```
1
     03CFWTCS
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
    SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
     ----×
 2
    In re WTC Disaster Site Litigation
 3
                                         21 MC 100 (AKH)
     ----x
 4
                                         New York, N.Y.
 4
 5
                                         March 12, 2010
 5
                                         2:00 p.m.
 6
    Before:
 6
 7
                      HON. ALVIN K. HELLERSTEIN
 7
 8
                                         District Judge
 8
 9
                             APPEARANCES
9
   WORBY GRONER EDELMAN & NAPOLI BERN LLP
10
        Attorneys for Plaintiffs
10 PAUL J. NAPOLI
    WILLIAM H. GRONER
11
    DENISE A. RUBIN
11
12
    MARK J. BERN
12
    MICHAEL MACE
1.3
13 SULLIVAN PAPAIN BLOCK McGRATH & CANNAVO
14
         Attorneys for Plaintiffs
14 ANDREW J. CARBOY
15
   NICHOLAS PAPAIN
15
16 GREGORY J. CANNATA & ASSOCIATES
16
         Liaison Counsel in 102 Case and Attorneys for Some
17 Plaintiffs
    GREGORY J. CANNATA
17
18
18
   PATTON BOGGS LLP
19
         Attorneys for Defendants City of New York and Contractors
19 JAMES E. TYRRELL, JR.
JOSEPH E. HOPKINS
20
    CHRISTOPHER DIMURO
21
21
   SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
22
         Attorneys for Defendants Port Authority of New York and
22 New Jersey
23
   BETH D. JACOB
24
25
        SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
                                                 (212) 805-0300
```

2 03CFWTCS APPEARANCES

(Continued)

1 2

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY
Attorneys for WTC Captive Insurance Company
MARGARET H. WARNER

6
7 (Case called)
8 (In open court)

THE COURT: We're here for two purposes this afternoon. The first is to hear the formal presentation of that which the press already carried this morning, and that is an agreement of settlement in the numbers of cases numbering about 10,000 in three master calendar dockets, and I'm going to ask in just a few minutes if Ms. Warner would describe those settlements to everyone. The agreement of settlement is subject to an order that it is fair and appropriate and just to all affected, and that date for that hearing will have to be set.

In a formal sense, what is before us now is a motion to stay all proceedings while the parties go about implementing the various steps called for by their agreement of settlement, and while the Court is able and others are able to study a very complicated agreement. I'm sure there are not enough copies to go around, but the settlement with its exhibits is about three inches thick and complicated, and I just received this document SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

2.3

last night. So I will have to decide this motion for a stay. It's called for a decision now, but I'm not sure that I will be fair if I decided it now, and I have some ideas as to how to deal with that.

And then I've scheduled for some time a motion brought on by the Port Authority to dismiss I think all but one of the lawsuits against it because of various preconditions to suing established in the laws of New York and in New Jersey pursuant to the compact that established the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey in the early 1920's, and we'll get to that argument later on, and notwithstanding the motion to stay, since everything is done on that, I will hear that motion.

Before Ms. Warner begins, I'll do two things: First, I'll give you an idea of what I think I need to do and then the parties can address that as we go along. And, second, I think I will just discuss very briefly or ask Ms. Warner to discuss who it is that she is representing.

It's important for me to deal with this settlement document quickly, because the parties have agreed on numbers of things that have to happen within set time periods and those time periods begin as of yesterday. So it wouldn't be good for the usual leisured time that Courts have to review documents and hold a fairness hearing. And I thought I ought to create an obligation on myself to discuss with you perhaps next Friday my initial impressions on reviewing the document what issues I SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

need to think about more, what I have concerns about or any other thing that comes to mind in relationship to the ultimate obligation to approve the settlement.

And the second is to schedule an actual fairness hearing. I thought first that we could do it in two weeks, but various people have obligations during that second week. The third week is the week of Passover, the second week is the Easter week, the third week is the Passover week. I'll be away, and before we can get together it becomes mid-April, perhaps a little bit earlier than that, and that won't do. many things have to happen and there's too much of a high degree of expectation. So at least people ought to be able to know and react to various issues that I spot, if any, and bring to your attention. So I thought this time next week, 2:00, would be the time that we could assemble and I could deliver my impressions. And it's also my idea that there may be a lot of people who want to speak at that time, and present their views, and I want to be receptive to that. So I thought that by 12 noon the day before, anyone who wishes to speak should register in a way that we'll develop, identify the person and whatever standing that person has to speak and I'll be liberal on the issue of standing, and, if possible, a very short summary, a sentence or two what that person wishes to speak about. We will not allow redundant information to be given, redundant objections to be given. If one person has said something, it's SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

not the number who identify themselves with that person, it's the quality of what that person says. So we will have to exercise a discipline so that people don't become repetitive. It's not going to be a planning board hearing. It's going to be much more focused than that.

So that's what I envision for next Thursday as a time of registration by noon, and Friday at 2:00 to deliver these impressions. And then I think the first time after that to have a formal hearing will have to be in early April. Perhaps we could do April 12, Monday, at 2:00 for a fairness hearing. So much for that.

In 2004, I think, Congress authorized and the Federal Emergency Management Authority funded an insurance company, a captive insurance company which would provide an insurance resource protecting the City and its contractors against loss, liability or expense in relation to the exposures of the City and its contractors with regard to the lawsuits and other claims then asserted and continuing to be asserted against the City and the contractors, a captive insurance company meaning a company that is dedicated in its insurance to a specific option was created. Ms. Warner and her law firm have been the counsel for the captive, and have done, as other counsel have done, an extraordinary job in representing her client. She has been the focal point of carrying on the negotiations that we'll hear about with liaison counsel for the plaintiffs, primarily Paul SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

2.3

Napoli. And Ms. Warner will report what their agreement has achieved.

I should say one thing more about this, or two things more about this. There was an issue about the expense and the very substantial expense being incurred by the City in defending itself and its contractors. The City had been successful in obtaining insurance, if I remember correctly, to the extent of approximately \$77 million, which had as one of its features indemnification of the City against litigation expense. Ms. Warner brought a lawsuit on behalf of the captive against the insurers to impress upon the insurers the obligation that she alleged they had to pay those expenses on a continuing basis. I heard argument and delivered judgment in favor of the captive insurance company. The insurers appealed, and that appeal remained pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

A settlement was reached between the captive and the insurers which was a necessary predicate for continuing and consummating the settlement negotiations which you'll hear about today. That settlement, if I remember the amount correctly, and may I announce it, Ms. Warner? I may not. But I just want you to cover it because there have been many questions that have been raised in connection with availability of funds and who is enriching, arguably, themself by those funds. And that has to do with the issue of payment of defense SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS costs.

2.3

Another point that has been raised, and I'm not sure that's covered yet, it has to be, is the issue of litigation expense on behalf of the plaintiffs. I pointed out in other areas, and perhaps in this case as well, that there are special circumstances involved with the tragedies of 9/11, the national tragedy and the personal tragedies, that do not allow normal rules of how expenses of litigation are defrayed, and require reasonable limits on what attorneys may recover. That was the specific focus of two of my decisions in the wrongful death actions, where all attorneys were limited, where plaintiffs' attorneys were limited to 15 percent of settlements.

We have not discussed what rules should apply to these cases, but I want to let everyone know that this will be one area of special attention on my part. Mr. Napoli and his colleagues and his firm and allied firms have done an extraordinary job. He's carried the litigation expense, and they've been substantial expense, throughout. His firm and other plaintiffs' firms deserve reasonable compensation, and it's part of my job to make sure that he gets it. But it's also my job, as it is with all other respects, to make sure that everything that passes through this Court is fair and reasonable, and I want to let everyone know that this will be one point of attention.

There have been other points of attention, but I think SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

CELIMOC

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I've said enough at this point and I'd like Ms. Warner now to proceed.

MS. WARNER: May it please the Court. Margaret Warner from McDermott, Will & Emery for the WTC captive insurance company and its four employees.

Your Honor, if I may, I would like to introduce to the Court my partners, Mark Collins and Ryan Smethurst, and my associate, Andrew Genz.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MS. WARNER: Plaintiffs' liaison counsel, Mr. Napoli, Mr. Groner, Mr. Carboy and Mr. Papain, lead defense counsel for the City and the contractors, Mr. Tyrrell and Mr. Hopkins and the WTC captive insurance company bring to the Court today the culmination of 22 months of good-faith negotiations, exhaustive consultation with doctors, scientists, medical experts, statisticians, careful consideration of the Court's and the special master's extensive work and direction in these cases over the past six years. The Court is all too aware of the complexity of these cases. They are the largest, certainly most emotionally wrenching, most medically and scientifically novel and legally complex mass tort litigation in the country. What we bring to you today in that context could only have been achieved due to the Court's and the special master's thorough direction of the litigation, including pressure in the litigation, and the special master's particular work on the SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

2.3

medical severity charts and their memoranda to the Court and the parties on distribution issues. In addition, as the Court has noticed, the Court's ruling in the lawsuit brought by the WTC captive against certain underlying insurers was of immense assistance in bringing this matter to conclusion on behalf of the City and its contractors, and while I am not at liberty due to confidentiality agreements to disclose specifically the amount of money that resulted from the settlement due to the proceedings before your Honor and before the Second Circuit, I can assure everyone that they resulted in a situation where the extensive and appropriate legal fees to defend the City and its contractors were largely reimbursed to the WTC captive, so that the captive's initial grant of federal taxpayer funds could be used for the purpose that it shall be used for now.

The parties' agreement is detailed. As the Court already showed everyone, this is the settlement process agreement. It is 95 pages long, it has 22 exhibits. This agreement can bring this litigation to a just conclusion in difficult and complicated circumstances. It will provide the parties with a transparent, fair, efficient process to distribute just payments to individual plaintiffs. The settlement is fairly valued from the ground up for these plaintiffs' claims against the City and its contractors. But it does more, we believe, your Honor, and we appreciate the schedule that you have set forward in Court today, because we SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

2.3

believe that this settlement process agreement which has been the result of these extensive negotiations and consultations can present a pathway for other plaintiffs and other defendants in the 100, 102 and 103 dockets to join it and pledge additional monies for settlement of these cases.

This agreement is based upon a careful assessment of the medical issues here, the very difficult medical issues that have been presented by these cases. It reflects the many also difficult legal issues of causation, both scientific, medical, general and specific to each plaintiff. It also reflects the very difficult legal issues associated with immunity, given the nature of the genesis of this litigation, whether duties were owed given the particular plaintiff population here, and very difficult factual issues, because, after all, we are discussing the aftermath of 9/11.

We believe, your Honor, and we believe that you will find after careful consideration and after a little bit more than a night to go through these 95 pages and 22 exhibits, that this will provide for a transparent process to evaluate these individual claims in a manner that is fair, consistent and medically reliable.

The foundation of this resolution that has been reached is a settlement construct that some could call a grid. This settlement construct was substantially derived directly from the painstaking work of the special masters when they SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

worked with the parties on the so-called severity chart, and what the parties did in the negotiations was merely add to that very important work done by the special masters with additional diagnostic criteria and medical proof requirements that had been recommended after immense and lengthy consultations by both the plaintiffs' lawyers and the lawyers for the WTC captive and the City and contractors with medical doctors, scientific experts and others. This agreement couples this medical criteria with other indicias of proof for each individual plaintiff, such as detailed work verification for proof that a person worked at the site, and the submission, all electronically, so that it will be the most efficient and the least costly of claims forms that will be submitted by each plaintiff in an easy manner, an understandable manner, under penalties of perjury, so that we can assure that the plaintiffs who should receive this money do receive this money.

It is also subject to audit, so that the entire process can be transparent to the Court and to the public and can demonstrate the integrity of this resolution, given the public importance of these cases. All of this, your Honor, will be overseen by an independent third party, what we have termed an allocation neutral. That person will work with a claims administrator and a board of certified physicians who will administer and assist this very difficult process of determining how much each plaintiff should receive. All of SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

2.3

these people who will be involved in this process are experienced in mass tort settlement resolution.

Your Honor, when these are handed out, and we do have a number of them available, perhaps not enough for the number of people in the courtroom, I would respectfully request that people direct their attention to pages 49 through 59 of this document. This lays out in great detail the painstaking work to develop appropriate medical criteria, impairment criteria, so that each plaintiff receives an individual evaluation of their medical condition. It will deploy rigorous, spelled-out diagnostic and impairment criteria, again, developed in consultation with pulmonologists, oncologists, ear, nose and throat physicians and other experts. These pages also spell out that the test that various plaintiffs will have to show as part of their medical records, which they've already had, are widely accepted tests laid out by the American Medical Association or the American Thoracic Society.

Under this settlement process agreement, there are four tiers of injury. These were negotiated to streamline the distribution process and, equally importantly, to assure consistency among the plaintiffs, which will promote fairness. These criteria and the tiers also will allow for the timely distribution to individual plaintiffs, and we are very mindful, your Honor, that the timeliness of this is of great importance. These cases, as you noted, have been pending for a number of SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

2.3

years. They were difficult cases. They took time to get to this point, but we are at that point where we can do this in a manner that is fair, that is transparent, that is consistent and will allow each individual plaintiff to know that his or her situation has been looked at closely.

There will be five components of payments under the settlement process. The first will be payments pursuant to the grid or settlement construct for the 100, 102 and 103 dockets. Those payments, as I have said, will be made on the grid based upon the medical condition and impairment levels set forth in the medical records of each plaintiff.

THE COURT: 100 is 21 MC 100, which is the collection of cases brought against the City and its contractors in the basic World Trade Center site.

102 is the collection of cases brought against various land owners in the area surrounding the World Trade Center, where the City may be a tenant or a landlord, but where the City was not directly involved in the cleanup and reconstruction efforts.

103 is a case where the plaintiffs may have worked both at neighboring sites and in the World Trade Center site. This settlement, as Ms. Warner will explain, deals with all three in relationship to the City's and the City's contractors' roles, their direct roles in 100, where the City had a role as landlord or tenant in 102, and in 103. So I just thought it SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CEWTCS

22 23

was useful for everyone to understand what it is those dockets stand for.

MS. WARNER: So the five components, again, of potential compensatory payments, the first, the grid, as laid out by the Court with regard to the separate dockets.

The second, a permanent disability fund set aside for plaintiffs who have been found disabled already due to their work at the site.

The third, plaintiffs who have had certain surgeries, such as lung transplants and certain sinus surgeries, a separate amount payable to an individual plaintiff if they demonstrate through their medical records that they have undergone these certain surgeries.

The fourth, payments to plaintiffs who also have certain orthopedic injuries due to their work at the site. And five, a cancer insurance policy, which has been secured after extensive negotiation with the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, a particular component I would like to address in some detail, your Honor. This component of the settlement goes straight to the very great concern and fear that certain of the plaintiffs in this litigation have about the fear of contracting cancer in the future. Those are very real fears, and those will be covered in terms of a policy underwritten by Met Life. It is subject to regulatory approval by the New York State Insurance Department, but this policy will cover SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

respiratory and blood cancers that may develop for the current plaintiffs. All plaintiffs must enroll in this policy, and Met Life must accept all plaintiffs except those who already have been diagnosed with one of the covered cancers. The benefit will be \$100,000 if one of these cancers is contracted, and there will be certain other terms and conditions with regard to the policy.

The financial terms are as follows: The WTC captive on behalf of the City and its contractors to settle all claims against the City and its contractors in the 21 MC 100 docket, 21 MC 102 docket and 21 MC 103 docket will pledge the following cash: \$575 million, which will include the premium payment for the cancer policy. In addition, \$25 million also may result from contingent payments over five years if certain conditions develop, or are met. These additional monies will be available for the most severely injured plaintiffs.

95 percent of the plaintiffs who have brought claims against the City and its contractors must opt in to this settlement process agreement in order for it to go forward. The plaintiffs' lawyers feel strongly that this can be achieved and that it can be achieved after the plaintiffs have been able to receive a briefing on the agreement. If more than 95 percent of the plaintiffs with claims against the City and the contractors choose to opt in, that will result in 2 percent more money going into the settlement for every 1 percent of SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

additional plaintiffs who opt in, and, therefore, that will allow the WTC captive to pay up to a potential of 657.5 million just on behalf of the City and the contractors.

As I said before, we also believe, however, that this construct will allow other plaintiffs and defendants to join and increase the amount of dollars. The settlement also cannot go forward without the Court entering certain case management orders in each of the dockets. Those case management orders will govern the efficient management of all opt-out cases and all future cases should they be filed, and the purpose of these case management orders which build upon the work of the Court already in these cases in its management oversight of these cases since 2004 will assure that only well-evaluated, causally-related cases proceed, and this is very important, as I will set forth in a moment.

This settlement, reached after lengthy, careful negotiations, and certainly vigorous litigation, will result in the WTC captive fulfilling its purpose, the purpose that Congress asked it to fulfill, to protect the City of New York and its contractors who answered the call when our nation was attacked on 9/11, and, and equally important, to create a fair, medically-based, rigorous process to distribute taxpayer funds, the taxpayer funds entrusted to the WTC captive to injured workers and first responders who also without hesitation and without self-interest answered the call and went down and SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

picked up the pieces to allow this City to move beyond Ground $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Zero}}$.

Your Honor, the WTC captive as the result of this settlement will keep certain assets and we will keep those assets, as we are required to do, and as we are entrusted with taxpayer funds, in case that sometime in the future there are other injuries that should arise, because it would be unfortunate and inequitable, it would be unfortunate and inequitable to give all of this money out now and not leave a fair amount for future potential claims. The number of possible future claims cannot be determined, and certainly not now, and certainly the position of the litigants has said a lot about what we do or do not think might arise in the future. But the captive must preserve some funds if there are future injuries that develop. If any remaining dollars ultimately are not paid out after the captive fulfills its commitment as required by Congress to stay in business for 25 years, if any remaining funds are not paid out, they will be returned to the taxpayers.

Your Honor, all the components of this agreement connect. And each are dependent upon each other. It is a whole. We believe, both the plaintiffs' lawyers, the defense counsel and the counsel for the WTC captive, that this agreement in its whole rises to the challenge presented by these difficult and complicated cases that present significant SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

2.3

legal and factual hurdles.

We thank the Court. We thank the Court, your Honor, for the compassion with which you have presided over these cases for the last six years, and for your unstinting commitment to fairness and transparency. If I may say, your Honor, for us at the WTC captive and its counsel, this is the Court's admirable legacy to the bench, the litigants and the residents of New York for being asked to preside over these difficult and complicated cases, and we hope that you will find that what we have done with the utmost of care will rise to the levels that you have always evidenced and always require.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Warner. Before I -- excuse me, sir, lady. If you're here, you need to stay here. There will be no early filing of reports. I've always been accessible to the press, I've always wanted to make sure that each member of the press who approached me understood what was going on. No one got an unfair shake. No one is allowed to get a quick deadline. You will be here until it is over.

There are a few things I want to bring up. First of all, Ms. Warner, I want to thank you for your remarks and for your summary. If people want copies of the briefing, can people pay a modest amount moment to your office to get a copy?

MS. WARNER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: First of all, you used the phrase "ground SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

2.3

up" settlement, the settlement was made from the ground up and the term was used yesterday in explaining the settlement to me early on and Ms. Warner, could you tell us what you mean by it?

MS. WARNER: I apologize, your Honor, for a little bit of use of perhaps the insurance and defense lawyer vernacular. What we mean by that is that an attempt was made in negotiating the settlement and in negotiating the amount of the settlement and the various components, the five components that are laid out. The plaintiffs' lawyers and us tried very hard to look at these cases on the basis of what the level of injuries were that were presented by the plaintiffs, and how those level of injuries ultimately could be compensated in light of these difficult other aspects of the cases, such as the causation issues.

THE COURT: There were defenses raised by the City and its contractors that were unique, and which have been the subject of some of them, of opinions and orders and appeals. For example, the City contended that it had immunity because of emergency responses for the benefit of all under a state statute passed in the aftermath of World War II. The City raised a defense that many of the people were not in an employment relationship and only could benefit from the strict features, the beneficial features of the labor laws of New York State if they had an employment relationship, and that was the subject of the opinion and a question of fact. There were SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

other defenses that made this unique and what Ms. Warner is saying is that in evaluating the case an effort was made to value each case in accordance with various kinds of precedents and creating a certain merits-oriented discipline. One, of course, can argue with the application of all these different criteria, but when the term is used "ground up," it means that there's an effort to create a merits-oriented settlement with regard to each of these cases.

MS. WARNER: Yes, your Honor, and if I may add, also to evaluate these cases on an individual basis, given the complexities of any trial that might be had for an individual plaintiff, the fact that prior to the trial, during the trial and subsequent to the trial, it would have to be a whole number of very difficult questions decided both by a judge, your Honor, or a jury, and in fact, as the Court knows, there are pending before the Court approximately 120 motions for summary judgment that address a number of these issues, and the need to decide those motions, in our view, would be completely precluded and unnecessary by going forward with this settlement. Which means in looking at it in toto, an individual plaintiff would not need to go through the rigors that the tort system requires to ultimately get the compensation and the sheer practical problem that we all face and that the Court has grappled with for years, that there are so many of these cases, that it is very difficult to have SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

trials in them at any near time in the future other than a few trials.

THE COURT: For example, in a tort case, in most cases you have to prove causation. You have to prove that the negligence of the defendant or some other degree of fault by the defendant or some degree of responsibility by the defendant caused the illness. For one thing, many of the toxic quality of elements in the air had no precedent, so it's very hard to prove causation. Another instance, another aspect of the problem, the ailments that were complained of were ailments that in some degree or another are common among the population, and so to prove causation, the relationship to the cases here presents a unique set of problems. With regard to cancers, for example, that they are slow developing, and many people, unfortunately, are subjected to it, so how do you prove that there's an element of causation. This is one aspect of the proof, by a grounds-up settlement was one of the means that there was an effort made to discount all these features and creating a merits-oriented settlement with respect to individuals, and Ms. Warner says there are 120 motions before me. Yes, that's true. Some of them had unique difficulties, and while we have yet to see what we call the Daubert motions, for a Supreme Court case with that name, which requires the judge as a gatekeeper to measure the quality of the expert that is brought to bear to show causation, and one problem I could (212) 805-0300 SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

03CFWTCS

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

let you know is that there's no science, because there's no experience. It's very hard to have enough expertise that passes muster. All of these would have been coming before me. All of these would have had to have been settled before the trials that were set for mid-May. And even if we were to have these trials, there would be enough questions that they would give us enough consistency of experience to be able to apply them in a general way.

So what this settlement does, again, without passing on the reasonableness and fairness of each particular quotient of the settlement or of the whole, is to avoid all this work, to avoid all these major questions and to make sure that the plaintiffs have a recovery, a recovery that is graduated according to the severity of their injuries, measured by the degree of severity according to the AMA and American Thoracic Society standards, and also in terms of their ability or disability to continue to do work, if they have died or some other calamity has occurred, some other noticeable injury has occurred or they've undergone some operation to help them and which also should be considered. So there's an effort to graduate results according to the severity of injury. Not everybody will be equally awarded. Indeed, there will be unequal awards in relationship to the way that this work caused an impact on the health and welfare of the workers.

In addition, we are going to build a system in which SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

we have built in throughout to make sure that what people say about their health is objectively measured, and accurately measured. So this will not be a give-away. But it will be, especially after we go through with this in terms of criteria of fairness and application of fairness, fair and just results, as fair and as just as we can make them. This in a way is a culmination -- Ms. Warner, go ahead.

MS. WARNER: Your Honor, if I may just say one thing in practicality. I am properly advised that this morning when the papers were filed for this matter today, the settlement process agreement was filed with the Court and is therefore available by looking at the Court's docket.

THE COURT: Yes. But it's not so easy to get copies of the docket and it will be a lot easier if your office can be set up to make copies available at the cost of reproduction or thereabouts.

MS. WARNER: Yes, your Honor. And I should note that pursuant to your direction yesterday, we have a number of copies in the courtroom today that I can make available.

THE COURT: Excellent. Thank you.

And the criteria which Ms. Warner was speaking about that was put in place to identify people most severely impacted owes a great debt in this respect and in so many other respects to the quality of the two special masters that I appointed in this case. Professor Eric Twerski of Brooklyn Law School is SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

2.3

here. Professor Twerski, please stand. And Professor James Henderson of Cornell Law School who was here yesterday but had an important matter with his grandchildren that takes precedence. He is not here today, but both will be here, I hope, next week.

With regard to the sessions next week, those who wish to speak should register. May I, Mr. Napoli, ask you to give your address so people can identify themselves to Mr. Napoli, to Mr. Tyrrell and to Ms. Warner, and they will make these lists known to me as well. Mr. Napoli, do you wish to comment on the things that Ms. Warner said?

MR. NAPOLI: No, I don't, but I would like to point out that on our website we've now posted the settlement agreement and all the agreements in PDF so they can be printed and downloaded from there as well.

THE COURT: Announce your website.

 $\,$ MR. NAPOLI: It is 877 WTC hero. It's specifically for this litigation.

THE COURT: 877WTChero.com.

MR. NAPOLI: Also, our address is 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10118.

THE COURT: Mr. Napoli will stay a few minutes later and give this information to anyone who wants it. Mr. Tyrrell.

Court has had an opportunity to hear a reasonably detailed

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

MR. TYRRELL: Your Honor, now that everyone in the

03CFWTCS

2.3

presentation from Ms. Warner concerning the settlement agreement, I do wish to circle back to the question that your Honor left open at the outset. The application that we made was of course to enter a stay today for an appropriate period of time. We do not want to waste resources. There are deadlines because of the May trial date. I think yesterday we filed 30 more summary judgment motions. This is extraordinarily expensive and time consuming, and, frankly, to submit that much more to the Court is a problem.

I recognize that there may be issues that some wish to speak about the stay, but I think there is -- it is undoubted that people need, including the Court and the special masters time to read this, that this impacts everything else that we have been doing. So we would urge the Court to enter the stay as soon as possible, or if necessary to do it in bites, so that we get a stay for a period of time until we come back to you, but to force all of these parties in all of these cases to now proceed with the things that they are doing when they need time to decide if they wish to join this, if they wish to comment on this, seems unduly wasteful of resources.

THE COURT: Is there anyone here representing any party who objects to a stay?

 $\operatorname{MS.}$ JACOB: Your Honor, Beth Jacob for the Port Authority of New York.

THE COURT: Please come up, Ms. Jacob.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

03CFWTCS

MS. JACOB: Beth Jacob for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. I'm not objecting to the stay. We haven't seen the settlement agreement. We don't know what the terms of the stay are. But as the Court has mentioned there is a motion we have pending before the Court --

THE COURT: I'm going to hear it. MS. JACOB: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anybody else?

2.3

MR. CANNATA: Your Honor, Gregory Cannata, the plaintiff's liaison for the 102 litigation. Do I understand that the Court is staying the entire 102 litigation, not only the City defendants but all defendants?

 $\,$ THE COURT: That's the motion. I want to hear objections.

MR. CANNATA: Your Honor, we have not been served with any of the papers on the order to show cause. I understand there was a brief that was not included in the --

THE COURT: Mr. Cannata, let me suggest this, because I think a lot of people are in your shoes. I'll take the objections next week. My disposition is to grant the motion, unless there's some showing in some particular matter of injustice. Obviously, we cannot go through this very complex document while at the same time working hard to push forward various matters in the litigation. And obviously, if I'm taking away valuable pretrial time, I can't expect people to be SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

27 03CFWTCS ready to try the case when the cases were set. So my 2 disposition is to grant the motion next Friday with the 3 possibility of discrete exceptions where people show a need. 4 MR. TYRRELL: Your Honor, may we understand that 5 between now and Friday, so that people who are taking 6 depositions and what have you --THE COURT: They should stop. 7 8 MR. TYRRELL: -- should know that there's an interim 9 stay? 10 THE COURT: Yes. They should stop. Anybody disturbed 11 by that? Ms. Rubin? 12 MR. RUBIN: Your Honor, should we also assume that 13 papers due on the pending motion next Friday --14 THE COURT: Don't send them to me. I have no more 15 room, anyhow. 16 All right, so that deals with everything here. And I 17 will see you next Friday to continue this. Sir? 18 MR. PAPAIN: Nicholas Papain from the firm of Sullivan 19 Papain Block McGrath & Cannavo, 120 Broadway, New York, New 20 York 10271. Your Honor, I just want to put that on the record 21 so that as co-liaison counsel we are also available for any questions that may arise. 22 2.3 THE COURT: Thank you very much. If you stay where 24 you are, Ms. Jacob and Mr. Mace, everyone else can adjourn. 25 (Adjourned) SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300