, the parties intend to draft a public version of their respective filings, exchange those draft filings, and review and confer with each other regarding the proposed public filings. The parties believe this process has several advantages. First, because

preparing the "Highly Confidential" version of SAC evidence requires an extended effort, which must be completed before counsel can undertake the preparation of either a "Confidential" or a public version, the proposed process will provide parties with additional time to prepare the public versions more carefully. Second, the process will help minimize disputes between the parties concerning necessary redactions in public versions of "Confidential" or "Highly Confidential" materials and the possibility of inadvertent disclosure of such protected materials. Finally, the three days it will take to complete this process will not unduly delay public review of these materials. Indeed, the additional time taken to prevent inadvertent disclosures of sensitive information serves the public interest. As to the service of "Confidential" versions (or an alternative list) of pleadings or evidence containing a party's own "Highly Confidential" material, the parties have agreed to defer this filing by one business day. The proposed protective order adopts these deferrals.

Therefore, the parties jointly propose that the protective order in this proceeding be modified to include the following additional paragraphs:


1. If a party files with the Board a pleading or evidence containing Confidential and/or Highly Confidential material in accordance with this Protective Order, that party shall, within three (3) business days after the filing of such pleading or evidence, file with the Board a public version of such pleading or evidence from which all Confidential and Highly Confidential material has been redacted. On the first day of that three-day period following the day of the filing, the parties shall exchange draft public versions of their filings. On the second day, the parties shall provide comments on the other party's draft. Workpapers accompanying such pleading or evidence need not be included in the public version.
2. If a party (the "filing party") files and serves upon the other party (the "reviewing party") a pleading or evidence containing the filing party's Highly Confidential material, the filing party shall also prepare and serve upon the reviewing party a Confidential Version of the pleading or evidence from which the filing party's Highly Confidential material has been redacted within one business day of the filing. The Confidential Version may be provided in hardcopy or electronic format at the option of the filing party, and may be disclosed to those personnel employed by the reviewing party who have read a copy of this Protective Order and executed the attached Undertaking for Confidential Material ("In-house Personnel"). Alternatively, in lieu of preparing and serving a Confidential


Version of any such pleading or evidence, the filing party may provide to outside counsel for the reviewing party a list of the filing party's own Highly Confidential information that must be redacted from its Highly Confidential Version prior to review by the reviewing party's In-house Personnel. If the filing party chooses this latter option, it shall provide the list to outside counsel for the reviewing party within one business day of the filing of the Highly Confidential version, and such outside counsel shall redact the designated material prior to review of the pleading or evidence by the reviewing party's In-house Personnel.

3. Workpapers accompanying a pleading or evidence and containing the filing party's Highly Confidential material need not be included in a Confidential Version (or substitute list) of the pleading or evidence provided to the reviewing party. To ensure that each party can respond with appropriate input from In-house Personnel to evidence or other material or information filed by another party, the parties shall cooperate promptly to redact or otherwise identify portions of such workpapers filed as Highly Confidential so that redacted versions thereof can be disclosed to a party's In-house Personnel.

For the foregoing reasons, the parties urge the Board to grant this Joint Motion.

Respectfully submitted,


Samuel M. Sipe, Jr.
Anthony J. LaRocca
Cynthia L. Quarterman
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 429-3000


John M. Cutler, Jr.
McCARTHY, SWEENEY
& HARKAWAY PC
Suite 600
2715 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 775-5560

Attorneys for The Burlington Northern
and Santa Fe Railway Company

Attorney for PPL Montana, LLC

May 9, 2003