

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

1 THOMAS R. BURKE (CA SBN 141930)
2 MONDER KHOURY (CA SBN 312949)
3 JULIA M. QUEIROZ (CA SBN 364116)
4 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
5 50 California Street, 23rd Floor
6 San Francisco, California 94111
7 Telephone: (415) 276-6500
8 Facsimile: (415) 276-6599
9 Email: thomasburke@dwt.com
10 mikekhoury@dwt.com
11 juliaqueiroz@dwt.com

12 Attorneys for Petitioner
13 CALMATTERS

14 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

15 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

16 CALMATTERS,

17 Petitioner,

18 v.

19 BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY
20 OF CALIFORNIA,

21 Respondent.

Case No.

**VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF
MANDATE TO ENFORCE CALIFORNIA
PUBLIC RECORDS ACT**

Case No.

VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE

Petitioner CalMatters petitions this Court for a writ of mandate requiring Respondent the Board of Regents of the University of California (the “Regents”) to promptly and fully comply with the California Public Records Act (“CPRA”). UC Berkeley receives over \$42 million per year in taxpayer-funded institutional and government support to subsidize its athletics operating expenses.¹ The public is entitled to know how those funds are spent. Between September 22 and October 6, 2025, CalMatters submitted numerous CPRA requests to University of California and California State University campuses for records related to payments to student-athletes relating to Name, Image, and Likeness (“NIL”) agreements. Central to this petition are CalMatters’ CPRA requests to the University of California, Berkeley (“UC Berkeley”). Counsel for CalMatters and counsel for the Regents discussed this dispute multiple times since CalMatters made the Request, but were unable to reach a resolution that would provide key information about the tens of millions of dollars that UC Berkeley pays to select athletes to play for the university. The Regents have therefore constructively denied CalMatters’ CPRA requests, leaving CalMatters with no choice but to file this action.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS

1. When public institutions distribute public resources, the public is entitled to know who receives those resources, in what amounts, and on what terms. *See Int’l Fed’n of Pro. & Tech. Eng’rs, Loc. 21 v. Super. Ct.*, 42 Cal. 4th 319, 334 (2007). Consistent with that principle, the compensation paid by the University of California to professors, athletic coaches, administrators, and even student employees working on University of California campuses is publicly available.² For example, UC Berkeley’s head football coach earned \$4,700,500.00 in 2024, its head basketball coach earned \$2,536,667.00, and an assistant football coach earned \$860,000.00.³ Their compensation information is publicly accessible because it is required by

¹ *See, e.g., University of California, Berkeley Student Press Freedom Index*, Knight-Newhouse Coll. Athletics Database, <https://knightnewhousedata.org/fbs/acc/university-california-berkeley> (choose “2025” from dropdown) (last visited Aug. 20, 2025).

² *See Compensation at the University of California: Annual Wage*, Univ. of Cal., <https://awage.prod.finapps.aws.ucop.edu/wage/> (last visited Aug. 20, 2026).

³ *Id.*

1 law. Those disclosures are not treated as an issue of privacy; they are treated as a necessary
2 incident of public accountability.

3 2. The California Public Records Act embodies a “fundamental and necessary”
4 policy of transparency in the conduct of public business. *See Int’l Fed’n*, 42 Cal. 4th at 329.
5 Courts have applied that policy to require disclosure of records showing what public entities pay
6 their workers. *See id.* (granting CPRA petition for writ of mandate, requiring the city to release
7 name, titles, and salaries of its employees); *Sacramento Cnty. Emps.’ Ret. Sys. v. Super. Ct.*, 195
8 Cal. App. 4th 440, 474 (2011) (granting CPRA petition for writ of mandate, requiring the county
9 to release name, titles, and pension amounts of its retired employees).

10 3. Founded in 2015, CalMatters is a nonpartisan, nonprofit newsroom committed to
11 covering California politics and policy. To fulfill its mission to inform the public, CalMatters
12 depends on access to public records. For over a decade, CalMatters has delivered journalism
13 that familiarizes Californians with quality-of-life issues and potential solutions, aimed at effecting
14 reform and promoting accountability among leaders. As a part of its diverse programming,
15 CalMatters covers issues across California’s education system, including protections for
16 transgender athletes in schools, legislative reforms aimed at preventing sexual abuse by
17 educators, and tax dollars spent on intercollegiate athletics—the issue at the heart of this petition.

18 4. UC Berkeley and the Regents have long described intercollegiate athletics as one
19 piece of an overarching educational pursuit, where student-athletes’ academic performance is a
20 focal point of athletic program success. Long before athletes could profit from NIL agreements,
21 the Regents considered student-athletes’ academic performance to be “a central element of
22 annual performance evaluations.”⁴ As well, UC Berkeley specifically noted that its mission is
23 “to support student athletes in developing as independent, self-reliant and successful young
24 adults.”⁵

25
26
27 ⁴ *Regents Policy 3501: Policy on Student Athletes*, Univ. of Cal. Bd. of Regents (May 12, 2016),
<https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/policies/3501.html>.

28 ⁵ Athletic Study Center, *About*, UC Berkeley, <https://asc.berkeley.edu/about> (last visited Aug. 20, 2026).

5. But UC Berkeley’s recent NIL and revenue-sharing plans describe a materially different environment—one organized around personal brands, endorsements, business registries, tax restructuring, NIL collectives, and direct compensation. For example, UC Berkeley launched “Golden, the official Name, Image & Likeness program of Cal Athletics,” described as “a comprehensive set of resources for student-athletes to build their brands and take advantage of NIL.”⁶ Such programs are designed to help student-athletes monetize their NIL through opportunities such as “Appearances and Autograph Sessions,” “Endorsements and Sponsorships,” and “Entrepreneurial Ventures (starting a business or selling clothes, shoes, etc.),”⁷ all of which mark a shift in UC Berkeley’s business relationships with its student-athletes.

6. The landscape for student-athlete compensation has continued to evolve in recent years. For example, the 2025 *House v. NCAA* settlement permitted public universities to directly compensate student-athletes for the first time.⁸ The settlement enabled universities to provide up to \$20.5 million annually to student-athletes through a revenue-sharing pool that may include university funds separate from and in addition to their athletics revenues and other sources.⁹ CalMatters was the first newsroom to detail the sponsorship deals that followed the settlement.¹⁰

7. After the settlement was reached, UC Berkeley’s Chancellor, Richard Lyons, announced that UC Berkeley would participate in the new revenue-sharing model, which permits universities to provide up to \$20.5 million annually to student-athletes.¹¹ In the same

⁶ *Golden (NIL)*, Cal Golden Bears Athletics, <https://calbears.com/sports/2023/7/13/NIL.aspx> (last visited Aug. 20, 2026).

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *In re Coll. Athlete NIL Litig.*, 803 F. Supp. 3d 959 (N.D. Cal. 2025), *appeal dismissed*, No. 25-4185, 2025 WL 2831020 (9th Cir. July 29, 2025), and *objections overruled*, No. 20-CV-03919 CW, 2025 WL 3501920 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2025).

⁹ *See, e.g.*, Knight-Newhouse Coll. Athletics Database, *supra*.

¹⁰ *See* Adam Echelman, *California College Athletes Could Soon Be Paid Directly by Their Schools. Here’s What’s at Stake*, CalMatters (July 3, 2025), <https://calmatters.org/education/higher-education/2025/07/college-athletes-california/>. *See also* Adam Echelman & Erica Yee, *College athletes can now make millions off sponsorship deals. Here’s the first look at California’s numbers*, CalMatters (Mar. 6, 2025), <https://calmatters.org/education/higher-education/2025/03/nil-deals-california-college-athletes-sponsorships/>.

¹¹ Strategic Communications, *A message About UC Berkeley's response to changes in intercollegiate athletics*, UC Berkeley News (June 11, 2025),

statement, Chancellor Lyons explained that UC Berkeley’s revenue-sharing pool “will, in our case, be made up of Athletics revenues, philanthropic funds, and some campus funds.”¹² These payments are funded, in whole or in part, by taxpayer dollars. Notwithstanding, UC Berkeley has not produced records sufficient to show how those public funds are being distributed.

8. To shed light on the distribution of these public funds, CalMatters submitted CPRA requests to sixteen public California universities between September 22 and October 6, 2025. In those requests, Petitioner sought four categories of records:

- a. Any and all payment records to student-athletes as of July 1, 2025, including payments by the university to an athlete for use of their NIL, payments pursuant to the *House v. NCAA* settlement, or any payment by the university to a vendor or intermediary that will distribute dollars to student-athletes;
- b. Any and all contracts made on or after January 1, 2025, including provisional contracts, made between the university and any student-athletes pertaining to their compensation, including but not limited to compensation for their NIL;
- c. Budget information for the 2025-26 school year for each Division I athletic team, including line items that reflect regular expenses and revenue for the academic year, or any payments pursuant to the *House v. NCAA* settlement; and
- d. Reports submitted by student-athletes to the university regarding their NIL transactions since July 1, 2024, including the name of the vendor, the date and dollar value of the transaction, and the type of transaction.

9. In each request, CalMatters requested that if the university determined that personally identifiable information (“PII”) would exempt the request, to redact any such information rather than withhold the records entirely.

<https://news.berkeley.edu/2025/06/11/a-message-about-uc-berkeleys-response-to-changes-in-intercollegiate-athletics/>.

¹² See *id.*; see also Knight-Newhouse Coll. Athletics Database, *supra*.

1 10. This Petition concerns UC Berkeley, the university that has publicly committed
2 significant sums to student-athlete compensation. Specifically, this Petition responds to UC
3 Berkeley's refusal to produce records responsive to categories (a) and (c)—i.e., payment records
4 and contracts pertaining to student-athlete compensation and athletic budget information.

5 Requests to Other Campuses

6 11. In addition to the requests to UC Berkeley, Petitioner submitted the same public
7 records request to fifteen other California public universities. Four universities—Cal State
8 Bakersfield, UC Davis, Cal State Northridge, and Cal State Fullerton—timely responded that
9 they had not made any payments to student-athletes and therefore had no responsive records.
10 CalMatters has also brought a separate action against UCLA for its violations of the CPRA.

11 12. Several universities produced at least partial records, demonstrating that the
12 payment records and contracts Petitioner sought are, in fact, disclosable public records. San
13 Diego State provided information about aggregate payments to athletes on each team, revealing
14 that the university had paid millions of dollars to student-athletes, predominantly male athletes.
15 UC Riverside produced redacted contracts that included information about which team each
16 student played on, showing that only the men's basketball team had been compensated. UC San
17 Diego produced redacted contracts, though without identifying each student-athlete's team. Cal
18 State Long Beach, after initially providing only a template contract, ultimately produced contracts
19 that included dates of payment, though with names and teams redacted. That these universities
20 were able to produce responsive records—while still protecting student privacy—underscores
21 that the exemptions cited by the Regents do not justify wholesale withholding of the requested
22 records.

23 13. The remaining universities—Fresno State, UC Santa Barbara, Cal Poly San Luis
24 Obispo, Sacramento State, and San Jose State—either never substantively responded to
25 Petitioner's requests or provided only template contracts containing no payment information,
26 despite Petitioner's repeated follow-up communications over a period of months. Fresno State,
27 for example, acknowledged the request in October 2025 and stated it would comply by January 2,
28 2026, but has produced nothing despite three follow-up communications. Sacramento State

never even acknowledged the request. These failures are notable because, unlike UC Berkeley, none of these universities affirmatively denied that the requested records are public. Rather, they simply failed to act—conduct that itself violates the CPRA’s mandatory deadlines and constitutes a constructive denial of Petitioner’s requests. That UC Berkeley chose to formally deny the requests, while smaller universities that have spent far less on student-athlete compensation were able to produce responsive records, only highlights the implausibility of Respondent’s position that these records are categorically exempt from disclosure.

14. UC Berkeley, a university that has publicly committed significant sums to student-athlete compensation, has refused to produce any records whatsoever. The facts of the denial are set forth below.

The UC Berkeley Request

15. On September 22, 2025, Petitioner submitted a CPRA request to UC Berkeley (the “UC Berkeley Request”) seeking the same aforementioned categories of records related to student-athlete compensation. A true and correct copy of the request is attached here as **Exhibit A**.

16. On September 30, 2025, UC Berkeley acknowledged receipt of the request. On March 10, 2026—nearly six months after receipt—UC Berkeley denied the UC Berkeley Request. A true and correct copy of the denial is attached here as **Exhibit B**.

17. With respect to payment records responsive to category (a), UC Berkeley claimed that “under state and federal law, the University is generally prohibited from disclosing student records and other personally identifiable information,” citing Government Code §§ 7927.700 and 7927.705 and FERPA. UC Berkeley disregarded CalMatters’ request for records with PII redacted, despite the CPRA’s requirement to disclose nonexempt portions of records after redacting exempt material.

18. UC Berkeley also improperly claimed the requested documents responsive to categories (b)-(c) “are currently in a draft format” and are therefore exempt from disclosure under Government Code §§ 7927.500 and 7927.700. UC Berkeley further invoked inapplicable Government Code § 7922.000, claiming that “the premature release of such document is clearly

1 outweighed by the public interest in withholding the information so as to protect the University's
 2 negotiating position and the overall fairness of [the] negotiation process." UC Berkeley also
 3 claimed the documents were exempt under the attorney-client privilege and attorney work product
 4 doctrine, without any further explanation as to how the privileges apply. Withal, UC Berkeley
 5 stated only that it was "proposing to withhold the document until it has been finalized and
 6 executed," without proposing any procedure or timeline for finalization and execution.

7 *Negotiations with the Regents*

8 19. To streamline its requests and promote efficiency and transparency between the
 9 Parties, CalMatters engaged in a series of discussions with the Regents, including the UC
 10 Berkeley Request.

11 20. Following several months of discussion between the Parties, on May 28, 2026, the
 12 Regents provided a supplemental response on behalf of UC Berkeley, stating that the campus was
 13 willing to provide the following documents:

- 14 a. The total institutional spend on *House v. NCAA* benefits and payments for the
- 15 2025-2026 academic year;
- 16 b. The total number of teams receiving *House v. NCAA* benefits and payments in
- 17 the 2025-2026 academic year;
- 18 c. The total number of institutional student-athlete NIL agreements for the 2025-
- 19 2026 academic year; and
- 20 d. Each university's template NIL License Agreement for the 2025-2026
- 21 academic year.

22 21. A true and correct copy of the May 28, 2026, supplemental response is attached
 23 here as **Exhibit C**.

24 22. Despite the fact that these offered records would lack any substantive value
 25 related to the Request, the Regents have not provided any further responsive information or
 26 records to date.

27 23. The CPRA requires an agency that receives a CPRA request to determine whether
 28 the requested records are exempt from disclosure within strict deadlines and to promptly release

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

all non-exempt records. Gov't Code § 7922.535(a). It does not allow an agency to deny access, to simply ignore a request indefinitely, or to withhold entire records when redaction of exempt information would permit disclosure of the remainder, all while broadly citing exemptions meant to be construed narrowly. *See* Gov't Code §§ 7922.525, .535(a); *see also Versaci v. Super. Ct.*, 127 Cal. App. 4th 805, 818 (2005).

24. Notwithstanding the public's undeniably strong interest in knowing the details of how millions in taxpayer dollars are being expended, the Regents have refused to disclose such records. Their ongoing refusals violate the CPRA and Article 1, § 3 of the California Constitution. CalMatters is left with no choice but to file this action.

PARTIES

25. Petitioner CalMatters is a nonprofit newsroom that covers California politics and affairs. Its ability to serve the public depends in significant part on timely access to public records. CalMatters therefore has a direct and beneficial interest in the Regents' compliance with their legal duties under the CPRA.

26. Created by the California Legislature in 1868, Respondent the Regents make up the governing body of the University of California system and are responsible for the universities' student affairs, governance, compliance, and public engagement, among other duties. According to their bylaws, it is the Regents' mission to act in "the best interests of the people of California."¹³

27. The Regents constitute a state agency under Government Code § 7920.510.

28. The Regents, on behalf of UC Berkeley, maintain, use, and possess the records sought by this Petition.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

29. This Court has jurisdiction under Government Code §§ 7923.000, 7923.105, Code of Civil Procedure §§ 1060 and 1085, and Article VI, § 10 of the California Constitution.

¹³ *See Bylaws 21. Duties and Requirements*, Univ. of Cal. Bd. of Regents, <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/bylaws/bl21.html#bl21.1>.

1 30. Pursuant to Government Code § 7923.100 and Code of Civil Procedure § 394(a),
2 venue is proper in this Court because the Office of the Regents of the University of California is
3 located in Oakland, within Alameda County, and the records sought are situated in the same
4 county.

5 **THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT**

6 31. Under the California Public Records Act, Government Code §§ 7920.000 *et seq.*,
7 “access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business is a fundamental and
8 necessary right of every person in this state.” Gov’t Code § 7921.000. All records “containing
9 information relating to the conduct of the public’s business prepared, owned, used, or retained by
10 any state or local agency” must be made publicly available for inspection and copying upon
11 request, unless they are exempt from disclosure. Gov’t Code §§ 7922.525, .535; 7920.530. If
12 documents contain both exempt and non-exempt material, the government must disclose all non-
13 exempt material. *Id.* § 7922.525. Where an agency invokes a CPRA exemption, “the burden is
14 on the agency to persuade the court that the exemption is appropriate.” *Versaci*, 127 Cal. App.
15 4th at 818 (quoting *Ripskis v. Dep’t of Hous. & Urban Dev.*, 746 F.2d 1, 3 (D.C. Cir. 1984)).
16 Exemptions are construed narrowly. *Id.*

17 32. The law is settled that public entities are required to disclose, at a minimum, the
18 wages that they pay their workers. *See Int’l Fed’n of Pro. & Tech. Eng’rs*, 42 Cal. 4th at 329
19 (granting CPRA petition for writ of mandate, requiring the city to release names, titles, and
20 salaries of its employees); *Sacramento Cnty. Emps.’ Ret. Sys.*, 195 Cal. App. 4th at 474 (granting
21 CPRA petition for writ of mandate, requiring the county to release names, titles, and pension
22 amounts of its retired employees); *San Diego Cnty. Emps. Ret. Ass’n v. Super. Ct.*, 196 Cal. App.
23 4th 1228, 1247 (2011) (same). Such disclosures are vital because they “provide[] information
24 about the government’s management of public f[u]nds, in which the public has a legitimate
25 interest.” *Id.*; *see also Int’l Fed’n*, 42 Cal. 4th at 334 (*citing San Diego Union v. City Council*,
26 146 Cal. App. 3d 947, 955 (1983)) (“Public visibility breeds public awareness which in turn
27 fosters public activism, politically and subtly encouraging the governmental entity to permit
28 public participation in the discussion process. It is difficult to imagine a more critical time for

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

public scrutiny of its governmental decision-making process than when the latter is determining how it shall spend public funds.”). Indeed, UC Berkeley publicizes the wage information of all its employees, ranging from then-Chancellor Richard Lyons, who earned \$631,183.00 in 2024, to student workers earning less than a thousand dollars.¹⁴ By allocating public funds to student-athletes and engaging with them in relationships that increasingly resemble commercial business arrangements, UC Berkeley and other public institutions are operating in a manner that demands greater public access, transparency, and accountability. If the salaries of professors, athletic coaches, and even student workers are subject to mandatory public disclosure, then the payments UC Berkeley makes to student-athletes from public funds must be disclosed as well. As a matter of law and public policy, UC Berkeley cannot escape its obligations under the CPRA.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

For Violations of the California Public Records Act and

Article I, § 3 of the California Constitution

33. CalMatters incorporates herein by reference the above allegations, as if set forth in full.

34. The CPRA and the California Constitution require the disclosure of the records requested by CalMatters.

35. The Regents’ steadfast refusal to provide the requested records violates the CPRA and Article I, § 3 of the California Constitution.

CalMatters therefore requests the following relief:

1. That the Court issue a writ of mandate directing the Regents to promptly provide CalMatters with all requested records except those records or parts thereof that the Court determines may lawfully be withheld;

2. That the Court award CalMatters its attorneys’ fees and costs under Government Code § 7923.115(a) and any other applicable statutes or basis;

3. For all other and further relief that the Court deems proper and just.

¹⁴ See *Compensation at the University of California: Annual Wage*, *supra*.

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

1 DATED: September 10, 2026

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

Thomas R. Burke
Monder M. Khoury
Julia M. Queiroz

4 By: 
5 Thomas R. Burke

6 Attorneys for Petitioner
7 CALMATTERS

VERIFICATION

I, John D’Anna, am the managing editor for CalMatters. I have read this Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate and am informed, and do believe, that the matters herein are true. On that ground I allege that the matters stated herein are true.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: September 10, 2026

Signed by:

 5BDAABEFC624497
 John D’Anna

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

EXHIBIT A

From: **Adam Echelman** <aechelma@calmatters.org>

Date: Mon, Sep 22, 2025 at 3:51 PM

Subject: Athletics PRA requests

To: Pra Departmental <pra@berkeley.edu>, Justin DiTolla <jdittolla@berkeley.edu>

Hi Justin and the public records team at Cal,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing to make four separate public records requests:

1. I'm seeking any and all payment records to student athletes as of July 1, 2025. This could include, but is not limited to, payments by the university to an athlete for use of their NIL, payments pursuant to the House v. NCAA settlement, or any payment by the university to a vendor or intermediary that will distribute dollars to student athletes. If you determine that personally identifiable information would exempt this request, I ask that you simply redact any personally identifiable information.
2. I'm also seeking any and all contracts made on or after January 1, 2025, including provisional contracts, made between the university and any student athletes pertaining to their compensation, including but not limited to compensation for their name, image and likeness. If you determine that personally identifiable information would exempt this request, I ask that you simply redact any personally identifiable information.
3. I'm seeking a copy of budget information for the 2025-26 school year for each of your Division 1 athletic teams. This should include line items that reflect regular expenses and revenue for the academic year, as well as line items that include any and all payments pursuant to the House v. NCAA settlement.
4. Finally, I'm seeking a copy of reports submitted by student athletes to the university regarding their NIL transactions since July 1, 2024. This should include the name of the vendor, the date of the transaction, the cost of the transaction in dollar value, and the type of transaction, such as "social media." The format should be very similar in format to the document provided late last year (attached). It should also include any or all information submitted via NIL Go, such as any deals reported or any recipients or vendors who have signed up via NIL Go. If you determine that personally identifiable information would exempt this request, I ask that you simply redact any personally identifiable information.

Article 1, § 3(b)(2) of the California Constitution expressly requires you to broadly construe all provisions that further the public's right of access, and to apply any limitations on access as narrowly as possible. I also want to note that Government Code § 6253(d) prohibits the use of the 10-day period, or any provisions of the CPRA or any other law, "to delay access for purposes of inspecting public records."

Thanks so much,

Adam

--
Adam Echelman (he/him/his)
Higher education/workforce reporter

CAL MATTERS

calmatters.org

Twitter: [@adamechelma](https://twitter.com/adamechelma)

Cell: [508-904-9041](tel:508-904-9041)

EXHIBIT B

From: UC Berkeley Public Records Office <nra@berkeley.edu>

DocuSign Envelope ID: BC45BB6F-F56F-8DC6-8020-DCE064DA4ED6

Date: Tue, Mar 10, 2026 at 4:31 PM

Subject: PRA Request: NIL and Athletics Budget Data

To: Adam Echelman <aechelman@calmatters.org>

Dear Mr. Echelman:

This is to acknowledge and respond your updated California Public Records Act (CPRA) request below.

In response to your request #1, under state and federal law, the University is generally prohibited from disclosing student records and other personally identifiable information. Please see Government Code sections 7927.700 and 7927.705, as well as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. section 1232g).

In response to your requests #2 and #3, the requested documents are currently in a draft format, which is exempt from disclosure pursuant to Government Code sections 7927.500 and 7927.700. In addition, Government Code section 7922.000 which permits the University to withhold records where the public interest in withholding the information clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure. The premature release of such document is clearly outweighed by the public interest in withholding the information so as to protect the University's negotiating position and the overall fairness of negotiation process. Both of these significant public interests would be severely compromised by the premature release of these documents. Furthermore, we are only proposing to withhold the document until it has been finalized and executed. These documents are also exempt from disclosure pursuant to the attorney-client privilege and attorney work product doctrine (Government Code Section 7927.705).

In response to your request #4, we are searching and collecting for the documents that are responsive to your request. We are striving to produce the non-exempt records in the next two to three week if not sooner.

Regards,

Liane Wong
Director of Public Records Office

Public Records Office
University of California, Berkeley

EXHIBIT C

Queiroz, Julia

From: David Zonana <David.Zonana@ucop.edu>
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2026 5:04 PM
To: Burke, Thomas; Rice, David; Khoury, Mike; Queiroz, Julia; Daniel Scannell; Michelle Kim
Subject: RE: UC NIL Contracts CPRA

[EXTERNAL]

Tom:

I write to follow up on our conversation yesterday and your request that UC provide a written statement of the records that UCB and UCLA are prepared to provide in response to your client's CPRA request (in addition to records already provided). After further discussion with the two campuses, both are prepared to provide the following:

1. Total institutional spend on *House v. NCAA* benefits and payments for the 2025-2026 academic year;
2. Total # of teams (if applicable, Olympic sports are counted as 1 team) receiving *House v. NCAA* benefits and payments in the 2025-2026 academic year;
3. Total # of institutional student-athlete NIL agreements for 2025-2026 academic year; and
4. Each campus's 2025-2026 NIL License "template".

As I stated on our call, UC believes this production strikes a reasonable balance between the public interest in knowing how much money UCB and UCLA are spending on NIL, while protecting our student athletes' legitimate privacy interests and the public interest in preserving UCB and UCLA's ability to hold their own in a highly competitive environment where they compete directly with private universities that are not subject to public disclosure laws.

As we also discussed, our impression is that with regard to the other five campuses, your client is largely satisfied, although there may be a few loose ends to be addressed. We are available at your convenience to drill down on any outstanding items. We also appreciate your commitment to provide UC with a response and notice prior to initiating any legal action. Concerning your question on venue, I have an inquiry into our litigation colleagues but have not received a reply yet.

Sincerely,
David

David A. Zonana

Principal Counsel - Educational Affairs & Governance
UC Legal -- Office of the General Counsel
1111 Franklin Street, Oakland, CA 94607
(510) 987-9231 (w) / (510) 913-3577 (m)

PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION -- This e-mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee named above and may contain information that is privileged and confidential attorney-client communications and/or attorney work product. Any dissemination, distribution or copying is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please inform the sender of the error and permanently delete it from your email account and all servers.