1	l <b>I</b>	FATES BANKRUPTCY COURT	
2	DIST		
3	IN RE:	. Chapter 11	
4	THE HERTZ CORPORATION, et	. Case No. 20-11218 (MFW) al., .	
5 6		<ul><li>824 North Market Street</li><li>Wilmington, Delaware 19801</li></ul>	
	Dobton		
7	Debtor	s May 27, 2020 10:30 A.M.	
8	TRANSCRIPT OF T	ELEPHONIC FIRST DAY HEARING	
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARY F. WALRATH UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE		
10		TITED DIMINICOLLECT CODES	
11	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:		
12		Mark D. Collins, Esquire John H. Knight, Esquire	
13		Brett M. Haywood, Esquire Christopher M. De Lillo, Esquire	
14		J. Zachary Noble, Esquire RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER, P.A.	
15		One Rodney Square 920 N. King Street	
16		Wilmington, Delaware 19801	
17			
18		Electronically Recorded by Brandon J. McCarthy, ECRO	
19	Transcription Company:	Reliable	
20		1007 N. Orange Street	
21		Wilmington, Delaware 19801 (302)654-8080	
22		Email: gmatthews@reliable-co.com	
23	Proceedings recorded by e transcript produced by tr	lectronic sound recording, anscription service.	
24			

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES	(Continued):
2 3 4	For the Debtors:	Thomas E Lauria, Esquire Matthew C. Brown, Esquire Amanda Parra Criste, Esquire WHITE & CASE LLP 200 South Biscayne Boulevard
5		Suite 4900 Miami, Florida 33131
6		- and -
7		J. Christopher Shore, Esquire
8		David M. Turetsky, Esquire Andrea Amulic, Esquire
9		1221 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10020
11		- and -
12		Jason N. Zakia, Esquire 111 South Wacker Drive
13		Chicago, Illinois 60606
14		- and -
15		Ronald K. Gorsich, Esquire Aaron Colodny, Esquire
16		Andrew Macintosh, Esquire Doah Kim, Esquire
17 18		555 South Flower Street, Suite 2700 Los Angeles, California 90071
19	For the U.S. Trustee:	
20		UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE
21		844 King Street, Suite 2207 Lockbox 35
22		Wilmington, Delaware 19801
23	For Deutsche Bank:	Marshall S. Huebner, Esquire DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP
24		450 Lexington Avenue New York, New York 10017
25	For the Canadian Noteholders:	Gregg M. Galardi, Esquire ROPES & GRAY LLP 1211 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES	(Continued):
2	For the Ad Hoc Group of Second Lien	AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
3 4	Noteholders:	One Bryant Park Bank of America Tower New York, New York 10036
5 6	For Barclay's Bank:	Brian Trust, Esquire MAYER BROWN LLP 1221 Avenue of the Americas
7		New York, New York 10020
8		- and -
9		Suzzanne S. Uhland, Esquire LATHAM & WATKINS LLP 885 Third Avenue
10		New York, New York 10022
11	For FACT:	John D. Demmy, Esquire SAUL EWING ARNSTEIN & LEHR LLP
12		1201 North Market Street, Suite 2300 Wilmington, Delaware 19801
13	Day the Charles Comment	
14	For the Chubb Company:	DUANE MORRIS LLP
15		30 South 17th Street Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
16	For Credit Agricol:	Michael Luskin, Esquire LUSKIN, STERN & EISLER LLP
17		Eleven Times Square
18		8th Avenue & 41st Street New York, New York 10036
19	For the Ad Hoc Group	Rachel C. Strickland, Esquire
20	of Unsecured Bondholders:	WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP 787 Seventh Avenue
21		New York, New York 10019
22	For the Ad Hoc Committee of MTM	Richard G. Mason, Esquire WACHTELL LIPTON ROSEN & KATZ
23	Holders:	51 West 52nd Street New York, New York 10019
24		

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (	Continued):
2	For Peter Lee & Latonya Campbell:	Jahan C. Sagafi, Esquire OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP
3		One California Street 12th Floor
4		San Francisco, California 94111
5	For ATS Processing Services, LLC and	Mark A. Salzberg, Esquire SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS (US) LLP
6	American Traffic Solutions Consolidated:	2550 M Street, NW Washington, DC 20037
7	  For City of Atlanta/ATL	Eric Smith. Esquire
8	& Memphis International Airport:	
10	For Pittsburgh	Mark Minuti, Esquire
11	International Airport:	SAUL EWING ARNSTEIN & LEHR LLP 1201 North Market Street, Suite 2300 Wilmington, Delaware 19801
12	  For Westchester	Michael E. Collins, Esquire
13 14	Fire Insurance Company:	MANIER & HEROD, P.C. 1201 Demonbreun Street, Suite 900 Nashville, Tennessee 37203
15		Nasiiville, leililessee 3/203
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

FIRST DAY MOTIONS: 1 Joint Administration. Debtors' Motion for Entry of an Order Directing Joint Administration of the Chapter 11 Cases [Docket No. 14] 3 4 Ruling: Order Entered Prime Clerk Retention Application. Debtors' Application for Entry of an Order Appointing Prime Clerk LLC as Claims and Noticing Agent [Docket No. 15] 6 Ruling: Order Entered Creditor Matrix. Debtors' Motion for Entry of Interim and Final 8 Orders (a) Authorizing Debtors to (i) File a Consolidated Creditor Matrix, (ii) File a Consolidated List of 50 Largest Unsecured Creditors, (iii) Waive Requirements to File a List of, and Provide Notice to, All Equity Holders, (iv) Redact Certain Personal 10 Identification Information for Individual Creditors, and (b) Granting Related Relief [Docket No. 16] 11 Ruling: Order Entered on an Interim Basis 12 Worldwide Automatic Stay. Debtors' Motion for Entry of an Order 13 (i) Confirming, Restating, and Enforcing the Worldwide Automatic Stay, Anti-Discrimination Provisions, and Ipso Facto Protections of 14 the Bankruptcy Code, (ii) Approving the Form and Manner of Notice, and (iii) Granting Related Relief [Docket No. 17] 15 Ruling: Order Entered 16 Utilities. Debtors' Motion for Entry of Interim and Final Orders 17 (i) Approving the Debtors' Proposed Form of Adequate Assurance of Payment to Utility Providers, (ii) Establishing Procedures for 18 Resolving Objections by Utility Providers, and (iii) Prohibiting Utility 19 Providers from Altering, Refusing, or Discontinuing Utility Services [Docket No. 18] 20 Ruling: Order Entered 21 Cash Management. Debtors' Motion for Entry of Interim and Final 22 Orders (i) Authorizing, But Not Directing, the Debtors to (a) Continue Use of Their Existing Cash Management System, Bank 23 Accounts, Checks and Business Forms, (b) Pay Related Prepetition Obligations, (c) Continue Performance of Intercompany Transactions, 24 and (d) Continue Hedging Practices; (ii) Waiving the Section 345(b) Deposit and Investment Requirements; and (iii) Granting Related 25 Relief [Docket No. 19]

Ruling: Order Entered 1 Employee Wages. Debtors' Motion for Entry of Interim and Final Orders (a) Authorizing, But Not Directing, the Debtors to: (i) Pay Prepetition Wages and Compensation; (ii) Continue Certain Employee 3 Incentive and Expense Programs; (iii) Continue Certain Employee Benefit Programs; (b) Authorizing All Banks to Honor Prepetition Checks for Payment of Prepetition Employee Obligations; and (c) Granting Other Related Relief [Docket No. 20] Ruling: Order Entered 6 Taxes. Debtors' Motion for Entry of Interim and Final Orders (i) Authorizing, But Not Directing, the Debtors to Pay Certain Prepetition Taxes & Fees and (ii) Granting Related Relief [Docket No. 21] 9 Ruling: Order Entered 10 Critical Vendors. Debtors' Motion for Entry of Interim and Final Orders (i) Authorizing, But Not Directing, the Debtors to Pay 11 Prepetition Claims of Foreign and Critical Vendors, (ii) Confirming Administrative Expense Priority Status for Outstanding Prepetition 12 Purchase Orders, and (iii) Granting Related Relief Thereto [Docket No. 22] 13 Ruling: Order Entered 14 Airport Authority Claims. Debtors' Motion for Entry of Interim and 15 Final Orders (i) Authorizing, But Not Directing, the Debtors to Pay Prepetition Claims of Airport Authorities and (ii) Granting Related 16 Relief Thereto [Docket No. 23] 17 Ruling: Order Entered 18 Customer Programs. Debtors' Motion for Entry of Interim and Final Orders (i) Authorizing, But Not Directing, the Debtors to (a) 19 Maintain Their Existing Customer Programs and (b) Honor Certain Prepetition Customer Obligations, and (ii) Granting Related Relief 20 Thereto [Docket No. 24] 21 Ruling: Order Entered 22 Franchisees Motion. Debtors' Motion for Entry of an Interim and Final Order (i) Authorizing, But Not Directing, the Debtors to 23 Honor Prepetition Obligations to Non-Debtor Franchisees in the Ordinary Course and (ii) Granting Related Relief [Docket No. 25] 24 Ruling: Order Entered 25 Insurance. Debtors' Motion for Entry of Interim and Final Orders

(a) Authorizing, But Not Directing, the Debtors to (i) Maintain

1 2 3	Existing Insurance Policies and Pay All Insurance Obligations Arising Thereunder, (ii) Continue Insurance Premium Financing and (iii) Renew, Revise, Extend, Supplement, Change or Enter Into New Insurance Policies and Insurance Premium Financing Agreements and (b) Modifying Automatic Stay with Respect to Workers' Compensation Programs [Docket No. 26]
4	Ruling: Order Entered
5	Notice and Hearing Procedures. Debtors' Motion for Entry of (i)
6	Interim Order (a) Establishing Notice and Hearing Procedures for Trading in Equity Securities in the Debtors, and (b) Setting Record
7	Date for Notice and Potential Sell-Down Procedures with Respect to Trading in Claims Against the Debtors; and (ii) Final Order (a)
8	Establishing Notice and Hearing Procedures for Trading in Equity Securities in the Debtors, and (b) Setting Record Date for Notice
9	and Potential Sell-Down Procedures and Establishing Procedures Applicable to Trading in Claims Against the Debtors Following the
LO	Occurrence of a Determination Date [Docket No. 27]
L1	Ruling: Order Entered
L2	
L3	EXHIBITS I.D. REC'D
L4	Declaration of Jamere Jackson 30
L5	Declaration of Benjamin Steele 35
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

(Telephonic proceedings commenced at 10:30 a.m.)

THE COURT: Good morning, this is Judge Walrath from Delaware.

I want to first confirm that everybody who is participating by Zoom has muted their Zoom microphone and is also on CourtCall because CourtCall will be recording the hearing and is the official court reporter for today.

This is the first day in the Hertz Corporation bankruptcy case. So, I will turn it over to counsel for the debtor. And, again, please identify yourself.

MR. COLLINS: Good morning, Your Honor. It's Mark Collins from Richards, Layton & Finger. Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. COLLINS: Your Honor, I am trying to get on Zoom. I am on CourtCall. I think I will try to continue to get into Zoom as soon as I can.

Your Honor, it's a pleasure to be before you this morning. I do hope everyone at the bankruptcy court and the clerk's office is healthy and safe. And as always, I want to thank Your Honor for scheduling today's hearing.

Your Honor, I have the pleasure of introducing our co-counsel, Tom Lauria of White & Case, the company's lead restructuring counsel to Hertz. And with Your Honor's permission I would like to turn the presentation over to Mr. Lauria to make some additional introductions and to turn to

|| today's agenda.

2.3

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Collins.

Mr. Lauria?

MR. LAURIA: Good morning, Your Honor. Can you hear me okay?

THE COURT: Yes, I can.

MR. LAURIA: Fantastic. Well, I want to start out by thanking the court for setting this hearing on shortened notice. It's of great importance to the company and we hope to get this Chapter 11 case off to a good start.

I'm going to be joined today by my partners Chris Shore, David Turetsky, Matt Brown and Ron Gorisch. In addition, we are also going to be joined on the record today by five of our associates who have been the people who have really done the hard work to get us here and as a reward for that they are each going to get an opportunity to speak to the court today and present, at least, one motion. In that regard I have assured them all that the court will be easier on them then I was during the preparation.

So, with that said, today marks the first day in the next chapter, I think it's fair to call it Chapter 11, of the long history of the Hertz rent-a-car business. With a little luck, a turnaround in the economy, a lot of hard work and the court's guidance we are sure that it will not be the last.

I would like to give a brief presentation.

Recognizing the size and complexity of the case I thought it

would be helpful to the court to provide some background

information regarding the company as we launch into the first

days.

(Off record discussion)

THE COURT: I have it.

MR. LAURIA: Okay. I think we're set. Your Honor, do you have the deck?

THE COURT: I do. Thank you.

MR. LAURIA: Thank you.

So, there are thirty debtors before you. The top holding company is called Hertz Global Holdings. It is the ultimate parent. It is publicly traded and, at least, at this moment still traded on the New York Stock Exchange. In addition there are twenty-nine direct or indirect subsidiaries including the Hertz Corporation that are either issuers, or borrowers, or guarantors under the company's US and Canadian debt, or have cross default provisions that were triggered by the Chapter 11 filing of the Hertz Corporation in this case, but what you have before you is, effectively, the entire US operating business of Hertz.

As I will explain in a little bit of more detail in a moment Hertz's businesses in the United Kingdom, in Europe, in Australia and New Zealand are not included in

these filings because we were able to obtain waivers of cross defaults in the various credit documents so that we did not have to seek relief as to those entities and we have everybody over there comfortable that this case does not result in an insolvency that requires the directors or officers of any of those companies to seek immediate insolvency relief. That is something that we're, obviously, going to keep an eye on as events unfold.

In addition, Hertz's businesses in Asia and Latin America are also not before the court at this time because that is largely a franchise business. So, as a technical matter those legal entities are not part of the Hertz family; although, they all have contractual relationships with one or more of the debtors.

So, flipping to the next side in the deck Hertz has four main businesses. Far and away the most important is the vehicle rental business conducted through the Hertz, Dollar Thrifty, and Firefly brands. This business is conducted both off and on airports around the world. It produces over 90 percent of the revenues and approximately 90 percent of the earnings of the business.

Hertz also has another business that is a little bit hidden, that is its vehicle sales business. At any point in time Hertz historically has over 500,000 vehicles in its fleet around the US. Currently, about 730,000 vehicles. And

as you would expect, it regularly has to dispose of old
vehicles and make way for new ones. So, we have a massive
vehicle disposition business. We sell through three
channels. As you would expect, we have a business where we
sell direct through Hertz retail outfits, we sell through
auction houses, and we have a dealer direct business where we
sell in bulk to used car dealers around the United States and
in Europe.

We have a franchise program, as I mentioned. This is basically how the Hertz international business is run outside of the UK, Europe and Australia. And we have a separate business, Donlen, which was acquired in 2012; that is a fleet managment and leasing business where Hertz, basically through Donlen, provides servicing services to the owners of the vehicles to lease them directly to large corporate users. That is, effectively, a standalone business.

Turning to the next slide, this is a snapshot of the company's current debt obligations. As you can see at the bottom of the page Hertz reports on a consolidated basis from an accounting perspective just under \$20 billion dollars of debt; however, about 14 of that, that's the bottom one-third of this page, is non-recourse debtors. These are obligations that are used -- that Hertz has used to finance its fleet around the world, and in many cases this financing

has been done through SPV's that are not designed to be debtors. The largest piece of that financing is about \$10.9 billion dollars of debt that is owned by the Hertz Vehicle Finance entity, HVF.

2.3

You will see, Your Honor, there are a lot of acronyms in this case and it's always difficult to keep them straight.

HVF has a fleet today of about 500,000 vehicles, and the debt associated with those vehicles is about 10.9. The debt there is non-recourse to Hertz and the connection between those vehicles and Hertz is through a lease pursuant to which Hertz has the right to operate and maintain those vehicles, and then turn them back when it determines it's no longer going to use them.

In addition, about \$1.6 billion dollars of this non-recourse debt is related to the Donlen business. This is the financing for the fleet that Donlen services. And the second largest piece is about 1.4 -- the third largest piece, I'm sorry, is about \$1.4 billion dollars which takes the form of the European vehicle notes and European ABS program.

Again, the vehicle notes are direct obligations of Hertz

Europe. The ABS debt is an obligation of an SPV that in turn leases the vehicles to Hertz.

Going to the top of this slide there's about \$5.2 billion dollars of direct obligations owed by Hertz. That's

broken down into three components; first lien debt, second lien debt, and unsecured debt.

2.3

The first lien debt has three pieces. In addition to the 615 and 656 million respectively reflected by the RCF facility, the revolver and the term loan there is also about \$540 million dollars of outstanding LC's. That is about in the middle of the page. You can see the letter of credit facilities, the senior RCF and the LC facility. Those are both secured. So, when we add those to the revolver and the term loan we have a total of about \$1.93 billion dollars of first lien debt.

In addition, we have a \$350 million dollar second lien facility and about \$2.9 billion dollars of unsecured debt and that, again, has two components. There are four issues of notes -- I'm sorry, five issues of notes that total about \$2.7 billion dollars. Then back to the middle of the pate under LC facilities you will notice the ALOC or ALOC facility, this is an unsecured letter of credit facility pursuant to which letters of credit have been issued to secure the obligations of Hertz under the ABS facility. So, grand total about 5.2 of direct obligations and a little over \$14 billion dollars of indirect obligations through the vehicle financings around the world.

I would have a slide for you that shows the debtors and the corporate structure here, but there are so

many entities in the structure that we could not come up with a slide that didn't look like a bowl of spaghetti for present purposes. So, we'll have to save that for another time, perhaps when we actually have a live in-person hearing.

2.3

So, flipping to the next slide I thought it would be helpful to give just a brief summary of purchase history. The company started in 1918, it's hard to believe that they even had cars then, when a fellow named Walter Jacobs bought and starting renting 12 Model-T's. In 1923 that business was purchased from John D. Hertz. Thank God, can you imagine where we would be if Mr. Hertz didn't get involved. And he turned this into a national business by 1925.

He sold the business to General Motors in 1926 who provided the capital to take the company, first, much wider nationally and then global. The first international business was started in France in 1950. And in 1953 GM sold the business back to Mr. Hertz. At that time he took the company public for its first time. It was a New York Stock Exchange traded public company. It had a fleet comprised of about 14,000 trucks and 13,000 cars. And by 1955 had over 1,000 locations around the world.

In 1967 the company was taken private by Radio Company of America. It was subsequently sold to a couple of other private owners. The fleet grew to over 400,000 vehicles and in 1987, of all people, Ford bought Hertz. So,

we originally were with GM, now were with Ford. The business expanded into China in 2002. It changed hands through a couple of private equity firms. 2006 it went public again.

We acquired the Donlen business in 2011 and Dollar Thrifty in 2012.

This next slide shows some of the key business metrics of the company as of 2019. So, we're up to 12,000 location, about 38,000 employees worldwide. The largest the fleet got to in 2019 was about 770,000 cars with Hertz locations in 160 countries. Annual revenue in 2019 was 9.8 billion and the company had \$650 million dollars of adjusted corporate EBITDA.

As I previously mentioned, if you look over at the two pie charts to the upper right; although we do have some other business lines, by far the most important part of the business from a revenue and EBITDA perspective is the rental car business. Between US and international it's about 93 percent of revenue and about 86 percent of adjusted EBITDA.

I think also important on this slide is on the bottom right that shows about two-thirds of the business is run through airport locations. Stay tuned, this has a lot to do with why we're here.

Flipping to the next slide our 2019 financial performance really had the company moving in the right way.

Nine consecutive quarters of earnings growth and ten

consecutive quarters of revenue growth. Vehicle utilization was maintained over the prior three year period of relatively steady level of around 80 percent. As you can see, revenues from 18 to 19 increased by 3 percent. EBITDA grew by 50 percent from 430 million to 650 million. And we were able to maintain SGA and related expenses relatively steady.

2.3

So, the company felt that it was positioned for strong success in 2020. Indeed, in the middle of 2019 the company was able to raise \$750 million dollars of new equity which it used to delever the balance sheet. And on the basis of the strong performance, was protecting a significant growth in the business going into 2020.

You can see on the bottom of the page there the expectation was that we'd have revenues of over \$10 billion dollars in 2020 and we would have EBITDA of over \$750 million dollars. And, indeed, these expectations were borne out in the first two months of the year as results were up about 6 percent year over year as compared to the same period of time in 2019.

And then came COVID. And this was not a spider. It was not a hurricane. No, it was more like an earthquake and registered about 9.0 on the Richter scale. In a matter of weeks, and without any kind of warning, the business went from performing above prior year performance to performing dramatically below prior year performance. The business was

off, in very short order, by approximately 75 percent.

2.3

This raised a number of difficult issues and decisions for the company. In effect, the reaction was much like being a firefighter. Management was putting out fires, trying to figure out how to keep the company going. The employee force was cut dramatically. Over 14,000 employees have been terminated and another 7,000 have been furloughed. That's largely in Europe where the ability to terminate employees is much more complicated.

We canceled, substantially all new 2020 vehicle orders. In that regard I want to point out the company had anticipated building its fleet up in July and August to about 880,000 cars. It canceled every order that it could. It returned every car that it could and it's begun carefully moving out some of its existing inventory. Currently that inventory stands at about 730,000 vehicles and we are studying the appropriate way to reduce that number based on the fact that, at least, in the near term we don't anticipate the vehicle utilization will be anything close to what it was in the past.

It's important to note, I guess, at this juncture, the ABS lenders had made a file complaining that we haven't done anything to help them to this point. I just want to note that had we been unable to return and turn back the substantial number of vehicles that we had on order it's

likely that we would have had 150,000 vehicles more then we currently have. That could have increased the ABS exposure another \$2 or \$3 billion dollars from the current level of 10.9. So, we've kind of been trying to deal with these problems seriatim. The first thing we had to do is turn back the cars that were already on the way and now we're focusing on how to reduce the size of the fleet that we currently have.

From an operational perspective we did not make rental payments in April and May. We negotiated a deeply discounted or free rights to store our surplus vehicles at airport locations. You can imagine at any point in time we generally have 75 to 80 percent of our fleet out on the road being utilized. Today that number is more like 15 percent. So, we have a lot of vehicles that we have to take care of. We've made arrangements to do that and we've negotiated long term rent abatements and deferrals with numerous landlords.

Also, importantly, the company drew down its credit facilities. In the US it had access to about \$615 million dollars under its revolver which it drew down and it had, in Europe, about \$118 million euro availability, it also drew that down. I should mention that the company also sought financing under the various government programs that had been provided and unfortunately was unable to procure any of that support.

So, as the crisis unfolded we found ourselves facing what I think we can fairly call a triple witching hour. We had a significant decrease in revenue that was ongoing and when that was going to ease up became uncertain, over the passage of time. At the same time we had increasing ABS program costs. The base rent runs at about \$300 million dollars a month. Added to that, in order to continue having access to the fleet financing component of the ABS structure, there is a mark to market component which was going to run us about \$135 million dollars in the month of April alone and was anticipated to increase going forward.

So, we have lower revenue and higher rent expenses with respect to the fleet. And to make matters worse, because of the lockup pursuant to COVID, it was basically a shutdown of the used car market. So, we are unable to relieve our lease liabilities by selling cars into the market.

So, you know, we had a triple witching hour, as I've been calling it, and I guess to convert that into a grand slam we were also faced with a situation where all of the predictive tools that we've come to rely on for planning the business on a go forward basis became unreliable. The uncertainty and uniqueness of the COVID crisis put the company in a position where it could not reliably predict what the business would be next week much less three months,

six months, nine months, a year from now.

So, what to do about the lease. Hertz had total liquidity of about a billion-two in the US going into April. It was operating at a negative cash-flow of over \$100 million dollars per month, and it was looking at a \$400 million dollar lease payment on April 27th. That amount was going to be more in May and in June. It's not hard to do the math to see that if there wasn't a change Hertz was going to completely exhaust its liquidity in two or three months.

So, the very difficult decision was made not to make the April 27th lease payment. That resulted in an immediate occurrence of an amortization event under the lease financing which means that Hertz could no longer borrow money under the facility and the proceeds from the sale of any cars would go only to pay down the debt. It would not become available to Hertz and --

THE COURT: Excuse me, Mr. Lauria. Could I ask all the parties to please mute their phones so we don't get feedback. Thank you.

MR. LAURIA: So, the next event in the sequence there is a liquidation event which would have entitled the ABS lenders to begin seizing and selling the fleet. That was going to happen on May 4th. So, we engaged with our lender constituencies and were able to negotiate a short forbearance with the ABS lenders and corresponding waivers from our

corporate lenders to buy us eighteen days, to May 22nd, to try to figure out what to do.

Those waivers and forbearances also gave us more time to try to address the issues in the UK, Europe, and Australia which we were, otherwise, preparing to file insolvency proceedings in the absence of some relief. So, we had, basically, eighteen days. We engaged with our various lender constituencies. We started working on potential frameworks that focus principally on how we would deal with the lease obligation and the management of our fleet and tried to see if we could get to a further forbearance. We also spent a lot of time with our non-US creditors working on relief as to the cross defaults if we were forced to make US filing.

So, with that period of time we were able to get waivers of cross defaults in Australia, waivers of cross default from our European noteholders and European ABS, and our UK financing. I might add that we've been sitting on pins and needles with respect to the European note financing. I confirmed, really fifteen minutes before the commencement of the hearing, that we had finally gotten over the required 50 percent waivers there, delivered in-hand, so that all of the European waivers are now fully effective. And we have been working with those lender groups to not take any action pending getting delivery of the last — it turned out to be

one and a half percent that had somehow gotten tied up in the clearing house for the solicitation over there.

We were, however, unable to get to any kind of resolution that would extend the timeline with respect to our ABS lenders in the US or with our Canadian lenders who had cross default provisions with respect to a US filing. So, on Friday, about ten o'clock p.m., we commenced the Chapter 11 cases for the various US debt obligors and the Canadian entities that had cross default provisions.

At the time of the filing the company was sitting on just under \$900 million dollars of cash. We believe the vast majority of that is unencumbered. Certain exceptions that we have addressed in a proposed cash collateral and adequate protection stipulated order that we will be submitting for the court's consideration during the course of the hearing.

I guess the most important aspect of that is that we have the liquidity to continue operating at this point and we will sort it out with our lenders over the next few weeks, the extent to which there is agreement or disagreement on the amount of that cash that's unencumbered either come back to the court, hopefully, with further agreement and if not with some degree of dispute.

In addition, the European entities are currently positioned to fund themselves. There is over 200 million

euros of available cash liquidity in our European business and we believe that that's going to get us through until the end of September or October. As the dust settles on the commencement of this case we will turn our attention to what we will do about that liquidity issue that we have in Europe.

So, today we're focused on obtaining the usual menu of first day relief in order to ensure a smooth transition into Chapter 11 and to take care of the various ministerial and administrative matters that the court is familiar with. I think we have a total of 15 motions pending; four of those relate to administration, joint administration, the combined creditor matrix, retaining Prime Clerk, and getting a global notice of stay approved so that we can send that out around the world to make sure that people know that there is a stay in place here.

The remaining motions with one exception all deal with the business, employees, utilities, insurance, cash management, surety taxes, critical vendors. We've got probably one slightly unusual matter, that is some relief we're seeking with respect to our airport concessions to make sure that we don't have any interference with our ability to continue using our airport locations. We also have a customer program motion, a motion to protect our franchisees; again, important because most of them are outside the United States. And we have a motion seeking approval of two cash

collateral stipulated orders.

We also have, and I tend to put it in a separate category, a motion to preserve value for the estate. That is a trading order. As most of the parties know we have very large NOL's here. I believe upwards of \$9 billion dollars. We want to do what we need to, to preserve that asset to the extent that it may become important or valuable to fund a reorganization.

So, in the next sixty days we've got to focus on a number of things. Number one, we've got to work on right sizing our fleet. It's currently out of alignment with our business from a used standpoint, from a value standpoint and ultimately from a benefits standpoint. We just got cars that we're not able to use and that really aren't providing benefit to the estate.

During the brief forbearance period leading up to the filing we engaged with our ABS lenders and sought a consensual resolution, at least, on an interim basis of our lease and fleet issues. Although we didn't get there, I think we made some progress and we're hopeful that a platform has been established for future discussions.

As the court is aware, 365(d)(5) provides us with a sixty day breathing spell which we badly need here with respect to making our lease payments. After that we're going to have to return to making lease payments. We are likely to

seek relief from the court under the equities of the case doctrine to address the lease obligation on a going forward basis assuming that we can't get to some sort of a combination or agreement with our ABS lenders that will accommodate the company's realistic liquidity requirements.

So, extreme uncertainty remains. We can try to address the things that are in our control, but we can't do anything about what's not in our control. And as this page summarizes we still face enormous uncertainty both near term, immediate term and long term. We just don't know what's going to happen with this COVID pandemic, when people are going to be free to move around, when people are going to return to traditional travel patterns, if ever, and what the new normal is going to look like six months, nine months, a year from now.

And without any certainty around those things it's extraordinarily difficult to figure out how you're going to reorganize a company like Hertz because the value of the business is uncertain and its capacity to service debt is less then uncertain. Right now it's effectively no.

Okay. So, what are we trying to accomplish?

We're focusing on three things here. We've got to reduce the leverage at the corporate level, that is at \$5.2 billion dollars. It's going to have to come way down. And whatever debt we have will probably have to be pick type debt for some

period of time. We have to right-size our fleet and that really includes two components. We have to have a fleet that we can afford and we have to have a fleet that will allow us to make money when and if the economy comes back. And it's very clear that to keep this business going long term we're going to have to raise a substantial amount of new capital.

So, we're going to work hard to stabilize the business in the initial phase. We're going to have to focus on the lease in the not too distant future and we're going to have to try to work with our stakeholders to come up with a workable capital structure for this business.

I guess I will conclude by referring to the Hertz moto "We're here to get you there." It seems like that's what we're going to do. We're going to get there.

So, Your Honor, unless the court has any questions what I'd like to do is turn to the agenda. Pursuant to the agenda letter that's been filed with the court I believe there's an amended letter. I would like to hand the microphone over to Mr. Shore who will introduce the first day declarant which will set the evidentiary predicate for the various matters that we would like the court to consider.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

All right. Mr. Lauria, who have you turned the mic over to and does he have it off mute?

MR. LAURIA: Mr. Shore is supposed to be speaking 1 2 here. I don't know where he is. MR. SHORE: Sorry. I was on mute, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Shore. 4 5 MR. SHORE: I would like to -- can you see me on 6 Zoom? 7 THE COURT: Not yet. 8 MR. SHORE: Okay. 9 THE COURT: Let me get Mr. McCarthy to do that. 10 There it is. Thank you, Your Honor. Chris Shore 11 MR. SHORE: from White & Case, proposed counsel for Hertz Corporation and 12 its affiliated debtors. Again, I'd like to thank the court 13 for hearing us today especially under the present 14 15 circumstances. As Mr. Lauria just said, I'll be handling joint 16 17 administration and moving some of the declarations into 18 evidence that are part of the first day motions today. The joint administration motion is on the docket 19 20 at No. 14. As set forth therein joint administration is warranted here under Bankruptcy Rule 1015(d) and Local Rule 21 22 1015-1. For administrative purposes each of the thirty 23 debtors is and keeping them all under one caption will ease the administrative burden on the court and all parties in 24

interest given that motions, pleadings, hearings, claims and

25

orders will all generally (inaudible) multiple estates.

In addition, we sought the court's approval of the official caption in the proposed order. We believe it meets

Section 342(c)(1) given the length of the Prime Clerk website for all of the debtors' full names, addresses, and tax I.D. information.

The facts underlying the motion are attested to in the declaration of Mr. Jamere Jackson, Hertz's chief financial officer, which is filed at Docket No. 28. Mr. Jackson, I believe, is in the Zoom reading and if he could get pulled up on the screen and introduce himself to the court.

THE COURT: Mr. McCarthy?

There he is. Mr. Jackson?

MR. JACKSON: Good morning, Your Honor. I am

Jamere Jackson, executive vice president and chief financial

officer of the Hertz Corporation.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. SHORE: Okay. What I'd like to do today, Your Honor, is provisionally move Mr. Jackson's declaration into evidence for each of the motions on the agenda subject to cross examination. Given that we can flip back and forth between speaking parties more easily than in the courtroom what I'd ask is that to the extent that anybody wants to, including the court, question Mr. Jackson about facts

```
relating to a particular motion that will be upcoming we take
 1
    up that question and when the subject motion is being argued.
 2
    I think it will just be easier to keep the process moving
 3
 4
    forward and efficiently rather then bring up the witness now
    and have people question him about all sorts of motions that
 6
    aren't up yet, if that's okay with Your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: I think that's a good procedure.
   First, let me ask --
 9
               MR. SHORE: (Indiscernible) Mr. Jackson regarding
10
    joint administration I'll proceed.
               THE COURT: Let me ask, Mr. Jackson, first, have
11
12
   you reviewed your declaration and does it accurately reflect
    what you would testify on direct with respect to any and all
13
    of the motions today?
14
15
               MR. JACKSON: Yes, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: All right. Any objections by anybody
16
17
    to admission of the first day declaration?
18
          (No verbal response)
               THE COURT: All right. We will reserve cross
19
20
    examination with respect to the motions until those motions
    are called. The declaration will be admitted into the
21
22
    record.
23
          (Declaration of Jamere Jackson, admitted)
24
               MR. SHORE: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
               In addition, I'd like to draw Your Honor's
25
```

attention to Docket 139 which is the affidavit of service of 1 2 Sebastian Higgins which applies to each of today's motions other than cash collateral, which Mr. Turetsky, my partner, 3 4 will be addressing. But as set forth in Mr. Higgins's affidavit each of the first day motions listed, including the joint administration motion, was served on the core 2002 6 service list and various other parties listed on Exhibits A 7 to J in the affidavit. All those pleadings were served on 9 May 25th via email or first class mail as indicated in the declaration. 10

We have received no objections to the joint administration motion. In addition, we provided the U.S. Trustees Office with an advanced copy of the motion, and order, and received no comment.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, unless the court has any questions we'd respectfully request that the court enter the proposed joint administration order attached as Exhibit A to the motion on a final basis.

THE COURT: All right. Does anybody wish to be heard?

MR. HUEBNER: Your Honor, may I be heard?

THE COURT: Yes. Who is that?

MR. HUEBNER: Your Honor, this is Marshall Huebner of David Polk on behalf of Deutsche Bank as ABS agent. Can you both hear me and see me, Your Honor?

THE COURT: I can.

MR. HUEBNER: Your Honor, let me first begin with an apology. As you can tell both from the fact that it looks like I am in an attic (indiscernible) for which I am extremely embarrassed. Like many Manhattan dwellers with large families we actually had to decamp pretty quickly. So, I am very embarrassed and apologetic not to be dressed appropriately especially for a hearing of this magnitude. I just did not have a (indiscernible).

Your Honor, we will be talking a little bit more throughout the hearing. We've actually reached agreement with White & Case on changes to several of the orders. With respect to joint administration we certainly have no objection.

I do want to emphasize something that Mr. Lauria touched upon because it's actually critical, which is Hertz does not actually own any of the 500,000 vehicles that constitute its fleet. In other words, no debtor owns those. They are owned by non-debtor entities to which we and other noteholders are the lenders totaling the overwhelming majority of the debt which Mr. Lauria went through a little while ago.

So, for the avoidance of doubt, because this will come up in other motions like cash management, the joint administration motion the filing do not include the non-

debtor SPV's. Those are not (indiscernible) administered and 1 2 are entirely outside the bankruptcy system with respect to the ownership of the fleet, et cetera. 3 4 So, I know that that sort of came and went in the 5 proceeding, but because it is a very unusual structure to 6 have a debtor not actually own virtually all of the assets that it uses in its business, and instead of having them be 7 the non-debtor SPV's I thought that that was worth just very 9 quickly highlighting which is why the joint administration of 10 the actual debtors, who are not owner entities, is (indiscernible). 11 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 12 Anybody else wish to be heard with respect to 13 joint administration? 14 15 (No verbal response) THE COURT: All right. I will enter the order 16 17 granting the motion. 18 MR. SHORE: Thank you very much, Your Honor. At this point I will turn the virtual podium over 19 20 to Amanda Parra Criste to handle the Prime Clerk retention. 21 MS. PARRA-CRISTE: Good morning, Your Honor. Can 22 you hear me okay? 23 THE COURT: I can.

MS. PARRA-CRISTE: Great. As Mr. Shore mentioned,

I'll be addressing the Prime Clerk retention application this

24

25

1 | morning.

entry of a final order appointing Prime Clerk as their claims and noticing agent in these cases. As Mr. Jackson attested to in his first day declaration, the debtors complied with the local rules and the court's protocol for the employment of claims and noticing agents and obtained, at least, three other court approves claims agent proposals.

Based on these proposals the debtors determined that Prime Clerk's rates are competitive and reasonable especially in light of Prime Clerk's experience, and the quality of its services. An experienced claims agent like Prime Clerk is needed in these cases where there are easily thousands of creditors and parties of interest listed on the debtors' creditor matrix.

Additionally, Prime Clerk is a disinterested party as defined in the code. And as evidenced by the declaration of Mr. Benjamin Steele, who is the vice president of Prime Clerk, and I understand is also present in the virtual courtroom here today.

If there are no objections I would ask that his declaration be admitted into evidence at this time.

THE COURT: All right. Any objections?
(No verbal response)

THE COURT: All right. It will be admitted.

(Declaration of Benjamin Steele, admitted)

MS. PARRA-CRISTE: Thank you, Your Honor.

Additionally, Your Honor, prior to filing the applications we shared a draft with the U.S. Trustee who did provide a few comments to the proposed form of retention order. Those comments were addressed with language that was added to the order that was attached as Exhibit A to the application filed on Sunday.

There have been no other requested changes to the proposed form of order; therefore, we believe the U.S.

Trustees comments have been resolved and we're not aware of any other objections that have been filed in respect of the application.

In sum, Your Honor, the relief that the debtors are requesting is not only appropriate, but routinely granted in Chapter 11 cases of this size and complexity. Unless the court has any questions we respectfully request that Your Honor enter the order approving the appointment of Prime Clerk as the debtors' claims and noticing agent in these cases which was attached as Exhibit A at Docket No. 15 to the application.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask, again, does anybody wish to be heard with respect to the claims and noticing agent motion?

(No verbal response)

THE COURT: All right. No objections having been voiced I will enter the order then. Thank you.

MS. PARRA-CRISTE: Thank you, Your Honor.

I will now cede the screen to my colleague, Ms. Kim, to continue with the next item on the agenda.

MS. KIM: Good morning, Your Honor. For the record Doah Kim of White & Case for the debtors.

Agenda No. 4 is the matrix motion filed at Docket No 16. By this motion the debtors seek authority to file a consolidated creditor matrix, file a consolidated list of top 50 largest unsecured creditors, to waive certain requirements relating to all equity holders of Hertz Global Holdings and to redact certain personal identification information for individual creditors.

With respect to the first point the debtors seek to file a single consolidated matrix in lieu of a separate one for each debtor. The debtors have received no objections from the U.S.T. or any other party to this request. The debtors have also received no objections to the request to file a consolidated list of top 50, not top 20, unsecured creditors.

I will note that Ms. Richenderfer has requested some additional information to gain a better understanding of the unsecured creditor universe for purposes of committee selection. And the debtors' professionals are already

working on compiling the necessary information to get that to the U.S. Trustee as soon as possible. And we will continue to work with the U.S. Trustee to help this process.

With respect to the equity holders the U.S.

Trustee has raised some service concerns and I will let Ms.

Richenderfer speak to those. Before I do I want to emphasize that Hertz Global Holdings is a public filing company with thousands of shareholders. It would be impossible to locate the addresses, much less identities, of each and every one of these shareholders.

The company does make public filings with the U.S. Securities Exchange Commission including the 8(k) that was recently filed on May 26th to announce the commencement of these cases, and here the debtors propose to limit the service to those parties receiving the orders of the equity and claim trading motion, and the debtors submit that this is standard for companies of this size to limit service in such a way.

Finally, the redaction of sealing issue. No party has objected to this request. The U.S. Trustee has also not objected. In fact, the U.S. Trustee has noted that this order for this motion can be final. We are, however, aware that Your Honor has expressed some concerns regarding this issue in other cases. Here, we believe it's appropriate to redact all personal identifiable information of individual

creditors. The debtors are not asking to redact the entire creditor matrix, but just the personal identification information such as home addresses of individuals such as employees and customers. Not redacting can cause undue risk of identity theft, harassment, violence by a former domestic partner, or other types of unlawful injury.

Although the European entities are not debtors in these cases the debtors still maintain international connection and I understand that the debtors have individual creditors who are citizens of the European Union Member Countries. These individuals are protected by the European General Data Protection Regulations, or the GDPR, which I understand can apply extra territorially to entities doing business with those in the EU. For these individuals the debtors believe to be protected by the GDPR the debtors seek to redact all personally identifiable information, and this includes names and home addresses. And the creditor matrix that has been uploaded with the court has been redacted in such a way.

Unless Your Honor has any questions we respectfully request that Your Honor enter the order granting this motion.

THE COURT: Well, I do have some concerns about this. Have there been any incidences where any of the employees or customers are subject to threats of domestic

1 | violence or identity theft that you can provide as an 2 | evidential basis for your request?

MS. KIM: As of today I am not aware of specific examples that I could provide for you, Your Honor, but we can certainly look into that issue.

THE COURT: Because I am reluctant to give a blanket waiver of the requirements of the bankruptcy code and rules that do require that creditors' information, addresses, be included in the matrix.

How many of the creditors are individuals that you seek to redact?

MS. KIM: The number is in the hundreds, I believe, Your Honor. Again, if Your Honor is not comfortable with providing -- granting this relief on an interim basis we could certainly come back at the second day hearing with further evidence.

THE COURT: Let's do that. I won't approve it on an interim basis. We'll deal with it on a final basis.

MS. KIM: Your Honor, how about the other request in this motion?

THE COURT: Let's talk about that. I think that you have stated in your trading motion that you will be providing notice to all of holders of stock in excess of 5 percent, all transfer agents for Hertz stock, any person who has filed a Schedule 13(d) or 13(g) with the SEC since

December 2016, and the States Attorney General for all states
in which you operate which I understand from your first day,
I think, you have 48 states where you operate. Is that
correct?

MS. KIM: That is correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, on an interim basis
I will grant this relief, but, again, I want to address this
at the final hearing as to whether or not that is sufficient
notice for notifying all shareholders. And I understand,
again, you're going to make filings with the SEC regarding
your bankruptcy filing and also give public notice, but let's
talk about that at the final hearing as far as whether or not
I redact or waive the requirement to give notice to all
shareholders.

MS. KIM: Understood, Your Honor.

MS. RICHENDERFER: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Ms. Richenderfer?

MS. RICHENDERFER: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. Linda Richenderfer for the U.S. Trustees Office.

Your Honor, I think that you focused in on one of my responses to the debtors' concern about how could they possibly give specific notice to each and every shareholder. It seemed to me that the way that it's usually done is the notice is given to the transfer agent or the street name, and then they are responsible for passing it on.

One thing we talked about was since the notices are going to have to go out to the transfer agents, and they're going to be asked to forward it onto anyone owning 4.5 percent or more, my question was why can't the notice of commencement also be given to the transfer agents with the direction that they send it not only to those owing 4.5 percent or more, but to all shareholders.

2.3

Believe me, I appreciate the idea that the debtors do not have the ability, I think, even to list each and every shareholder and their addresses. That is information that resides in others and the request was made that they just make -- that they pass the information on with the instruction that the others who have that information pass it onto the shareholders.

THE COURT: I thought that maybe I misread the trading motion as well as this motion. I thought that they were providing the transfer agents with the notice of the commencement of the case.

MS. RICHENDERFER: Yes. They are, Your Honor. As I read the transfer order -- I'm sorry, the NOL order is that they're giving it to the transfer agents, but they are only asking the transfer agents to pass it onto shareholders owning 4.5 percent or more. My point just being that the transfer agents would be in a position to send the notice of commencement to all shareholders that they are aware of, not

just those holding 4.5 percent or more. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. Let me hear the debtors' 3 response to that. 4 MS. KIM: Your Honor, the equity of trade claiming 5 motion does say that it will be served to transfer agents for 6 Hertz stock, but the (indiscernible) registered holders with known addresses (indiscernible). That is who will be served 7 with the case commencement notice. 8 9 THE COURT: So, all shareholders? 10 MS. KIM: Substantial shareholders, Your Honor. THE COURT: Why not all shareholders? 11 12 MS. KIM: Not all shareholders, Your Honor, because of the reasons I stated earlier. There are just 13 thousands of shareholders, Your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: But is that not the transfer agent's 16 issue? 17 MS. KIM: Your Honor, I'd have to --18 MR. TURETSKY: Your Honor, my apologies for interrupting the colloquy. This is David Turetsky of White & 19 20 Case. Can you hear me? 21 THE COURT: I can. 22

MR. TURETSKY: Your Honor, we hear your concerns.

What we will do is work with the transfer agent to make sure that it gets to all shareholders. I think our view had been that it was customary to serve it out on the substantial

23

24

25

shareholders as well as rely on the public filings. That's what companies tend to do, but we hear your concerns. If it's Your Honor's preference we will work with the transfer agent to make it more broad.

2.3

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

I think that this may become an issue. Let's eliminate it right up front.

MR. TURETSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else, Ms. Richenderfer? Do

MS. RICHENDERFER: Your Honor, I think then that perhaps the form of order that's been supplied to you will need to be, in some way, have some slight changes in it because according to this the requirements to file the equity list is waived and the requirement to provide notice to the equity holders is waived. I think what we've just discussed is that there is a process by which the debtors will attempt to make sure that it reaches all equity holders.

So, perhaps, Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the proposed order or something debtors and I can speak of offline and tweak them appropriately.

THE COURT: All right. Then I'll look for a revised form of order to be submitted under certification of counsel and uploaded after you've reached agreement with the U.S. Trustee.

MS. KIM: Debtors will do that. Thank you, Your Honor.

Moving onto Agenda Item No. 5 what is the automatic stay motion. By this motion the debtors seek entry of a final order confirming the application and enforcement of key protection afforded to the debtors under the bankruptcy code. These are the automatic stay provisions under Section 362, the anti-termination and anti-modification provisions of Section 365, and the anti-discrimination provisions of Section 525, and to approve the form and manner of notice attached as Exhibit 1 to the motion.

The factual allegations to this motion are being attested to by Mr. Jackson, the company's CFO and his first day declaration.

Your Honor, this is customary relief for debtors to do business abroad such as the debtors here. The debtors interact and have relations with vendors, counterparties, and government entities located and operating in non-US jurisdictions. Although the company did not end up filing entities outside the US and Canada, the debtors are still parties to agreements such as franchise agreements with international parties. These foreign entities may not be aware or may misapprehend scope and certain protections afforded to the debtors under the bankruptcy code. Further, such governmental entities may not engage with the debtors

without a court order or may even discriminate against them.

2.3

To be clear, the relief requested in this motion does not seek to expand or rewrite and modify such protections; rather, the debtors simply seek to confirm, restate, enforce and help inform its non-US creditors of such code provisions that they may be unfamiliar with. The notice is appropriate and important for the debtors to help limit disruptions to operations, and help advance efficient administration of these cases.

I am aware of one limited objection that was filed late last night, an objection by the Canadian Securitization Noteholders. I believe they allege, among other things, that the order requires additional clarification. The debtors disagree. The notice and order do not (indiscernible) the scope of the automatic stay. Counsel should be aware that the purpose of this order is not for sophisticated entities like his clients, but rather the notice is for trade vendors and other parties in foreign counties who may not understand the bankruptcy code or require a Federal Court order explaining it. This is not meant to be a tricky order, Your Honor. And parties should be aware of that.

We have received some comments from the parties and the debtors have incorporated such comments. They are reflected in the last sentence of Paragraph 4 of the order. So, I believe its Page 3 of 11 in the PDF of the blackline.

```
THE COURT: Let me look at that.
 1
               MS. KIM: Sure.
 2
               THE COURT: Did you revise this order or is it the
 3
 4
   original one?
 5
               MS. KIM: The order was slightly revised, Your
 6
   Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: I'm not seeing it on my zip drive.
               MS. KIM: I think it's titled "Global Stay Order
 8
   Redline."
 9
10
               THE COURT: Okay. I do see it. Paragraph 4, you
11
    say?
12
              MS. KIM: Yes, Your Honor. Page 3 of 11.
13
               THE COURT: All right. That is the only revision?
14
               MS. KIM: Yes, Your Honor. The U.S. Trustee had
15
   no comments or objections.
16
               MR. HUEBNER: Your Honor, may I be heard for a
17
   moment?
18
               THE COURT: You may.
               MR. HUEBNER: Your Honor, its Marshall Huebner
19
20
   again.
21
               Just because counsel did not actually read the
22
    language out and there are many people on the phone
23
    (indiscernible), these comments came in from us. While I
24
   absolutely agree and accept that it is now intended to be, in
25
    counsel's words, a "tricky" order this provision actually
```

was, in fact, inappropriate and quite mischievous because it actually was a permanent injunction by the court as they originally drafted it that all persons are required to perform their obligations under the contracts which is, of course, (indiscernible).

I don't think this court intended to issue an affirmative injunction on no notice. So, the language for the benefit of all, which is a very important change, is that subject to the provisions of the bankruptcy code and applicable law counterparties and executory contracts or unexpired leases may be required to continue to perform...

Again, just because there are so many people on the phone and they don't know what the changes are I actually think it is important that for the sake of the record and the benefit of many effected parties that we make clear the changes that were agreed to very early this morning or extremely late last night.

THE COURT: All right. I will ask counsel for the debtor to read that change in Paragraph 4 for the record.

MS. KIM: Will do, Your Honor. The last sentence of Paragraph 4 of the revised order now states,

"Accordingly, subject to the provisions of the bankruptcy code and applicable law, counterparties --

(Phone interference)

2.3

-- executory contracts for unexpired leases may be

required to continue to perform their obligations --

THE COURT: Excuse me. Excuse me. Could the party who is speaking on the phone with somebody else please mute their CourtCall line. Thank you.

Go ahead, Ms. Kim.

MS. KIM: I will reread it just in case. The last sentence of Paragraph 4 of the revised order states,

"Accordingly, subject to the provisions of the bankruptcy code and applicable law, counterparties to such executory contracts or unexpired leases may be required to continue to perform their obligations under such leases and contracts during the post-petition period."

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, its Gregg Galardi on behalf of the Canadian noteholders.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. GALARDI: I or Mr. Huebner may have been the "tricky" lawyer. We did file an objection. I think that language helps our concerns and I did hear counsel refer to that there was no intention to extend the order beyond non-debtor — to non-debtor property or non-debtor accounts. That was our concern because of the reference to 105. I don't think it's necessary to go beyond 362. I think I heard that clarification with Mr. Huebner's language.

We were concerned, obviously, about the implications. We have accounts, we have rights, and we

didn't want to be stayed from exercising those rights. 1 2 understand our contractual obligations to the Canadian servicers to pay them their fees under their contracts, but 3 4 then we will be exercising certain remedies because of the defaults to pay down certain of the notes from non-debtor 6 property. I just wanted to make that clear on the record, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So, as I understand it the language is acceptable and the limited objection is not being pressed.

MS. KIM: Yes, Your Honor. So, the debtors respectfully request that Your Honor enter the revised order on a final basis.

THE COURT: All right. Anybody else wish to be heard on that?

(No verbal response)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. I will enter the order.

MS. KIM: Thank you, Your Honor.

Item No. 6 is the utility motion. This is a routine motion. The debtors seek entry of an interim and final order approving the proposed form of adequate assurance of payments to utility providers establishing procedures for resolving any objections and requests by utility providers relating to the proposed adequate assurance, and prohibiting utility providers from altering, refusing or discontinuing

service. The facts set forth in this motion have been attested to by Mr. Jackson in his first day declaration.

2.3

To operate their business the debtors require standard utility services such as water, electricity, gas and telecommunications. The debtors maintain over 3,800 accounts with utility providers for their locations throughout the US and Canada which are reflected in Schedule 1 attached to the motion. This list is, of course, not exhaustive.

Prior to the petition date the debtors' average monthly cost of utility services was approximately \$5 million dollars. The proposed adequate assurance deposits to be held for utility providers is at 50 percent of the debtors' estimated monthly costs which is calculated to approximately \$2.5 million dollars. The deposits will be held in adequate assurance deposits with the bank that is a party to a UDA with the U.S. Trustee. And, although the debtors anticipate that some utility providers may demand additional adequate assurance that exceed the proposed deposits, we have proposed the adequate assurance procedures set forth in the motion and that we're asking Your Honor to approve today.

If we do receive any additional demands we will review and proceed in line with such procedures. Again, we did not receive any objections to this motion. And we would request that Your Honor enter the order.

MS. RICHENDERFER: Your Honor, this is Linda

Richenderfer.

2.3

THE COURT: The revised -- I'm sorry. Ms. Richenderfer, go ahead.

MS. RICHENDERFER: I'm sorry, Your Honor. One of the things I just noticed in this order and we probably also need it for the matrix order since they're both on an interim basis, I don't think debtors have yet brought up the notion of when they would like the second day hearing to occur and what the objection deadline would be, and those are issues of — they're always an issue of importance to me, but in addition with respect to getting the committee formed, as Your Honor may know, it takes a little bit longer these days. I am sure I am going to get an awful lot of responses.

One of the things that I had asked debtors to provide for me that I don't have yet is the list of top 50 creditors. I think I only have email addresses that were provided for ten of the 50 creditors. So, because the creditors also tend to be under stay at home orders faxing it to their offices or mailing it there is not going to do the trick. I had no access, quite frankly, right now to a fax machine unless I take my Pennsylvania registered car into Delaware and risk being stopped by the State Police in Delaware.

So, those are all just reasons why, Your Honor, getting the email addresses is so important. Then that leads

us to what the dates of the second day hearing will be because we will have to get the committee, of course, in place as soon as possible so they have an opportunity to review all of these.

THE COURT: Well, I can address that latter issue.

I think the request has been, and the court has cleared, June

25th at three p.m. for the second days. So, the objection

deadline would be the 18th.

I will ask, Ms. Kim, can you address the issue of getting email addresses to the U.S. Trustees Office?

MS. KIM: Of course, Your Honor. The debtors have received that request and we are in the process of collecting that information. We will get that to Ms. Richenderfer as soon as possible.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. KIM: Your Honor has reminded me there are some changed -- there is a revised order and there are some changes. I do want to note those changes for the record. The only change, and it's a minor one, is to Paragraph 5(ii) found on Page 3 of the redline PDF. The change is at the request of the prepetition secured parties, specifically Barclay's, the ad hoc second lien group, and the ad hoc group of term lenders, have requested to be part of the notice parties.

Other than that there are no other changes and we

ask that Your Honor enter this order on an interim basis. 1 THE COURT: All right. Does anybody else wish to 2 3 be heard, then, on that motion? 4 (No verbal response) 5 THE COURT: All right. With those changes and 6 your agreement to provide the U.S. Trustee with email 7 addresses I will enter the order. 8 MS. KIM: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 With that I will now turn it over to my colleague, 10 Mr. Colodny. 11 THE COURT: And you will -- did you fill in the 12 final hearing -- excuse me, the second day hearing date on 13 that order. 14 MS. KIM: I believe it is in Paragraph 19, yes. 15 June 18th at four p.m. 16 THE COURT: All right. I will enter that order. 17 MS. KIM: Thank you, Your Honor. 18 MR. COLODNY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Aaron Colodny on behalf of the debtors with respect to the cash 19 20 managment motion which is filed at Docket No. 19. Can you 21 hear me okay? 22 THE COURT: I can. Thank you. 23 MR. COLODNY: The factual allegations in the 24 motion have been attested by Mr. Jackson, the company's CFO, 25 in his first day affidavit and serve as the factual predicate for this motion. By the cash management motion, pursuant to Sections 105, 345, 363, 364, and 503 of the Bankruptcy Code the debtors seek relief which I break into eight different buckets.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The first is the authority to make intercompany transfers to non-debtor affiliates in the ordinary course. The second is the authority to continue using their cash management system, the third is the authority to make certain intercompany transfers between debtors in the ordinary course of business pursuant to the cash management system. fourth is the authority to pay prepetition bank fees necessary to operate the cash management system. The fifth is the authority to pay certain credit card processing fees. The sixth is an interim waiver of the Section 345(b) investment and deposit requirements. The seventh is authority to enter into certain post-petition hedging transactions in the ordinary course of business. The eighth is to continue using prepetition checks and business forms until they are depleted in which time the debtors will replace the designation as debtor-in-possession.

I would like to thank a lot of parties for staying up late last night to work with us on this order. I believe we lodged a revised interim order with Your Honor this morning which includes certain changes to resolve informal objections made by the United States Trustee and the debtors'

secured lenders, objections raised by the Donlen ABS facility agent at Docket No. 112, other informal objections for the debtors' secured lenders and the HVF trustee. We also received, late last night, an objection by the Canadian securitization lenders. We have included language in the order which we believe addresses their concerns. However, I will address those at the end of the presentation and point Your Honor to that language.

I want to start off with what we consider to be one of the key elements, and I know Your Honor is very sensitive to this, which is the intercompany transfers to non-debtors. We worked very hard with Ms. Richenderfer and I commend her for staying up late with us last night and over the weekend to reach an agreement as to an interim cap on transfers to non-debtors. That cap is \$70 million dollars which is at Paragraph 23 of the revised order.

While that cap was large, approximately \$60 of the \$70 million dollars is not the type of transfer typically before this court where a debtor funds a non-debtor entity with estate proceeds. Rather, that \$60 million dollars is comprised of customer receipts that two debtors, Donlen Corp., and Dollar Thrifty Automotive Group Canada, which I'll call DTAG Canada, will receive and are obligated to pass along to the vehicle owning non-debtor counterparties pursuant to servicing agreements.

In exchange, each of those entities earns a fee
under the relevant agreements. Put simply, those
transactions the debtors simply act as a task group where
they collect customer receipts and pass them along to the
lessee's of the vehicles. Making those transfers is
essential for each of those debtor entities to continue to
operate its business and to ensure its customers receive the
services they expect.

For instance, Donlen, as Mr. Lauria mentioned, services a number of corporate clients who rent their vehicles. They make a lease payment to Donlen Corp., who then remits it to the servicer or the beneficial owner of the lease. If those lease payments weren't made then there could be interruption in Donlen's business because a backup servicer would be appointed and the lease payments would have to them be bifurcated with servicing agreements that Donlen provides. Donlen's business is to provide a one stop shop for its customers. And the debtors intend to continue that and by passing along these will allow them to do it.

Accordingly, we believe that those transfers are in the best interest of each debtors' estate. And I briefly walked through Donlen. I'm happy to do DTAG Canada if you would like or I can move along to the second smaller bucket of debtor and non-debtor inter-company transactions.

THE COURT: But with respect to both, it's the

||same?

2 MR. COLODNY: Correct. It's a pass-through to 3 those customers.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. The remainder of it, then?

MR. COLODNY: Thank you.

The second bucket is of debtor-to-nondebtor intercompany transactions, compromises of payments that The Hertz Corporation makes to Hertz International, Ltd., a nondebtor affiliate, to fund certain expenses that are forwarded to Hertz's international franchisees through the company's one-bill program. This bucket makes up approximately eight to \$10 million of payments in the next 30 days; importantly, THC is compensated for substantially all of these payment through the remittance of certainty royalty payments by franchisees.

Accordingly, the net outflow of funds from the debtors overtime is minimal, if any. These payments are essential to provide the company's international franchisees with the back office support they expect and require from the debtors. This includes reservation bookings through the debtors' central online system and other expense advantages. The franchisees then remit royalties which are passed through the THC through a netting process, which I described before.

The debtors -- you know, one of the debtors' key

differentiating factors is its global reach. A lot of customers and companies rely on the debtors to get their clients, their customers, their employees where they are throughout the world and the debtors' franchise network is extremely important to that. As Mr. Lauria mentioned, you know, the franchise network is the only debtor presence in Latin America and many other countries and we request that —we believe that maintaining that and through these payments is in the debtors' best interests. And, again, I would stress that I believe that this would be a very limited net outflow from debtors.

So, in sum, the company requests the ability to continue intercompany transfers to nondebtors in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$70 million during the interim payments and we believe that all of these payments are in the best interests of the debtors' estate, are a proper exercise of the debtors' business judgment and should be approved.

MR. HUEBNER: Well, Your Honor, once again, this is Marshall Huebner. I think that counsel said that he would get at the end to the additions that were worked out and negotiated, so I think it may take -- it may be useful to take a minute and discuss those because they're actually quite mission critical to those of us who had serious concerns.

Number one, as may be discussed in the

(indiscernible) case, 75 percent of the, quote, debt of the Hertz family is actually off balance sheet and is in -- you know, they got very attractive terms and rates because of the structure and so one of our two changes is that consistent -- and I'll just quote the language now to save the second person from having to read it because it is agreed and it is critical not only to my group, which, alone, is owed \$4.85 billion, that's in the other series and (indiscernible) of ABS notes that are out there that total up to the 14.8:

"Consistent with prepetition practice, the proceeds from the sale of any vehicles owned by HVF that secure the financing issued by HVF II shall be remitted to BNYM, which is Bank of New York, as trustee for HVF and applied in accordance with the documents governing the THC ABS facility."

And then the second issue, which is also very important and important to resolve many people's objections, the like of (indiscernible) but that for the avoidance of doubt, bank accounts held solely in the name of one or more nondebtor entities, including Hertz Vehicle Financing, LLC are not bank accounts, subject to the terms of this interim order.

And let me explain why that's so important, Your Honor. The way the whole structure works is that because they don't own the fleet, the vehicles -- the facility

vehicles, the structures do, it's all, you know, kind of waterfall (indiscernible) automatically and among other things, as vehicles are sold, the proceeds go into the structure to pay down the structure because it's not Hertz's property, it's someone else's property, and the bank accounts matter a great deal and the routing of the money matters a very great deal.

Because the debtors ask for, which is customary and others that (indiscernible) issue, we had no objection to the authority to open and close and change bank accounts in their discretion, having it clear in this motion beyond (indiscernible) that that authority most assuredly does not extend to opening, closing, or changing in any way the bank accounts and payment structures for nondebtor entities, including all the HVF, Hertz Vehicle Financed-structured entities, which is very important to us and many of the party, as well, and I think we probably resolved a bunch of people's objections in one sweep by adding that language.

So, hopefully, that's helpful to the Court and to other people, we'll have a few more conceptual things to say a little bit later, but this, actually, I think was probably the -- it's the only other motion in which we added specific language, which White & Case, again, graciously staying up until very late in the night and starting very early this morning, was able to work out, I think, for the benefit of

all parties. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. Well, that deals with 3 Paragraphs 26 and 27 --4 MR. GALARDI: And, again, Your Honor --5 THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Galardi? 6 MR. GALARDI: Yes, Your Honor. And, again, we 7 haven't gotten to see the order. I think it was just sent to me by Mr. Collins -- I thanked him for that -- but as 9 Mr. Huebner had said and as we have the same concerns, in Canada there's even a little bit more of a wrinkle. 10 are no unencumbered assets in Canada that we're aware of and 11 we wanted to be clear about where the funding for a lot of 12 13 the first day relief was coming, if it wasn't coming from our 14 collateral. 15 So, this was a common issue. We'll look at the 16 order to see if it resolves it with respect to the cash 17 management, but I don't think I've heard a clarification as 18 to where the actual cash is coming for funding the Canadian operations. 19 20 MR. COLODNY: Your Honor, this is Aaron Colodny. I think we have someone writing on the screen. 21

But I intended to address those at the end of the presentation and, again, having gotten through one of my eight points, I can address them now or I can go and march through my order and then come back to them at the end,

22

23

24

25

however Your Honor would like. 1 2 MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, I'm happy if he marches 3 through. I just wanted, while Mr. Huebner was on the line, 4 to raise the point. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Colodny? 5 MS. RICHENDERFER: Your Honor, (indiscernible). 6 7 This is --MR. COLODNY: Okay. (Indiscernible) Your Honor --8 9 MS. RICHENDERFER: This is Linda Richenderfer, 10 again, from the U.S. Trustee's Office. Paragraph 27 is something I'm just seeing now for 11 the first time and one of the things that's not clear to 12 me -- and, like, maybe just confirmation could be given to 13 us -- is that the list of bank accounts that is going to be 14 15 attached to this form of order, that none of the bank 16 accounts listed are accounts that are held solely in the name 17 of a nondebtor entity. 18 MR. COLODNY: That's correct, Your Honor. There are no nondebtor bank accounts Exhibit C. 19 20 MS. RICHENDERFER: Okay. Thank you. 21 UNIDENTIFIED: Your Honor --22 THE COURT: Excuse me. Before we go on, somebody 23 is asking that their audio be turned on, but I have no idea 24 who they are. 25 UNIDENTIFIED: Your Honor, because the audio is

through the clerk --1 2 THE COURT: Yes, the audio is through CourtCall, but I don't even know who this is sending the message. 3 4 UNIDENTIFIED: While it's actually sort of fun to 5 watch them writing and typing, they may just want to hang up 6 and call the CourtCall operator. 7 MR. COLODNY: Your Honor, is it okay if I proceed with the request to continue the cash management system? 8 9 MR. TRUST: Your Honor, this is Brian Trust at 10 Mayer Brown for Barclays as the Donlen ABS facility agent. I do have some comments and remarks that I'd like to make. 11 Would now be an appropriate time before debtors' counsel 12 13 continues? 14 THE COURT: No. Wait one second. I'm trying to 15 figure out who this person is. MR. TRUST: Certainly. I will wait, Your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: They have not signed in to CourtCall 18 and I have no idea, therefore, whom they represent. UNIDENTIFIED: Your Honor, my team is telling me 19 20 it's someone named Jayden, J-A-Y-D-E-N. 21 THE COURT: Yes, and I don't have them on my 22 CourtCall list. I don't have them on my CourtCall list so

MR. COLODNY: Shall I proceed with the cash and

request to continue the cash management system, Your Honor?

they are not being heard. All right.

23

24

25

THE COURT: You may.

MR. COLODNY: So, the second item of eight is the debtors' request to continue the cash management system in the ordinary course of business and as I and my colleague, Greg Warren, note, the debtors' cash management system is extremely complicated. It is a web of 112 bank accounts that is operated by the Central Treasury Department located in Paramus, New Jersey. It's organized into two main regions, the U.S. and Canada, and each of the debtors' business segments within a region, those are what Mr. Lauria said earlier, vehicle rental, Donlen car sales and franchise licensing has a unique structure of accounts to collect receipts from the debtors' millions of customers and disburse payments to their numerous vendors throughout the day.

At the highest level, each of the debtors' business segments and the customer receipts received from them are collected in depository and lockbox accounts. Those funds are then swept to operating accounts which ultimately either concentrate in a master account for each region, or as discussed previously in the case of Donlen and Dollar Thrifty Group Automotive Canada, they're transferred to nondebtor affiliates, pursuant to servicing agreements.

The master accounts for the U.S. and Canada also disburse money to the various businesses to meet their daily operating needs. For instance in the Hertz rental car

business throughout the day, the THC master account sends
money to the THC operating account and case-by-case, I mean
The Hertz Corporation, which subsequently funds control
disbursement accounts.

Overall, the cash management system is a highly sophisticated system that allows the debtors to collect receipts at their hundreds of locations throughout the United States and Canada, track cash needs in real time, monitor the debtors' cash position, accurately forecast the debtors' operating requirements, and facilitate the payments of the debtors' obligations as they come due.

If the debtors were required to fundamentally change the cash management system, it would cause a significant disruption to their business, cause them to be unable to meet certain obligations, and destroy value for all stakeholders; moreover, the cash collateral system allows the debtors to identify prepetition expenses from post-petition expenses. The debtors have worked with their advisors, both White & Case and FTI Consulting to develop practices that will ensure that no prepetition expenses are paid without Court approval.

I am happy to walk Your Honor through any specific flow of funds, with respect to any of the particular pots if you would like; otherwise, the debtors request that the Court authorize them to continue to operate their cash management

system in the ordinary course of business.

THE COURT: All right. Are there revisions to the form of order, other than the two paragraphs that Mr. Huebner and Mr. Galardi highlighted?

MR. COLODNY: There are, Your Honor. I'll keep on going through my eight points and I will stop pausing at the end of each of them so we can make our way through this.

So, my next point is the debtor-to-debtor intercompany transactions. As I said, the cash management system operates to move cash between the debtor entities; for instance, the THC master account funds distributions to the Dollar Thrifty. The Dollar Thrifty brand funds it back to operating entities.

Now, the third item we'd request is the ability to continue debtor-to-debtor transactions in the ordinary course of business. We have worked with the company to segment prepetition intercompany claims and post-petition intercompany claims. We are not seeking to pay prepetition intercompany claims; those will be frozen as of the petition date. And we're requesting that post-petition intercompany claims be afforded administrative expense priorities. We believe this expense is -- this relief is necessary to the operation of debtors' businesses and appropriate in complex Chapter 11 cases.

The fourth item is the payment of prepetition bank

fees. In order to maintain the cash management system, the debtors incur and must pay bank fees to keep their accounts operating.

The debtors anticipate that approximately 2.7 million of prepetition bank fees will be due and payable in the interim period and we believe that the payment of these fees is an ordinary course transaction and an appropriate use of the debtors' business judgment.

If the fees aren't paid, bank counterparties could shut down accounts and fundamentally disrupt the cash management system. Accordingly, we believe it's in the debtors' best interests to pay these fees and to keep their cash management system operating.

The fifth item is the payment of certain prepetition credit card processing fees. Credit card receipts are the debtors' primary source of payment from its customers. Credit card companies charge the debtors certain processing fees to continue processing these accounts. Those amounts include up-front processing fees, refunds, back end fees, and returns from receipts. The chargebacks or refunds are generally netted regarding against pending payments owed to the debtors.

The debtors estimate that approximately \$1 million of prepetition credit card processing fees are outstanding and request the ability to pay prepetition credit card

processing fees so that we can continue to operate and to receive receipts as we do in the general course of business.

The sixth item of relief is an interim waiver of the requirements to Section 345(b). Importantly, Local Rule 2015-2(b) provides that if a motion for a waiver under Section 345(b) of the Bankruptcy Code is filed on the first day of the case and there are more than 200 creditors, which there are in this case, the Court may grant an interim waiver.

Here, we believe that cause also exists for a waiver, due to the complexity of the debtors' business and the cash management system and the Treasury Department's guidelines to ensure the debtors' funds are protected; moreover, the majority of banks that compromise this cash management system are authorized depositories of the United States Trustee.

We are going to continue to work with

Ms. Richenderfer to ensure that she has the information

necessary to confirm that all the debtors' accounts are held

in a responsible manner and that all the United States

Trustee's rights are reserved with respect to that matter;

accordingly, we submit that cause exists for an interim

waiver of the 345(b) period and request that the Court grant

that relief.

Seventh, we are requesting the ability to enter

into post-petition hedging transactions in the ordinary course of business. In the ordinary course of the debtors' business, it enters into certain (indiscernible) derivative contracts which are primarily forward and swap contracts to reduce the company's exposure to certain fluctuations caused by issuing intercompany loans to otherwise making payments to foreign vendors.

The debtors also enter into certain interest rate derivative contracts. As Mr. Lauria said, you know, part of the run-up to these Chapter 11 cases was to, for the benefit of everybody, keep some of the European entities out. So, we do not anticipate that there will be a lot of derivative contracts entered into going forward because of the lack of a need to transfer foreign currency. We do believe that these are ordinary course transactions and are certainly seeking a court order for some comfort to other parties that were able to enter into them moving forward.

The eighth request and final request is the debtors' ability to use their prepetition checks and business forms. The debtors have existing checks and business forms that don't bear the debtor designation, debtor in possession. Requiring the debtors to change business forms would impose undue delay. This relief is customary in large Chapter 11 cases. I believe that Your Honor has recently entered an order similar to this in the VIP Cinema case and it is

routinely granted by this Court.

And I would like to turn now to the objections that we received. We received two formal objections to the cash management motion and several informal objections from the United States Trustee and from various lender groups.

The first formal objection was raised by the Donlen ABS facility agent where they requested that we include language that makes clear that Donlen may only terminate its bank accounts subject to the ABS facility if permitted by the relevant agreements thereunder. If you turn to Paragraph 11 of the order, which I circulated to Mr. Trust prior that hearing, about halfway down that paragraph is a provided further however section where we make clear that any opening or closing of the bank accounts by Donlen Corp. have to be made in agreement with the ABS facility documents, to which Donlen is a party, to the extent those obligations are still in existence.

We received comments from Mr. Trust yesterday, either this resolves his objection, but I will pause to let him raise his points.

MR. TRUST: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Brian
Trust of Mayer Brown, counsel to Barclays Bank PLC, as the
administrative agent under the Donlen ABS facility.

White & Case is correct, we have resolved that limited objection, such that if and to the extent, given the

complexity of the account structure, which includes debtor, nondebtor, and joint accounts with debtors and nondebtor affiliates, that to the extent there's any opening or closing of said bank accounts, it must be done in compliance with, and not violate, any of what has been generally described in the motion as the Donlen ABS facility documents.

I would also note briefly, Your Honor, just for the record, that the ABS -- the Donlen ABS facility agent does not have a (indiscernible) objection to the cash management program, as described by proposed counsel to the debtors; in fact, they made clear and I think it was amplified today on the record, there's a current intent to continue operating, pursuant to the various Donlen agreement, servicing agreements remitting monies, lease payments in accordance with all obligations under the facility documents and consistent with prepetition practices. And, quite importantly, the stated intent on the part of the proposed debtors to continue servicing the leases, remitting lease collections, et cetera, also consistent with the prior or the prepetition bankruptcy practices.

I would just make one final note for the record, this is an extraordinarily complex series of transactions with multiple entities, including, importantly, nondebtor affiliates. The Donlen servicer, you know, is acting as a servicer, effectively, of this substantial financing program.

It is not an obligor, nor an issuer. It is not, effectively,

(indiscernible) point made prior (indiscernible) discussion

by Mr. Huebner.

So, based upon that, the administrative agent, under the Donlen ABS facilities suggests (indiscernible) rights. They will continue to work with (indiscernible) structure funding mechanisms, intercompany debt flows, and the implications of the like by and among the debtors and the various is important nondebtors affiliates. And we certainly expect to communicate and coordinate with Hertz's proposed counsel and advisors in that regard.

Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. HUEBNER: Your Honor, if I could be heard for just a second? It's Marshall Huebner.

Two quick things. One, I realize we're testing. We keep telling the people who keep trying to take over the screen that they can't get audio this way. So, this is probably the way that we can do it, to have people stopping to continue their right note saying turn on audio, because they're not hearing us when we tell them you can't get audio this way.

Does this -- can people see this so that we can tell them, Your Honor?

THE COURT: I have instructed the ECRO to bar those who keep trying to take over the screen share. He's

barred a few, but more keep showing up, so ...

MR. HUEBNER: Okay. Well, hopefully

(indiscernible) --

THE COURT: But I will -- now, let me unmute myself.

For all of the parties who are seeking to take over the share screen, we are going to exclude you from the Zoom if you do that, all right. Thank you.

Back to Mr. Trust [sic].

MR. HUEBNER: So, it's Mr. Huebner, Your Honor.

So, as long as White & Case will confirm for the benefit of all parties -- and I apologize to Mr. Colodny, I, like others, I think after Point 1 thought he was turning to the Court for a potential entry of the order -- as long as the two provisions I read into the record, which were agreed with White & Case are not objectionable to any other party and were going in the order, I think we are resolved on this one, as well, on behalf of the VFN facility.

MR. COLODNY: And, Your Honor, I can read those into the record now so that everyone has them in front of them. Paragraph 26 of the order says:

"Consistent with prepetition practice, the proceeds from the sale of any vehicles owned by HVF and secured a financing issued by HVF II shall be remitted to BNYM, Bank of New York Mellon, as trustee for HVF and applied

in accordance with the documents governing the PCH ABS facility."

Paragraph 27 of the revised order provides:

"For the avoidance of doubt, bank accounts held solely in the name of one or more debtor entities, including Hertz Vehicle Financing, LLC, Hertz Canada Vehicle

Partnership, and DTGC Car Rental Limited Partnership are not 'bank accounts' subject to the terms of this interim order."

THE COURT: And is that acceptable?

MR. HUEBNER: It is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll assume it is.

MR. COLODNY: Your Honor, I would like to next go to the objection that we received late last night from the Hertz's Canada ABS facility agent, and that is located at Docket Number 138.

With respect to the cash management motion, the Hertz Canada lenders asserted that the interim cash management order does not apply to nondebtor bank accounts, as we just discussed, it does not. Additionally, we have some concerns that the Canadian lenders do not have standing because they do not have a claim against the estate; nevertheless, we included the language that I just read and included specific references to the two nondebtor entities.

And we submit and would ask Mr. Galardi if that resolves his concern now that he's had a chance to review it.

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, I guess the only concern that we would have is, as you've seen, Mr. Huebner has added Paragraph 26 to make sure that it's consistent with the prepetition practice that the proceeds from the sale of any vehicles are deposited into the account.

In Canada, as we set forth in our papers, it's the sale and rental of any vehicles, we had expressed a concern.

If we could have similar language agreed to, I think that would resolve our objection, along with the affirmation in Paragraph 27, that they're nondebtor accounts.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GALARDI: And let me -- Your Honor, just to give some explanation and, again, we -- I'm going to try to avoid talking later on in the hearing -- to the extent they are using funds from those accounts, which is their cash collateral, they're not seeking approval, so we are presuming that they're using the unencumbered assets and cash that they described. Earlier, I think it was 866 million to make the payments under the prepetition orders.

So, as long as they deposit funds and segregate those funds into the nondebtor accounts as they would from rentals or vehicle sales, which we hope they ultimately have, I think we will be resolved on the cash management motion.

MR. COLODNY: I will reserve the cash collateral questions for my colleague David Turetsky that will be

addressing those later on in connection with the cash collateral and adequate protection order.

I believe we need to discuss with our clients about the language that you have requested, but I, you know, I believe we should be able to reach some sort of agreement and we will be submitting a certification of counsel with the revised order, providing that, if we are able to reach that agreement, Your Honor.

MR. TRUST: Thank you, Your Honor. Brian Trust from Mayer Brown on behalf of Barclays, as the Donlen facility ABS agent.

It appears to me, having taken a look at this language in Paragraph 26 which was just noted on the record, that it should be expanded to the extent applicable to cover, similarly, proceeds of sale and/or lease proceeds from the Donlen facility that also shall be remitted to the relevant trustee in accordance with the relevant Donlen ABS facility documents.

So, my ask so that we have consistency among the ABS facilities, including the nondebtor affiliates of the transaction, is that we create that consistency for purposes of this order across all said facilities. I believe it will take a bit of drafting on the part of White & Case as proposed counsel to the debtors, but I think as a substantive matter, it makes good sense and I would, therefore, request

that the proposed counsel to the debtor undertake that revision for consistency and substantive purposes.

THE COURT: All right. I'll ask counsel for the debtor to work on a proposed form of order that is acceptable to both, the Donlen and the Canadian noteholders, as well as other parties who have given you comments.

MR. ZAKIA: Your Honor, I apologize, this is Jake Zakia from White & Case. I don't mean to interrupt, but can I just raise one point?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ZAKIA: On the Canadian -- I just want to make sure I understood counsel right because if what I heard on the Canadian front was that it's the lender's position that the revenue generated by the Canadian operation postpetition, which just so, you know, to ex play how this works, Your Honor, unlike in the United States, in Canada, Hertz arranges for the lease from the SPV to ultimate customers and it earns a fee -- I don't know if you call it a commission -- but a fee under its contract for providing that service.

If what I heard counsel say is that they believe that those fees that are collected by the Canadian debtors should be segregated in some way or preserved, I think I just wanted to make it clear so that everybody's not mislead, I do not think the debtors agree with that it is not our position that the Canadian lenders who are lenders to nondebtor SPVs,

would have a lien on the revenue generated by the Canadian debtors.

If it was something else he was talking about, I apologize, I just didn't want to have a miscommunication that blew up later.

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, it's actually not a lien. It is actually our property by way of proceeds under the documents. Those proceeds are held in trust and they are then circulated and put into the bank accounts.

So, we do believe it's our property and, yes, we do have a pay a servicing fee, but the generation of whether it's rentals or dispositions is to be held in trust for our benefit and then put into the accounts.

MR. ZAKIA: I'm sorry, Your Honor. If I could just respond, and, again, I think maybe we're talking past each other.

As previously discussed by Mr. Colodny, I think the pass-through portion of it where we collect receipts that are then passed through to the Canadian entities, we have sought approval to continue to do that and would continue do that.

And to the extent that money finds its way into the nondebtor accounts, because we have complied with our obligation to pass it through, then I think maybe counsel and I are in agreement and we don't have an issue.

```
I just wanted to make clear that that revenue that
 1
 2
    comes back, that servicing fee that comes back to the
    Canadian debtors under those contracts and our position,
 3
 4
    would not be encumbered and I just didn't want to
   misunderstand any of that. I hope that that clarified what
 6
   we were talking about.
 7
               MR. GALARDI: I think it does clarify it and we
    can take it offline to clarify it, but I believe that what
 8
 9
    you're saying is that the servicing fees are owed and would
10
    be paid pursuant to the contracts, and that's our
11
    understanding.
12
               MR. ZAKIA: Yes, and they would be unencumbered,
    and I just didn't want any misunderstanding that there was a
13
   position --
14
15
               MR. GALARDI: That is --
               MR. ZAKIA: -- (indiscernible) cash collateral.
16
17
               MR. GALARDI: Yeah, that is my understanding.
18
    They are unencumbered. They are your receipts under the
19
    servicing agreements.
20
               MR. ZAKIA: Okay.
                                  Thank you.
21
               And I thank Your Honor. Sorry to interrupt.
22
    just didn't want a misunderstanding on that point.
23
               THE COURT: All right.
               MS. RICHENDERFER: Your Honor, this is Linda
24
25
   Richenderfer from the Office of the United States Trustee.
```

I'm beginning to become concerned here. I initially had concerns about Paragraph 26 and subsequent dialogue here, I think, is highlighting my concerns.

We're getting into areas that I think don't normally fall within the four corners of a cash management order and we're really getting into issues that would be covered by the cash collateral order, questions as to who has control over what funds and liens and that would be in an interim order for cash collateral; it wouldn't be in a final cash management order.

I don't know, we'll wait and see how it gets tweaks by the parties thereto, but I don't also think that we have anything in the record right now that supports some of these positions that I'm hearing about by the parties.

As to the basis by which certain money should go to certain locations, I am glad that counsel from White & Case jumped in. I would say that I know I have not had sufficient time to understand all the nuances of the system, the Canadian or the U.S. system.

So, I guess that's just the long way of saying that I'm very concerned that we're getting into substantive issues as to the rights of certain lenders, what they have a right to, what is part of the debtors' assets that they have liens on, what is part of the nondebtors' assets, and, again, I think that these are things that normally would be in a

cash collateral motion, so we'd have an interim order so that the committee could investigate and become comfortable with the manner in which the cash is being handled.

MR. COLODNY: Your Honor, if I could just address that very directly, you know, Paragraph 5 of the interim order contains an explicit reservation with respect to any liens or adequate protection on cash. By this motion, we are not seeking to say who has a lien and what cash, in any way, shape or form. We are simply seeking to maintain and move our cash collateral -- and move our cash management, get these ordinary course transactions approved and the necessary relief to continue that.

We included a couple provisions at the request of the HVF lenders to clarify certain concerns that they had. If my mind, they were comfort language more than anything, because, as I said at the beginning, you know, none of those nondebtor bank accounts are included on Exhibit C. This motion sought no relief with respect to nondebtors, except for the limited intercompany transactions that I mentioned earlier.

And, you know, it is essential to the debtors to be able to move, to exercise, and to operate their cash management system immediately. We have, you know, thousands of people around the country that are waiting to get paid, whose bank accounts are currently frozen, and it is

imperative that we are able to turn that back on and that the Court is able to authorize the cash management system and move forward.

And, you know, I fear that we are getting a bit off-track and I think Ms. Richenderfer really put her finger on that and I want to, you know, bring the focus back to what this motion is supposed to do, which is to authorize the debtors to continue to use their cash management system to be able to pay the debts that they need to pay to operate so that there isn't a value destruction for the estate.

MS. RICHENDERFER: Your Honor, Linda Richenderfer.

Again, I appreciate Counsel pointing out

Paragraph 5 and maybe because I think we're going into a

third area here, where we're talking about something other

than whether or not something is subject to a lien or

adequate protection. Maybe after the language is put in that

certain of the Canadian-related lenders want, we may need to

tweak Paragraph 5 a little bit just to make clear that the

Court is not ruling on whether or not available cash is

subject to a lien or I should say that rights are reserved,

with respect to the foregoing and it seems to me that we're

now getting into an area as to whether or not cash does or

does not belong to a debtor from the conversation I just

heard concerning the Donlen portion of the business.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let me suggest this,

I'll ask the parties to work together to try and come up with 1 2 language for the cash management order that only deals with cash management, but preserves parties' interests and then we 3 4 can deal with the security interests in the cash collateral order. 5 MR. COLODNY: We'll do that, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. And I'll look for that under certification of counsel, then. 8 9 Mr. Colodny, are you the next motion, also? 10 MR. COLODNY: No, I would like to pass this to Mr. 11 Mackintosh. I think you've heard enough of me. Eight points is far too much. 12 13 Thank you very much, Your Honor. 14 (Laughter) 15 THE COURT: Thank you. MR. MACKINTOSH: Your Honor, Andrew Mackintosh of 16 17 White & Case, proposed counsel to the debtors. 18 Can you hear me okay? 19 THE COURT: I can. 20 MR. MACKINTOSH: Great. So, the next motion up is the employee motion; it's Docket Number 20. And the purpose 21 of this motion is to minimize the impact of this bankruptcy 22 23 filing to a workforce that's already seen significant disruption over the last three months. 24 25 The debtors' CFO, Mr. Jamere Jackson, has attest

to the facts set forth in the motion in his first day declaration at Docket 28.

The debtors' request for relief today is interim only and the interim relief in the motion is limited to four main categories. First is that the debtors seek authority to make cash payments to employees for Section 507(a)(4) obligations in the ordinary course of business up to the statutory cap.

The debtors' only outstanding prepetition wages are owed to their hourly workers. These workers are paid weekly; one week in arrears and their next payroll date is tomorrow. Bi-weekly payroll on May 21st paid salaried employees current through May 24th in the ordinary course, leaving them with no prepetition wage claims. Relating to these payroll payments, the debtors seek customary relief to satisfy all ancillary prepetition payroll obligations, including the forward withholdings paid with the employer component of payroll taxes, and to pay processing fees to their payroll processors.

The second category of relief that the debtors seek on an interim basis is to pay prepetition amounts owing in respect to their various benefits plans. So, this includes maintaining their self-insured employee health care plan and dental plan, their other insurance plans, making pension contributions, paying administrative fees or

(indiscernible) other retirement plans, and, otherwise, complying with the requirements under union contracts. The pension contributions, in particular, are limited to union employees and are required under those agreements.

The third category that the debtors seek on an interim basis is to honor a few other narrow items as prepetition obligations that don't really fit neatly into the last two categories. So, these are non-cash PTO obligations, expense reimbursements, and relocation and moving expenses.

So, the PTO during the interim period, the debtors proposed to pay employees for time they take off from work, but not to honor requests to cash out the paid time off.

The reimbursements are customary relief. Most of these obligations are balances on corporate credit cards that are employee-named and are employee credit. So, failing to pay would have an adverse effect on employees.

The last category is relocation expenses. This relates to limited short-term housing for employees and certain moving expenses who have been willing to continue their employment by the debtors.

The fourth and final relief sought on an interim basis is simply to continue their prepetition employment practices on a post-petition basis, subject to limitations imposed by Section 503(c) of the Bankruptcy Code.

And the debtors also seek customary relief

authorizing banks to honor payments relating to the payments authorized by this motion.

The Office of the United States Trustee has requested and the debtors have agreed to make one modification to the interim order, as filed as Exhibit A to the motion, and that request relates to what was referred to in the motion as the "fiduciary exception." That fiduciary exception, as described in the motion, will allow debtors to pay amounts otherwise not payable as a result of the order for relief in this case in the event that the debtors' managers would incur personal liability as a result of that nonpayment or if there would be some adverse impact on the debtors' ability to operate.

Now, as the Court has heard a few times already today, the debtor group that's before the Court is a bit smaller than it might have been and the fiduciary exception was drafted with international entities in mind where the debtors could face issues of international law or actions by a non-U.S. Government that would be difficult to deal with in this court. The debtors, accordingly, agreed to limit the fiduciary exception to Canadian employees, which is now just the only international debtor group before the Court, without prejudice to their rights to exercise the fiduciary exception with respect to the U.S. employees upon further court order.

I want to be clear on this and as is reflected in

the motion, the debtors don't believe that they have any 1 2 obligations in excess of the priority cap and that obligations that would otherwise -- of any other wage 3 4 obligations in excess of the priority cap, that would trigger this fiduciary exception in Canada; however, out of an abundance of caution, it gives comfort to our Canadian 6 directors, the debtors' Canadian directors and other 7 employees, that we asked that this be included. 9 And that change appears on Paragraph 2 of the 10 proposed interim order and I can read that into the record if the Court desires. Ms. Richenderfer has --11 THE COURT: All right. 12 13 MR. MACKINTOSH: Yes? 14 THE COURT: Although I have it, you should read it into the record so that those in the meeting also can hear 15 it. 16 17 MR. MACKINTOSH: Yes. So, Paragraph 2 of the 18 interim order, as attached to the motion, and with the words "pursuant to the fiduciary exception." So, before that 19 20 period, we've inserted, "With respect to Canadian employees

And it continues, "The limitation on the fiduciary exception --" the immediately preceding sentence is:

21

22

23

24

25

only."

"Without prejudice to the rights of the debtors to seek further order of the Court to exercise a fiduciary

exception with respect to U.S. employees."

So, again, this one modification resolves all the U.S. Trustee's comments to the interim order. The debtors received one additional comment to the interim order, which was resolved without change.

We had one limited objection which has already been referenced on a few occasions this morning. The Bank of Montreal and Nova Scotia Bank made an objection to the extent that Canadian employees are being paid from cash collateral, I believe that they have not identified any cash collateral and the debtors now believe their contemplated payments would be made from cash collateral. The debtors also further note that the amount of the interim request for Canada is relatively modest; less than \$780,000.

Moving on to just the amounts that we're talking about here, the total prepetition amount that the debtors seek to pay during the interim period is 29.4 million, of which 28.7 million is on account of U.S. employee obligations and, again, about 780,000 is on account of Canadian employee obligations.

Page 4 of the motion has a breakdown by category of the various U.S. amounts and Page 5 shows various Canadian amounts in U.S. dollars with categories substantially similar to the U.S. categories.

Now, if the Court has any questions about any of

these amounts or otherwise, I'm prepared to address them.

THE COURT: I do have one question. I just want to confirm or have you confirm, this relates only to active employees of the debtors, not to any of those terminated employees?

MR. MACKINTOSH: So, Your Honor, there are two categories that -- so, the short answer is, actually, it does relate to some other employees that wouldn't be considered active status. So, there are two categories of those other employees; one is employees that are on furlough and these are employees that the debtors hope to be able to call back when business returns as this crisis subsides. And there are 1700 furloughed employees in the United States and 850 furloughed employees in Canada.

Now, these furloughed employees are not receiving any -- they're not receiving any pay. They are receiving benefits. The debtors have continued their benefits during the furlough period and desire to continue to honor those benefits obligations to those employees.

The second set of employees who are covered by the request even on the interim basis are severed employees -- are terminated employees. And the debtors have unfortunately had to terminate a fairly large number of employees over the last two and a half months. So, just in the U.S. there are about 14,000 employees who were terminated in a various set

of actions since April. And the terms of the severance obligations to those employees are set by agreements, with respect to salaried workers and are set by union contracts, with respect to the hourly workers. These agreements, which are all prepetition agreements, and all occurred within the 180 days prior to the petition date, in some cases, do propose to pay these terminated employees in excess of \$13,650.

The debtors have requested authority to pay them only up to the statutory cap and this relief is the same relief on an interim basis and on a final basis. And the rationale for that request is twofold. First is that -- and, again, these are, you know, undoubtedly entitled to priority treatment as severance claims under the claim or Section 507(a)(4), and the second reason is that these folks have obviously suffered a very difficult disruption.

And the debtors, although, you know, are proposing to pay them far in excess of the priority cap, obviously it would be quite offensive to some of (indiscernible) to some of the other parties' interests, paying them up to this statutory cap only affects, again, the timing of the payment and will hopefully ease the impact even on these terminated employees, of these bankruptcy filings. These are obligations that the debtors would need to meet under a plan and the debtors submit that it's appropriate to avoid further

disruption in the lives of these folks who have, 1 2 unfortunately, had to be let go. THE COURT: All right. Thank you for answering 3 4 that. 5 Let me see if anybody else has any questions or objections to the motion or form of order? 6 7 (No verbal response) THE COURT: All right. I hear none and I will 8 9 enter the order, as necessary, to keep the debtors' 10 operations going for the next interim period. 11 MR. MACKINTOSH: Thank you very much, Your Honor. That will provide a lot of relief to the company and its 12 13 employees. 14 THE COURT: And I note that you did file a revised 15 order and that's the one that has been uploaded? MR. MACKINTOSH: Yes, Your Honor. That's the 16 17 order that reflects the comments from the U.S. Trustee and I 18 believe resolves all of those outstanding comments. THE COURT: All right. I'll enter that order, 19 20 then. 21 MR. MACKINTOSH: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 Your Honor, the next item on the agenda I also 23 will handle and this one is the tax motion. The request here 24 is to pay certain prepetition taxes and fees. Again, the

debtors' CFO, Mr. Jamere Jackson has attested to the facts in

25

the motion in his first day declaration and today's request for taxes and fees is, again, limited to interim relief.

The proposed interim order would authorize, but not direct, the debtors to pay certain prepetition taxes and fees to various U.S. and Canadian taxing, licensing, regulatory, and other authorities. Now, of this aggregate 19.5 million request on an interim basis, only 95 percent is attributed to trust fund taxes. This large and disproportionate share reflects what anyone who's ever looked at a rental car receipt knows that rental vehicle transactions are heavily taxed.

The debtors' rental car transactions

(indiscernible) are subject to sales taxes, use taxes, and in some -- sales taxes, use taxes, motor vehicle rental taxes, and in some cases, all of the above. These taxes are typically paid monthly and the debtors have substantial obligations coming due as soon as May 30th.

In addition to the sales, use, and motor vehicle rental taxes making up that 95 percent of the interim ask, the debtors also ask for authority to pay another \$800,000 in property taxes, business licenses, and franchise taxes.

So, these sales-and-use taxes, being the 95 percent ask are appropriately the focus of our discussion today. They are held in trust. They are collected by the debtors from their customers and they must be remitted to the

applicable taxing authorities. They're not property of the debtors' estates under Section 541(d) and the debtors' estates are therefore not diminished by making the payments.

Moreover, these and all or substantially all of the other \$800,000 requested for which authority is requested to pay in the interim order, 800,000 and other -- the additional 800,000, all of these would be payable under a debtors' plan, pursuant to Section 1129(a)(9) in full.

So, paying these taxes now would serve only to accelerate the payment, but not to increase it and, in fact, payments now would actually decrease the payment. Interest on these taxes will accrue at state law rates, under Section 511(a) and in many cases, these interest payments are substantial. Interest on the claims could be entitled to priority under Sections 507 (indiscernible) or payable under Section 506(b) on a secured property tax claim.

In addition, the debtors' managers and other employees could be personally liable for failing to remit trust fund taxes which would be extremely disruptive to the debtors' efforts to reorganize. So, by the debtors' motion, they also seek customary relief authorizing banks to honor payments relating to the payments authorized by the motion.

The Office of the United States Trustee has had no comments on a form of interim order and the only other comment that we received on this form of interim order was

resolved without change.

Once again, the Bank of Montreal and Nova Scotia
Bank objected only to the extent Canadian taxes are paid from
their cash collateral (indiscernible). Again, they've not
shown there to be cash collateral and are due. We don't
believe that payments would be made from anything that could
possibly constitute cash collateral. In any event, the
amount of the Canadian taxes payable in the interim period is
just \$65,000.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MACKINTOSH: There's a chart, again, as with the employee motion, showing what amounts are sought to be paid by a category in the U.S. and in Canada; it's on Page 3 of the motion. And I would note that none of the taxes sought to be paid pursuant to this motion are old taxes. These are all current amounts and the debtors believe it's reasonable to continue paying these taxes in the ordinary course of its business.

If the Court has any questions, again, I'm happy to answer them, but if not, the debtors submit this is customary relief warranted under the circumstances and it should be granted.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I had no questions -- well, you've answered my questions.

Let me see if anybody else wishes to be heard on

this tax motion? 1 (No verbal response) 2 THE COURT: I hear none. I'll enter the order, 3 then. I note you have a revised order with the second day 4 hearing, so I'll enter that order. MR. MACKINTOSH: Thank you very much, Your Honor. 6 7 With that, I will pass the virtual podium to my 8 colleague, Ron Gorsich. 9 MR. GORSICH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 10 Gorsich with White & Case, proposed counsel for the debtors. Are you able to hear me? 11 12 THE COURT: I can. MR. GORSICH: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 presenting the next two items on the agenda, starting with 14 the critical vendors. 15 16 MR. GORSICH: By this motion, we are seeking entry 17 of interim order authorizing, but not directing, the debtors 18 to pay prepetition claims of foreign and critical vendors, confirming administrative expense priority status for 19 20 outstanding pretty big purchase orders, and granting the related relief. The facts set forth in this motion, again, 21 22 have been attested to by Mr. Jackson, Hertz's CFO, in his 23 first day declaration. 24 You've heard a bit about the debtors' operations 25 already today and I'll try not to repeat too much of that as

we go through this, but the relief -- to put the relief requested in this motion in context, it's important to understand the scale of the company and how it operates. Simple put: Hertz is everywhere. They're in 48 states and have 1600 different airport locations, 2600 more off-airport locations, and over 500,000 vehicles in their fleet. It takes a very large network of vendors to make sure all of those vehicles are kept in good condition and ready to go for their customers and to keep all of those locations up and running.

All in, the debtors rental business alone uses over 40,000 vendors. This is compounded by the fact that the debtors are so spread out and that they typically cannot have large contracts with national suppliers for everything. Some have to be, by necessity, smaller suppliers in areas where they need -- where they may be the only realistic option for a particular spot. These types of relationships are exactly the type that often satisfy the rigorous test to be considered a critical vendor.

With that in mind, the debtors seek an interim relief on four areas. First, authorizing, but not directing, the debtors to pay critical vendor claims and the foreign vendor claims in a capped, aggregate amount of \$34.6 million on an interim basis. To put this in perspective, this amount is truly the bare minimum of what might be needed to avoid

business interruption. It represents less than 10 percent of the total outstanding accounts payable as of the petition date and also represents less than 10 percent of the total 40,000 vendors.

So, we've spent a good amount of time going through the lists, working with the debtors, working with FTI, analyzing each vendor to make sure it was truly critical and qualified to be in this program, but to make sure that they were essential, not replaceable, do not have an executory contract in most instances, provide good pricing, credit (indiscernible) terms, may have a 503(b)(9) claim, could have a possessory, a mechanics, or other lien or that's likely to return vehicles until paid or is a foreign vendor or that could otherwise cause disruptions in the company's business.

Just during the hearing, I've already gotten two emails about cars that are trapped at locations because vendors are holding them pending payment. It's a very real issue for this company; they have a lot of cars and there's a lot of places. And, candidly, Your Honor, we could not have narrowed the vendor caps any more without causing extreme concern and disruption for the company.

The second area of relief we're looking for is confirming the administrative expense priority status of all undisputed obligations of the debtors from prepetition

purchase orders outstanding with vendors and suppliers, of
goods and services ordered by the debtors but that not yet
have been delivered. I'd like to emphasize this point as it
was of particular interest to the Office of the United States
Trustee. In this relief, we're only seeking to pay for goods
and services delivered after the petition date that would be
considered an admin expense anyway, so that we do not have to
reissue a purchase order.

We are not seeking to pay any goods or services delivered prior to the petition date. If they were part of a petition order and they're prior to the petition date, they're in the previous cap. We're not expanding that at all by this.

With this clarification, we satisfied the concerns of the Office of the United States Trustee regarding this motion. I believe they have no further objections.

On the third point, the debtors request the authority, but not direction, to make critical vendor payments upon the conditions that, one, the debtors get to determine who's included as a critical vendor in their sole discretion. So, this is one area where we did receive objection and it has been slightly modified in the amended order with new Paragraph 4.

Do you have that have in front of you or I am happy to read it into the record?

But in essence, we agreed to consult --

THE COURT: I have it, but you should read it for the record.

MR. GORSICH: I'd be happy to.

The debtors shall consult with, one, Latham & Watkins, LLP, as counsel to Barclays Bank PLC; two, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, LLP, as counsel to the ad hoc second lien group; and three, Arnold & Porter, as counsel to the ad hoc group of term lenders on a professionals-only basis, one day prior to making any proposed payments to critical vendors, except to the extent that the debtors determine that providing such notice would be commercially unreasonable.

Getting back to the conditions for payment -- it's number two -- if the vendor accepts payment, it has been deemed to accept customary trade terms. Three, as necessary, the debtors may condition payment on entry into a trade agreement. Four, if a vendor accepts payment but then does not follow the terms, the debtors can treat the payment as an unauthorized post-petition transfer. And, finally, the fourth area of relief is authorizing banks to honor payments made pursuant to this motion and similar routine relief.

At this point, Your Honor, we have resolved the issues from the Office of the United States Trustee and other parties in interest. I do not believe there are any other objections to the motion and to the extent you have any

questions, I'd be happy to go over them; otherwise, we 1 2 request that you enter the interim order. THE COURT: You've answered my questions. 3 MR. HUEBNER: Your Honor, may I be heard? 4 5 THE COURT: Let me hear from -- is that Mr. Huebner? 6 7 MR. HUEBNER: It is, Your Honor, and apologies for popping up. It is Mr. Huebner. 8 9 So, we have no issue with this and as you know, we 10 actually did not file a written objection to anything, but given that we are owed almost \$5 billion, I think that where 11 other parties will be talking more about in a few minutes are 12 now getting notice of specific things like this, we would ask 13 that to the extent it is a professionals' eyes-only list, 14 that Davis Polk be added to the list. 15 To the extent that it is a client list to these 16 17 various motions, as sort of, you know, core, noticed parties 18 like this, that Deutsche Bank, through its counsel, on behalf -- with that sort of parity (indiscernible) very large 19 20 facility (indiscernible) we have no other concerns. MR. LAURIA: Your Honor? 21 22 THE COURT: Any objection by the debtor? 23 MR. LAURIA: Your Honor, if I may be heard? 24 THE COURT: Yes. Who are you? 25 MR. LAURIA: This is Don Lauria --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LAURIA: -- with White & Case. Sorry for not identifying myself, Your Honor.

I've tried to kind of let this pass through this hearing on the hopes that we would have time, not today, but in the future, to resolve this, but I think it's worth noting. Mr. Huebner represents a group of creditors who are not creditors in any shape, form, or respect of the debtors. Indeed, they negotiated very hard in their financing documents to be creditors (indiscernible) bankruptcy (indiscernible) the special purpose vehicle.

So, we are really extending them a courtesy today in listening to the creditor of a creditor in the court. And I had hoped that we could pass on this and just take it up, figure out a protocol that would work, but I think we have just kind of gone a bit too far when a creditor of a creditor -- not an actual creditor in the case -- is seeking to review our critical vendor payments, which are designed to sustain the business that they are not a creditor of.

And I just really think that the interference at this point has to kind of be toned down. I look forward to working with Mr. Huebner to getting to a resolution of this, but it really has got to stop.

MR. HUEBNER: Sure. Your Honor, may I be heard on that point, because it's a fair point to raise, but I

actually believe that including, given Your Honor's ruling on the topic, the answer may be better than the question.

First of all, I would note that in Mr. Lauria's affirmative presentation, as he quite straightforwardly put up on the chart for all to see, you know, 15 billion of the 20 billion is owed to parties in the situation of my client, so it's a little inconsistent to have on the one hand say, Here is the debt that we're all here to resolve; on the other hand, say that someone shouldn't even be allowed to be heard.

Second, as Your Honor, of course, also remembers, the latter pages of his deck, they're actually almost exclusively about their intentions, with respect to the (indiscernible) debt and Section 365(d)(5). And so, again, to say that we are somehow an interloper in this hearing, that, frankly, is just vertiginous.

But then, of course, there is the law on which Mr. Lauria, I believe, is actually just wrong. And so, just for an example, as to Your Honor's own ruling in In re

Weinstein Holdings, LLC, 595 B.R. 455, (Bankr. D. Del. 2018),

I believe citing a Second Circuit case, In re James Wilson,
and others yet to be followed, the definition of "party in interest" is actually quite broad and I think that the parties (indiscernible) notes speak for 11 billion of the

19 billion that the debtors, themselves, put up on the screen as why they're in Chapter 11, have a right to be heard or see

where everything is going, I think we're in a pretty strange (indiscernible) indeed.

Again, we didn't file any written objections. We worked out all of our comments consensually with the debtors. I'm not really sure asking to see where the money is going, because, again, I will have more to say. Nobody has made a counter-set of remarks as to Mr. Lauria. I didn't want to interrupt the flow before they launch right into the first day motions. I think the cash collateral motion probably is going to be the time where rounding out the record so that the Court understands a few more things that were not in the presentation, that are certainly germane to people owed \$15 billion here, is going to be quite important.

So, if we were (indiscernible) --

THE COURT: Well, let me -- Mister --

MR. HUEBNER: -- I would agree --

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Huebner, I'm not going to order the debtor to share the CD list with you or your client or counsel for your client at this stage because they are creditors of nondebtors.

I have recognized that you are a party in interest and entitled to notice in this case, but I think that that stops at sharing the list of critical vendors on an interim basis, anyway, and hopefully you can talk to Mr. Lauria or counsel for the debtors and I'll deal with it on a final

1 | basis if it's still an issue.

MR. HUEBNER: Absolutely, Your Honor, and thank

3 you.

MR. SALZBERG: Your Honor, if I may be heard.

5 THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SALZBERG: This is Mark Salzberg from Squire Patton Boggs, we represent ATS Processing Services LLC and American Traffic Solutions Consolidated LLC.

Our clients provide, among other things, whole management and violation management services to both the rental and fleet management businesses. And so doing under various contracts that historically advanced over \$8 million dollars per month on behalf of the debtors or three of the debtors. There is, of course, a substantial amount owed to my clients prepetition.

It's unclear from the critical vendor motion if ATS or American Traffic will be deemed to be critical vendors. We've reached out to counsel to discuss, but we understand that they have certainly been inundated with issues and inquiries. So, it's not surprising that we have not yet spoken to counsel.

We want to just put on the record and advise the court that we will likely file a motion next week, set for hearing on the 25th, seeking an order directing the debtors to make an early assumption rejection determination to

provide ATS with adequate protection. We will continue to 1 2 reach out and confer with counsel for the debtors and we hope to reach some sort of resolution, but I want to put that on 3 4 the record. 5 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Gorisch? 6 7 MR. GORISCH: Hearing nothing else we would ask that the order be entered, the interim order. 8 THE COURT: I will enter the order with those 9 10 revisions. 11 MR. GORISCH: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 Moving onto Item 11 on the agenda, Docket No. 23, this is the debtors' motion for entry of interim and final 13 orders authorizing, but not directing the debtors to pay 14 15 prepetition claims of critical vendors, confirming the --16 THE COURT: No. I think you're --17 MR. GORISCH: I'm sorry, a final order authorizing 18 the debtors to pay airport authorities. 19 THE COURT: There you go. 20 MR. GORISCH: Reading the wrong line. Thank you. 21 Again, the facts set forth in this motion have 22 been attested to by Mr. Jackson, Hertz's CFO, in his first 23 day declaration. As I just said, Your Honor, Hertz is 24 everywhere, but where it's most prevalent is at airports. 25 Hertz is very well known for its airport vehicle rentals and

these are essential locations for the company. Maintaining these locations will be an important part of the company's recovery.

The company has 1,600 airport locations in the US alone. The airport locations make up the majority of the debtors' revenue and airport authorities are the only party that the debtors can contract with to make sure that they can continue to operate at these profitable locations.

By this motion the debtors seek interim relief in three areas. First, the debtors seek to pay certain prepetition claims of airport authorities located in the US and Canada up to an interim cap of \$8.9 million dollars. I would note that at this time the debtors are not discussing any MAG or any other rent; that will only be addressed on a final basis.

Authorizing the debtors to use reasonable exercise of their business judgment to renew and replace bonds or letters of credits supporting of any obligations owed to the airport authorities. Three, as with other motions, seeking to pay prepetition claims. We are also asking your debtor authorized banks to allow such payments to go through.

We'll go over a couple of key points about the three buckets of fees we are seeking to pay that were of interest to the Office of the United States Trustee which we have resolved.

First, concession fees are for a specific percentage of revenue the debtor generates at an airport; usually a 10 percent minimum. As such, they are calculate continuously, are based on earnings at the airport and are kept up to date. The bulk of the concession fees are from May with a relatively small amount from April. So, these are not old and cold charges.

Similarly, the customer -- the CFC, customer facilities charges, are all from the month of May. Again, these are typically charged and passed through to customers and remitted to the airports.

The Conrac charges, which are fees from the operation and maintenance of commentaries around the airport, for busing, and passengers, and having the common use facilities for rental car agencies are also up to date.

These are thinly capitalized joint enterprises between the car rental companies and as such the fees are collected monthly.

Second, all of the funds for both the concessions fees, which are a percentage of the rental, and the customer facility charges have already been collected from customers and are due to the airports. CFC's are always a direct pass-through charge that shows up separately on the customer's invoices and concession fees.

Having explained these two points the U.S.T. had
no further questions or comments on the motion. And, again,
we have agreed to add new Paragraph 4 to the interim order
requiring that the debtors consult on a professionals basis
only, one day's prior notice, with the exception to the
extent that debtors determine that providing such notice
would be commercially unreasonable.

Would you like me to read that into the record again, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MR. GORISCH: New Paragraph 4, the debtors shall consult with Latham & Watkins LLP, as counsel to Barclay's Bank. Two, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP as counsel to the ad hoc second lien group. Three, Arnold & Porter as counsel to the ad hoc group of term lenders on a professional basis only one day prior to making any proposed payments on account of airport authority claims except to the extent that the debtors determine that providing such notice would be commercially unreasonable.

As there have been no other objections to motion, Your Honor, with that, unless the court has any questions, we would request that the court enter the revised interim order.

THE COURT: I had no questions.

Does anybody else wish to be heard?

MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Eric Smith, Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell, on behalf of the City of Atlanta, the owner operator of the Hartsfield Jackson International Airport, on behalf of the Memphis Shelby County Airport Authority, the owner/operator of Memphis International Airport, and the Hillsborough County Aviation Authority, the owner/operator of the Tampa International Airport.

These airports do generally support debtors' motions, but they have a couple of concerns. Unfortunately, we weren't able to get all the documentation together that would enable us to file a written objection. We will be filing a very limited objection before the June 18th deadline that generally will concern how CFC's were defined under the motion and reservation of rights with respect to the nature and ownership of CFC's, but we will also be reaching out to debtors' counsel and expect to have it all worked out before the final hearing. We expect it to just be a minor tweak to the final order and we have plenty of time to get that done, but I just wanted to let counsel know that we have that coming and we're committed to working and will work it out.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. GORISCH: Thank you. We appreciate that. I'm sure we will be able to work it out.

THE COURT: All right. Then I will -- anyone 1 else? 2 3 MR. MINUTI: Your Honor, Mark Minuti. May I be 4 heard briefly? 5 THE COURT: You may. MR. MINUTI: Thank you, Your Honor. Mark Minuti, 6 7 Saul Ewing Arnstein & Lehr. I will be extremely brief. represent the Allegany County Airport Authority, that's the 8 9 operator of the Pittsburgh International Airport. 10 We filed a response. We do not in any way oppose the motion, but the motion does describe the agreements with 11 the airports. It touches on the debtors' position relative 12 13 to the CFC's. We have a different view. Your Honor is not 14 being asked to decide anything with respect to that today. 15 So, what we really did was just reserve rights. Like counsel 16 before me, our intent is to work it out before the final 17 hearing, but we just wanted to go on the record with our 18 reservations. 19 Thank you. 20 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 21 MR. COLLINS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. May I 22 be heard? 23 THE COURT: You may. 24 Michael Collins. I'm with Manier & MR. COLLINS: 25 Herod, representing Westchester Fire Insurance Company. And I

represent the surety side of Westchester. You may hear from the insurance side of Westchester later on in this hearing.

The surety side of Westchester has issued about 35 million of surety bonds that support the concessionaire agreements that we have been discussing here. Right now -- and I've talked with Mr. Gorisch this morning and I think we're going to resolve our issues.

Our issue primarily is that we need a little more definition in the release because the bonds that we have will be coming up for renewal. They are typically issued on an annual basis, and as they come up for renewal the debtors need to be in a position to be able to work out the details of a go forward surety credit facility. Typically what we see in first day motions will grant more authority to do that then what we've seen and what's before the court today.

So, hopefully we will get with Mr. Gorisch and work out those details, and have that resolved prior to the final hearing, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Good. Thank you.

Anyone else?

(No verbal response)

THE COURT: All right. Then I will enter the order, the revised order that's been uploaded and we'll continue this to the final hearing.

MR. GORISCH: Thank you, Your Honor.

Moving onto Agenda Item 12, customer programs.

The debtors' motion for entry of interim order authorizing,

but not directing the debtors to maintain their existing

customer programs and honor certain prepetition customer

obligations, and granting relief related thereto. Again, the

facts set forth in the motion have been attested to by Mr.

Jackson, Hertz's CFO, in his first day declaration.

The customers have come to trust the Hertz name over the last century. Hertz cannot operate without its loyal customers. If we have no customers we have no business. I think COVID has proven that to be very true. Fierce competition in the rental industry makes it crucial that Hertz remain a brand its customers can trust, especially now with the public's attention on the bankruptcy that the debtors need to be able to assure their customers who may be wondering right now whether they are out their points, which many people focus on and treasure quite dearly, and that Hertz is going to make good on its promises to its loyal customers. If we cannot do this there's a big risk that loyal customers will switch to another brand.

With that in mind today the debtors are seeking entry of an interim order in two areas; first, authorizing them to honor and maintain their existing customer programs in the ordinary course, and pay certain prepetition obligations relating to customer programs, and, second, as

with other motions, seeking to pay prepetition claims, Your Honor. We'd also ask that you authorize banks to allow such payments to go through.

The majority of the customer programs we seek to honor have no cash outlay. As I mentioned, the customer points, this can be used to secure future vehicles, but they have no cash value. Business rewards programs include corporate discounts and rates, again no cash value. Certain promotions, coupons, discounts, upgrades, free rentals, vouchers, initiatives, all of these are very important things that they foster the relationship with the customer without having a specific cash outlay.

We also seek authority to make payments where there is a cash outlay. The largest one of these is prepaid charges and reservations. Customers have the option of prepaying reservations in order to access special rates. They then are allowed to cancel under certain conditions and get a refund. With the pandemic the debtors have added the flexibility to allow prepaid charges to be applied to reservations made in the next twenty-four months. So, in our experience most cases people will wait and use that in that manner; however, we want to make sure that we have the authority to provide any refund that customers would like under the terms of their agreement.

This area specifically we did discuss with the 1 2 Office of the United States Trustee who was concerned about not having a cap on an interim basis. So, we agreed to 3 4 include a \$10 million dollar cap in the interim order. In response to those concerns we added new Paragraph 4 to the order which I will read into the record. 6 7 "Notwithstanding anything in this order to the contrary during the interim period, the debtor shall neither 8 9 (I) refund any amounts on account of the business deposits or 10 Donlen deposits or (II) refund more than 10 million in prepaid charges without seeking further relief from the 11 court." 12 That was in what we filed. I'm just highlighting 13 it for Your Honor that we added that after discussions with 14 the U.S.T. 15 16 THE COURT: All right. Anything else? 17 MR. GORISCH: With that, Your Honor, I don't 18 believe we have any other objections to this motion and we request that the interim order be entered. 19 20 THE COURT: Does anybody else wish to be heard? 21 (No verbal response) THE COURT: All right, I will enter the order. 22 23 have no questions. 24 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. GORISCH: 25 Moving onto agenda item number 13, franchise

motion. This is the debtors' motion for entry of interim order only here authorizing but not directing the debtors to honor prepetition obligations, the non-debtor franchisees in the ordinary course and granting related relief.

2.3

As with the other motions, the facts set forth in the motion have been attested to by Mr. Jackson, our CFO, in his first-day declaration. This is particularly important for this motion as it resolved the only concern that the UST had relating to the evidentiary basis. With that understanding, the office of the United States Trustee believed that there was sufficient basis in the motion and has no further objection.

As we discussed, the company has numerous and significant franchisees relationships that are very important on a global market. Nearly half of the company's locations, over 6,000 locations, are franchisees; 383 of which are in the United States; 5200 are spread over approximately 150 countries and territories around the globe. This scale demonstrates the continuing operation of the franchisee locations and is crucial to maintaining the debtors' global presence and brand-name recognition.

The company's franchisee program is profitable and the company realizes the significant net gain by continuing to maintain it. In order to offer their customers a seamless experience no matter where they are in the world or if they

are at a corporate location or a company location or a

franchisee location, regardless of where they go, it is

essential that the debtors provide the same service, customer

programs, and corporate accounts at franchisees as they do at

company locations anywhere in the world.

2.3

To do this, the company and the franchisees must provide consistent service, regardless of whom should ultimately bear the expense or who receives the funds for any given rental. Some of the items that go into this are royalties the franchisees (indiscernible), reservation fees that come through a centralized system, third-party reimbursements, one-way rentals, and one of the biggest items is centralized billing for corporate accounts.

If a corporate customer for a large U.S. company travels abroad, they utilize the same corporate accounts rent-a-car in Italy as they would in the U.S. and it gets billed through the U.S. and is netted out as part of the system. I believe you heard about this earlier in the context of Mr. Lauria's presentation.

At the end of each month, the debtors' automated batch system produces a statement detailing the franchisee obligations and sets off the total amounts payable and receivable and comes up with a net result. This is an automated netting process that is done each month. And by this motion on an interim basis, the debtors are simply

requesting to run the netting for May in the ordinary course of business and pay out any amounts owed to the franchisees as a result.

2.3

Based on the April process, this is expected to result in, after all the netting is done and the obligations are settled, approximately \$1 million dollars of invoices that the debtors will have to pay to franchisees while it should result in approximately \$17 million dollars of receivables from franchisees. We would expect non-debtor subsidiaries to have to pay out approximately \$2 million resulting in a net gain to the company of approximately \$14 million dollars as part of this netting process.

Not only this but failing to run this process could negatively impact the debtors' ability to maintain its relationships with franchisees and it would needlessly put the global reach that they are able to maintain by licensing their brand names around the world in jeopardy.

With that, Your Honor, we would request interim relief authorizing the debtors to, one, run their automating netting process for the month of May in the ordinary course of business, including netting prepetition amounts against post-petition amounts; issue related statements for the month of May to franchisees and settle those statements in the ordinary course by obtaining any obligations owed to them.

As I said, we have resolved any conflicts with the

office of the United States Trustee. I do not believe there are any other objections to this motion. Unless Your Honor has any questions, I would ask that you enter the interim order.

THE COURT: Does anybody else wish to be heard?

MR. DEMMY: Yes, Your Honor.

2.3

THE COURT: All right, go ahead.

MR. DEMMY: Your Honor, John Demmy of Saul Ewing Arnstein & Lehr. We represent an entity, an organization called FACT Inc. which is an organization comprised franchisees or licensees, as they're sometimes called. There's approximately thirty in our group.

And I want to say at the outset, we're happy about this motion and generally support the motion and simply wanted to raise our support and also advise the court that historically there's been a process involved in the ordinary course in which there's some discussion and reconciliation of the netting process and the amounts that result from the netting process that was described by debtors' counsel. And it's our intent to engage in that process going forward in the ordinary course and to work constructively with the debtors to ensure that the process proceeds as it has historically in the ordinary course.

And other than that, Your Honor, I would say that we support the motion and look forward to rolling forward and

working with the debtor as we go to a final hearing. 1 2 THE COURT: All right, thank you. Anybody else? (No verbal response) 3 4 THE COURT: All right, I have no questions on this 5 motion, and I will enter the order in order to allow the debtors' business to operate as smoothly as possible. 6 7 MR. GORISCH: Thank you, Your Honor. With that, I'll turn over the virtual podium to my colleague, Andrea 8 9 Amulic. 10 MS. AMULIC: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Andrea Amulic from White & Case, proposed counsel to the debtors and 11 debtors-in-possession. Can you hear me okay? 12 13 THE COURT: I can. MS. AMULIC: Great. I would first like to echo my 14 15 colleague's previous statements and thank the court for 16 accommodating us virtually today. 17 The next item on the agenda is agenda item 14, the debtors' insurance motion which was filed at Docket Number 18 26. 19 The facts set forth in this motion have been 20 attested by Mr. Jackson in his first-day declaration. By 21 22 this motion, the debtors seek authority to continue and 23 maintain existing insurance policies and pay all insurance obligations and premium finance obligations arising in the 24

25

ordinary course.

The debtors seek authority to pay in the interim period \$5.95 million on accounts of prepetition claims and obligations. This interim amount comprises four million in premium payments on account of the debtors' liability insurance supplement programs, as well as \$1.95 million in reimbursements to third-parties that administer the debtors' insurance program that are subsequently reimbursed by drawing on accounts of the debtors.

The debtors are required to maintain insurance as a matter of law and maintenance of their insurance programs is essential to their business. The debtors have made every effort to ensure that this requested interim amount is as well as possible without threatening the viability of the insurance program.

The debtors also seek authority to renew, extend, supplement or replace insurance policies as needed in their business judgment to continue using Marsh as their insurance broker; retain any other insurance broker they deem necessary in their business judgment and to pay related broker fees in the ordinary course; to authorize banks to facilitate payments on account of insurance obligations and premium finance obligations and; a limited modification of the stay to permit the debtors' employees to proceed with worker's compensation (indiscernible).

Very briefly the debtors' insurance policies

(indiscernible).

THE COURT: Nothing; go ahead.

MS. AMULIC: Sorry. The debtors' insurance policies include without limitations general liability, property, auto, worker's compensation, directors and officer liability, special (indiscernible) and (indiscernible) liability. The debtors either pay their premiums in full or they finance the premiums through a premium finance agreement with Opco, which are paid in quarterly installments, and the debtors are current on all premiums in the relevant policy period.

The debtors also maintain a liability insurance supplement program through which they offer customers the ability to purchase supplemental insurance when they're renting cars at the counter. This is a very valuable and necessary part of this debtors' insurance regime.

Debtors' (indiscernible) separately maintain property, general liability, vehicle, umbrella access, cyber and crime liability policies and is current on payments in the relevant policy periods thereafter.

The debtors also self-insure their auto liability, general liability and employer's liability insurance. Two of the company non-debtor subsidiaries hire Bermuda Limited and Probus Insurance Company Europe Limited provide direct or indirect reinsurance coverage in the United States and Europe

respectively.

The debtors also maintain twenty-four surety bonds and five letters of credit which are required for compliance for self-insurance requirements.

Finally, the debtors work with Marsh's insurance broker and they're current on all payments to Marsh in the policy period.

Exhibit C which is attached to the motion filed as a chart with details regarding the policies and premiums.

I'm happy to walk through any of the programs in more detail if the court has questions.

THE COURT: I have no questions.

MS. AMULIC: Sorry?

THE COURT: I don't have any questions with respect to any of them.

MS. AMULIC: Great. Okay. Therefore, the debtors submit that the continuation of the insurance policies and payments of insurance obligations and premium finance obligations in the ordinary course is appropriate with (indiscernible) Section 105(a) and 363(b), as well as the Doctrine of Necessity. Payments of the insurance obligations is also consistent with the debtors' fiduciary duties to maximize the value of the bankruptcy estate under 1107(a) and 1108.

Disruption of debtors' insurance coverage would

- cause irreparable harm including the incurrence of direct
  liability and material costs and losses on account of insured
  claims, the loss of good standing certification
  (indiscernible) in all jurisdictions in which they operate
  and the inability to obtain or exorbitant pricing on
  obtaining similar replacement coverage.
  - The debtors accordingly request that the relief be granted. The relief requested is standard and is routinely granted in Chapter 11 cases.
  - We have provided a copy of the proposed order to the U.S. Trustee and have received no comments. We did receive minor comments from counsel to Chubb and ESIS, the claims administrator, and have made minor revisions to the order in accordance of those comments.
  - The revised order has been lodged. I'm happy to walk through the comments and read them into the record if Your Honor would like.
    - THE COURT: I think you should do that.
- MS. AMULIC: Okay. On the first page, there's just a movement of the defined term, insurance obligation.
- 21 | THE COURT: Okay.

MS. AMULIC: Page 2, subclause three, the request for authority to renew, revise, extend, supplement, change or enter into new insurance coverage and engage in related transactions as needed. The new language is and engage in

related transactions.

There's also a clarifying footnote which says for the avoidance of doubt. The term insurance policy shall include all insurance policies including those providing worker's compensation coverage and those providing LIS coverage issued or providing coverage at any time to the debtors and any agreements related to insurance policies or self-insured programs, whether or not listed on Exhibit B of the motion.

On the next page, paragraph two, there's additional language after the term the LOCs, which read, "And any surety bond provided as security for insurance obligations."

Paragraph four on the same page provides, without further order of this court, the debtors are authorized but not directed to renew, revise, extend, supplement or change any of the insurance policies. Then there's new language, and any collateral security required in connection therewith, including, but not limited to, LOCs and surety bonds.

There's also clarifying footnote on this page which says, for the avoidance of doubt, the term insurance obligation shall include all premiums, deductibles, self-insured amounts, administration fees and costs, bonds, broker's fees, (indiscernible) and all other amounts arising under or in connection with insurance policies.

Then on the next page, there's a clarifying

footnote on worker's compensation policies. It says, for the

avoidance of doubt, the term WC policy shall include all

worker's compensation insurance policies issued or providing

coverage to the debtors or their predecessors and any

agreements related thereto.

Finally, there's just the entry of the final order dated -- sorry; the final hearing date and objection deadline in paragraph fourteen.

THE COURT: Okay. Does anybody else wish to be heard on the motion then?

12 MR. COLLINS: Yes, Your Honor. Very briefly, if I
13 may.

THE COURT: And you are?

MR. COLLINS: This is Michael Collins, again, for Westchester Fire Insurance Company.

Westchester is a subsidiary of Chubb Companies, so you'll see Chubb referenced a lot on the documents.

Again, we kind of came a little bit late to this and I spoke with counsel for the debtors this morning. We have some issues with the phraseology and the way the bonds are treated under this motion, and a little bit of a gap with some other bonds that we have out there. Again, we'll look forward to working with the debtors in relation to the final order.

We just reserve our rights with regard to this 1 interim that we have some issues in terms of how the relief 2 3 is being granted. But I do think those can be worked out pretty easily once we get to the final order, Your Honor. 4 Thank you. 5 THE COURT: All right, thank you. Anybody else? 6 7 MS. HEITZENRATER: Yes, Your Honor. Can you hear 8 me? 9 THE COURT: I can. 10 MS. HEITZENRATER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Catherine Heitzenrater from Duane Morris on behalf of 11 Chubb and ESIS. And we represent the insurance side of Chubb 12 as compared to Mike's surety side or, Mr. Collins, excuse me; 13 surety side. 14 15 We appreciate the debtors' inclusion of certain of 16 the changes that we requested to the interim insurance order, 17 but we do anticipate having negotiations with the debtors 18 with respect to some additional language that we would like 19 to add and we just reserve our rights with respect to that 20 and look forward to working toward a resolution. THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else? 21 22 (No verbal response) 23 THE COURT: All right, then I will enter the order as it has been revised. Thank you. 24 25 MS. AMULIC: Thanks very much, Your Honor.

I will now cede the screen to my colleague, Andrew 2 Mackintosh.

MR. BROWN: I think you mean Matthew Brown.

MS. AMULIC: Sorry. I mean Matthew Brown.

MR. BROWN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Matthew Brown of White & Case, proposed counsel to the debtors. Can you hear me okay?

THE COURT: I can.

MR. BROWN: Great. Your Honor, I'm going to be taking up the next item on the agenda, item 15 which is the equity trading motion, lodged at Docket Number 27 for which today we're only seeking interim relief.

As with the other motions presented today, the facts will predicate requested in the emergency -- I'm sorry; equity trading motion have been attested to by Mr. Jackson, the company's CFO.

Your Honor, pursuant to the motion, the debtors are seeking two types of interim relief. First, the debtors are seeking to establish notification and hearing procedures relating to transfers of equity securities or beneficial interest in the debtors which would apply only to transactions by which would result in a person becoming or ceasing to be a holder of 4.5 percent or more of the equity securities in debtors' Hertz Global Holdings.

Second, Your Honor, we'd be asking the court to

establish the petition date, May 22nd, as the record date
related to potential claims trading procedures that would
only come into effect pursuant to a final order and then only
if and when the debtors seek to confirm a plan of
reorganization that would utilize Section 382(1)(5) of the
Internal Revenue Code to maximize the use of their net
operating losses or NOLs.

As I'm sure Your Honor is aware, this type of relief is often requested in large cases where the debtors have NoLs and other tax attributes that they seek to protect. If trading in the company's equity is not monitored, it is possible that an ownership change could be deemed to occur under federal and state (indiscernible) laws, in which event the company would be severely limited in using its net operating losses and other tax attributes.

In that regard, in the current case, as of December 31st, 2019, Your Honor, the debtors' estimated tax attributes included, without limitation, federal NOLs of approximately \$9 billion and approximately \$5.3 billion of state NOLs.

To maintain this tax attributes could provide significant value to the debtors' stakeholders if these cases progress. As such, through the motion, the debtors are seeking approval on an interim basis at this time of procedures that will allow the debtors to monitor the trading

in Hertz stock.

Specifically, the proposed equity trading procedures require that substantial holders, that is holders of, at least, 4.5 percent of Hertz stock, identify themselves to the court and that certain trades in Hertz stock be approved by the debtors or, if the debtors object, then by the court.

The transactions that would be subject to such procedures, Your Honor, are purchases by substantial shareholders, purchases that would result in a person becoming a substantial shareholder, and sales by substantial shareholders including sales that would result in a person no longer be a substantial shareholder.

In each case, Your Honor, the substantial shareholder would have to give thirty-days advance notice to the debtors of a proposed transaction and the debtors would then have twenty-days to respond or object. If an objection is filed by the debtors then the transaction may not proceed, absent court approval.

Your Honor, we believe these procedures are fairly standard in a case of this size and complexity. We believe their reasonable and here are necessary to allow the debtors to insure they preserve the value of their substantial tax attributes for their estates.

With respect to the second (indiscernible)

requested setting the record date, Your Honor, the debtors
are not seeking substantive relief in the interim order.

Instead, the debtors are seeking only that the court set the
petition date as a record date so that debtors can provide
notice to claimholders. The debtors may, at some later time,
seek to have claims sold down to permit the debtors to
consummate a plan of reorganization that maximizes the use of
the debtors' NOLs and other tax attributes.

Your Honor, the motion was served on, among others, the debtors' equity holders owning 5 percent or more of the Hertz stock and no objections were filed with respect to the interim relief requested and we are aware of none. We did, however, receive several comments from the office of the United States Trustee which comments we accepted and incorporated into a revised form of order which I believe Your Honor should have. And if it's okay, I'll just walk through what those changes are. They're relatively simple.

At the request of the trustee, we deleted from the order completely paragraph seven on page 5 and paragraphs ten, eleven and twelve, all which went to essentially deeming that the notice of the record date was sufficient which is an issue we can take up at the final hearing, if necessary.

So unless Your Honor has any questions, we would ask that the order be entered, as revised and submitted.

THE COURT: All right, does anybody else wish to

be heard?

MS. RICHENDERFER: Your Honor, this is Linda
Richenderfer from the office of the United States Trustee.

Just a point of clarification there. That the provisions that were removed concerned claims and potential purchases of claims. They did not go to shareholder equity, substantial shareholders. And so, seven, ten, eleven and twelve have been completely taken out. And so, at this point in time, there is nothing is deemed to be noticed to claimholders or to potential purchasers of claimholders of a potential sale down order.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BROWN: We agree with that, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you're not seeking anything on the (indiscernible) to claims trading. All right. Anybody else wish to be heard?

(No verbal response)

THE COURT: All right, I'll enter the order then on an interim basis.

MR. BROWN: Thank you very much, Your Honor. And I will cede the virtual podium to my partner, David Turetsky.

MR. TURETSKY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. David
Turetsky of White & Case on behalf of the debtors. Can you
hear me, Your Honor?

THE COURT: I can.

MR. TURETSKY: Let me start out by thanking Your 1 2 Honor for your consideration this afternoon and saying how nice it is to see Your Honor, even at a distance. I do help 3 you're doing well and those in your chambers are doing well 4 and that your family is all well.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I will be presenting the debtors' motion for agreed interim order authorizing the use of Donlen cash collateral and granting adequate protection and that motion was filed at Docket Number 137.

Let me start out by acknowledging that we did file it last night which we recognize from Your Honor's perspective sometimes it's not ideal, but we are also mindful that there are benefits and very strong benefits having consensual agreements, even if only an interim basis early in the case.

The motion was proposed -- and the proposed orders were served on the notice parties last night, and by email, and by first-class mail this morning. There's an affidavit of service that was filed by Sebastian Higgins of Prime Clerk. That is at Docket 139 and that's substantially a service of this motion.

We're also relying on the background facts that were in the first-day declaration that Mr. Shore introduced earlier today.

Your Honor, as my partner, Mr. Lauria, alluded to

earlier in his remarks, the debtors have entered the Chapter 11 cases with approximately \$883 million of cash, the majority of which the debtors contend is unencumbered. The debtors intend to use that unencumbered cash, as well as post-petition receivables that the debtors similarly contend is unencumbered to fund the early stages of the case.

With that said, the debtors also acknowledge that there is certain cash that is cash collateral. And so, I would like to walk you through those categories because I think it lays the groundwork for what we've done in this motion and in this order.

The first is that the debtors acknowledge that Sidecar cash is cash collateral. And this is cash that results from the sale of used cars that were financed using the proceeds of the debtors' Sidecar facility. And so, you will see there is a separate order for the Sidecar facility.

The other cash that the debtors acknowledge is cash collateral is cash collateral belonging to the prepetition secured parties. And by prepetition secured parties -- it's a defined term in our motion, and I am referring to the RCF lenders, the term lenders, the second lien noteholders.

And we think that there is a very limited amount of cash collateral that we can substantiate belongs to them.

And that is proceeds of contracts that were completed prior

to the petition date and certain proceeds of contracts that were either received prior to petition date or maybe received post-petition.

In addition to that, there is cash that resides in certain accounts at JPMorgan. Those accounts include the THC master account which is referred to in the motion; the THC AP account, also referred to in the motion and; the DTG AP account.

Now for that cash collateral, we acknowledge that cash collateral that is included in those accounts is cash collateral and it may be Sidecar collateral and it may be the prepetition secured parties cash collateral.

And then, finally, there is Donlen cash collateral which is cash that is used to fund the Donlen business. And the debtors recognize that that cash collateral is cash collateral of the prepetition secured parties.

So that is the debtors' position and it may not shock Your Honor to hear that there have been some debates about the extent of the unencumbered cash and that the prepetition secured parties, you know, may disagree, and I would think they would tell you they do disagree with the debtors' conclusion.

But with that said and in effort to create peace and resolve concerns, at least on an interim basis, and hopefully it has laid the predicate for additional

discussions that may occur, which hopefully will resolve in more long term peace, debtors agreed and engaged in negotiations with the prepetition secured lender and with the Sidecar lenders.

And what we have arrived at is an agreement whereby the debtors will be permitted to use the cash they believe is unencumbered to fund their business, to use the Donlen cash to fund the Donlen business, you know, for general corporate purposes, as well as for Donlen's allocated cost for the Chapter 11 case. And that's important because the Donlen business is costly to run, so it's a significant (indiscernible). And then to postpone for another day the disputes on cash collateral.

And so, what the debtors, the prepetition secured parties and the Sidecar parties have agreed to, through separate orders, is to provide a limited adequate protection package to the parties. And you'll note, Your Honor, that this is a limited adequate protection package where there's no current interest, there's no 506(c) waiver, but I can walk you through what that package looks like.

The first element of adequate protection is that the Donlen cash will be segregated, so that cash will be put into account and used solely for purposes of running the Donlen business. Cash collateral that is collected in the JPMorgan accounts that I referred to earlier will similarly

be put into a segregated account at an institution that both the Sidecar lenders and the prepetition secured lenders agree to.

There will separately be the segregation of corporate cash collateral that is outside of the JP account, again that's that limited proceeds of contract and that will be at an institution that is mutually satisfactory to debtors and to the prepetition secured parties.

And, lastly, as part of the Sidecar order, there will be a segregation of all Sidecar cash that comes in during the cases and it will be segregated for the benefit of the Sidecar parties in an account that the Sidecar parties agree to.

There will be weekly reporting requirements relating to the Donlen and the corporate cash collateral, as well as to the Sidecar collateral. There is a silent adequate protection lien for each of the prepetition secured parties, as well as the Sidecar parties.

And by silent, I mean it's a replacement lien for collateral that, you know for diminution and collateral, but the lenders and the beneficiaries of that lien are not able to assert that lien as a basis for objecting to a DIP. Their sole remedy with respect to that lien is distribution under a plan. So, it is more limited than their typical adequate protection lien.

And then they will get -- the parties will get 502(b) claims for diminution and value, you know both the Sidecar lenders and the prepetition secured lenders. They'll get payments of reasonable professional fees. The Sidecar -- sorry, the prepetition lender's cash collateral agreement runs through and right to use Donlen collateral, particularly runs through the day after the next hearing which is June 26th, if you assume a 25th hearing, or if the court enters a different order.

And, finally, the parties will get 552(b) rights on a limited basis for the prepetition secured parties that will be with respect to Donlen collateral and for the Sidecar parties that will be with respect to the Sidecar agreement.

The parties, importantly, are retaining all rights and all parties, you know, recognize that the court is not being asked to make findings of priority of perfection, enforceability or avoidability of liens. All rights are reserved and all parties may request that the court modify the adequate protections even retroactively.

So that, in a nutshell, is the adequate protection package and the order that the debtors have negotiated. I'm happy to walk you through, to the extent that Your Honor has any questions. And let me leave it at that for the moment before taking you through some changes that we've made to the order.

THE COURT: All right, no I did have a chance to read them. I have no questions, but let me hear if any other parties wish to be heard?

MS. UHLAND: Your Honor, can you hear me?
THE COURT: I can.

MS. UHLAND: Yes, hi. This is Suzanne Uhland with Latham & Watkins, representing Barclay Bank in its capacity as agent for the first lien lenders. Those are the lenders under the credit agreement referred to with the term lenders and the revolving lenders, as well as agent under a letter of credit agreement facility.

So on the original chart if you saw at the beginning, it's about \$1.3 billion of first lien in the loans and then an additional approximately \$540 million of outstanding letters of credit. This group of first lien lenders we definitely appreciate the efforts that the debtors have gone to over the past 48 hours or 72 hours to get to an agreement with respect to an interim order with respect to the adequate protection to use the cash collateral so that we can facilitate a smoother commencement to this Chapter 11 process.

This group of lenders is the group of lenders that has been supporting operations of Hertz and they support and will support their efforts to restructure a Chapter 11.

They're also the parties that provided the liquidity that the

debtors have spoken about that they are using now to operate during this difficult time. And these first lien lenders are also prepared to assist to address additional liquidity needs to the extent necessary for a successful restructuring of these enterprises.

Just briefly I wanted to underscore a couple of things that I think were, frankly, alluded to about this particular agreement with respect to adequate protection.

First, just one correction. I think counsel for the debtors mentioned that we would have an administrative claim; at least, I heard them say 503(b). In fact, the agreement provides for a 507(b) failure of adequate protection claim, to the extent of diminution of value and failure. I just wanted to clarify that point, that the 507(b) is obviously a priority administrative claim.

Second, I want to be very clear that our position on this is that this is an interim order and these are interim protection. And for both the debtor and the secured party, we have an ability to go back and modify the adequate protection during this interim period.

So we, as lenders, are reserving our right to, if appropriate, either negotiate with the debtors or ask this court to find that we should be receiving adequate protection payments in the form of interest that relate back to the petition date.

We also hope to obtain other more typical
protection in the form of more robust reporting. We are
receiving some reporting here. We understand that the
debtors have been very strapped and continue to be over the
interim period, but we look forward as these cases progress
to obtain more robust reporting and to cooperate with them to
get improved information flow.

Finally, I do want to give the court a heads up about the issue that was raised which is the dispute with respect to the extent of our cash collateral. There is a substantial dispute and it's really more of, I don't know, a technical UCC dispute, if you will, with respect to the nature of our liens on particular assets and particular investment accounts.

We, therefore, believe that a majority of the debtors' cash on hand and cash equivalents on hand, as they set out in their cash management motion, are, in fact, encumbered by first liens and, therefore, when those accounts are liquidated those would constitute cash collateral.

We hope that as a result of the anticipated improved level of communication between the debtors and the lenders we'll be able to resolve this issue quickly and without court intervention. But given the magnitude of the delta, of this dispute, we would seek to, short of being able to get consensual resolution, we would want to come to the

court promptly to get that issue resolved.

2.3

With that, Your Honor, I want to also thank you for taking the time and for addressing this adequate protection and cash collateral hearing on very short notice. I think it was productive that the parties had up until late last night to try to get these issues resolved.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

Anybody else wish to be heard --

MR. LUSKIN: Your Honor, if I might -- this is
Michael Luskin for Luskin Stern & Eisler representing credit
Agricol. We are the agent on the Sidecar facility and we
appear with Derrick Abbott from Morris Nichols who I believe
also is on the line as our Delaware counsel.

I just wanted to emphasize that the proposed order has been negotiated over really a period of almost two weeks running through this morning, right before the hearing. That it is, as has been mentioned, only an interim order. We all understand that all parties that are secured lenders and so on are reserving all rights that it can be revisited. Andin that regard, we'll certainly keep our eye on collateral value as they trend during the next few weeks.

We urge the court to approve this order on an interim basis and, like everyone else, thank you for your time on short notice via Zoom and CourtCall.

That's all I had, unless you have any questions

about the Sidecar facility and, again, thank you. 1 THE COURT: No thank you. Anybody else? 2 3 MR. PREIS: Yes, Your Honor. This is Arik Preis 4 from Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld. Can you hear me? 5 THE COURT: I can. MR. PREIS: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll be very 6 7 brief. Again, Arik Preis from Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld. We are representing an ad hoc group of second lien 8 noteholders. 9 10 I wanted to confirm three things. One, we do, 11 indeed, agree to the interim order. Two, we are very interested in working with the debtors on their various goals 12 that they've set forth at the beginning that Mr. Lauria went 13 14 through, and we look forward to that. And, three, we very much support many of the statements that were made by Ms. 15 Uhland about the secured party's views with regard to their 16 17 collateral in this order. 18 I have nothing else to say, Your Honor. Do you 19 have any questions? 20 THE COURT: I do not. Thank you. 21 MR. PREIS: Thank you. 22 MS. RICHENDERFER: Your Honor, this is Linda 2.3 Richenderfer. 24 THE COURT: Ms. Richenderfer. 25 MS. RICHENDERFER: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

I would be remised if I didn't say it on the
record that, first of all, this motion was filed without the,
at least, 24 hours' notice that's required under our local
rules. And my concern with that, as I just heard one of the
attorneys describe how this was negotiated over a two-week
period. So, I am not quite sure why this motion was filed
very late last evening, or maybe even this morning. I'm not
quite sure.

I know that around eight or nine o'clock last night, I think I received some draft documents, did not have a chance to review them. And as we've been sitting here during this conference, I keep getting redline new versions of the two new forms of order. I think it's only two. I want to verify that also.

2.3

And so, I am quite concerned. I understand the need for this, but I don't understand why a cash collateral motion wasn't filed in the first instance. And so, I will just say for the record that my office has not had sufficient time to review this or understand the repercussions of this, in any form or fashion.

The fact that it's interim gives me some peace of mind. There were certain provisions though. For instance, I think in both of them part of the adequate assurance package is the payment of fees. And I think that there's a total of seven law firms and three advisors that would be fees. And

the first fee payment would be due ten days after Your Honor enters the interim order.

2.3

And this is part of an adequate protection plan and at this point in time, I don't know that anybody has shown that adequate protection is necessary. I question the immediate payment of such fees which I'm sure will be multimillion dollars from the estate during the interim period and why that can't wait until after the final order, particularly in consideration of the manner in which this has been brought to the court's attention on such short notice and, like I said, in violation of our local rules giving 24 hours' notice for a first day relief.

And so, I don't know if there are any other things that may come out, I reserve the right to address. Oh, I just found my notes. It's eight law firms and three advisors. And I'm sure based on the names, we're going to see many millions of dollars that they're going to seek long before we have the final hearing on this particular motion.

MR. HUEBNER: Your Honor, it's Marshall Huebner from Davis Polk.

By our account, it's actually ten law firms and three financial advisors from (indiscernible). We all knew three weeks ago exactly when the forbearance was terminating which was last Friday night. It's actually quite distressing to hear this was under negotiations (indiscernible).

There are many first day that are filed that have been negotiated further between the filing. Here, obviously, the first day (indiscernible) were not even filed until several days after the petitions which (indiscernible) usual.

By the debtors' own motion, they believe only \$34 million 904 thousand 593 dollars and 37 cents actually constitutes cash collateral. Obviously, the lenders strongly disagree. We, of course, have no information to form a view. But a package like this and, you know, filed at 12:06 a.m. for the very first time on the docket, we didn't even know that there was anything coming. People just happened to be still be awake. It sounds like the U.S. Trustee, at least, got a courtesy copy several hours earlier.

But to authorize, you know, this scope of relief on (indiscernible) information is, at a minimum, at the border of unprecedented. And so, we're not objecting because we don't know enough to object and that amount be appropriate, but we have some pretty grave concern. And I think, like the U.S. Trustee, and probably many other parties, we'll need to understand a lot of this much much better to form a view. We may end up supporting it. We just don't know.

But the second liens, they're the ones out of the money. You know, we just have no idea and this is an awful lot of relief on essentially three business hours' notice and

the filing date was known three weeks ago and this has clearly been in the works for, at least, two weeks. It just doesn't feel comfortable.

MS. STRICKLAND: Your Honor, this is Rachel
Strickland from Willkie Farr & Gallagher. Together with
Young Conaway we represent a significant portion of the \$2.7
billion dollar unsecured senior notes.

We understood that these were involve any fairly fast and furious. We just wanted to raise the fact that we commend the debtors for being cautious with respect to interim relief on cash collateral. We believe that there are significant assets of this estate that are unencumbered and look forward to continuing discussions with the company and with the other parties before any order is entered on a final basis, but we understand the debtors did the very best that they could to not only address issues that were late-breaking, but also to notify parties such as ourselves on an issue as they were evolving in real time.

THE COURT: Anyone else wish to comment?

MR. LOHAN: Yes, Your Honor. This is Brian Lohan from Arnold & Porter. We represent an ad hoc group of term loan lenders. Our lenders are -- or Ms. Uhland's client is the agent for our term loan.

And I just wanted to echo Ms. Uhland's comments,

Mr. Preis' comments. And in hearing the comments that were just made to Your Honor, I just kind of want to take a step back and remind Your Honor that Mr. Turetsky, I think, characterized it very well. This is a very limited adequate protection package. It's also interim relief with everybody's rights reserved.

And us, as the term lenders, as well as Ms.

Uhland's client, Mr. Preis' client, we all believe that it

was more important to save our fights for another day, to the

extent we have to have them at all, and start this bankruptcy

case out on the right foot.

So with that, Your Honor, we would request and support -- we request you enter the order and we support the relief the debtors are asking.

MR. TURETSKY: Your Honor, may I respond?

I think the first thing to remember here is and this was just mentioned by Mr. Lohan. This is interim relief, all rights are reserved, including a right to challenge the adequate protection package retroactively. That's something that is in the order.

So, the parties rights are reserved. We understand it was less than ideal, that this motion was filed last night. I don't believe it's been in negotiation for two weeks. I think it's more like a week. And I will tell you that Your Honor --

(Webex operator comes on)

2.3

MR. TURETSKY: Hello?

THE COURT: Go ahead. We're still on. I don't know why that came up.

MR. TURETSKY: I just heard something and I was in a flow, Your Honor, and now I'm taken out.

We view, you know we recognize it was less than idea that it was filed last night, but I will tell Your Honor that up until late last night we weren't sure we were going to have an adequate protection order.

These were extraordinarily hard-fought negotiations that are very very deeply held views here, and they're different among the various parties, so we really did, you know, negotiate with our secured lenders. It was very hard to get to where we were. And, frankly, I think having gotten where we got to, it was incumbent upon us to file this motion and to preserve the fight for another day.

I do agree with Ms. Uhland. I do not think I said 503(b) but if I did, I was mistaken. It's 507(b).

I think, you know, I heard Mr. Huebner at Davis

Polk, I just, you know, again, I'm not sure what the standing
is here to make the argument. But to the extent that there
is standing, right to preserve, there's a retroactive ability
to challenge it.

As for the fees, Your Honor, Your Honor, the

debtors aren't crazy about paying fees. The debtors have
been very cautious about cash collateral, about how they're
handling their cash, but there are give's and takes to every
deal. And part of the give that the debtors have to give
here was to pay people their reasonable fees.

We do anticipate and we do hope for constructive discussions following this. We believe that this relief is absolutely critical at this point in the case. It's, again, interim relief and all rights are reserved.

I can walk you through the changes that we would - unless you want me to do that first or ask that the court
enter the order and I can walk you through what changes were
made to the order. I'm happy to go either way.

THE COURT: Well go through the changes.

MR. TURETSKY: Okay. And, Your Honor, if you'll indulge me for a moment, I have to pull up the redline to the court. I understand that Your Honor has that redline.

THE COURT: I do.

2.3

MR. TURETSKY: So I am starting with the agreed interim order for the prepetition secured party. There was a change to the order to paragraph two of the order; that's on page 12 of the reline. And that is to define the interim period. That's the period during which the debtors have authority to use the Donlen cash collateral. And I can read that out if people would like.

THE COURT: You should read it out.

2.3

MR. TURETSKY: Okay. And I'll read the whole sentence so that it's in context for people.

The subject to the terms here are Donlen is hereby authorized to use Donlen cash collateral solely in the ordinary course of business and in accordance with past practices. The Donlen's (indiscernible) requirements on general corporate purposes in the allocated costs and expenses of administering and filing Chapter 11 case.

Here is the new language: Until the date after the final hearing or as otherwise ordered by the court. And that's defined as the interim period.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. TURETSKY: And I'm happy to move to the next change, unless Your Honor has reviewed that.

THE COURT: That's fine. Go ahead.

MR. TURETSKY: For the next change it is paragraph 3(c) towards the bottom of the page on page 15, there was language added, and this is in the paragraph that speaks to the adequate protection lien. And this language was added at the request of the debtors' surety. And it reads,

Notwithstanding anything that's contrary to what's herein, no provision of this interim order shall prime, create a rights or interest that pari passu, diminish, or effects any rights including the surety's right of

(indiscernible), claim, lien, interest or remedy of law or inequity with any surety for any of the debtors or any non-debtor affiliates of any of the debtors against any person, entity, assets or the proceeds thereof, whether arising under or in connection with surety bonds or instruments issued by any surety or arising under contract statute or by operation of law by virtue of the equitable lien, equity subrogation, or otherwise, all of which rights, claims, liens, interest, defenses, and remedies are not waived or released and are reserved without limitation.

This is language that was added in response to an informal inquiry from the sureties this morning, having seen the motion, and we ran this language by the prepetition secured parties as well as Sidecar parties. And they were agreeable to putting it in.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. TURETSKY: The next change is actually a change that is not yet been made to the order but -- and we can provide Your Honor with a new order, but it involves striking a phrase.

It is on page 18, paragraph (f). There's a sentence that begins, During the interim period. . .and as know, Your Honor, we just defined the interim period earlier on in the order. This has a reference to the motion. We ask that Your Honor strike that reference to the motion so strike

the (as defined in the motion). 1 2 THE COURT: Where is that? 3 MR. TURETSKY: It's on page 18 of the redline, paragraph (f). The paragraph with the title professional fee 4 5 (indiscernible). THE COURT: I have that. Oh, you're just striking 6 7 the second line of that. Okay. MR. TURETSKY: Just, again, just -- defining the 8 9 term. It's just to make it conforming to the other change that we made. 10 11 THE COURT: Okay. MR. TURETSKY: And then at the end on page 23, 12 we've inserted the language for the final hearing, as well 13 14 as, you know, the objection deadline as well. I don't know 15 if Your Honor would like me to read that into the record as well. I'd be happy to do it but it really is --16 17 THE COURT: That's not necessary. No, that's not 18 necessary. MR. TURETSKY: And then on the Sidecar agreement, 19 20 it's largely conforming changes, but I'm happy to walk Your 21 Honor through that as well. 22 THE COURT: Just send me additional changes. 23 MR. TURETSKY: I don't think there are any

additional changes. I think it includes the language that we

gave the surety. It includes the language on the objection

24

25

```
deadline and (indiscernible) hearing date.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Okay. All right, anything else, then?
               MR. TURETSKY: Other than our humble request that
 3
 4
   you enter the interim order, no.
               THE COURT: Well, I do note the U.S. Trustee's
 5
 6
    objection with respect to the lack of 24 hours' notice, but
 7
    under these unique circumstances, and since it is not a
    contested motion for use of cash collateral, but a consensual
 9
    one and with the protection that you have noted that all
10
    relief for or against the lenders, the subject to challenge
    and retroactive revision, I will enter the orders, the two
11
    orders as revised with those protections afforded to the
12
13
    sureties.
14
               MR. TURETSKY: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: And I will ask that you upload two new
16
    orders, but I don't think you need to file a certification of
17
    counsel with respect to that one additional deletion.
18
               MR. TURETSKY: We'll do so. Thank you, Your
19
   Honor.
20
               THE COURT: Anything else today?
               MR. TURETSKY: Not from me, unless Mr. Lauria has
21
22
    something.
23
               MR. LAURIA: Your Honor, it's Tom Lauria, if I may
   be heard?
24
25
               THE COURT: You may.
```

MR. LAURIA: Thank you. I just wanted to thank
the court again for extending us the courtesy of having this
hearing on such short notice and dealing with the
technological difficulties that we are all facing in trying
to conduct business in this brave new world.

Importantly, just as a follow-up, we want to be able to get the revised cash management order to the court as soon as possible, hopefully in an hour or two so that we can ensure that the internal workings of the company's business can continue without interruption. We'll have a real problem if we can't get that done.

So, I've been pushing everybody sidebar here while the remaining matters have been going forward to get that order finalized. And I trust that we can get that to chambers and get that entered hopefully later today.

THE COURT: Well as soon as it's uploaded, the court will address it.

MR. LAURIA: Right. Thank you.

MS. RICHENDERFER: Your Honor, this is Linda
Richenderfer and as soon as I receive a draft, I will review
it so that it can be submitted to the court as soon as
possible.

THE COURT: All right, have you gotten the drafts that were uploaded this morning?

MS. RICHENDERFER: Your Honor, yes. I've been

following along and have everything as I said the changes to
the cash collateral kept coming in, but I think right now
we're just looking at the matrix and the cash management
orders that would go in under certification of counsel.

THE COURT: Okay. Those two, yes. All right,

THE COURT: Okay. Those two, yes. All right, thank you then.

All right then --

MR. MASON: Your Honor, I --

THE COURT: Go ahead. I'm sorry.

MR. MASON: Excuse me, Your Honor. It's -- my apologies, Ricky Mason from Wachtell Lipton Rosen & Katz. I wasn't sure if anyone else was going to be speaking today, but I'd just like to make a few remarks, if I could, on behalf of the medium term noteholders.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MASON: Thank you, Your Honor. And I'll be very brief and very very much appreciate Your Honor's indulgence. Again, Ricky Mason of Wachtell Lipton Rosen & Katz, Your Honor, representing the steering committee of medium term noteholders, the so-called MTM's that Mr. Lauria had referred to in his presentation.

And I just want to speak briefly on a couple of points raised in his presentation. I'm joined by our Delaware counsel Patrick Jackson of the Faegre firm.

Your Honor, the ABS structure that Mr. Lauria had

referred to has \$11 billion dollars in debt and my purpose here is just to introduce who we are because I think you'll probably see us and hear from us during the course of the case.

About \$11 billion dollars the MTN's or the medium term noteholders are a majority, Your Honor; approximately \$6 billion dollars. We're the largest part, if you will, of the overall capital structure for Hertz. The VFN's represented by Mr. Huebner are the rest of the ABS structure between \$4- and \$5 million dollars, I believe.

The MTN's, Your Honor, are publicly held notes.

They're very broadly held in a market judging from the calls and emails that we've gotten over the past week, broadly held in the institutional market by insurance companies and mutual funds, hedge funds and other assets, managers, Your Honor.

They are, in our view, a critical part of vehicle financing for Hertz and other companies, at a very very low cost.

The debtor has enjoyed and used that financing for many many years. And presumably, we think, intends to enjoy it for many more as time, as things get back to normal and as time progresses. And, in our view, how they (indiscernible) the ABS, the MTM's included in that, will probably be a critical to obtaining that goal, Your Honor, if that is their goal, and we'll hear more from the debtors during the case.

Just very briefly, Your Honor, the steering

committee for the MTM's organized last week, so we have not been involved very long. The steering committee has about a billion dollars in MTM notes itself and its growing. And we're in touch with approximately in total, I think, \$3.5 billion dollars of MTM's, so a very large critical mass, we think, for this case.

We are coordinating with the VFN's represented by Mr. Huebner here with the Davis Polk team, but just wanted to make it clear we are a separate group. And we're not involved in the prepetition negotiations, Your Honor, that Mr. Lauria had referred to.

We do share the VFN's concern that the debtors are leasing effectively our cars, the ABS cars without paying for them. And we understand the equities of the case issued that Mr. Lauria referred to. For our own part, we think using cars without paying for them is not particularly equitable. And the MTM's and the VFN's will be engaging with the debtors in litigation on Section 365 if that is unfortunately necessary.

But we also think it's critical for the debtors, hopefully, to have a dialogue with us as soon as possible.

Mr. Lauria mentioned a proposed framework for a resolution of these cases and of the lease backing the ABS. We're very very anxious, Your Honor, to see his proposal and, frankly, we're ready to roll up our sleeves and engage with him and

his co-advisors and the debtors right after this hearing.

So, I appreciate your time, Your Honor. Thank you for your indulgence. Just wanted to set that out on the record so that you knew who we were.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah and, Your Honor, to supplement that, Judge, for a moment. I do want to end on a hopeful note for all concerned.

Our client group that owes \$4.9 billion dollars is comprised as nineteen of the world's largest (indiscernible). And a number that we all need to keep in mind here because it is an important number is sixteen dollars. And why do I say sixteen dollars? Because the average car in Hertz's fleet depreciates by sixteen dollars a day, roughly, which is sensible. If you own a car and take, you know, five, six thousand dollars a year, it's worth less than the year before.

The problem is when you take \$5800 dollars a year average depreciation and you multiply it by 500,000 cars, you get \$3 billion dollars of lost (indiscernible). Not risk, but actual loss as the fleet depreciates and we're not being paid for it. And so, most of our rent, Your Honor, is actually depreciation rent for the decrease in value of the cars which is \$240 million dollars.

As Mr. Lauria alluded to, there were some conversations that were started. And finally, I'm not going

to get in our views on them which are a little bit different
because it doesn't matter. We stand ready, willing and able
to continue to engage starting thirty seconds after this
hearing ends, Your Honor, to continue the dialogue to figure
out how we can be de-risked fairly through the type of
rationalization that Mr. Lauria referred to, coupled with
payments.

There are going to be many other provisions of the Code given that my client and Mr. Mason's group are owed \$11 billion dollars that are going to be relevant here. You know, we -- I think you know our way, Your Honor. You've seen us for many years. We try to never ever litigate unless there's really no choice.

The goal here is the business deal that saves this iconic company. But if the idea is that they're going to not pay us rent while our fleet depreciates a quarter of a billion dollars every month, which in the bankruptcy world, by the way, is called diminution in value, it's going to be complicated.

So we stand ready, Your Honor. I did want to end on a hope since we have some comments on motions but I wouldn't want anybody to think that we don't believe that their (indiscernible) will be a value maximizing way forward that gives our country, frankly, the right Hertz that can come out of this strong and resilient on the other side.

```
THE COURT: All right, well thank you to
 1
    everybody. And just let me say this bankruptcy works best if
 2
    all the parties are able to work out their differences and
 3
 4
    come together on a consensual path forward. And I am
    encouraged by the party's suggestion that they're willing to
 6
    try that.
 7
               If it is not possible; of course, I'm here and
    available to resolve any disputes, but I think the business
 8
    mentioned take a crack at it first.
 9
10
               All right, I think we are at the end of our
11
    hearing and we'll stand adjourned.
12
               MR. SAGAFI: Your Honor --
13
          (A Chorus of "Thank you, Your Honor")
14
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you.
15
               MR. SAGAFI: Your Honor, I'm sorry. Is there time
16
    for one more comment?
17
               THE COURT: Who is this?
18
               MR. SAGAFI: This is Jihan Sagafi. I represent
19
    the ad hoc group of litigation creditors. And I just wanted
20
    to make sure that our input is considered. I had thirty
21
    seconds if you have time, Your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.
23
               MR. SAGAFI: Thank you, Your Honor.
24
               The ad hoc group stands for tens of thousands of
25
    Hertz's workers and consumers, customers asserting claims in,
```

at least, nineteen different class actions and similar
representative actions pending against the debtors as of the
petition date, in addition to many more individual actions by
workers and consumers.

I, along with other counsel for Hertz's workers
who are asserting wage theft, discrimination and Warn layoff
claims, as well as consumers asserting deceptive practices

to emphasize that fair treatment of these creditor's claims is of paramount legal and moral importance in these cases.

We also hope that the parties will see these class actions and other litigation as providing in addition to an opportunity to fix the capital structure of the company, an opportunity to fix a management culture that has been

claims are coordinating in this effort. And we just wanted

inattentive to worker and consumer rights, giving rise to a significant array of these class actions being litigated around the country.

So we look forward to working with the debtors and our fellow creditors to these ends. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. And with that said, we will stand adjourned.

(A Chorus of "Thank you, Your Honor")
(Proceedings conclude at 2:17 p.m.)

1	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>
2	
3	We, MARY ZAJACZKOWSKI and WILLIAM GARLING, certify that
4	the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic
5	sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled
6	matter.
7	
8	/s/Mary Zajaczkowski May 28, 2020 Mary Zajaczkowski, CET**D-531
9	
10	/s/William J. Garling May 28, 2020 William J. Garling, CE/T 543
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	