



# DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

---

---

STATEMENT OF

STEVEN C. SUNSHINE  
DEPUTY ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL  
ANTITRUST DIVISION  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RAILROADS  
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONCERNING

COMPETITIVE REVIEW OF RAILROAD MERGERS AFTER ICC SUNSET

ON

JANUARY 26, 1995

Madam Chairwoman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I very much appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today to explain how the Department of Justice would review railroad mergers and acquisitions if the Interstate Commerce Commission's authority to review and approve those transactions is repealed. The Department of Justice believes that railroad mergers and acquisitions should be reviewed under the same legal standards that apply to virtually every other sector of our nation's economy. We believe that the antitrust approach would provide significant advantages, saving time and scarce federal resources and reducing burden and delay on the merging parties, while still protecting the public interest by preventing anticompetitive mergers.

For most of our economy, Congress has chosen to rely on market competition rather than government regulation to protect consumers and the public interest. Not only does competition best allocate scarce goods and services to those who value them most highly, it also forces firms to become as efficient as possible. Consumers benefit where competition is vibrant -- it provides the highest possible quality of goods and services at the lowest possible cost. The antitrust laws protect competition by prohibiting unreasonable restraints of trade, including mergers that threaten substantially to lessen competition.

A number of important industries have in recent years been largely freed from economic regulation, including trucking, airlines, and natural gas production. Building on earlier regulatory and legislative efforts, the Staggers Rail Act of 1980 substantially deregulated the freight rail industry by placing more reliance on market forces. The Staggers Act is widely credited with revitalizing freight railroads, many of which were in precarious financial condition. The next logical step to deregulate further the rail industry would be to eliminate prior government review and approval of mergers under the "public interest" standard that is currently embodied in the Interstate Commerce Act.

Under the Interstate Commerce Act (ICA), rail carrier mergers must receive prior government approval under a broad "public interest" standard before they are permitted to occur. If a merger transaction involves two class I railroads, the ICC may not approve it unless and until the Commission determines that the transaction is, on balance, "consistent with the public interest."<sup>1</sup>

The ICA directs the Commission to consider competition, but only as one of five factors to balance in assessing the public

---

<sup>1</sup> 49 U.S.C. § 11344(c). If a merger transaction does not involve two class I railroads, the ICA requires approval unless the ICC finds there is likely to be substantial lessening of competition, creation of a monopoly, or restraint of trade in freight surface transportation in any region of the United States and the anticompetitive effects of the transaction outweigh the public interest in meeting significant transportation needs. Id. § 11344(d).

interest: the effect of the proposed transaction on the adequacy of transportation to the public; the effect on the public interest of including, or failing to include, other rail carriers in the proposed transaction; the total fixed charges that would result from the proposed transaction; the interest of carrier employees affected by the proposed transaction; and whether the proposed transaction would have an adverse effect on competition among rail carriers in the affected region.<sup>2</sup>

The ICA contemplates intervention in the process by competitors and other interested parties, and provides for lengthy time periods for the Commission to conduct evidentiary hearings and issue its determinations. It can take the Commission up to two to three years to render its decisions on mergers having significant competition issues. Even a rail merger that raises few competitive concerns can be under review at the ICC for a year or more. For example, the ICC recently completed its review of the proposal by the Union Pacific for authority to take control of the Chicago & North Western. Union Pacific filed its application on January 29, 1993; the ICC approved the transaction in December 1994. There was extensive participation by competitors -- competitors who were perhaps

---

<sup>2</sup> 49 U.S.C. § 11344(b)(1).

more concerned with their own private interests than with the merger's likely impact on rail customers.

A more dramatic example of the time that ICC proceedings can take was the Santa Fe's proposal to take control of the Southern Pacific, which the Department opposed at the Commission. Those railroads first notified the ICC about their proposed combination on November 22, 1983. The ICC's ultimate decision, which disapproved the transaction, was not made until almost 3 years later, on October 10, 1986. Then, close to 2 more years passed before the ICC ordered Santa Fe to divest the Southern Pacific stock, which the ICC had allowed Santa Fe to hold in a voting trust.

The ICA's public interest standard as applied in ICC railroad merger proceedings has led to the negotiation of many protective and other conditions that caused the merged carrier to make concessions to protesting parties, which often include its principal competitors. Such conditions can limit the potential efficiencies of a merger and protect competitors from the enhanced competition that could otherwise result from a procompetitive combination.

In contrast, merger enforcement under the antitrust laws protects competition, not competitors. Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 18, the primary provision of the antitrust laws governing mergers and acquisitions, prohibits those transactions that threaten "substantially to lessen competition in any line of commerce in any section of the country." The central issue under

the Clayton Act is whether the merger will result in increased prices to consumers or reduced services.

Merger decisions are made far more quickly under the antitrust laws than under the ICA. Under the premerger notification provisions of the Hart-Scott-Rodino ("HSR") Act,<sup>3</sup> routine mergers that raise no antitrust issues can be consummated upon the expiration of a 30-day waiting period (15 days for cash tender offers). When requested, the antitrust enforcement agencies will in appropriate cases agree to "early termination" of the waiting period in less than 30 days.

Where a merger does raise antitrust concerns, we are able to obtain all of the information we need to resolve those concerns expeditiously. If we need additional information from the parties to complete our investigation, we can issue a "second request" that will extend the waiting period an additional 20 days after the parties supply the requested information.<sup>4</sup> The Department seeks information from competitors, suppliers, customers, employees, and other knowledgeable parties in order to analyze the effects of the merger. In addition, we can seek documents, deposition testimony, and interrogatory answers from the parties and other persons pursuant to the Antitrust Civil Process Act.

When the Department determines that a proposed merger raises significant competitive issues, several steps are available to

---

<sup>3</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 18a.

<sup>4</sup> 15 U.S.C. §§ 18(b)(1), (e).

speed resolution of the matter. Most such matters are resolved in 6 months to a year. The parties can "fix-it-first" by restructuring the transaction, which avoids a legal challenge by the Department. If the investigation runs its course and the Department decides to challenge the transaction, the parties and the Department frequently negotiate a consent judgment that corrects the competitive problem but otherwise allows the remainder of the transaction to go forward.

If the Department concludes that a merger transaction as structured would violate the antitrust laws, and the parties do not wish to restructure it, the Department must go to court to prevent the transaction. The Department can seek a preliminary injunction, which prohibits the merger pending a full trial for a permanent injunction. Even if the case goes through a full trial, it will likely be resolved less than a year after the complaint is filed, substantially less time than it usually takes the ICC to reach a final decision on a merger under the ICA. However, only a small percentage of the mergers reviewed by the Department are challenged in court.

The analytical framework we use in merger investigations is set forth in the 1992 Horizontal Merger Guidelines, issued jointly by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. These Merger Guidelines have been cited and relied on by the courts in merger cases. Under the Merger Guidelines, we assess the merger's likely harm to competition, and consider any efficiencies that may outweigh potential harmful effects.

Our competitive analysis takes into account the position of each of the merging firms in each economically meaningful "relevant market", the relevant market's concentration, the extent to which that concentration would be increased, the competitive conditions likely to exist in the market after the transaction, and the likely ability of the resulting firm to raise prices or lower services to the detriment of consumers. We define relevant markets carefully, through an evaluation of any effective substitutes customers have for the services provided by the merging firms.

For railroad mergers, the analysis begins with identification of the affected routes. For two railroads with largely parallel routes, the logical starting point for defining a market is the carriage of a particular commodity from one point (called an origin) to a second point (called a destination) by the merging railroads.



Once the affected routes are identified, the analysis generally focuses on an evaluation of the other rail, intermodal, product, and source competition options available to shippers. Intermodal competition is the ability of a shipper to substitute another mode of transportation, usually truck or water carriage, for the shipment of a particular commodity between a particular origin and destination. If truck or water service is available and is a close substitute for rail carriage for certain commodities, these competitive alternatives would prevent a rail carrier from raising its rates for these commodities. For other commodities, however, trucks may be at a significant disadvantage to rail where, for example, the distance the commodity is shipped is great, the volume of the commodity shipped is large, or the value of the commodity as compared to its weight is small.

Other forms of competition considered include product and source competition. "Product competition" is the ability of a shipper to substitute another commodity that allows use of a transportation system other than the merged rail carrier. "Source competition" is the ability of shippers in the region of the merging railroads to avoid high rail rates by shipping a commodity to another destination or by obtaining it from another source, again using other than the merged rail carrier.

If one or more of these forms of competition is available, its existence will be reflected in the Department's definition of the markets affected by the merger. If such competition is significant, it may defeat or limit the ability of the merged carrier to raise prices. The degree to which any of these methods of competition will be effective will vary according to the nature of the commodities, routes, and perhaps other factors, including differences in demand and/or supply elasticity for different commodities.

The antitrust laws do not prohibit efficient railroad mergers that can benefit shippers. The Merger Guidelines expressly recognize that mergers can enhance efficiency. When necessary to an evaluation of the net competitive effects of a merger, we consider the prospect that real efficiencies will be achieved that could not be realized absent the merger. Thus, the Department of Justice will challenge a merger only when its likely harm to competition is not outweighed by its likely efficiencies.

The Department has not opposed rail mergers that did not significantly threaten competition. Over the past 10 years, the Department opposed only one rail merger in its entirety -- the proposed consolidation of the Santa Fe and Southern Pacific Railroads -- a transaction the ICC ultimately disapproved. The Department raised no objection to the two rail mergers most recently approved by the ICC: Kansas City Southern's acquisition of Mid-South, and the Union Pacific's control of the Chicago &

North Western.

In sum, our analysis of proposed railroad mergers using the Merger Guidelines is the same general analysis we use in reviewing mergers subject to the antitrust laws. That analysis is sophisticated, thorough, and flexible -- it involves far more than simply computing market shares or concentration figures. It takes into account all the dynamics of the markets with which we are dealing.

Subjecting railroad mergers and acquisitions to the antitrust laws would expedite both the investigation and resolution of such transactions.

Madam Chairwoman, this concludes my prepared remarks. I would be happy to respond to any questions that you or other members of the Subcommittee may have.