1	JEROME J. SCHLICHTER (SBN 0545	513)							
2	jschlichter@uselaws.com MICHAEL A. WOLFF (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> )								
3	mwolff@uselaws.com JOEL D. ROHLF (admitted pro hac vie	ce)							
4	jrohlf@uselaws.com SCHLICHTER BOGARD, LLP 100 South Fourth Street, Suite 1200								
5	100 South Fourth Street, Suite 1200 St. Louis, MO 63102								
6	Telephone: (314) 621-6115 Facsimile: (314) 621-5934 Lead Counsel for All Plaintiffs								
7	Steven M. Goldsobel (SBN 166405)								
8	steve@sgoldsobel.com Law Offices of Steven Goldsobel, A Professional Corporation								
9	1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1750 Los Angeles, CA 90067								
10	Telephone: (310) 552-4848 Facsimile: (310) 695-3860								
11	Local Counsel for All Plaintiffs		X O V P T						
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA								
13	WESTER	RN DIVISION							
14	ALLEN MUNRO et al.,	CASE NO. 2:	16-cv-06191-VAP-E						
15 16	Plaintiffs,								
17	V.	DECLARAT WOLFF	TION OF MICHAEL A.						
18	UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA <i>et al.</i> ,	Hon. Virginia	A Phillins						
19	Defendants.		: August 14, 2023						
20	· ·	Time: Place:	2:00 p.m. Courtroom 8A						
21		Tiucc.	350 West 1st Street Los Angeles, CA 90012						
22			2001mge100, 01170012						
23									
24									
25									
26									
27									
28									

I, MICHAEL A. WOLFF, hereby declare and state:

- 1. I am a partner at the law firm of Schlichter Bogard, LLP (formerly named Schlichter Bogard & Denton LLP). I am one of the attorneys representing the plaintiffs and the class in this matter. This declaration is submitted in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorneys' Fees, Reimbursement of Expenses, and Incentive Awards for Class Representatives.
- 2. I am admitted pro hac vice in this case (Doc. 38) and have been involved in all aspects of this litigation. If called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the facts set forth below as I know them to be true based upon my own personal knowledge or upon my review of the records and files maintained by the firm in the regular course of its representation of Plaintiffs in this case.
- 3. This action commenced on August 17, 2016. It has been my experience that retirement plan participants are reluctant to serve as named plaintiffs and class representatives in class actions because of the commitment of time and resources necessary to prosecute those actions, being subject to examination at deposition and at trial, and for fear of retaliation or alienation.
- 4. Class Counsel prepared and served on Defendants an interrogatory and 47 requests for production of documents. Class Counsel also issued subpoenaes duces tecum to seven third parties: Fidelity Investments Institutional Operations Company, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America and Annuity Association of America-College Retirement Equities Fund (twice), CapFinancial Partners, LLC, the Prudential Insurance Company of America, the Vanguard Group, Inc., Ropes & Gray, LLP, and the California Institute of Technology.
- 5. Defendants produced 38,353 documents and third parties produced 7,028 documents. In addition, in response to Plaintiffs' second subpoena duces tecum, TIAA produced more than 2,000,000 pages of documents. The documents were produced in electronic format and had to be stored by Class Counsel on its ESI storage system.

- 6. Defendants issued to the Class Representatives four sets of interrogatories and three sets of requests for production of documents. Class Counsel discussed these discovery requests with the Class Representatives and assisted them in responding.
- 7. Class Counsel took the depositions of eight University of Southern California current or former executives and three of Defendants' expert witnesses.
- 8. Defendants took the depositions of each of the eight Class Representatives and Plaintiffs' five expert witnesses. Class Counsel prepared each of them for their depositions and defended those depositions. Plaintiffs' depositions lasted 4 hours (Clark), 3.75 hours (Dickman and Olson), 6.5 hours (Munro), 4.5 hours (Singleton), 3.5 hours (Snyder), 3 hours (Wheeler), and 2.75 hours (Wolgemuth). Class Counsel met with each Class Representative in person to prepare for the depositions and attended the depositions in person with each Plaintiff.
- 9. The Class Representatives stayed apprised of the proceedings at each stage of the case. Throughout the course of the litigation, the Class Representatives remained in regular contact with Class Counsel through e-mail, telephone calls, video conference, and written correspondence.
- 10. Each Class Representative sat for a deposition and assisted with preparing their declarations in support of class certification and responding to Defendants' discovery requests.
- 11. Class Counsel intended to call Plaintiffs Allen Munro, Steven Olson, Corey Clark, Jane Singleton, and Dion Dickman to testify at trial, and spent several hours preparing for their testimony. The other Class Representatives also discussed issues in this case with Class Counsel to assist Class Counsel in preparing for trial.
- 12. The parties engaged in two mediations: on July 2, 2019 with David Geronemous of JAMS (Doc. 148) and on June 28, 2022 with Robert Meyer of JAMS (Doc. 263). Thereafter, the parties engaged in further repeated settlement negotiations in December 2022, separately and with the assistance of JAMS

mediator, Robert Meyer. Negotiations continued until the parties reached a settlement in principle on the evening before trial. The parties continued negotiating final terms, and Plaintiffs filed the Settlement Agreement on February 23, 2023. Class Counsel provided the terms of the tentative settlement and the Settlement Agreement to the Class Representatives, who provided their approval on behalf of the Class to Class Counsel.

13. Over the course of litigation through May 8, 2023, Class Counsel have expended 13,285 attorney hours and 1,393 non-attorney hours on this case, for a total attorney and staff expenditure of 14,678 hours. The chart below shows the amount of hours spent by attorneys and staff broken down by experience:

Total	14,678.50		\$ 13,713,525
	1,393.30		\$ 589,709
Staff	10.40	\$ 190	\$ 1,976
Paralegal	1,340.90	\$ 425	\$ 569,883
Law Clerk	16.30	\$ 425	\$ 6,928
IT	25.70	\$ 425	\$ 10,923
Staff	Hours	Rate	Total
	13,285.20		\$ 13,123,817
0-4 Years	1,028.10	\$ 635	\$ 652,844
5-14 Years	7,427.30	\$ 840	\$ 6,238,932
15-24 Years	1,877.00	\$ 1,165	\$ 2,186,705
25 Years +	2,952.80	\$ 1,370	\$ 4,045,336
Attorneys	Hours	Rate	Total

14. Detailed billing records can be made available for the Court's review upon request.

15. The rates included in the above chart were approved for Class Counsel in a similar ERISA fiduciary-breach action in *Ford v. Takeda Pharms. U.S.A., Inc.*, No. 21-10090, 2023 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93286, at \*6–7 (D. Mass. Mar. 31, 2023). They were provided by Sanford Jay Rosen, a founding partner of Rosen, Bien & Galvin, LLP, a 27-lawyer litigation firm in San Francisco and a recognized national expert

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

on prevailing rates for complex class action attorneys, who testified that the above rates were reasonable based on the current legal market, Schlichter Bogard's extensive experience in ERISA class actions, and the fees charged by national attorneys of equivalent experience, skill, and expertise in complex class actions. Ford, No. 21-10090, Doc. 109 at 2, 21-25 (Jan. 20, 2023) (declaration). See Declaration of Jerome J. Schlichter ¶41. 16. The above chart provides a lodestar cross check for Class Counsel's request for a one-third fee of \$4,350,000. That award constitutes a lodestar multiplier of nothing like even a straight hourly rate, much less any award for risk. It is merely a fraction of the lodestar of 0.32—an award of only 32% of a reasonable hourly rate. To compensate attorneys for the risk they undertake in contingency fee arrangements, courts usually award more than the lodestar amount, including multiples of 1.5–3 times the lodestar. See, e.g., Campos v. Converse, Inc., No. 20-1576-JGB, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 147715, at \*15 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2022). 17. Even if the Class Counsel were allowed only half of the hours they expended on this case or were paid at rates that were half the market rates allowed in *Ford*, which would be far lower than the rates that were allowed in *Marshall v*. Northrop Grumman Corp., No. 16-6794-AB, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 177056, at \*20 (Sep. 18, 2020), and In re Northrop Grumman Corp. ERISA Litig., No. 06-6213-AB, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 223293, at \*16 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2017), the requested one-third fee award still would not fully compensate Class Counsel for its time, or anything for the massive risk incurred. 18. Class Counsel have continued to and will spend time on this case in discussing the notice procedure with the Settlement Administrator and the Independent Fiduciary, coordinating conclusion of the settlement procedure with opposing counsel, preparing and filing documents with the Court to conclude the settlement process, responding to Class member inquiries, and attending the final

approval hearing on August 14, 2023. Class Counsel will not be compensated for

10

11

27

28

24

any of this work.

19. Class Counsel incurred \$1,184,891.40 in litigation expenses. Below is a list of expenses:

Depositions	\$	64,225.25
Experts and Consultants		882,635.17
Filing Fees, Hearing Transcripts, Subpoena Services and Related Costs	\$	6,743.15
Mediation	\$	29,078.63
Copies and Postage	\$	16,702.10
ESI expenses	\$	89,805.71
Research and Investigation	\$	5,285.03
Travel and Lodging	\$	55,849.55
Trial Expenses	\$	34,566.81
Total Expenses	\$	1,184,891.40

- 20. "Depositions" refers to costs for deposition transcripts and video recording in this case.
- 21. "Experts and Consultants" are the costs for the experts and consultants that Class Counsel utilized in this case.
- 22. "Filing Fees etc." refers to costs related to obtaining admission of Class Counsel pro hac vice, service of summonses and subpoenaes, costs for court hearing transcripts, and court filing fees.
- 23. "Mediation" refers to the charges of the two mediators that the parties used in this case.
- 24. "Copies and Postage" refers to costs for delivering documents in this case to the Class Representatives and courtesy copies to the Court and the cost of printing those documents.
  - 25. "ESI Expenses" refers to the cost for ESI storage and organization.
- 26. "Research and investigation" refers to Lexis, Westlaw, and PACER charges for research related to this case.
- 27. "Travel and Lodging" refers to the costs for traveling and accommodations of Class Counsel for meetings with the Class Representatives and other class members (\$2,029), attending court hearings (\$9,264), arguing Defendants' appeal

of the Court's denial of the motion to compel arbitration (\$1,847), attending depositions (\$12,968), attending two mediations (\$2,704), meeting with proposed Class Representatives for declarations and attending the hearing on class certification (\$2,173), preparing for, meeting with Class Representatives, and attending trial (\$24,511), and attending the hearing on preliminary approval of the settlement of this case (\$354). (All amounts are rounded).

- 28. Class Counsel paid all of these expenses when they were incurred. Class Counsel paid other expenses related to this litigation in excess of \$19,000, of which they are not seeking payment from the Gross Settlement Fund.
- 29. On or about June 15, 2023, the settlement administrator sent notices to Class members. In total, approximately 58,846 notices were sent. The Settlement Agreement and Plaintiffs' memorandum in support of preliminary approval have been published on the website www.usc403bsettlement.com since March 31, 2023.
- 30. Class Counsel has not received any objections from Class members to Class Counsel's request for one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount as attorneys' fees, reimbursement of expenses of up to \$1.5 million, or incentive awards of \$25,000 for each Class Representative.
- 31. In accordance with Article 3 of the Settlement Agreement, Defendants engaged Gallagher Fiduciary Advisors LLC to be the Independent Fiduciary for the Plans to review the Settlement Agreement and determine whether to approve and authorize the settlement on those terms on behalf of the Plans in accordance with the requirements of ERISA Prohibited Transaction Class Exemption 2003-39, as amended. That review included the provisions for payment to Class Counsel of fees equal to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount (\$4,350,000) and expenses up to \$1,500,000 and payment to each Class Representative of \$25,000 as an incentive award. Doc. 362-1 §7.1. On June 29, 2023, the Independent Fiduciary informed counsel of its approval and authorization of the Settlement Agreement.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. Executed on June 30, 2023 /s/ Michael A. Wolff Michael A. Wolff 

No. 2:16-cv-06191-VAP-E