Pages 1 - 43

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable Charles R. Breyer, Judge

IN RE: VOLKSWAGEN "CLEAN DIESEL"
MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES, AND
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

) No. C 15-MD-2672 CRB

San Francisco, California Wednesday, January 18, 2017

)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For PSC Plaintiffs:

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN LLP

275 Battery Street - 29th Floor San Francisco, California 94111

BY: ELIZABETH J. CABRASER, ATTORNEY AT LAW

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN LLP

250 Hudson Street - 8th Floor

New York, New York 10013

BY: DAVID S. STELLINGS, ATTORNEY AT LAW

For PSC Plaintiffs:

BAILEY & GLASSER LLP

209 Capitol Street

Charleston, West Virginia 25301

BY: BENJAMIN L. BAILEY, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

REPORTED BY: Jo Ann Bryce, CSR No. 3321, RMR, CRR, FCRR

Official Reporter

1	APPEARANCES: (CONTINUED)		
2	For PSC Plaintiffs: KELLER ROHRBACK LLP		
3	1201 Third Avenue - Suite 3200 Seattle, Washington 98101		
4	BY: LYNN L. SARKO, ATTORNEY AT LAW		
5	For PSC Plaintiffs: BLEICHMAR, FONTI & AULD LLP		
6	1999 Harrison Street - Suite 670 Oakland, California 94612		
7	BY: LESLEY WEAVER, ATTORNEY AT LAW		
8	For Plaintiffs Napleton Orlando Imports, LLC, Napleton Sanford Imports, LLC, Napleton		
9	Automotive of Urbana, LLC and J. Bertolet, Inc.: HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP		
10	1918 Eighth Avenue - Suite 3300 Seattle, Washington 98101		
11	BY: STEVE W. BERMAN, ATTORNEY AT LAW THOMAS E. LOESER, ATTORNEY AT LAW		
12	BASS SOX MERCER		
13	2822 Remington Green Circle Tallahassee, Florida 32308		
14	BY: RICHARD N. SOX, ATTORNEY AT LAW		
15	For Plaintiffs: FINKELSTEIN THOMPSON LLP		
16	505 Montgomery Street - Suite 300 San Francisco, California 94111		
17	BY: ROSEMARY M. RIVAS, ATTORNEY AT LAW		
18	For Plaintiff U.S. Department of Justice: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE		
19	Environment and Natural Resources Div. 601 D Street, N.W.		
20	Washington, D.C. 20004 BY: JOSHUA H. VAN EATON, TRIAL ATTORNEY		
21	BETHANY ENGEL, TRIAL ATTORNEY		
22	For Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission: FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION		
23	Bureau of Consumer Protection 600 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.		
24	Mailstop CC-9528 Washington, D.C. 20580		
25	BY: JONATHAN COHEN, ATTORNEY AT LAW		

1	APPEARANCES:	(CONTINUE	ED)
2	For Plaintiff	State of	California: OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
3			State of California 455 Golden Gate Avenue - Room 11000
4		BY:	San Francisco, California 94102 NICKLAS A. AKERS
5		D1 •	SENIOR ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
6	For Defendant	Volkswage	
7			SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP 125 Broad Street
8		BY:	New York, New York 10004 ROBERT J. GIUFFRA, JR., ATTORNEY AT LAW M. DAVID POSSICK, ATTORNEY AT LAW
9	For Defendant	Volkawaa	
10	FOI Delendant	VOIRSWAGE	HERZFELD & RUBIN PC 125 Broad Street
11			New York, New York 10004
12		BY:	MICHAEL B. GALLUB, ATTORNEY AT LAW
13	For Defendant	Porsche:	ALSTON & BIRD LLP
13			One Atlantic Center
14			1201 West Peachtree Street Atlanta, Georgia 30309
15		BY:	KARA F. KENNEDY, ATTORNEY AT LAW
16	For Defendants	Robert I	Bosch Gmbh and Robert Bosch LLC: CLEARY, GOTTLIEB, STEEN & HAMILTON LLP
17			2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
18		BY:	Washington, D.C. 20006 MATTHEW D. SLATER, ATTORNEY AT LAW
19	For Objector Smith Volkswagen, Ltd.:		
20			SMITH VOLKSWAGEN, LTD. 4304 Kirkwood Highway
21		BY:	Wilmington, Delaware 19808 THOMAS C. SMITH, PRESIDENT
22	For Objector (Volkswagen:	CMS Volksv	vagen Holdings LLC dba Palisades
23			ARENT FOX LLP 555 W. Fifth Street - 48th Floor
24		BY:	Los Angeles, California 90013 VICTOR DANHI, ATTORNEY AT LAW
25		DI:	VICIOR DANGI, ALLORMEL AL LAW

Wednesday - January 18, 2017 1 8:10 a.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 Calling Civil Action MDL Case Number THE CLERK: 4 5 C 15-MD-2672, In Re Volkswagen "Clean Diesel" Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litigation. 6 Counsel, please state your appearances for the record. 7 MS. CABRASER: Good morning, Your Honor. Elizabeth 8 Cabraser, Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, plaintiffs' 9 lead counsel on behalf of the PSC, and appearing with me today 10 11 is my partner David Stellings. THE COURT: Good morning. 12 MR. VAN EATON: Good morning, Your Honor. 13 Van Eaton for the United States, with my colleague Bethany 14 15 Engel. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. AKERS: Good morning, Your Honor. Nicklas Akers 18 on behalf of the California Attorney General and the California 19 Air Resources Board. MR. BERMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Steve Berman, 20 21 member of the PSC, appearing here today as co-lead counsel for the franchise dealers. 22 23 THE COURT: Good morning. MR. COHEN: Good morning, Your Honor. Jonathan Cohen 24 for the Federal Trade Commission. 25

MR. GIUFFRA: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert Giuffra, Sullivan & Cromwell, for the Volkswagen defendants. Also with me is David Possick, my colleague; and we also have Mike Gallub with the Herzfeld & Rubin firm who is our co-counsel. Good to see you again.

THE COURT: It's a pleasure.

MS. KENNEDY: Good morning, Your Honor. Kara Kennedy with Alston & Bird for the Porsche defendants.

MR. SLATER: Good morning. Matthew Slater of Cleary Gottlieb on behalf of Robert Bosch Gmbh and Robert Bosch LLC.

THE COURT: All right, good morning. Well, thank you very much for attending.

As you know, this is the time that is set for the hearing on the final approval of the franchise dealer aspect of the litigation, which is what I want to turn to first. And then, taking advantage of everyone's travels to California, I'd like to get a report from those who wish to report to the Court as to the progress of the litigation to date and where we intend to go from here.

So let me remind the parties that we are on CourtCall, which means that you should come to the microphone and speak into it so that those individuals who are not in the courtroom but are participating by way of CourtCall have the opportunity to hear what is being said.

So let's start now with the franchise dealer. It was

preliminarily approved I believe in December, is that correct, by my recollection?

MR. BERMAN: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And maybe, Mr. Berman, you'll come forward and you can enlighten us and tell us where we are and why it is your opinion that we should give final approval to the settlement.

MR. BERMAN: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

First, with me today is my co-lead counsel Mr. Sox with the red tie, and the class representative, Mr. Bertolet, has traveled all the way from Pennsylvania in support of the settlement because he feels proud to be one of the class reps in this case and this is an important matter for the dealers.

Now, Your Honor has been focused, and I would say rightfully focused, on the consumers and the environment, but there were other people hurt by Dieselgate, and that included the dealers, and the dealers have seen the value of their franchises diminished. They have lost revenue from people aren't coming in to get their cars fixed anymore, and they have cars on their lots they can't sell because of Dieselgate.

So this settlement, which is a \$1.6 billion settlement, is a substantial recovery for the dealers. It would be in a normal case a huge recovery. Obviously it pales in comparison to the consumer case, but it's one of the largest settlements in class action history.

So we have -- and what we did in coming up with the value is we tried to look at how the dealers were harmed. So the first payment of almost \$1.2 billion, that is for the diminished value of the franchises, and that amount was estimated by your expert, Mr. Stockton, and it's contained in his report.

But we also knew that the dealers were receiving incentive payments, and we negotiated for those payments to continue. We negotiated -- and those are worth hundreds of millions of dollars as well.

We negotiated a deferment of capital that dealers had promised that they would put into the dealerships. They obviously don't have the money right now to be putting capital in, so we obtained that benefit for the class.

And we negotiated what will happen to the cars that are on their lots. They're basically going to get paid the same way the consumers get paid.

Those were the areas of concern the dealers had. We addressed every single one of those, and it results in an average cash payment of 1.85 million to the dealers with a minimum of 1.07 and a maximum of 3.57.

So if you look at why we think final approval is appropriate, not only did we recover a huge portion of the damages, but the reaction of the class has been extraordinary.

As of today, 87 percent of the class has elected -- or has

signed an individual release, meaning that they will get paid immediately at least 50 percent of what they're owed. So 559 out of 644 dealers have signed that release, and what that means is that they don't have to wait for the effective date. So even if you said "I don't approve this settlement," they felt it was fair enough that they wanted to go forward.

And I should mention that, these are sophisticated businesspeople who are multimillion-dollar franchises, many of whom had lawyers that we talked to. So the settlement and the fact that they signed individual releases comes from a careful scrutiny.

And I would also point out to the Court that not only is Mr. Bertolet here, but we also had a committee of dealers that we worked with of five dealers throughout the country that kind of were semi-elected by the dealers because the dealers kind of know each other, and they worked with us and they also think the settlement is fair.

So for those reasons, we think the settlement should be approved.

And I would address very briefly the two types of objections that have come forward, if that's okay with the Court.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BERMAN: Some of the objectors have argued that the plan of allocation wasn't fair. And the way the plan of

allocation came about was first we negotiated the 1.2 billion diminished value payment I'll call it; and then we had to come up with a way to allocate it, and we spent lots of time thinking about it.

But to its credit, Volkswagen had thought about allocation when it set up the dealer support program, and its plan of allocation for the dealer support program was based on each dealer's vehicles in operation in the dealer's assigned primary area it's called.

And the dealers were living with that. As far as we knew, no one was objecting to that plan of allocation; and since it seemed to capture the business reality of "These are all the Volkswagen vehicles in your area, that's a good measure of your damage," we went with that plan of allocation.

There is no way we could have come up with a plan of allocation that would have satisfied 652 dealers 100 percent. So it's not surprising to me that a couple -- and I should say a very small number -- of dealers have concerns with the plan of allocation, but we think it's fair and it was the best plan of allocation we could come up with.

The second issue that has come up is the release, and we have a proposed modification to the release that may make it more palatable, but first I just want to take a second to tell the Court why I think the release was adequate without any modification.

And that is, there is a misperception, perhaps amongst some of the dealers, that the settlement talks were solely focused about Dieselgate. And it's clear from the complaints, I think, and the declarations that's not true. When we were negotiating the settlement, there was the Dieselgate issue, which was certainly probably the foremost issue among the dealers, but there were other issues the dealers were concerned about.

For example, some of the dealers believed that Volkswagen had made promises to sell a certain number of cars in the U.S. that they did not meet. Some dealers were concerned with how Volkswagen had been allocating territories. Some were concerned with other issues that were encompassed in both Mr. Napleton's complaint and Mr. Bertolet's complaint. So the complaints and the settlement talks were broader than just TDI.

And, in fact, I think the reason that Volkswagen paid such a high percentage of the diminished value damages is because they knew there was more on the table than just those diminished value damages. If there hadn't been more on the table, I don't think we would have gotten the numbers we did get.

So we thought at the time that we had the release that covered other claims, that it was justified by the settlement talks and by the complaints that were on file in this case.

This is not a case where all of a sudden we added to the

release claims that had not been discussed or not present in the litigation; and for that reason, we think the cases that were cited by the Palisades group are inapposite.

But here's what we do propose to make sure there's no unfairness whatsoever:

In paragraph 9.3 of the settlement agreement, there are items 2 through 5 that contain release of categories other than TDI. What we're proposing to do is to file an addendum to the settlement agreement and a revised proposed order, which I hope we get in by Friday, that would say that the release does not apply in those categories to any person that had a claim with respect to those categories that had been filed prior to April 6, 2016.

The April 6, 2016, date is the date the Napleton complaint was filed. So the Palisades litigation, for example, would be able to go forward, and there's one other person out there who also has litigation that would be able to go forward if that dealer chose to do so.

So we hope to get that filed by Friday.

THE COURT: Are you aware of any other objector who has a claim filed subsequent to that date?

MR. BERMAN: Subsequent to that date?

THE COURT: Yeah. Subsequent to April 6, 2018 [sic].

MR. BERMAN: I'd have to let Volkswagen answer that.

I'm not aware of any sitting here. The reason I used the

```
April of 2016 date was by then Napleton had, you know, made
 1
     this a public issue. If someone really had cared about these
 2
     issues, they would have already been on file.
 3
              THE COURT: And we don't have an objection from
 4
 5
     somebody who has that claim which claim was manifested after
     April 6, 2018 [sic]?
 6
              MR. BERMAN: No such objection --
 7
              THE COURT: I mean, 2000 --
 8
              MR. BERMAN: April 6, 2016.
 9
              THE COURT:
                          '16. We're not there yet, right.
10
11
              MR. BERMAN: No such objection.
              THE COURT:
12
                          Okay.
13
              MR. BERMAN: So unless you have any questions,
     Your Honor --
14
15
              THE COURT:
                          No.
                               I mean, I think that's fine.
                                                              I don't
16
     know whether an objector is here this morning.
17
              MR. BERMAN: There is an objector. Mr. Smith from
     Delaware, I believe, is here, and he would like an opportunity
18
19
     to address the Court.
20
              THE COURT:
                         Okay.
21
          Mr. Giuffra.
                            Thank you very much, Your Honor.
22
              MR. GIUFFRA:
23
          About a year ago, I was actually standing at this podium
     and Your Honor pressed us about trying to address cars on the
24
25
     road, the environment, and I think that Volkswagen clearly has
```

shown that actions speak louder than words. I mean, I promised to do it, but we really did do it.

And I think it's important to consider the dealers settlement as part of the overall package of settlements that have been accomplished over the last year. I mean, first we did the 2-liter settlement. The 3-liter settlement is obviously very well along. We've resolved matters with the government entirely, I believe.

And the dealers are very important to Volkswagen.

Volkswagen has been in operation in the States for 60 years,
and we really want to build stronger relationships than we've
even had before, and they've been strong, with our dealer
network because that's a critical frontline for the company and
its sales efforts.

So what we've attempted to do here is result in global peace with our dealers and the network, and that's because we realize that the dealers are critical to the success of the brand.

The dealers are also, Your Honor, critical to the success of the implementation of the 2- and 3-liter settlements because customers go to the dealers, bring their cars back to do the buyback transactions or -- and this will now start with the 2-liter Gen 3 cars -- to have the fixes be done. So the dealers are critical to the success of the 2-liter and 3-liter consumer settlements showing that interconnection.

Now, this settlement is clearly fair. It should be approved by the Court. And Mr. Berman made the point before about 87 percent of the folks have already signed releases and we paid out my understanding is nearly half a billion dollars already to the dealers.

The number of opt-outs in this case, Your Honor, 7 opt-outs out of a class of 652. That's less than 1 percent of the class. I mean, very -- 1 percent of the class. Excuse me. So very small amount of opt-outs.

The number of objectors that I believe are left, people who haven't signed a release -- I believe Mr. Smith's client has already signed a release, which raises the question of whether he even has standing to get up here and object -- I believe it's just two now that the Palisades issue has been taken care of.

And so this settlement reflects Volkswagen's continued commitment to make things right in the United States for its customers, for the environment, and for its dealers to rebuild trust.

And, you know, we have 6,000 employees in the United States. We have dealers literally in all 50 states, and the dealers are critical to the continued success of Volkswagen. And the company has obviously spent a tremendous amount of money trying to put the diesel issue behind it in the States.

As Mr. Berman said, we're talking about average compensation of \$1.85 million to each dealer. The total amount is about 1.2 in cash compensation.

In addition, we've resolved some of these other issues that the dealers have -- for example, how to deal with the cars that they have, the TDI cars that were on their lots -- and that's all been worked out to the satisfaction of the dealers.

With respect to the Palisades issue, we're aware that as of that April 4th date, which I believe is the date I have for when the lawsuit was filed -- there was the Palisades complaint, there may be one other -- we're not aware of any other complaints, but the idea would be if you had a pending complaint as of that date of April 4th, you would be carved out from the parts of the settlement dealing with allocation complaints, sales growth incentives, and that kind of thing.

But as Mr. Berman pointed out, we paid a substantial amount of money for more than just the resolution of the diesel claims. We wanted to have global peace with our dealer network because our dealer network is so important to the continued success of Volkswagen.

In terms of the objections that remain, which I believe are two, they're largely about the allocation formula having to do with whether you should base it on sales or whether you should base it on the number of vehicles in operation in a particular area that's the dealer's area.

And car dealers make a lot of money from doing repairs and selling used cars and the like, and so looking at just new car sales is not an appropriate measure. And this is the way -- it's the standard in the industry to do it this way and, again, the vote of the dealers, an enormous support for the settlement, confirms that it's overwhelmingly a fair settlement.

There's one other objection that's been raised under a California provision, which on its face says you can resolve matters as we have in this case, so we think that's an objection that's not warranted.

So in sum, Your Honor, Volkswagen strongly urges the Court to approve this settlement. It's part of an interconnected, interrelated series of settlements, and it's all about trying to make things right in the United States -- customers, dealers, the environment, regulators -- and I think once this settlement is resolved and the remainder of the 3-liter and the government settlements, I think we will have done a substantial amount of work to close the door on the Dieselgate matter for Volkswagen in the United States.

So thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Are there any objectors who wish to be heard this morning?

(Hand raised.)

THE COURT: Yes, sir. Would you come forward, please,

and identify yourself.

MR. SMITH: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. SMITH: Thanks for this opportunity.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. SMITH: My name is Tom Smith. I'm here from Smith Volkswagen in Wilmington, Delaware. I've come a long way to make my points about the allocation method that was used.

When Volkswagen first came out with multisupport payments to the dealer on a monthly basis when this debacle first occurred, the formula that they used I tried to understand from out of the gate. I could not understand why our formula that applied to our store and other dealers like us came out to such a small amount of money compared to an average dealer. I consider myself to be an average dealer in sales volume.

So I started with the chain of command with our original representative, asked him; went to the regional sales manager, and all the way to the dealer district manager and asked him where the formula came from.

And I thought it was mysterious that this formula -- the best I could get when I was just simply trying to get an answer to a question was that this formula was derived somehow from some other type of settlement from Nissan or Toyota, and they applied it because they had very little time to decide how to make a monthly support payment, and so they used this.

So I thought, well, I don't know anything myself that

Toyota or any of the other manufacturers had that was close to

this. There was nothing that I could see that was similar.

So I thought, well, I'll check with now the five dealers that were appointed to see if I could get some headway into why this formula was used and whether it would be applied to later settlement funds. If they would have modified it or changed it, I would not have had an objection but they did not.

What they failed to do in the support payments through the dealer remediation efforts was to include the automobiles that dealers like us and others sold into open-point areas.

Now, Volkswagen did not pay anyone, in my understanding, for any car sold into an open-point area. However, they did pay dealers across areas of influence for cars that other dealers sold into their area. In other words, if I bordered a dealer near me, the cars that he sold into my area I got credit for in the formula. Likewise, the automobiles I sold into their area, they got credit for.

Why they then excluded the automobiles that were sold into an open-point, like where Smith Volkswagen is located --

THE COURT: You have to explain to me, what is an open-point?

MR. SMITH: An open-point is an area that Volkswagen has determined that they need representation for a dealer but they don't have it. That is considered an open-point. I am

parked right next to an open-point. I am one and a half miles approximately from an open-point.

And the way people buy cars, obviously, in a general geographic area, it is natural that I sell cars over into this open-point area. They were excluded for me just like they were for other dealers, but the simple question they would have had to ask is: Well, are there any dealers in this group that are so grossly affected by not paying them in an open-point area, that it's just grotesque?

And I came out being one of those people. I have averaged over 200 cars a year in these years that they measured, of the five years, into an open-point. That's a thousand cars.

THE COURT: Let me ask you a question. In your dealership, what percentage of your sales are sales of cars in the open-point area?

MR. SMITH: I have --

THE COURT: And I don't know quite how -- I don't know whether the measure is number of cars or value of cars, or something like that, but can you give me some idea?

MR. SMITH: I can, Your Honor. For example, in the year 2013 -- I had to extract this information from our Volkswagen representative, and he could only go back so far; but in the year 2013, which is one of the settlement years, we sold 542 Volkswagens, 207 of them were sold into the open-point area.

In 2014, we sold 513 new Volkswagens and 214 were sold into open-point area.

In years prior to that, which were included, years '12, '11, and '10, year '12, 2012, 594 in new cars sold, 487 in new cars sold, and in 2010, 399. I suspect that at least 200 of those cars out of each one of those years would have been in this calculation. That's a detail that Volkswagen has and they chose not to use in this allocation formula.

THE COURT: So you say your experience with your dealership is that approximately somewhere in the neighborhood of 30 or 40 percent of your sales is into the open-point?

MR. SMITH: In one year 43 percent.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MR. SMITH: And so it makes a big difference. It's 1,000 cars --

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. SMITH: -- times 10, \$10,000. Even with the original support payment, a 10,000-dollar a month figure, I am an average dealer, I expected a figure of somewhere around \$1.8 million. Instead, I'm at the 1.252 number.

I just think it's grossly unfair. It would have been so easy to ask someone about if there were any outliers that were grossly affected by this settlement thing. They could have included us.

Heavens, with the amount of dollars that are involved

```
here, this turns out to be such a small amount of money in
 1
     terms of all that's involved with the EPA and the Justice
 2
     Department. It's the difference between -- when this is done
 3
     today, this is going to be either 100 percent right according
 4
 5
     to the Court, which it won't be for me; or when it's done
     today, it will be 100 percent wrong, and it will stay that way
 6
     forever. And I just -- I had to come out here to do this, to
 7
     say this.
 8
                          I appreciate you coming here.
 9
              THE COURT:
                                                          I don't
     know that things are either 100 percent right or 100 percent
10
11
     wronq.
             I mean, these are efforts made in a very complicated
     area to try to achieve some sort of equity, and I understand
12
     your concern is that you feel you are being -- that you're not
13
     receiving that equity, that fairness that ought to be given.
14
15
          Do you have a sense of how much you would have gotten had
16
     the formula included your open points?
17
              MR. SMITH:
                          Yes, I do. It would have been, with my
18
     calculation of the 200 additional cars, 1.962.158 dollars
19
     compared to the 1 --
20
              THE COURT: You're going to have to do the math for
          What is the total --
21
     me.
                          The total amount of money?
22
              MR. SMITH:
23
              THE COURT:
                         -- that you would have gotten had the
     open-point been --
24
```

Calculated.

MR. SMITH:

25

THE COURT: -- calculated?

MR. SMITH: My calculation is 1,962,158. That's approximately 1,000 cars more that I would have been paid for on the 10-dollar per car formula. It's enough to bring me out here to California from Delaware.

THE COURT: Well, a lot of things bring people out to California, you know.

MR. SMITH: I like California, but --

THE COURT: You better get out of here before the rains come.

MR. SMITH: -- it's not a social call.

But I think the Court has the power to fix this even at this late date; and if it's not fixed for this particular dealership or others that may still be in limbo about what to do about this, it could still be fixed for them. This is all about us as the dealers. Or other things that come down the road with possibly Robert Bosch, it could be modified then so that more of our customers are included.

These customers in this open-point area, I can't understand how Volkswagen could exclude them because they've encompassed almost everyone. These cars sold into person's other areas of responsibility come out to a simple ZIP code. If one car gets sold in the state of Georgia in your area of influence, they know all the data.

So I don't see how they overlooked it or reasonably could

have overlooked it, and that's what I wanted to say today and that's why I'm out here in California.

THE COURT: Well, thank you very much.

I think I should turn to Volkswagen and get their response.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, we very much appreciate
Mr. Smith making the trip out to California, and he obviously
cares about Volkswagen and his dealership, and we appreciate
everything he has done.

Just as a procedural matter, my understanding is that

Mr. Smith has signed a release, does not have a claim anymore,
and has gotten his money. So he does not have standing any
longer to object. That's point one.

Point two is, in any settlement you can obviously pick a formula for how you calculate the amount of damages that are going to be paid for compensation to class members. In this case we did not use a formula based on the amount of sales. We based it on registered vehicles in operation in someone's primary area of influence. So that's sort of your geographic area that you're responsible for. And that's because retail customers tend to go to the local dealer for things like service, maintenance, warranty work, and that's a higher margin business actually than new car sales. And we think it's a better barometer of what the impact of this was, and obviously

the vote of the class members, the small number of opt-outs, and also the high number of folks who've already submitted releases.

But to go to the question of the open-point, what an open-point is is an unallocated area. It's an area where Volkswagen has the ability to put in another dealership and give that dealership that area, but someone like Mr. Smith is able to sell cars to people who live in that unallocated area.

And obviously Volkswagen will change, to the extent it can under its dealer agreements, you know, what can go on in an open-point. And it's clear that under the dealer agreements that Mr. Smith and other people had, he had no exclusive right to sell cars into the unallocated or open-point area.

So essentially what he's doing is, one, complaining about a formula that was the subject of a lot of negotiation, that was based on the same formula that was done to provide the customer support payments, a formula that we think best addresses the injury to dealers looking at their overall activity: Warranty work, not just sales work but also, you know, maintenance and things like that.

And so what he's essentially saying is "I had this unallocated area that Volkswagen didn't put somebody in. I was given the ability to sell into the unallocated area, and I should get additional compensation even though that's not my area." It's just not his area, but it's a place where he can

sell vehicles.

And so if he had wanted to opt out and litigate this issue, he could have done so. He signed the release, has gotten compensated, and so we think that this is a claim where essentially a class member is challenging the allocation formula.

And obviously reasonable people can disagree, but we think that the fact that so many class members, like Mr. Smith, have signed releases indicates that this is a fair method. And the law only requires the Court to approve a fair and reasonable settlement, and reasonable people can disagree about what's reasonable but this is clearly a fair and reasonable settlement, and he shouldn't have signed his release if he wanted to litigate this issue.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Any other objectors?

MR. DANHI: Good morning. Victor Danhi on behalf of Arent Fox on behalf of the Palisades group.

I just wanted to confirm that Palisades Volkswagen did not object to the settlement overall. It was just the scope of the release. Subject to the agreement that's been reached with Volkswagen and plaintiffs' counsel, we will withdraw our objection but only once we've seen the amendment to the settlement agreement and the revised proposed order. So I just wanted to go on record.

Well, that's fine. I appreciate your THE COURT: comments, and I accept the representations of the parties that they will draft a modification or addendum to the proposed It will keep your claim intact as designed; that is to say, by virtue of the dates. And what you're representing to me is if that does occur,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you will withdraw your objection?

That's correct, Your Honor. MR. DANHI:

THE COURT: So I would appreciate if the Okay. parties can furnish me that addendum by Friday of this week.

> MR. DANHI: Thank you, Your Honor.

And do you think you can do it by then? THE COURT:

MR. GIUFFRA: We will, Your Honor.

MR. BERMAN: Yes, we can do that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So is there anything further on this matter?

(No response.)

Okay. I will take the objections under THE COURT: submission and I will issue an order soon. And when I say "soon," I mean soon. Thank you very much.

Let me turn to some of the other issues because there have been a number of filings, and I think it might be useful to give the parties who are here and those who are participating by telephone a further understanding as to the progress of the settlement of a number of the issues raised by the litigation.

Let me call on the government, Mr. Van Eaton.

MR. VAN EATON: Thanks very much, Your Honor.

I'm actually thrilled that you noticed we had some extra filings since we were last here. We have continued to be very busy.

From the beginning of this case, you were very clear to us in your instruction to address the cars on the road equipped with the defeat devices in violation of the Clean Air Act.

As you know, the EPA and their partners at the California Air Resources Board shared that view and that priority, shared the Court's concern, and the pollution caused by the excess emissions from those cars became their top priority.

As you know, in September of 2015, which seems an eternity ago now, the notice of violation was issued. The United States then filed its complaint in January of last year -January 4th, just over a year ago -- and shortly thereafter, our case was transferred into this multidistrict litigation and you implored us to get to work, so we got to work.

This is a case --

THE COURT: I appointed Director Mueller to make sure everybody got to work.

MR. VAN EATON: You did that too and he did.

The remarkable facts in this case required a remarkable response; and, you know, we have now, Your Honor, filed three partial consent decrees that if ultimately entered by the Court

will resolve all of the claims alleged against Volkswagen in the United States complaint.

We believe that together these three settlements provide a comprehensive resolution by addressing the harm to human health and the environment by removing the cars from the road or fixing them in the first two consent decrees; requiring a punitive and hopefully a deterrent \$1.45 billion civil penalty, which is the largest ever under the Clean Air Act; and by imposing a tailored injunctive relief program consisting of required changes in corporate governance for Volkswagen, the introduction of third-party testing, and creation of an independent auditor to oversee the various required changes from the consent decree.

The first consent decree you're very familiar with. We addressed the 2-liter vehicles, which is the largest group of vehicles, approximately half a million cars. We lodged that consent decree in June. Your Honor entered that in October. We are months after we had filed our complaint, and that is now in the process of being implemented. The buyback program could cost up to \$10 billion. That's ongoing.

I wanted to make Your Honor aware that within the last two weeks, EPA approved the first emissions modification that the company had submitted to the regulators for approval. By doing so, that will allow car owners who wish to keep their vehicles to do so and have them modified rather than sell them back.

Those vehicles are the Generation 3 2-liter vehicles which are the model year 2015 cars.

And I understand from Ms. Cabraser and PSC that, you know, the class members are already availing themselves of that option.

That first consent decree also established a very important remedial measure, which is a \$2.7 billion mitigation trust to fund NOx-reducing projects around the country. We are in the process now of implementing that, identifying a trustee, and we will be filing additional papers with the Court to establish the trust and get it operational so the states can start using those funds to make their air cleaner.

In addition, work is also underway implementing the additional \$2 billion investment into the zero emission vehicle infrastructure.

So after that was entered, we turned immediately to seeking a resolution for the approximately 80,000 3-liter vehicles. The second partial consent decree relating to those vehicles we filed with the Court in December, just last month, which was two months after the entry of the first settlement.

Right now, Your Honor, it is undergoing the public comment process. We published in the Federal Register. And as we did with the first settlement, at the conclusion of that comment period, we anticipate filing a motion requesting Your Honor to enter the decree as an order of the court.

I just wanted to briefly kind of outline the framework of the 3-liter consent decree because we haven't appeared since we filed that. In some ways it's very similar to the 2-liter decree, but there are some different challenges that we faced, and so it has a little bit of a unique component to it.

So for the older vehicles, which we refer to as the Generation 1 vehicles, the 3-liter decree offers the same options as the 2-liter did, which is to say buyback, lease terminations, modifications, ultimately if they're proposed and approved.

The wrinkle with the 3 liters was there were newer vehicles which we refer to as Generation 2 vehicles, which Volkswagen believed was technically feasible to repair those vehicles so they could be brought fully into compliance with the certified emission standards. So the regulators thought that if that could happen, it should happen.

So if Volkswagen successfully demonstrates that that solution be achieved, then the consent decree does not require Volkswagen to buy those vehicles back. If they cannot achieve those technical standards, then the framework would revert back to the similar framework with the buyback, lease terminations, and emissions modification. We estimate that that program could cost up to an additional \$1 billion to implement.

Additionally, under the 3-liter consent decree, Volkswagen is required to fund an additional \$225 million into the trust

that is in the process of being established under the first consent decree to fund additional NOx-reducing projects.

The re-call rate in the 3-liter consent decree is the same as it was in the 2-liter. It's 85 percent with penalty payments into the trust fund for every percentage point that they come up short.

So by allowing Volkswagen to bring these vehicles into compliance with the certified emission standards where it's technically feasible to do so, we think that that is a good resolution tailored specifically to address the environmental concerns associated with those cars, and we look forward to considering the public comments on that and filing an appropriate motion with the Court at that time.

And then after dealing with the cars on the road, we then turned immediately to crafting the critical aspect of any enforcement action which, you know, this is. You know, we have spent a lot of time addressing the consumers and the environment; and, you know, it's important, I think, from the Justice Department's perspective to keep in mind that this is an enforcement action. This is a civil enforcement action. So an important part of this is punishing the offender and taking steps to assure that something like this never happens again.

So last week we filed a third partial consent decree with the Court, and we think it achieves those objectives. It was part of a set of coordinated federal resolutions pertaining to all of the 2- and 3-liter vehicles; and as a total, the resolutions contain \$4.3 billion in penalties resolving civil and criminal claims, including claims of the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol and alleged violations of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act, known as FIRREA, all of which were resolved in separate agreements that we did not file before Your Honor.

Under this third settlement, Volkswagen and Porsche defendants agreed to pay \$1.45 billion to resolve EPA's Clean Air Act civil penalty claim. It is, as I mentioned earlier, the largest ever civil penalty in the Clean Air Act. The payment will be due under the terms of the decree within 30 days of entry by the Court, plus interest from the date of lodging.

In addition and importantly, the consent decree requires

Volkswagen to take very specific actions to prevent similar

violations from taking place again. Some of the measures

include a suite of specific corporate governance measures, an

independent third party to perform annual in-use testing of

vehicles -- this is the type of testing that was used initially

to uncover Volkswagen's cheating by independent third

parties -- and, finally, retention of an independent auditor to

perform an audit of the many aspects of the injunctive relief

over the course of the consent decree to ensure that the

company is actually implementing those measures.

As with the 3-liter decree, we look forward to considering public comments. I believe that it has been submitted and we expect it to be published in the Federal Register, and our comment period will begin I think this week. So you'll hear from us in an appropriate time after we hear from the public.

And I guess just in conclusion, Your Honor, it's important for auto makers to do business in the United States to know that they have a duty to follow the laws, the environmental laws that were enacted to prevent and to protect the American people and prevent harmful pollution. They have a duty to play fairly with their competitors and deal honestly with the customers.

And we think that these settlements together provide a mechanism to, first, make the environment whole by removing the cars and offsetting the air emissions, to hold Volkswagen accountable for its violations of law and its breach of the public trust, and to require meaningful change and oversight designed to prevent this from happening again.

So the cost of all three of these civil settlements is up to approximately \$17.375 billion, and it is our sincere hope that this will send a message to Volkswagen and to others that would consider gaming the system that it does not pay to cheat.

So, Your Honor, subject to your questions at this point about any of those settlements that have been filed, that's all I have.

THE COURT: Well, I thank you for that report.

I note that while issues have been resolved in terms of Volkswagen's conduct, there remain individuals who have been charged criminally for violations of the law who were associated with Volkswagen, and those matters have not been resolved; is that correct?

MR. VAN EATON: That is correct, Your Honor. There were some Indictments announced last week.

THE COURT: Right. So in addition to all of the sanctions that have been imposed upon Volkswagen, there still remains what I would characterize as individual responsibility, responsibility of individuals who participated in the alleged -- because we're talking about a criminal case -- the alleged wrongful conduct.

MR. VAN EATON: Correct.

THE COURT: And I think that that coupled with what you have done may very well provide a startling disincentive for wrongful conduct to proceed. Both were important, at least in the Court's view, as to what I've observed. Thank you very much.

MR. VAN EATON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So let me turn back to the civil side for just a moment.

Ms. Cabraser, do you have any observations you wish to make at this time as our leader of the Plaintiffs Steering

Committee?

MS. CABRASER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Just briefly, a snapshot of where we are on the implementation of the 2-liter settlement. And Mr. Giuffra has got more precise and probably up-to-date statistics than I do, but I'll just give you a general impression.

As Your Honor knows, the 2-liter settlement was approved on October 25th to go into operation as soon as practicable thereafter. We're now three months into a very active claims process. There are 20 months to go.

Although the claims process itself extends out until
September of 2018, virtually all of the 2-liter class members
registered as early as possible, and we now have approximately
95 percent of the class participating in the process. There
have been over 451,000 registrations, and there have been over
383,000 claims under submission.

In response to that, nearly 267,000 offers for buyback or emissions modification have already been made, and those offers that have already been made to the class members total more than \$4.7 billion.

It is estimated, I believe, that in this month, January alone, over 60,000 actual buybacks will be accomplished. And as Your Honor has heard, the first of the emissions modifications has been approved and class members have already begun to go in for that modification process.

This has been the farthest thing from a self-executing settlement. To make this settlement work has required the active engagement of literally thousands of people at Volkswagen and in the claims supervisor's office. It's required the entire dealer network of Volkswagen dealers, and we thank those dealers because they're on the frontline of this process trying to make it work for the class members.

Because this is like a day-long house party at which everyone showed up in the first five minutes, there have been some challenges in getting the process up and running, and Your Honor is aware of those. The claims supervisor submits regular reports.

But I think it is noteworthy that three months into the process, with this level of participation, which we understand to be unprecedented, the system is ramping up, staffing increases constantly, procedures are streamlined constantly, and we rely on the class members themselves when they report in to us about their experiences to use what they say to make the process better on an ongoing basis.

Every firm in the PSC and many other firms are engaged literally on a daily basis, seven days a week, working with the class members to help them through the process, and we've fielded many, many thousands of communications in that respect, which we continue to do.

So this is a participatory process that requires active

engagement, not only by Volkswagen and its dealers and the claims supervisors and the regulators, but the class members themselves.

And we are at this point encouraged that the process will continue to improve and to become more efficient, and we hope to use what we have learned in this process when we turn to claims administration for 3 liters.

We understand that we are under a continuing confidentiality order with respect to a proposed 3-liter resolution. We are working toward our deadline of January 31st, 2017, to submit papers for this Court's preliminary review and we hope approval of that settlement.

It does track the structure that Mr. Van Eaton laid out with respect to the different generations of 3-liter vehicles, and it also puts finite time limits on the process of achieving a fully emissions-compliant repair for the Generation 3 vehicles such that class members will know exactly how long they will be waiting to learn if there is a fully emissions-compliant repair for their cars or not.

And, obviously, to the extent full compliance cannot be accomplished, the buyback as well as restitution and modification features of the 2-liter settlement will be in place.

This is a complicated settlement because of the different generations, because of the need as always to interact with the

regulators, and we believe that we are on track; and we will also have a proposed resolution of the class claims, the consumer claims, with respect to the Bosch defendants for consideration as well to add to the compensation that would be provided to the class members.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Giuffra, any final comments?

MR. GIUFFRA: Yes, Your Honor.

I think we are now three months into what is likely the largest, biggest, most complex buyback of a product in U.S. history, and I believe since we're the most litigious country in the world, probably in the world history, and I think we've made, you know, substantial, substantial progress.

Obviously there's going to be bumps in the road. The company has 700 employees working on this full-time. There are people in the dealerships also executing, again, this huge complex buyback. And whenever there's a complaint, for example, raised with the Court or with PSC, we move on it as quickly as we can.

And Ms. Cabraser gave you some of the data. Let me give slightly just some additional data.

She mentioned the 383,000 unique claims that have been filed. We currently have approximately 160,000 appointments that have been scheduled for people to actually execute on the

buyback, and they'll receive \$3.3 billion.

The question that Ms. Cabraser asked me last night and I've gotten additional information, this is as of January 17, there have been 66,877 people who have completed either their buyback or their lease terminations, and that has resulted in the payment out from Volkswagen of \$1.2 billion.

By the end of January, we expect to complete 96,000 buybacks/lease terminations, so we're well on the road when you actually think three months into, again, probably the most complex and biggest buyback in U.S. history.

Now, Mr. Van Eaton made an important point about the fix, and that's always been an important part of this process for VW. There are customers who want to keep their cars, they like their cars, get them fixed. And it was very important that on January 6th the EPA and the California Air Resources Board, after doing a thorough, thorough analysis, approved the Gen 3 2-liter fix.

That applies to roughly 70,000 vehicles. It covers the model year 2015 VW Beetle, Beetle Convertible, Golf, Golf SportsWagon, Jetta, Passats, and the Audi A3.

And then there are deadlines that are specified in the relevant documents for Volkswagen to make submissions for the Gen 1 and the Gen 2 2-liter. The first one is in January 27 for the Gen 1 2-liter. This is submission deadline for carbon EPA. And then for Gen 2, it's March 3, 2017, and there are a

lot of people working on that.

On the 3-liter settlement, Your Honor, as Ms. Cabraser said, I think we're making, you know, very good progress.

We're on track to file the papers on January 31st. We have a signed term sheet that's 34 pages long, and we've made a tremendous amount of progress.

When I listened to Mr. Van Eaton talk about all that had been accomplished in the last year, I sort of now know why I feel five years older, because I feel like we've done five years of work in one.

And I want to thank Director Mueller, Mr. Quarles, and Ari Savitzky of the Director's firm, Wilmer Cutler, for all that they did because they spent as much time as we did working this, listening to phone calls from people, and bringing everyone together, because there were literally thousands of points that had to be negotiated. And I, quite frankly, have never seen anything like, you know, something of this complexity.

I'd also like to thank all of our co-counsel. Everybody worked very, very well. We did not adopt the adversarial mode here. Everyone tried to -- I think led by Your Honor's direction -- tried to work the problem out, solve the problem.

And that's obviously in Volkswagen's interest. Volkswagen wants to be a successful car company in the United States, build on its traditions in the United States. It was, you

know, one of the leading car companies in the United States for, you know, the last 60 years and we want to continue to do that and to rebuild the trust, and that's what we're very committed to.

And we also want to thank the Court for all you did for sort of pressing everyone to accomplish so much in such a short period of time. So thank you very much on behalf of the company.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Let me just take a moment sort of to complete the point that the parties have all made in that the devotion, the service, the energy that, of course, the lawyers have given to this litigation have brought us to the point where we are today.

But the implementation of the settlement is in many respects nearly as complicated as the negotiations surrounding what mechanisms and terms should be implemented, and the success in the implementation while not perfect, because anything that humans touch is going to have some imperfections, has steadily improved over time. And I think that really the credit in part obviously goes to the people who have been hired to implement the program, but none of this would have worked without the dealers.

The dealers are the face of Volkswagen, and they are the individuals who have to interface with the consumer. And so

it's interesting that in a service industry, which -- a product service industry, which this is, the automotive industry, that it does come down to the willingness and the attitude of those people on the road or at the stores and the showrooms and the repair facilities, and so forth, to relate to the public.

I have received reports that dealers have been welcoming to consumers who come back. Obviously consumers who come back have different attitudes. Maybe the universal attitude is that they're upset, they're upset with what happened. This was an unanticipated event in their life at the time that they purchased the vehicles.

Nevertheless, I think that the dealers have been sympathetic, have been efficient, have been welcoming, and have given the consumers some added satisfaction that through this process, their concerns have been listened to, have been addressed, and have some type of solution.

Is it the perfect solution? Well, there's no such thing as a perfect solution to an imperfect problem or a problem that's very difficult, but I want to simply say that the Court is grateful to those people who interface with the consumer because I think that that is an added measure of satisfaction that can be given to people who feel, and justifiably so, that they were wronged by this transaction.

So I know that some dealers are here today, some may be on the telephone. They haven't been, you know, all that vocal in

this whole process, but they are indispensable and they have rendered a great service.

And I want to thank, of course, counsel of the Plaintiffs Steering Committee, who saw this as a problem and worked out a resolution of it, Mr. Berman and others, and thank, of course, the parties for devoting the energy.

So as we know, January 31st is one of those deadlines that the Court just simply isn't going to move, and we'll anticipate filings on or before that date with respect to the 3-liter cars, and then we will have a hearing for preliminary approval on Valentine's Day. Valentine's Day. So bring your Valentine to San Francisco, and we will hear this matter for a determination as to whether or not preliminary approval. It will be 8:00 o'clock on February 14th, and I anticipate with respect to the dealers that I'll have an opinion out shortly.

So thank you. We're in recess.

(Proceedings adjourned at 9:13 a.m.)

---000---

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Thursday, January 19, 2017 DATE: g andergen Jo Ann Bryce, CSR No. 3321, RMR, CRR, FCRR U.S. Court Reporter