IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA ---000---BEFORE THE HONORABLE MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR., JUDGE ---000---UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, No. CR. S-06-035 vs. ZACHARY JENSON, Defendant. ---000---REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT CHANGE OF PLEA TUESDAY, JULY 18, 2006 ---000---Reported by: KIMBERLY M. BENNETT, CSR #8953 RPR, CRR, RMR

For the Plaintiff:

McGREGOR W. SCOTT
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
501 I Street, Suite 10-100
Sacramento, California 95814
BY: R. STEVEN LAPHAM
Assistant U.S. Attorney

ASSISTANCE O.S. ACCOUNTER

ELLEN ENDRIZZI

Assistant U.S. Attorney

For the Defendant:

LAW OFFICE OF SHARI RUSK 1710 Broadway, #111 Sacramento, California 95818 BY: SHARI RUSK Attorney at Law

THE DEFENDANT: No.

25

Your Honor, the defendant will plead guilty to the sole count in the superseding information, and agrees that the factual basis attached to the plea agreement as Exhibit A is accurate. He also agrees to cooperate with the government in its continuing investigation and prosecution of this case.

In return, the government agrees to move at the time of judgment and sentencing to dismiss the indictment and to bring no further charges as a result of the facts contained in Exhibit A.

The government is not otherwise bound with respect to any sentencing recommendation, and may recommend a sentence up to and including the statutory maximum sentence.

There are certain agreements with regard to the guidelines, including the base offense level of 24, decreased by three levels as a result of the conspiracy count, and victim related adjustment of the terrorism enhancement which mandates an offense level of 32 and a criminal history category of 6. The government also agrees to a three-level decrease for acceptance of responsibility.

And, finally, the defendant waives appeal rights and rights to collateral attack.

THE COURT: Mr. Jenson, there are a number of items that were just related by counsel with respect to your agreement. Did you understand all of the terms and conditions of your plea agreement?

found guilty of a felony. The finding of guilt as to a felony offense is a very serious circumstance; do you

25

1 understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Such a finding may deprive you of valuable civil rights, such as the right to vote, the right to serve on the jury, and/or the right to possess any type of firearm; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you on probation or parole for any other offenses?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: The maximum penalty provided by law for a plea of guilty to a conspiracy in violation of 18 United States Code Section 371 is five years of imprisonment, a fine of \$250,000, a special assessment of \$100, and a period of supervised release of up to two years; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: In the event you are released from prison and placed on supervised release and you violate any terms of that release, you could be sent back to prison for up to two additional years without credit for time served; do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: In the event there has been economic loss suffered as a result of your criminal conduct, this Court

will order you pay restitution, unless it determines that restitution is not appropriate; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you discussed with Ms. Rusk the issues of sentencing as they currently stand in the federal court system?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: More specifically, have you discussed with your attorney the sentencing guidelines, although they are advisory at this time, the statutory requirements of 18 United States Code Section 3553(a), and any other factors that may be relevant to you as an individual and/or to this particular offense?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the Court will not be able to determine the precise sentence that you're going to receive in this matter, if there is going to be a sentence, until such time as all cooperation has been completed, there has been a time for comment by counsel, the preparation of the presentence report, and your time to speak to the Court prior to any judgment and sentencing; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that part of your plea agreement requires certain cooperation and certain statements

1 with the government, and do you understand that the 2 determination as to whether or not you have cooperated fully will be a determination made by the Court after consultation 3 4 with the government's attorneys in this matter? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 6 THE COURT: Do you understand that if you are 7 sentenced to federal prison for this offense that you will not be released on parole, as parole has been abolished in 8 9 the federal system? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 11 THE COURT: Do you understand that in accordance with 12 the terms of your plea agreement, you have waived, that means 13 you have given up, your right to collaterally attack your 14 plea today, or appeal from the sentence that the Court may 15 impose in this matter; do you understand that? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Counsel, do you join in your client's 18 waivers? 19 MS. RUSK: Yes, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Mr. Jenson, you have the right to continue to plead not quilty; do you understand that? 21 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 23 THE COURT: That would mean that you would have the

right to continue to proceed to a jury trial; do you

24

25

understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Before I take your plea today, I need to make sure that you understand all of your constitutional rights and are willing to give them all up.

The procedure that I follow is I list each of these rights to you here in open court. At the end, I'm going to ask you two questions, the first being, "Do you understand all of your rights?" The second being, "Are you willing to give them all up?"

Do you understand my procedure?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You have the right to have a trial by jury, the right to be presumed innocent, the right to have the government prove your guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. You have the right to have an attorney at all times. If you cannot afford an attorney, to have one appointed for you at no cost to you. You have the right to present a defense to these charges. You have the right to see and hear all witnesses and evidence that will be presented against you during a trial, and you have the right to cross-examine those witnesses during a trial. You have the right to use the power of this Court to bring any witnesses and evidence on your behalf in order for you to present your defense. You have the right to remain silent. You have the right not to have your silence used against you, or your decision not to

help accomplish it.

Three, one of the members of the conspiracy performed at least one overt act for the purpose of carrying out the conspiracy.

THE COURT: Mr. Jenson, do you understand each of the elements of the offense of conspiracy?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Counsel, will you please set forth a factual basis for this plea today.

Mr. Jenson, once again, listen carefully to the facts as they will be stated in open court.

MR. LAPHAM: Your Honor, I think when I was setting forth the elements I said indictment. Now that he's charged with a superseding information, it would be information.

THE COURT: Understood.

MR. LAPHAM: Your Honor, if this case were to proceed to trial, the government would show the following facts:

In August 2005, the defendant met with Eric McDavid and Lauren Weiner in Philadelphia to discuss ways of forwarding their ideas for protest and activism, including wanting to do something big that would get some notoriety. Among the things that they discussed was using explosives directed at government property and commercial property. Mr. McDavid, one of the co-defendants, first raised that idea, and also talked about specifically targeting cell phones and the United States Forest Service Institute for

Forest Genetics.

During the weekend of November 18th to the 20th, 2005, the defendant met with McDavid, Weiner, and a confidential source working for the government, to discuss further their plans of sabotage. At the outset, Mr. McDavid indicated that the very act of meeting and talking about this was a crime. The defendant agreed with that assessment, and understood that they were planning on committing crimes, and nevertheless proceeded with the conspiracy.

They proceeded to discuss targets, including the cell phone towers and the Institute for Forest Genetics, and also corporate office buildings.

At the conclusion of the meeting in November,

Ms. Weiner, indicated that she would be purchasing a number

of books, including the Poor Man's James Bond, and the

Survival Chemist, both of which have formulas for

manufacturing explosive devices.

From January 8th through the 13th of 2006, the defendant maintained temporary residence at a cabin in Dutch Flat with his coconspirators. During that time he discussed with McDavid and Weiner and the confidential source the plans for using homemade explosive devices and incendiary devices targeted at government and commercial facilities.

On January 10, 2006, the defendant traveled with McDavid and Weiner and the confidential source to the

Institute for Forest Genetics in Placerville to conduct surveillance and reconnaissance using fake names to disguise their true identities.

On January 11, 2006, the defendant was present when chemicals and other paraphernalia were purchased for the construction of explosive devices. He was aware at the time of the purpose for those purchases.

On January 12, 2006, defendants Weiner and McDavid began manufacturing a homemade explosive device for use against one of the targets that they had discussed. The defendant was present at the time, and was aware of the purpose for the concoction of those chemicals.

Finally, on January 13, 2006, the defendant was arrested after purchasing additional items to be used in making destructive devices, including respirator masks and a mixing bowl to replace one that had been damaged the previous day.

THE COURT: Mr. Lapham, would you also indicate the items purchased on January 11th, the canning jars, etc.

MR. LAPHAM: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I think the combination of all these items is such that it should be included in the factual basis.

MR. LAPHAM: On January 11th, the defendants purchased canning jars, coffee filters, a mixing bowl, hot plate and petroleum jelly, a gasoline can, bleach, extension cord and

1 battery testers.

THE COURT: Mr. Jenson, do you agree with the factual basis as just stated by the government's attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: How do you now plead to the count in the information stating a violation of 18 United States Code Section 371 for conspiracy; guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: It is the finding of this Court in the United States versus Zachary Jenson that this defendant is fully competent and capable of entering an informed plea. The Court also finds there has been a factual basis stated for his plea, and that he has made a voluntary, knowing, and intelligent waiver of all of his constitutional rights. His plea is accepted and he is now adjudged guilty of that offense.

Mr. Jenson, a written presentence report is to be prepared by probation to assist the Court in sentencing. You're going to be asked to give information for that report, you can have your attorney present if you so desire. At the time of judgment and sentencing, you will be permitted to speak to the Court, as will your attorney, as well as the government's attorney. You are formally referred to the probation officer for the preparation of that presentence report.

I am setting the date for judgment and sentencing for October 3, 2006 at 8:30 a.m. in this courtroom.

Ms. Rusk, is there anything further at this time?

MS. RUSK: Yes, Your Honor. I don't know if I need to take a minute to talk to the government, but pretrial services had recommended release in Mr. Jenson's case on some conditions. We had a hearing before the magistrate and his release was denied.

Now facts have changed, obviously; he's cooperated and he's pled guilty. The government needs to review the release package. And since he's already pled, the matter can probably be before Your Honor as opposed to a magistrate since it's post guilty plea.

The other thing is, I understand now that -- I had one of the plea agreements filed under seal, since he has cooperated. I understand that I think there is already information that the press may have, and that I'm concerned about his going back to Sacramento County Jail. So, I don't know, we may be able to reach an agreement with the government about how soon this matter can be heard before Your Honor to deal with the issue of his release. But I would like to at least -- if it's not today, at least set a date today.

THE COURT: I think that probably the best thing to do is for you to meet with the government's counsel. To be

quite frank with you, I don't believe that I have the information, even though it's post plea, what would be the change in circumstance that has come about, other than the fact that he has now admitted to the fact of conspiring to construct explosive and incendiary devices to destroy government and commercial property in Northern California, which would seem to present, at least at the outset, the belief that he might be a danger to the community.

MS. RUSK: I think, Your Honor, as a result of the fact that he's cooperated with the government and changed his plea, I think the government may be in a position, since the facts have changed, to recommend release, or to not be opposed to release once they've reviewed this.

THE COURT: Then I will allow this to take place through a review, but I will just advise you that if there is going to be any further review, it's going to be before this Friday as I will not be returning until the following Friday. If you wish to try to short set on special notice, I will be willing to do that.

At this point in time, any request for him to be released will be denied without prejudice as I don't find there has been a change of circumstance, other than the fact that I do find that he would be a potential threat, absent other information than what I have.

MR. LAPHAM: Your Honor, you're saying you would like

to hear it yourself?

THE COURT: Yes, at this point in time.

MR. LAPHAM: Then I suggest we'll meet and confer and we can get back to you before the end of the week.

THE COURT: I understand that there are certain matters that are being dealt with almost as we speak. I am not privy to that information other than what I have seen and heard in the factual basis at this point in time.

MS. RUSK: Is the Court available tomorrow?

THE COURT: I'm going to be in an evidentiary hearing that starts tomorrow at 9:00 o'clock, but I'm not -- unless you're telling me that it's going to be a long hearing, I'm assuming, looking at the way things are, the body language, it probably won't be, and may even be done by writing.

MS. RUSK: That would be fine. Why don't I suggest this, we could present a stipulation in writing, if the government is agreeable, but if we need to be before the Court should we set a time now so that we're here and that Mr. Jenson is brought over?

THE COURT: For a fail-safe, I'll make it 9:00 o'clock a.m. on Friday. That's the 21st of this month. If it's done before then, that's fine, but at least that will be the last day. Everyone will know that at the latest there will be a hearing before me at 9:00 o'clock, and I can schedule around that with my evidentiary hearing at that time.

MS. RUSK: We could submit a stipulation before then.

THE COURT: It may be that after I review the stipulation I may want additional information, which I may bring that up even before Friday. But the main thing right now is that you alluded to the fact that the plea agreement was going to request to be sealed?

MS. RUSK: That was my request. At this point, you know, if the press already knows about it, it may not make much difference, but that was my request, that it not be electronically filed so the other parties would not know of his cooperation while he was sent back to Sac County Jail.

MR. LAPHAM: Well, it seems like closing the barn door after. We certainly have no objection, if you want to seal it, but --

THE COURT: At this point I'm not certain what it would do.

MS. RUSK: I understand, Your Honor. I think it's unfortunate that it happened this way, but there is probably nothing we can do about it.

THE COURT: Under the circumstances, in light of how this has all come about, I don't think there is any other way this could have taken place, other than the fact that I would ask the marshals to please advise the county jail of the fact that there has been a plea here, and the circumstances, so that they can be made aware of the circumstances and take

whatever precautions are necessary to ensure Mr. Jenson's safety while incarcerated in Sacramento County custody.

MS. ENDRIZZI: Your Honor, if I may, I think he's currently in T-SEP, so one of the specific ways of preventing any sort of conflict is to make sure he doesn't have his three hours of release while Eric McDavid does. So that could possibly be --

THE COURT: That's going to be something that I'll deal with the county sheriff's department with, but I think once they've been advised that this is the circumstance that they will know how to make the arrangements as to where to put him and where not to.

Making direct orders to the deputies that are having to deal with the housed inmates can be problematic at times, because when the Court makes them in a vacuum, you're not taking into consideration what they're doing, and I find that it doesn't always work. It usually ends up creating more of a problem in the long run.

So, the general information that's conveyed by law enforcement generally takes care of things.

MR. LAPHAM: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Court is adjourned.

(Court adjourned, 3:27 p.m.)

--000--