UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

IN RE:) CASE NO: 07-20027
)
) Corpus Christi, Texas
SCOTIA DEVELOPMENT, LLC,)
) Thursday, April 17, 2008
) (1:59 p.m. to 2:39 p.m.)
Debtor.)

STATUS HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD S. SCHMIDT, UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

Appearances: See Page 2

Courtroom Deputy: Letty Garza

Court Recorder: Janet Silika

Transcribed by: Exceptional Reporting Services, Inc.

14493 S. Padre Island Drive

Suite A-400

Corpus Christi, TX 78418-5940

361 949-2988

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

COURTROOM APPEARANCES FOR:

Pacific Lumber, et al: NATHANIEL PETER HOLZER, ESQ.

SHELBY JORDAN, ESQ.

Jordan Hyden Womble and Culbreth, PC

500 N. Shoreline

Suite 900

Corpus Christi, TX 78471

Bank of New York

TOBY GERBER, ESQ.

Trustee Company:

U.S. Trustee: CHARLES STERBACH, ESQ.

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES FOR:

Pacific Lumber: KYUNG LEE, ESQ.

> Diamond McCarthy, et al. 909 Fannin, Suite 1500

Houston, TX 77010

Pension Benefit MARC PFEUFFER, ESQ.
Guaranty Corporation: Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation

Marathon Structured STEVEN SCHWARTZ, ESQ.

Finance Fund, LP: DAVID NEIER, ESQ.

> M. BRECKINRIDGE, ESQ. Winston and Strawn, LLP

200 Park Avenue New York, NY 10166

Scotia Pacific Company, KATHRYN A. COLEMAN, ESQ.

LLC:

Maxxam, Inc.: ALAN GOVER, ESQ.

White and Case, LLP

Scotia Pacific RICHARD J. DOREN, ESQ.

Company, LLC: Gibson Dunn and Crutcher, LLP

> 333 South Grand Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90071

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES FOR: (Continued)

LARRY ADAMS, ESQ. CSG Investments:

CSG Investments

Scotia Pacific CHRISTOPHER DONALD JOHNSON, ESQ. Company, LLC:

Diamond McCarthy Taylor and Findley

909 Fannin Suite 1500

Houston, Texas 77010

Scotia Development, LLC: G. LARRY ENGEL, ESQ.

Morrison and Foerster

The Blackstone Group: PETER LAURINAITIS, ESQ.

The Blackstone Group

California State MICHAEL WILLIAM NEVILLE, ESQ.

Entities: California Attorney General's Office

455 Golden Gate Avenue

Suite 11000

San Francisco, CA 94102

AG CA Resources Agency: PAUL PASCUZZI, ESQ.

Felderstein Fitzgerald, et al

400 Capitol Mall

Suite 1450

Sacramento, CA 95814

CNA Insurance Companies: RUTH VAN METER, ESQ.

Munsh Hardt Kopf and Harr, PC

Maxxam, Incorporated: JEFFREY E. SPIERS, ESQ.

Andrews Kurth

Bank of America, NA: EVAN M. JONES, ESQ.

> O'Melveny and Myers 400 S. Hope Street Los Angeles, CA 90071

U.S. Department of

Justice:

ALAN S. TENENBAUM, ESQ. U.S. Department of Justice

Ben Franklin Station

P.O. Box 7611

Washington, DC 20044

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES FOR: (Continued)

Scotia Pacific Company: WENDY K. LAUBACH, ESQ.

Diamond McCarthy

909 Fannin Suite 1500

Houston, Texas 77010

The Bank of New York
Trustee Company:

TOBY L. GERBER, ESQ. Fulbright and Jaworski

The Pacific Lumber, FRANK BACIK, ESQ.

Company:

PALCO/ The Pacific Lumber Company

Bank of New York: ALLISON BYMAN, ESQ.

Thompson & Knight, LLP

Marathon Structured JOHN PENN, ESQ.

Finance:

Haynes and Boone, LLP

Mendocino Redwood,

Company, LLC:

CRAIG P. DRUEHL, ESQ.
B. HALE WILLIAMS, ESQ.
Goodwin Procter, LLP

Beal Bank: JONATHAN NEERMAN, ESQ.

Hunton and Williams

Official Unsecured MAX

Creditor's Committee:

MAXIM BORIS LITVAK, ESQ.

JOHN D. FIERO, ESQ.

Pachulski Stang Ziehl and Jones, LLP

150 California Street

15th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111

Scotia Pacific Company: ERIC J. FROMME, ESQ.

Gibson Dunn and Crutcher, LLP

3161 Michelson Drive Irvine, CA 92612

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES FOR: (Continued)(Listen Only)

Murray Capital FRANCINE BRODOWICZ, ESQ.

The Pacific Lumber HEATHER MULLER, ESQ.

Company: PALCO/ The Pacific Lumber Company

Aurelius Capital WEI WANG, ESQ.
Management: Aurelius Capital

EXCEPTIONAL REPORTING SERVICES, INC

4

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES FOR: (Continued)(Listen Only)

Dow Jones News Wires: DAVID McLAUGHLIN, ESQ.

Dow Jones News Wires

The Times Standard: JOHN DRISCOLL, ESQ.

The Times Standard

Avenue Capital Group: STEPHEN BURNAZIAN, ESQ.

Avenue Capital Group

The Bank of New York MARK ALLAN WORDEN, ESQ. Trust Company, NA:

Fulbright and Jaworski

1301 McKinney Suite 5100

Houston, Texas 77010

Scotia Development, LLC: JOLI PECHT, ESQ.

Maxxam, Inc.

The Eureka Reporter: NATHAN RUSTON, ESQ.

The Eureka Reporter

Houlihan Lokey Howard TODD HANSON, ESQ.

And Zukin:

Houlihan Lokey Howard and Zukin

Watershed Asset ERIN ROSS, ESQ.

Management, LLC: Watershed Asset Management, LLC

Plainfield Asset BRETT YOUNG, ESQ.

Management, LLC: Plainfield Asset Management, LLC

HEATHER J. ZELEVINSKY, ESQ. Ropes and Gray, LLP:

Ropes and Gray, LLP

DAVID F. STABER, ESQ. Nature Conservency:

Akin Gump Srauss Hauer and Feld, LLP

The Pacific Lumber

Company, LLC:

GARY CLARK, ESQ.

PALCO / The Pacific Lumber Company

California State

Agencies:

STEVEN H. FELDERSTEIN, ESQ.

KIRK MILLY, ESQ.

Felderstein Fitzgerald Willoughby and

Pascuzzi, LLP 400 Capitol Mall

Suite 1450

Sacramento, CA 95814

		6
TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES F	OR: (Continued)(Listen Only)	
DK Partners:	EPHRAIM DIAMOND, ESQ. DK Partners	
Deutsche Bank:	JAMES M. DELAUNE, ESQ. Deutsche Bank	

	8	
1	Christopher Johnson?	
2	MR. JOHNSON: Present, your Honor.	
3	THE COURT: Larry Engel?	
4	MR. ENGEL: Yes, your Honor.	
5	THE COURT: Peter Laurinaitis?	
6	MR. LAURINAITIS: Present, your Honor.	
7	THE COURT: Michael Neville?	
8	MR. NEVILLE: Present, your Honor.	
9	THE COURT: George Lamb?	
10	(No audible response)	
11	Baker Botts? Do we have somebody from Baker Botts?	
12	(No audible response)	
13	Ira Herman?	
14	(No audible response)	
15	Paul Pascuzzi?	
16	MR. PASCUZZI: Present, your Honor.	
17	THE COURT: Ruth Van Meter?	
18	MS. VAN METER: Present, your Honor.	
19	THE COURT: Jeffrey Spiers?	
20	MR. SPIERS: Present, your Honor.	
21	THE COURT: Evan Jones?	
22	MR. JONES: Yes, your Honor.	
23	THE COURT: Alan Tenenbaum?	
24	MR. TENENBAUM: Present, your Honor.	
25	THE COURT: Wendy Laubach?	

	9
1	MS. LAUBACH: Present, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Toby Gerber?
3	MR. GERBER: In the courtroom, your Honor.
4	THE COURT: In the court.
5	Frank Bacik?
6	MR. BACIK: Present, your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Allison Byman?
8	MS. BYMAN: Present, your Honor.
9	THE COURT: John Penn?
10	MR. PENN: Present.
11	THE COURT: Craig Druehl?
12	MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, it's Alan Williams and
13	Brian Hale here for Goodwin Procter.
14	THE COURT: Okay, thanks.
15	Jonathan Neerman?
16	MR. NEERMAN: Here, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Maxim Litvak?
18	MR. LITVAK: Here, your Honor.
19	THE COURT: John Fiero?
20	MR. LITVAK: Your Honor, I'm here with John Fiero as
21	well.
22	THE COURT: Thanks.
23	Eric Fromme?
24	MR. FROMME: Present, your Honor.
25	THE COURT: Francine Brodowicz?

		10
1	MS. BRODOWICZ: Present, your Honor.	
2	THE COURT: Heather Muller?	
3	MS. MULLER: Present, your Honor.	
4	THE COURT: Wei Wang?	
5	MR. WANG: Present, your Honor.	
6	THE COURT: David McLaughlin?	
7	MR. McLAUGHLIN: Present, your Honor.	
8	THE COURT: John Driscoll?	
9	MR. DRISCOLL: Here, your Honor.	
10	THE COURT: Stephen Burnazian?	
11	MR. BURNAZIAN: Present, your Honor.	
12	THE COURT: Dan Kamensky?	
13	(No audible response)	
14	Mark Worden?	
15	MR. WORDEN: Good afternoon, your Honor.	
16	THE COURT: Joli Pecht?	
17	MS. PECHT: Present, your Honor.	
18	THE COURT: Nathan Rushton?	
19	MR. RUSHTON: Present, your Honor.	
20	THE COURT: Todd Hanson?	
21	MR. HANSON: Present, your Honor.	
22	THE COURT: Erin Ross?	
23	MS. ROSS: Present, your Honor.	
24	THE COURT: Brett Young?	
25	MR. YOUNG: Present, your Honor.	

	11
1	THE COURT: Heather Zelevinsky?
2	MS. ZELEVINSKY: Present, your Honor.
3	THE COURT: David Staber?
4	MR. STABER: Present, your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Gary Clark?
6	MR. CLARK: Present, your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Steven Felderstein?
8	MR. MILLY: Kirk Milly sitting in for
9	Mr. Felderstein, your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Ephraim Diamond?
11	MR. DIAMOND: Present, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: James Delaune?
13	MR. DELAUNE: Present, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Anyone else on the call?
15	MR. LAMB: George Lamb.
16	THE COURT: All right.
17	And in the courtroom, Mr. Jordan.
18	MR. JORDAN: Your Honor, Shelby Jordan, and Pete
19	Holzer, co-counsel, along with Baker Botts for the PALCO
20	debtors.
21	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Sterbach?
22	MR. STERBACH: Charles Sterbach for the United States
23	Trustee.
24	THE COURT: Mr. Gerber?
25	MR. GERBER: Toby Gerber on behalf of the Indenture

Trustee, and Mr. Jacob Cherner is here on behalf of -- as a business representative of Beal Bank and Scotia Redwood.

THE COURT: Okay.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I called this hearing cause I wanted to know if there's been any movement towards settlement. And I don't really know how to ask the question. I guess I could just ask it directly. And we can start with, since Mr. Gerber's in the courtroom, where are we with respect to the -- I mean, this case started out with -- as a case that had very little likelihood of settlement. There were -- and I'm not suggesting that parties had problems but there were more than just financial issues in this case. And it's boiled down, though, to basically two creditors now -- I mean, there are other plans, and I'm not ruling but right now we're got two creditor groups that are competing. And the -- one thing, you know, is we make the talk to individuals about bankruptcy. We talk about the two competing purposes of bankruptcy: a fresh start for the debtor but a way that creditors don't have to fight with each other. And if -- when you're down to a creditor's fight, it ought to be settled.

Okay. So that -- with that in mind, now Mr. Gerber.

I'm sorry I made you sit down there for a second.

MR. GERBER: May it please the Court, your Honor. I don't have much to report other than, I think, the parties have communicated with each other, reached out to each other. We

```
13
1
    don't have anything substantive to report. I don't know if the
 2
    Court -- and I don't think the Court wants to hear about --
 3
              THE COURT: No, I --
 4
              MR. GERBER: -- what the parties' positions are.
                                                                 But
 5
    I don't think that -- we believe, from the Indenture Trustee's
 6
    standpoint, your Honor, that we've got sophisticated parties on
 7
    both sides.
 8
              THE COURT: Right.
 9
              MR. GERBER: Parties who understand the issues and we
10
    certainly can continue to talk among ourselves and try to talk
11
    among ourselves. I think both sides are thinking very hard --
12
    at least I know from the Indenture Trustee's side and I think
13
    Marathon and MRC have represented to us that they're of
14
    solutions.
15
              THE COURT: Okay. Is somebody from Marathon want to
16
    say anything?
              MR. NEIER: Your Honor, this is David Neier. I would
17
18
    echo Mr. Gerber's comments.
19
              MR. GERBER: Yep, the --
20
              THE COURT: Okay. So then the next question, then,
21
         What can I do to facilitate movement? So I have thought
22
    about mediation. I called Judge Houser. She's not available.
23
    I don't know -- I mean, she says it's because of her schedule;
```

and I tend to agree with her that, you know, it's a difficult

We've got a two-week break and take -- we have to

24

25

situation.

1 find somebody that's -- if we're going to find somebody else to 2 assist in mediating, it's got to be somebody that doesn't need 3 a lot of education; somebody that can grasp the issues quickly and has the stature to move the parties in a certain direction. 4 5 Okay? I can think of three or four names of people that might 6 be able to do that. I just throw them out because I don't ever 7 select mediators. I would just give -- I have checked Houston: 8 Marvin Isqur is available -- has two days he could make 9 available to discuss this with the parties. I've talked to 10 Larry Kelly in Waco. He is available. He probably, now since 11 he's retired, would be charging some sort of a fee. I don't 12 know what it is. He's available. Stephen Felsenthal is not in 13 this case but has had experience doing this kind of thing. I 14 have not talked to Steve Felsenthal cause he's involved in one 15 of another case that I'm in -- not talked to him, have no idea 16 if he's available. The other name, I don't know if he's 17 available, I was thinking was McConnell. And I don't know 18 whether Mike McConnell's involved in this case or not. 19 are some names that I know of. If the parties thought that 20 there would be some value during this period of doing some kind 21 of mediation.

So now, let's hear about that.

22

23

24

25

MR. GERBER: Your Honor, from the Indenture Trustee's perspective, while we will follow whatever direction the Court sets for us, it's our view that again we believe we've got

1 | sophisticated parties on both sides that it probably isn't

2 | necessary for a mediator to be brought in and formality of

3 those types of proceedings and in the middle of the trial.

4 We'll do whatever the Court suggests is best but we think as --

5 and I hear Mr. Neier saying this -- that we're both working on

6 ideas to try and reach out to each other. Don't know that

7 | it'll be successful, and I hate to think that not using a

8 | mediator would be the difference. But in our view of the

world, we think we can talk directly with Marathon and MRC and

10 get as far as we would get with the mediator.

THE COURT: Okay. Marathon?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. NEIER: Your Honor, it's even easier on our side because unlike Mr. Gerber who has an Indenture Trustee who has to take instructions from a super majority of bondholders, we have basically two individuals both of whom have testified on the stand in front of you who are -- you know, who we take direct, you know, instructions from. They don't need to check with anybody. And so on our side, you know, we're ready to -- ready, willing and able to do whatever it takes to try and get a settlement done. Just structurally, I think it's a little bit different on the Indenture Trustee's side; but as Mr. Gerber says, his clients are sophisticated. And if they want to settle, they know how to do that.

THE COURT: Okay. What about -- what does the Debtor

25 think? Debtor have something they want to add to this?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JORDAN: Your Honor, on behalf of the PALCO debtors, I quess the thing that I would emphasize first is we encourage any effort to achieve case resolution. We selected to go last. We are -- we reported to the Court where we are and where we expect to be when we come back on the 29th. truly understand the Court's procedures to date, the Court -the order that was entered several days ago but not intended to eliminate our ability to put on evidence and establish our case even though maybe a little reading might lead certain parties to think that. We do not see us as a leader in resolving the dispute between Marathon and the noteholders. We don't -- we are in a position that we will be talking separately with those entities as these matters develop. But we don't see a role for us in that -- in the resolution of that issue and, quite frankly, have been on the sidelines to their posturing ever since the two weeks that we spent in preparation with Judge Houser all through the mediation process. So that's -- I guess in this respect, we are at the Court's disposal for anything the Court wants us to do. We are busy accomplishing our exit financing matters, and we are busy getting ready for the 29th so the Court has the benefit of our evidence and input when it comes time to evaluate the whole package assuming that there's not going to be a resolution between the noteholders and Marathon between now and then. At that point, we would be making the same analysis of our position that I'm sure the

1 noteholders or Marathon would and the Court will be if any
2 resolution by settlement is reached.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Coleman?

MS. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I generally agree with what Mr. Jordan said. I would simply add that we view all settlement talks as progress and hope that they are successful and would even anticipate those kinds of discussions. And any mediation that your Honor might encourage can go on after the May $2^{\rm nd}$ as well.

THE COURT: Okay. What about creditor's committee?

MR. FIERO: This is John Fiero, your Honor. I think our biggest concern would be that if I understand the way the Indenture works, the Indenture Trustee doesn't really have the ability to compromise without sort of getting his house in order, for lack of a better phrase. They need a super majority of bondholders to tell the Indenture Trustee that it is okay to compromise and that a compromise is a, you know, salutary thing. I don't know whether that's been accomplished by Mr. Gerber and the Indenture Trustee or not. But I fear that these two weeks could expire without that, you know, sort of basic understanding of whether or not you're, in fact, standing in the batter's box at the plate or not when Marathon and MRC are

theoretical because the Indenture Trustee remains bound and

talking to the Indenture Trustee or whether it's purely

required to try to get the full amount of the note.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Well the -- I'm going to assume, you know, that the -- that Mr. Gerber and Zack -- I'll take for granted that what they said at the beginning, that they were brought into this to settle it, work something out -- I'm going to assume that that's the case. And, of course, it's easy for me to do that. I can be naïve without, you know, I don't get paid for being -- representing anybody. So I'm going to assume that that's the case. But I think that the other parties in this case if they truly believe that the noteholders are never going to settle, then they need to get their plan in a position that it can be confirmed one way or the other and upheld on appeal. Now I don't know -- I mean, there are legal arguments that maybe you think you can win, but why take the risk. mean, there -- all of that sort of stuff. I don't know but -and you know what? I originally thought that perhaps Maxxam would come up with \$200 million and pay down the notes and then the rest could cash flow, and then we'd have an argument at least whether or not the Debtor can operate the property, you know, the normal way these things do. That didn't come up. That never happened. That was -- that plan never presented. And it was just -- that was just me thinking about this as I go I don't know -- there it is. As I said before, there is a great deal of pressure -- I mean, there are obviously a great deal of support for the Marathon plan. On the other hand, there are -- there is this little issue of, you know, the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bankruptcy Code requires indubitable equivalent to cram down the noteholders. So that issue is one important issue that we'll have to deal with one way or the other but nobody's complaining about Mendocino. I haven't heard from the Debtor yet but it sounds as though everybody's happy that they -nobody has suggested that they can't operate this business. don't know who the noteholders have in mind to operate it. They haven't chosen to tell us or maybe they don't have a deal yet, whatever. But I mean, the offer -- the noteholders, the Beal Bank offer obviously all of this stuff has been put together very quickly. And it has to in the bankruptcy Things move very quickly and so the fact that the Beal offer changed while the witness was on the stand is not surprising. That's not a -- I mean, if anything, that was just an indication from them that they were working to try to get it done right. And when somebody points out a problem, that's -with it, they tried to correct it but, I mean, obviously this case -- the best solution for this case is a solution which deals with all of the case, not just the trees. I mean, that's the solution that -- I mean, I don't think that the Bankruptcy Code envisions, you know, piecemeal stuff. I mean, it can be done. Obviously, it can be done. But I think overall the best solution is the whole case, not just part of it. And so you've got a framework, at least one framework to work that out whether you can do it by adding to the noteholder plan, I don't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I mean, I don't pretend to even suggest that I have a way to settle all of this. But I do see that it's a dispute now just able dollars. It's not a dispute about operating the forest. It's not a dispute about how many trees can get cut in a certain time period although those issues could come up in reviewing the two plans if we -- but that's not what this is about right now. It's about dollars which is the traditional things that businessmen settle because they don't want the crazy bankruptcy judge settling it for them. He's the loose cannon. You don't want that happening. Somebody -- somebody's going to win and somebody's going to lose if I have to decide it. Is there -- so is there anybody else that's got any other ideas? It sounds to me like you're not really that interested in mediation because you don't think that that really is going to get you moving in the right direction. there anyone else have an alternate opinion they want to say? So, okay. All right. Well maybe we've had a waste of time, then, today. So there -- you're still talking to each other but you -- there's been no movement yet? And when are we scheduled to start again?

MR. GERBER: We're scheduled to start on April the 29th, your Honor. Toby Gerber for the Indenture Trustee. And I think it's not that we haven't had any movement because I think the Indenture Trustee has some good ideas but the -- I

- 1 | think we're also waiting for Mendocino and Marathon, as I
- 2 | understand it, they advised that they were putting together
- 3 | something as well too. So because we haven't had progress yet
- 4 doesn't mean we won't have progress. On the other hand, you
- 5 know, there's a lot of difficulties to get into settlement
- 6 here.
- 7 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I would like, then, for Beal
- 8 and the noteholders and Marathon and Mendocino to at least
- 9 discuss who they would be interested in mediating if we do a
- 10 mediation.
- 11 MR. NEIER: Your Honor, this is David Neier. We'll
- 12 be happy to talk about that. But to Mr. Gerber's point, I'm
- 13 | not aware of any -- I don't know what he's waiting for because
- 14 I'm unaware of anything that we have said we're delivering to
- 15 him or even thinking of delivering to him that he's talking
- 16 about now. We certainly had some, you know, initial
- 17 | conversations but it's a real stretch to say that he's waiting
- 18 on us.
- 19 MR. GERBER: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to give that
- 20 impression. It was reported to me, your Honor, just so the
- 21 record is clear, it was reported to me that Marathon and MRC
- 22 were thinking about some things. I didn't say that they had
- 23 promised to deliver anything of the sort.
- 24 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 25 **MR. GERBER:** Okay.

MR. NEIER: We're always thinking.

THE COURT: Okay. And, of course, --

MR. WILLIAMS: And, your Honor, this is Alan Williams on behalf of Mendocino. If I could just weigh in --

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- for a second, because, you know, we would be prepared to go to mediation. I think that, you know, my sense is that maybe a little differently than Mr. Neier's and Mr. Gerber's, that maybe mediation would be helpful.

I think that this idea that Mr. Gerber has raised that, you know, they're waiting for us, I think we've been waiting for them. Obviously if they have somebody who's an intermediary, you know that, you know potentially, you know, eliminates any kind of, you know, miscommunications about, you know, who's waiting for who and who's obligation or opportunity it is to put something on the table.

Because the way we had understood and, you know, that way you get back to us, you know obviously whether that's or wrong, it's not important. The fact is, you know the reality is people may be thinking about a lot of stuff, but nothing meaningful has happened since we all left, you know, Corpus, you know, last Friday.

I think that the biggest concern that we would have and I'm sure everyone shares this, is that whether it be mediation or negotiations, whatever it is, that parties, you

- 1 know, meet, have conversations with a mediator, without a 2 mediator and reach some kind of conclusion relatively soon as 3 to whether or not we can reach an agreement. If we can, that'd be great, if we can't then, you know, your Honor has scheduled 4 5 some dates and, you know, we should, if we can't reach an 6 agreement we should finish the hearing and let your Honor 7 decide. 8 MR. NEIER: Yeah, and this is David Neier from 9 Marathon Structured, we're certainly not opposed to mediation. 10 THE COURT: Okay, well, -- well, good. So, in any 11 event I don't know. I would -- I again, I'm reluctant -- I'm 12 never reluctant to order mediation. I'm always reluctant to 13 order a particular mediator. 14 So, I would like for you to discuss and let me know 15 tomorrow if you can reach some agreement if I -- I'll discuss this mediation business. I'm not sure -- well, does that make 16 17 sense? Okay. 18 Discuss it among yourself. Talk amongst yourselves 19 and see where we can go. Anyone else have anything they want 20 to say? I think we've almost --MR. PASCUZZI: Your Honor, this is Paul Pascuzzi from 21 22 the California State Agency. 23 THE COURT: Yes, sir?
- 24 MR. PASCUZZI: Your Honor, I would just ask if you do

25 order the parties to mediation that you do it in the manner you

- 1 | it did last time where, for example, the California State
- 2 Agencies could be present at the mediation and be able to offer
- 3 any assistance as needed.
- 4 THE COURT: Okay. Well, you know, first of all, I
- 5 | think that the -- now, let me -- again, let me not -- I'm not
- 6 ruling on anything.
- 7 Right now the only operator of that is being
- 8 | considered in these plans that are before me right now are --
- 9 is Mendicino. I mean, we still have the debtor's plan; we're
- 10 going to look at that too. But looking at the ones that we
- 11 have here that are on the table, the, you know, the -- I mean,
- 12 | it's almost a fair characterization to say that the
- 13 | noteholder's plan is a liquidation plan of the forest.
- 14 Ultimately somebody's got to buy it and whether they're going
- 15 to operate it or they're going to turn it, I don't know. But
- 16 | that'll be an issue that you all will have all -- whatever you
- 17 | need to do when they decide what they're going to do with that,
- 18 but that's not a part of the plan.
- The other, the only other plan is the
- 20 | Mendicino/Marathon plan and I don't think that the agencies
- 21 have any problem with that. So, the only plan that can be by
- 22 agreement among these parties is some sort of an alternative of
- 23 the Marathon/Mendicino plan as far I can see.
- Now, again, I'm just the judge. I don't write these
- 25 plans. But, in order for anything else, for instance, for the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
noteholders to try to graft onto their some sort of plan that
takes care of Palco, and all those other companies, I suspect
that'd have to be re-noticed and all revoted and all sorts of
other stuff.
          So the only plan that can get confirmed out of these
hearings is one of the plans that's on the table or an
alternative of that plan that does not impact you. Or the
unsecured creditors. It only impacts the people presenting it.
Or else if it -- I mean -- or I've got to go re-noticing the
whole thing, go through the whole thing and that could kill all
the companies just to do that. I -- am I wrong? Isn't that
true? Am I -- isn't that correct?
          Mr. Gerber, do you want to say something?
          MR. GERBER: Yeah, your Honor, I don't think so.
think it's pretty clear to us that, you know, that modifying
either plan to provide for -- our plan already provides for
potential 363 sale of the mill as well.
          THE COURT: Oh, okay.
          MR. GERBER: -- and, but we need the permission of
Palco to go along with that as MRC currently has it set up,
there's a basically a transfer of ownership of the timberlands
to this Newco, but, you know, at a price that they're both, the
buyer and the seller, on --
```

-- and it's -- so if we could find a way

Right.

THE COURT:

to make that a fair sale, give everybody an opportunity to bid on that, I think you could come up with a plan under either the noteholder plan or the framework of Mendicino/MRC plan as long as we expose it to the marketplace and, you know, we could do that within a short period of time and --

THE COURT: All --

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

us --

MR. GERBER: -- make arrangements to make sure That would solve everyone's nothing fails in the meantime. legal problems as well as the monetary problems. It's not a question therefore just of dollars, you know, Marathon and MRC may have no interests in that type -- in that situation at all and it might be understandable why they -- why from their viewpoint they wouldn't want to do that. But from our viewpoint it would be a relatively simple matter to preserve the assets for a long enough period of time to make sure that they're marketed correctly and exposed to the marketplace. Everybody's solved then. You solved the legal problems that the Marathon/MRC plan and you solved the dollar problems, if you will, at the noteholders issues, just exposing it to the marketplace. It's a relatively simple fix; it doesn't quarantee that we will get a higher price. It doesn't require -- but it gives us --THE COURT: Well, are the noteholders --

MR. GERBER: -- guarantee the higher -- it gives

```
1
              THE COURT: -- are the note holders willing to
 2
    substitute themselves for Marathon and the deal that Marathon
    has with Mendicino?
 3
 4
              MR. GERBER: Yeah.
                                  I'm sorry are we willing --
 5
              THE COURT: In other words --
 6
              MR. GERBER: No, no.
 7
              THE COURT: Give Mendicino what its got and you take
    the noteholders position, I mean the noteholders take
 8
    Marathon's position, work out the exchange to where, in other
10
    words, they're going -- everybody gets paid off, all those
11
    others, in other words, are you willing to substitute and buy
12
    all the assets like they are and the same terms that they --
13
    that they're proposing?
14
              MR. GERBER: I don't think that's the right legal
15
    solution, but I -- I'd certainly want to give my indentured
16
    trustee the opportunity. I don't have a part in buying them,
17
    but step in there, might be very attractive, yes.
18
              But the point is, is that we don't think anyone
19
    should be able to set both the buyers side and the purchasers
20
    side of the value. We think the marketplace ought to do it.
21
    We don't think it would be fair necessarily to anyone else and
22
    that's the infirmity in the --
23
              THE COURT: There's already a market for the notes,
24
    isn't there?
25
              MR. GERBER:
                           For our notes.
```

But it's rarely the case where the one

MR. GERBER:

25

```
1
    party gets to be both the buyer and the seller. And set the
 2
    price. And that's what we have here. And it's easily fixable.
 3
    I -- you know, the --
              THE COURT: Okay. All right, well, in any event,
 4
 5
    everybody's still continue to try to settle this. Are we -- I
    don't know -- I don't know that it's been helpful or not, but I
 6
 7
    know I worry about it.
              So I hope you all are working in the right direction.
 9
    Anyone else, anything they need to say?
10
              MR. SPEAKER: Yeah, your Honor, if Mr. Cherner could
11
    just briefly address the Court?
12
              THE COURT:
                          Sure.
13
              MR. CHERNER: Good afternoon, your Honor.
14
              We understand that the Court correctly wants to know
15
    the status of negotiations and whether it would be beneficial
16
    at this point to determine whether the parties should be
17
    ordered to mediation.
18
              The Court's heard the lawyers' perspective and I'd
19
    appreciate a few minutes to provide a business prospective.
20
              Your Honor, the views that the parties should not be
21
    ordered to mediation. Given our view I thought it appropriate
22
    for me to spend a few minutes to explain to you the thought
23
    process and the rationale that goes behind that. Based on our
```

settle this matter, both through mediation and outside.

15 months in the case we've had many prior attempts to try to

24

25

- 1 there was never an offer made to us that didn't involve
- 2 hundreds of millions of dollars being transferred of noteholder
- 3 value to either Marathon or Maxxam.
- 4 Marathon and Mendicino as I'll describe in a minute
- 5 have no incentive to settle, your Honor. Marathon and
- 6 Mendicino are in a no lose position as they sit here today.
- 7 THE COURT: Okay, well that -- first of all that's
- 8 | not true because if I don't confirm their plan, you get the
- 9 forest. They're stuck with the mill and if you don't sell them
- 10 the stuff and you got enough money to hold out, eventually,
- 11 unless they want to hold out too, the mill's going to get
- 12 | foreclosed on or whatever and you're going to be able to buy it
- 13 | cheaply. So, I'm not sure whether they don't have any
- 14 incentive or you don't have any incentive.
- MR. CHERNER: Yes, sir. But they have a position
- 16 | that's unique here that's not normally achievable in the
- 17 marketplace. They have the proverbial two bites of the apple.
- 18 Marathon and Mendicino have a plan to take the forest
- 19 from the noteholders under their plan, without exposing the
- 20 assets to the market. And if their plan's not approved,
- 21 | Marathon and Mendicino can show up at the noteholder three sale
- 22 and be a bidder and achieve the exact same business result as
- 23 they would have achieved under their plans.
- 24 The status quo presents a free option to Marathon and
- 25 | Mendicino to see if this Court will approve their plan.

local economy.

Marathon and Mendicino will never come and offer their best price for the forest now inside or outside of mediation. If they lose their plan confirmation their worst outcome is to bid at the sale for the noteholders allowing them to achieve the same result of owning the timberlands and combining it with the mill. The noteholders objective is to expose the forest to the marketplace to determine the fair value to be paid by a buyer that will have the economic incentive to properly manage the forest for the benefit of the employees and the local economy.

In the event of a sale the noteholders will be paid whatever the market determines the collateral is worth, less the approved expenses and payment to the trade creditors. The note holders are trying do right by the Scotia estate and the

We understand this Court's focus on jobs and we agree. The note holders plan works to allow the market to bring the required well capitalized purchaser to buy the forest and to operate the forest. No one needs to lose in this case.

If you approve the indentured trustee's plan, all of the parties will obtain what they are entitled to receive without Marathon and Mendicino potentially receiving a windfall.

Marathon and Mendicino still get the benefit of bidding on the forest with the objective of combining the middle of the forest and the note holders have their collateral

```
exposed to the market to make sure the note holders are receiving the fair market value of their collateral. We're not offering to purchase the forest and then sit idle. We expect to have Palco offer to purchase or process the timber.
```

Your Honor, we need to move forward for a confirmation hearing on the indentured trustees plan and would hope that Marathon and Mendicino will see that this case can still end with the noteholders, Marathon, and Mendicino having a victory as well as this Court's objectives being fulfilled. And we appreciate your time.

MR. NEIER: Your Honor, this is David Neier.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. NEIER: I guess if the largest noteholder with 37/38 percent of the debt tells you he doesn't want a mediator and he doesn't want to settle there's not going to be a settlement. And that's disheartening to hear.

You know, I can say that we have a powerful incentive to settle, the Court has rightly figured that out that, you know, we want our plan confirmed and we recognize that there's risks on all sides, so we do have the incentive to settle. And I guess I would now think that, you know, there's not going to be a settlement based on Mr. Cherner's comments.

But, we certainly recognize the value of a settlement and as for this idea that we somehow have a free option, this is not free and certainly hasn't been a good case. The point

is that we have hooked up with the best operator, we have
gotten the support of the state agencies, the federal agencies
and the governor and the unsecured creditors and the
environmental organizations because we put forward the best
plan. And we don't see how that's going to risk -- how that's

going to happen in a liquidation scenario where any old Joe can end up operating this thing or not operating this thing. And

8 it'll be unmitigated disaster.

And I noticed that nobody indicated that they would support the estate while this marketing effort is going on.

The marketing has gone on since 2005. This company's been in play rather -- rather very visibly in the marketplace, so, you know, if they want to have further marketing, it's not going to result in anything.

MR. BRECKINRIDGE: Your Honor, this is Matt

Breckinridge from Marathon. Without a confirmation of our plan, I can virtually guarantee that Marathon will have to close the mill. Marathon cannot continue to allow its investors to support a money losing mill under the current configuration indefinitely. The mill is currently burning 2 million dollars a month of my investors' money.

In addition, I would echo Mr. Neier's comments that this has been exposed to the market. This forest has been in play as Mr. Dean pointed out when he signs the -- his initial CA in 2004, the company's been in bankruptcy for 15 months,

```
1 | anybody who has interest in the case, it's very well-
```

- 2 | publicized, should have shown up and either offered a plan or
- 3 offered to join up with one on the parties of interest who to
- 4 present a plan and so far we haven't seen anybody do that.
- 5 So, you know, this is -- this might as well been on
- 6 | the front page of the Wall Street Journal, that this company's
- 7 for sale.
 - THE COURT: Okay.
- 9 MR. CHERNER: Your Honor, we did not say we wouldn't
- 10 mediate if ordered by this Court. Of course, we'd mediate in
- 11 good faith, show up. I thought that the ask was whether there
- 12 | should be mediation, it had been fruitless to this point and I
- 13 | believe that direct negotiations -- if that avenue fell, but
- 14 | I'll be glad to speak to Sandy Dean, members of Marathon or
- 15 anyone else that'd like to speak.
- 16 | THE COURT: All right. All right, well, then just
- 17 | let me know somehow through the U.S. Trustee or directly to my
- 18 office if you reach an agreement on the name. I haven't
- 19 | decided we'll use it, but let me know what you have to say.
- 20 I -- the reason I struck -- the agencies wanted to
- 21 participate. I don't have any problem with everyone in the
- 22 case participating, it just seems to me that what the real
- 23 issue here are these four parties and really it's Beal Bank and
- 24 Marathon that need to reach an agreement. I mean the
- 25 | noteholders and Mendicino and all those -- I mean; those

```
parties are the ones that need to reach agreement for this to
1
 2
    move forward on one of these plans.
              They still have the debtor's plan they've got to --
 3
    they've got to trump. And we haven't heard that part yet. I'm
 4
 5
    not ruling on anything. But I'm not so sure -- in other words,
 6
    since we've only got two weeks before we start back up, I'm not
 7
    so sure that there's time for a mediation that involves
    everybody in this case. It seems to me that there is time,
 8
    perhaps, for a mediation that's meaningful for those four
10
    parties.
11
              But, -- and then when they reach it, I mean,
12
    obviously all of you, if they've reached an agreement, all of
13
    you would have to be written into it, but any plan that they
14
    might reach agreement on would have to be one that didn't treat
15
    you worse than -- I mean it had -- they would have to pretty
16
    much keep everybody else the way they were.
17
              MR. FIERO: Your Honor, this is John Fiero for the
18
                That's our analysis as well; we don't need to
    committee.
19
    participate in that mediation.
20
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fiero.
21
              All right. Thank you all, appreciate you coming
22
    again.
23
              MR. FIERO: Thank you, you Honor.
         (Proceeding adjourned at 2:39 p.m.)
24
25
```

CERTIF:	ICATION
---------	---------

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Join I Judan

April 18, 2008_

TONI HUDSON, TRANSCRIBER