

1 Paul Alexander (C.S.B. #49997)  
2 Emily Wood (C.S.B. #260382)  
3 ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP  
4 10<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
5 Three Embarcadero Center  
6 San Francisco, CA 94111-4024  
7 Telephone: (415) 471-3122  
8 Facsimile: (415) 471-3400

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff California Dental  
10 Association and Richard W. Barnes, DDS

11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
12 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

13 CALIFORNIA DENTAL ASSOCIATION, a  
14 California Corporation,

15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 DELTA DENTAL OF CALIFORNIA, a  
18 California Corporation,

19 Defendant.

Case No.: CGC-14-538849

**DECLARATION OF WHITNEY  
JOHNSON, DDS**

Date: April 21, 2017

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Judge: Hon. Mary E. Wiss

Dept.: 305

20  
21  
22 I, Whitney Johnson, DDS, hereby declare as follows:

23  
24 1. I am a licensed California dentist and have been a member of Delta Dental since 1994  
25 when I first entered into a Participating Dentist Agreement as a provider for Delta Dental. I was one  
26 of the claimants in the arbitration proceedings brought against Delta Dental in August, 2013. The  
27 matters set forth herein are based on my personal knowledge unless otherwise indicated.  
28

1           2. I understand the claims asserted against Delta Dental in this action are based upon in  
2 substantial part on the PDA that became effective January 1, 2011. I was a member of the Delta  
3 Dental at that time and a party to the PDA then in effect.

4           3. I further understand that the claims asserted in this action are claims for breach of  
5 contract and breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing by Delta Dental arising from its  
6 attempt to amend the PDA again in August, 2013, its attempt to impose reduced maximum  
7 allowable amounts for the Contracted Fee under the PDA, and its imposition of limits on fee  
8 reimbursements through a calculation that I now understand is referred to as the "INAP." As a  
9 member of the Delta Dental, I have submitted fees to Delta Dental on multiple occasions and Delta  
10 Dental has limited or reduced my submitted fees for a number of procedures, and to the best of my  
11 knowledge this includes the period since January 1, 2011.

12           4. In 2013, when I learned of the actions of Delta Dental with respect to its attempts to  
13 amend the PDA and to reduce the maximum allowable amounts for Contracted Fees under the  
14 PDA, I agreed to challenge the lawfulness of those actions in a legal action. When I did so, I  
15 intended that the legal challenge be one that would speak for all dentists who, like myself, were  
16 parties to a PDA with Delta Dental. While I believed at the time that I had valid claims to assert,  
17 my purpose in being a party to litigation was not solely to benefit myself but also to raise a  
18 challenge on behalf of dentists who, like myself, were parties to a PDA with Delta Dental. At the  
19 outset, I understood that this legal challenge would take place in an arbitration proceeding before  
20 the American Arbitration Association and I agreed to become a claimant in that arbitration, which  
21 was commenced in August, 2013.

22           5. Thereafter, in 2014, I learned that it was possible that the arbitration might be limited  
23 solely to the individuals who were claimants in that arbitration rather than benefit all dentists who  
24 had a similar PDA with Delta Dental. As a result, I agreed that the arbitration proceeding was held  
25 in abeyance due to litigation raising the same basic claims brought by CDA on behalf of its  
26 members in the San Francisco County Superior Court. Because I was interested in a result that  
27

1 benefitted all dentists such as myself, that was acceptable and I agreed that the arbitration  
2 proceedings should be held in abeyance in deference to the Superior Court action.

3 6. During the time that this litigation has been pending, I have stayed in contact with  
4 counsel, had discussions and exchanges with counsel and participated in conference calls discussing  
5 this action. I have also read articles concerning the litigation in order to stay abreast of how it was  
6 proceeding. In approximately September of 2016, I learned that as a result of mediation sessions  
7 held between Delta Dental and CDA, a possible basis for a settlement of the litigation had arisen. I  
8 learned that in order for the settlement to benefit all California dentists who had PDA's with Delta  
9 Dental, the procedure of a class action was being considered. I was requested to consider being a  
10 representative of the class of dentists who, like myself, had PDA's with Delta Dental since January  
11 1, 2011 and who believed that their fees had been unfairly and improperly limited by Delta Dental  
12 under that PDA and that Delta Dental had not provided accurate or sufficient notice either of how it  
13 determined the fee limitations or that it intended to reduce the maximum allowable amounts for  
14 Contracted Fees under the PDA.

15 7. In my experience, a common issue in dealing with Delta Dental for dentists such as  
16 myself is that the fee determinations seem to be a "black box" that Delta Dental does not explain,  
17 even when questions are raised. Based on my experience and the conversations I have had with  
18 other dentists over the past several years, I believe this to be a common issue among dentists who  
19 are parties to a PDA with Delta Dental. Since one of my primary goals from the outset had been to  
20 assert the legal rights of providers such as myself in dealing with Delta Dental, and not simply to  
21 pursue a claim on my own behalf, I agreed to become a class representative if approved by the court  
22 and if the court certified a class of which I am a member.

23 8. Since agreeing to serve as a class representative should the class that is sought be  
24 certified by the court, I have communicated with counsel concerning the potential settlement,  
25 participated in conference calls with counsel and other potential class representatives in which the  
26 potential terms of a settlement were described and discussed, reviewed the documentation sent to  
27

1 me concerning the settlement, including drafts of the settlement agreement itself. I have attempted  
2 to familiarize myself with the basic terms of the settlement as reflected in the draft settlement  
3 agreement that I reviewed and now in the revised Settlement Agreement that I have received from  
4 counsel. I have reached the conclusion that the settlement agreement is a fair and reasonable  
5 settlement not only for myself personally but for all California dentists who, like myself, are parties  
6 to a PDA with Delta Dental for participation in its network of dentists. I have concluded that the  
7 provisions for enhanced 120 calendar days of notice and particularly the individualized financial  
8 information that Delta must provide as part of that notice are valuable long term benefits for dentists  
9 such as myself who have entered into PDA's with Delta Dental. In fact, I believe that requiring  
10 Delta to provide this more complete and informative notice is important to the entire class of  
11 dentists who have entered into PDA's with Delta Dental calling for a "Contracted Fee" because this  
12 addresses the problem of the "black box" nature of Delta Dental's communications about its fee  
13 practices and provides important information that will allow dentists to plan their practices and the  
14 actions they should take in response to actions that Delta Dental takes.


15 8. I also concluded that the monetary provisions of the settlement, calling for \$34,750,000  
16 in cash payments to be allocated among dentists whose fees and been improperly limited by Delta  
17 Dental was fair and reasonable, particularly since I did not expect that any financial recovery for  
18 past injustices was likely or even possible when the litigation began. As of today, I do not know  
19 what, if any, actual monetary recovery will be paid to me personally and my conclusion about the  
20 fairness and reasonableness of the settlement is not based on the expectation that I personally will  
21 receive any particular monetary payment as a result of the settlement. Rather, I believe it is fair  
22 and reasonable to require Delta Dental to reimburse dentists for a significant portion of previous fee  
23 limitations that are claimed to be in breach of contract, and that the amount that each dentist receive  
24 from the cash portion of the settlement be related to the amount of actual harm that each dentist  
25 sustained, which is what I understand the principle behind the allocation of the cash portion of the  
26 settlement to be. I am also in agreement that the calculation of these allocations be based on the  
27 computerized records that Delta Dental has maintained, because it would be very difficult for  
28

1 dentists such as me to do going all the way back to 2011 and access financial records, some of  
2 which may have been lost or destroyed over the years.

3 9. If approved as a class representative, I will continue to work with counsel, to review  
4 materials related to the case and the settlement, to participate in communications and conference  
5 calls concerning the case and the settlement, and to act in a manner consistent with the interest of all  
6 California dentists in the class. Though I am a member of CDA, I understand that all dentists who  
7 are a part of the class, whether members of CDA or not, should be treated equally and that is the  
8 approach that I have taken and will continue to take as a class representative if approved by the  
9 court.

10 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my  
11 knowledge, information and belief.

12 Executed in Berkeley, California on April 21, 2017.

13  
14   
15 Whitney Johnson, DDS  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28