28 WYNNE LAW FIRM 100 DRAKES LANDING ROAD SUITE 275 GREENBRAE, CA 94904 (415) 461-6400

27

individual choice based). Hildreth Decl., ¶ 6. ..instead the Evidence Code 803: Improper Sustained: survey is designed to determine Assumptions. Hildreth's Overruled: X whether individual class members opinion should be struck

Case3:09-cv-03111-JSW Document116-2 Filed06/12/14 Page137 of 156

	<u> </u>		
1	were misclassified based on their	because it is based in improper	
2	job duties and where they spent	assumptions. <i>Hyatt v. Sierra</i>	
	their time.	Boat Co. (1978) 79 Cal.App.3d	
3		325, 337; Sacramento & San	
4		Joaquin Drainage Dist. Ex rel. State Reclamation Bd. v. Reed	
		(1963) 215 Cal.App.2d 60, 68.	
5		Hildreth misstates the purpose	
6		of the survey, which is to	
7		measure variation.	
′		Construction	
8	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 6.	Conslusory. Impermissible legal opinion.	Sustained: X
9	A trial plan based on random	Legal expert witnesses must be	Sustamou. 11
	sampling in this action cannot	qualified as such. Cal. Evid.	Overruled:
10	estimate the proportion of the	Code §§ 720, 801. The proper	
11	class that was misclassified, if	interpretation of a statute,	
12	any, and cannot determine whether individual class members	regulation or other law is an issue of law for the court to	
	whether individual class members were misclassified.	determine and expert	
13		testimony on such matters is	
14		therefore inadmissible. See	
1.5		e.g., Summers v. A.L. Gilbert	
15		Co. (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 1155, 1178 [whether a duty	
16		exists]; West v. Sundown Little	
17		League of Stockton, Inc.	
		(2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 351	
18		[whether defendant	
19		significantly enhanced risk of	
20	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 7.	plaintiff's injury]. Conclusory.	Sustained:
20	The degree of variation in the	Conclusory.	
21	elements to be measured may be		Overruled: X
22	such, especially in small		
	populations, that sampling is not		
23	an efficient way to proceed. Hildreth Decl., ¶ 8.	Incomplete hypothetical,	Sustained:
24	Let us suppose that the true	irrelevant.	Dastamod.
25	(unknown) population value is 5,		Overruled: X
	but using the sample you estimate		
26	7.7, with a 40 percent (relative to		
27	the estimated mean) margin of error at a 95 percent confidence		
	interval.		
28	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 8. Hearing	Impermissible legal opinion,	Sustained: X
.			

WYNNE LAW FIRM
100 DRAKES LANDING ROAD
SUITE 275
GRIEENBRAE, CA 94904
(415) 461-6400
WWW.WYNNELAWFIRM.COM

Case3:09-cv-03111-JSW Document116-2 Filed06/12/14 Page138 of 156

1	testimony from a randomly selected subset of the population	conclusory, speculation, and incomplete hypothetical.	0 1 1
2	may be efficient at trial, but as the example above demonstrates, it is	,	Overruled:
3	hardly representative or accurate		
4	of all class members, and certainly affects the aggregate		
5	potential liability of the defendant.		
6	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 10.	Lacks foundation, conclusory,	Sustained: X
7	then the Court, if it relied upon	and based on speculation.	Sustained:
8	the survey to select a sample of testifying class members at trial,		Overruled:
9	would select the wrong number of		
10	testifying witnesses for the sample and potentially arrive at		
11	the wrong conclusion. Hildreth Decl., ¶ 12.	Conclusory and based on	Sustained: X
12	The process of designing the	speculation.	
13	questionnaire, and the questionnaire itself, is flawed.		Overruled:
14	Not only is information absent		
	from plaintiffs as to the process of		
15	designing the questionnaire, the		
16	questionnaire will produce biased responses and lead to the wrong		
17	conclusions from the data.		
	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 14.	Lacks foundation.	Sustained: X
18	Dr. Krosnick has obviously decided		Overruled:
19	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 14.	Impermissible legal opinion.	Sustained: X
20	to (1) measure the outside sales		Overruled:
21	exemption with no proposal to address the administrative and		
22	commissioned sales exemptions;		
	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 15.	Impermissible legal opinion.	Sustained: X
23	Dr. Krosnick appears to think that the question on whether an		Overruled:
24	individual BBO was correctly		
25	classified as exempt simply		
26	revolves around estimating the number of hours spent working		
	inside or outside of US Bank		
27	premises.	Y 1	
28	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 16. Administrative exemption. I have	Irrelevant. The survey is intended to measure variation,	Sustained: X
	Administrative exemption. I have	michiged to measure variation,	Overruled:

WYNNE LAW FIRM
100 DRAKES LANDING ROAD
SULTE 275
GREENBRAF, CA 94904
(415) 461-6400
WWW.WYNNELAWFIRM.COM

Case3:09-cv-03111-JSW Document116-2 Filed06/12/14 Page139 of 156

- 1			
1	been advised by defense counsel	not exemptions.	
2	that if the Court is to determine		
3	whether BBOs are properly classified as exempt under the		
3	administrative exemption, this		
4	entails a consideration of the type		
5	of duties performed as a BBO that		
	qualifies for the administrative		
6	exemption whether or not those		
7	duties are performed inside U.S.		
	Bank property. A second requirement is that the number of		
8	overtime hours be estimated.		
9	From the set of estimates from the		
10	survey, the Court will then decide		
10	how many class members to call		
11	to testify at trial.		
12	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 17 and even if related to sales	Impermissible legal opinion.	Sustained: X
12	activities may still constitute		Overruled:
13	administratively exempt work.		
14	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 18.	Assumes facts not in evidence.	Sustained: X
ĺ	Not only is "work" not defined	The testimony misstates the	Overruled:
15	sufficiently, but also the question	purposes of the survey. The	Overruleu
16	of work (as defined) does not	survey is not intended to	
, ,	measure liability Hildreth Decl., ¶ 18.	measure liability. Assume facts not in evidence.	Cystoin od. W
17	This is not a sufficient measure to	The testimony misstates the	Sustained: X
18	establish liability in this matter. I	purposes of the survey. The	Overruled:
19	am informed by counsel for	survey is not intended to	
	U.S. Bank that liability needs to	measure liability.	
20	be established on a work-week by		
21	work-week basis for each and every week the individual worked		
	at U.S. Bank as a BBO.		
22	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 19.	Assumes facts not in evidence.	Sustained: X
23	The problem for Dr. Krosnick is	The testimony misstates the	
24	that first the liability issue needs	purposes of the survey. The	Overruled:
24	to be measured on a work-week	survey is not intended to	
25	by work-week	measure liability.	
26	basis. Hildreth Decl., ¶ 19.	Lacks foundation, conclusory	Sustained:
	Asking respondents to form some	and based on speculation.	
27	average in their head in the space	The sasta of spectrumon.	Overruled: X
28	of a few seconds, or even		
	minutes, is inviting inaccuracy		

WYNNE LAW FIRM

100 DRAKES LANDING ROAD

SUITE 275

GREENBRAE, CA 94904

(415) 461-6400

WWW.WYNNELAWEIRM.COM

Case3:09-cv-03111-JSW Document116-2 Filed06/12/14 Page140 of 156

1	into the results.		
2	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 19.	Assumes facts not in evidence.	Sustained: X
	If liability is to be determined	The testimony misstates the	Overruled:
3	accurately on a work-week by	purposes of the survey. The	Overfuled.
,	work-week basis	survey is not intended to	
4		measure liability.	
5	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 19.	Assumes facts not in evidence.	Sustained: X
	The average has no meaning for	The testimony misstates the	Overruled:
6	the definition of liability if	purposes of the survey. The	O verranea.
7	liability is to be established on a	survey is not intended to	
′	workweek by work-week basis.	measure liability.	
8	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 20.	Assumes facts not in evidence.	Sustained: X
	and arrive at an average for	The testimony misstates the	Overruled:
9	use in a legal setting where	purposes of the survey. The	` <u> </u>
10	accuracy is not only required, it	survey is not intended to	
	can affect the defendant's	measure liability.	
11	aggregate liability.	Impormissible less leninies	Sustained: X
12	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 21. Further, the declarations (signed	Impermissible legal opinion. Improper subject for expert	Sustained
	under oath) gathered by U.S.	opinion. Conclusory, assumes	Overruled:
13	Bank in opposing class	facts not in evidence and calls	
14	certification (which I've	for speculation.	
17	previously reviewed) indicate that	ior specialism.	
15	the nature of the BBO position at		
1.0	U.S. Bank may make it highly		
16	unlikely that the same procedures		
17	will be followed from one work		
	week to another (let alone from		
18	one year to another) and that the		
19	usual and unusual occur at near		
	random intervals throughout their		
20	work tenure. Some weeks they		
21	would have high sales, some		
21	weeks low sales. Some weeks		
22	may require more hours to meet		
22	outside clients, some weeks		
23	would see more hours inside a		
24	branch processing client loan		
	applications. The survey does not test for this potential variation		
25	that may impact not only a class		
26	member's work hours but also the		
	percentage of time spent outside		
27	the Bank or conducting other		
28	exempt work. What Dr.		
20	Krosnick's assumption (in		
1			

WYNNE LAW FIRM

100 Drakes Landing Road

Sutte 275

Greenbraf, CA 94904

(415) 461-6400

WWW.WYNNELAWFRM.COM

Case3:09-cv-03111-JSW Document116-2 Filed06/12/14 Page141 of 156

1	paragraph 28) does illustrate is		
2	Plaintiff's view of the BBO world		
_	under which the survey		
3	questionnaire has been drafted.		
4	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 22.	Lacks foundation, conclusory	Sustained:
4	Further to the measurement	and based on speculation.	Overruled: X
5	issues, the survey data will be		<u></u>
	biased in a number of ways. The		
6	direction and magnitude of that		
7	bias to a large extent is unknown.		
	Hence any measurement or		
8	estimated statistics (such as an estimate and its associated margin		
9	of error) from the data will		
9	equally be biased and		
10	inconsistent. Statistics from such		
,	data should not be relied upon.		
11	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 25.	Lacks foundation, conclusory	Sustained: X
12	The design of the survey further	and based on speculation.	
	emphasizes that plaintiff wishes	1	Overruled:
13	to use the individual's self-serving		
14	bias to his favor by essentially		
_	bribing the respondents to take		
15	part in the survey. While survey		
16	method does allow respondents to		
	be compensated by way of a		
17	small token as a "thank you" for		
18	their time, \$25 for a 20 minute		
ŀ	interview is tantamount to a bribe.	Lacks foundation, conclusory	Sustained:
19	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 26. However, even if such monies	and based on speculation.	Sustameu.
20	were not promised for survey	and based on speculation.	Overruled: X
20	response up front, self-serving		
21	bias would also operate through		
,,	the potential for financial gain		
22	from a decision in		
23	plaintiff s favor in the lawsuit.		
	The problem for surveys that deal		
24	with individuals who stand to		
25	gain from the survey results if		
	they are in their favor, is that		
26	responses are altered to suit their		
27	desired outcome. Asking		
	individuals about the hours they		
28	worked, where they are either		
	aware of the lawsuit, or are being		

WYNNE LAW FIRM
100 DRAKES LANDING ROAD
SUITE 275
GREENBRAE, CA 94904
(415) 461-6400
WWW.WYNNELAWERM.COM

Case3:09-cv-03111-JSW Document116-2 Filed06/12/14 Page142 of 156

1	asked about their effort as an		
	employee at U.S. Bank, will self-		
2	serve and provide an inflated		
3	response.		
١	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 27.	Assumes facts not in evidence.	Sustained:
4	Where the respondent is also the	2 200 4111 2 200 211 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	
_	actual subject of the survey itself,		Overruled: X
5	then a self-serving bias to some		
6	degree will be present, although		
0	the magnitude of that bias		
7	will remain unknown.		
	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 28.	Lacks foundation, conclusory	Sustained: X
8	This is a strange term for a survey	and based on speculation.	
9	that is required to collect precise	and based on spectation.	Overruled:
	economic measurements on time		
10	spent in various activities.		
11	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 28, ftnt 6.	Lacks foundation, conclusory	Sustained: X
11	Confidentiality for respondents in	and based on speculation.	
12	this instance is simply a way to	and based on spectation.	Overruled:
	hide individual responses		
13	from being examined and cross-		
14	checked.		
17	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 31.	Lacks foundation, conclusory	Sustained: X
15	Asking respondents to merely	and based on speculation.	
1.0	reconfirm their own answers will		Overruled:
16	not remove the uncertainties.		
17	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 31.	Lacks foundation, conclusory	Sustained:
	The type of reconfirming exercise	and based on speculation.	
18	(given in Question 18 of the	1	Overruled: X
19	survey) that Dr. Krosnick		
19	suggests is not sufficient to		
20	remove recall errors.		
	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 31.	Incomplete hypothetical,	Sustained:
21	Further, should the respondents	assumes facts not in evidence,	
22	decide to change their answers,	lacks foundation, conclusory	Overruled: X
	does this invalidate the first set	and based on speculation.	
23	of responses, or the second, or all	•	
_	the responses that the respondents		
24	gave? Obviously the respondent		
25	has had second thoughts.		
	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 34.	Lacks foundation; assumes	Sustained: X
26	Presumably, given the nature of	facts not in evidence,	
27	the question, it is not the case that	conclusory and based on	Overruled:
27	every U.S. Bank premises has a	speculation.	
28	"US Bank" logo on it.	_	
	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 35.	Lacks foundation, assumes	Sustained:
	<u> </u>	·	

WYNNE LAW FIRM
100 DRAKES LANDING ROAD
SUITE 275
GREENBRAE, CA 94904
(415) 461-6400
WWW.WYNNELAWFIRM.COM

Case3:09-cv-03111-JSW Document116-2 Filed06/12/14 Page143 of 156

1	By asking a BBO about his or her	facts not in evidence,	Overruled: X
2	drive time last, and after	conclusory and based on	O voltatod.
	suggesting work time is	speculation.	
3	comprised of three components,		
, l	the value of drive time will under-		
4	estimated or depressed.		
5	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 35.	Impermissible legal opinion.	Sustained:
	I understand from Defense	Improper subject for this	Overruled: X
6	counsel that, depending on	expert's alleged opinion.	
7	circumstances, driving to and		
′	from home, and/or driving		
8	between two U.S. Bank locations		
_	may constitute outside sales		
9	activities.		
10	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 38.	Conclusory, lacks foundation.	Sustained:
	Because the tests suggested by		Overruled: X
11	Dr. Krosnick do not have a		
	definite outcome, but an tt-		
12	ambiguous outcome, the tests		
13	cannot detect bias, nor correct for		
	bias.	r 1 C 1 (0 / 1 X
14	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 38.	Lacks foundation; assumes	Sustained: X
15	First, because of the self serving	facts not in evidence,	Overruled:
13	nature of respondents in this	conclusory and based on	· · ·
16	survey	speculation.	0 1 1
_	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 39.	Lacks foundation, assumes	Sustained:
17	Independent of the fact that the	facts not in evidence.	Overruled: X
18	data from a survey such as this is		
	unilaterally biased, the tests		
19	suggested by Dr. Krosnick cannot detect bias either.		
20	Hildreth Decl., ¶ 43.	Impermissible legal opinion.	Sustained: X
l	However, this matter before the	Improper subject for expert	
21	Court is not an eyewitness case as	opinion.	Overruled:
,,	far as I am aware.		
22	202 00 3 0003 011 00 01	1	
23			
24	Dated: September 18, 2013	WYNNE LAW FIRM	
ω "τ	Dated. September 10, 2013		
25		A	

28 WYNNE LAW FIRM 100 Drakes Landing Road

26

27

SUITE 275 GREENBRAE, CA 94904 (415) 461-6400

WWW.WYNNELAWFIRM.COM

8