

EXHIBIT C

1 John Cox (Cal. State Bar No. 197687)
2 john.cox@jcoxlawfirm.com
3 LAW OFFICES OF JOHN COX, P.C.
4 70 Stony Point Road, Suite 70-A
5 Santa Rosa, CA 95401
6 Office: 707.241.4567

7 Noreen Evans (Cal. State Bar No. 102385)
8 nevans@sonic.net
9 Mikal C. Watts (*Pro Hac Vice* application anticipated)
10 mcwatts@wattsguerra.com
11 Guy Watts (*Pro Hac Vice* application anticipated)
12 gwatts@wattsguerra.com
13 WATTS GUERRA LLP
14 70 Stony Point Road, Suite 70-A
15 Santa Rosa, CA 95401
16 Office: 707.241.4567

17 Roy E. Miller (Cal. State Bar No. 174821)
18 roy@hansenmiller.com
19 HANSEN & MILLER LAW FIRM
20 415 Russell Ave.
21 Santa Rosa, CA 95403
22 Office: 707.575.1040

23 *Attorneys for Petitioners*

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
CHAIR OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

24 *BONNIE CHRISTINE KOVEN, ROBERT*
25 *HERBERT KOVEN, BRIAN HOYT, TODD*
26 *AXBERG and APRIL DAWN AXBERG v.*
27 *PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY,*
28 *PG&E CORPORATION, et al, Sonoma*
County Superior Court, Case No.
SCV-261556

DECLARATION OF JOHN C. COX

JOHN C. COX declares:

1. I am the managing partner of the Law Offices of John C. Cox, P.C. counsel for

1 Petitioners Bonnie Christine Koven, Robert Herbert Koven, Brian Hoyt, Todd
2 Axberg and April Dawn Axberg. The facts set forth in this declaration are based
3 upon my personal knowledge, except where stated to be on information and
4 belief, and as to those, I believe them to be true.

5 2. The names of Petitioners and the name and address of their attorneys of record
6 are attached hereto as Exhibit A.

7 3. This petition is brought to seek coordination for pre-trial purposes of thirty-eight
8 (38) complaints filed in California Superior Courts on behalf of 273 plaintiffs who
9 suffered damages in the Tubbs fire specifically.

10 4. The names of the parties to the thirty-eight (38) actions sought to be coordinated,
11 the name and address of each party's attorney of record, the complete title of each
12 Included Action, the number of the action, and the title of the court in which the
13 action is pending are attached as Exhibit B. The Included Actions consist of the
14 following cases:

15 a. *Torrey Cortez Thomas, et al v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al*; Sonoma
16 County Superior Court Case No. SCV-261484, filed November 3, 2017;

17 b. *Brett Travis Burton v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al*; Sonoma County
18 Superior Court Case No. SCV-261489, filed on November 3, 2017;

19 c. *Summer June Hill v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al*; Sonoma County
20 Superior Court Case No. SCV-261490, filed on November 3, 2017;

21 d. *Leo Raymond Callagy, III, et al v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al*; Sonoma
22 County Superior Court Case No. SCV-261536, filed on November 15, 2017;

23 e. *Clifford Jack Hollenbeck, et al v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al*; Sonoma
24 County Superior Court Case No., filed on November 9, 2017;

25 f. *Debra Anne Davenport, et al v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al*; Sonoma
26 County Superior Court Case No. SCV-261542, filed on November 16, 2017;

27 g. *Bonnie Christine Koven, et al v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al*; Sonoma
28

1
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

- County Superior Court Case No. SCV-261556, filed on November 20, 2017;
- h. *David Tom Clausen, et al v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al*; Sonoma County Superior Court Case No. SCV-261558, filed on November 21, 2017;
- i. *Joshua Carucci, et al v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al*; Sonoma County Superior Court Case No. SCV-261564, filed on November 22, 2017;
- j. *Maria Angelica Reynoso, et al v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al*; Sonoma County Superior Court Case No. SCV-261587, filed on November 29, 2017;
- k. *William Michael Andrews, et al v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al*; Sonoma County Superior Court Case No. SCV-261599, filed on November 30, 2017;
- l. *Paul David Appleton, et al v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al*; Sonoma County Superior Court Case No. SCV-261602, filed on December 1, 2017;
- m. *Ross H. Bevier, et al v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al*; Sonoma County Superior Court Case No. [pending], filed on December 1, 2017;
- n. *Heidingsfelder, et al. v. PG&E Corp., et al*, Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-261436, filed October 24, 2017;
- o. *Krause, et al., v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562192, filed October 27, 2017;
- p. *Berry, et al., v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562172, filed October 27, 2017;
- q. *Green, et al v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562173, filed October 27, 2017;
- r. *Harvell, et al., v. PGE Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-561937, filed October 27, 2017;
- s. *Daniels, et al s v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562175, filed October 27, 2017;
- t. *O’Neal, et al v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court,

1
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

- Case No. CGC-17-561997, filed October 19, 2017;
- u. *Schrock v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-561983, filed October 18, 2017;
- v. *Evans, et al v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of Napa Superior Court, Case No. 17CV001224, filed October 25, 2017;
- w. *Tandrup, et al v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562246, filed November 1, 2017;
- x. *Ruiz, et al v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562251, filed November 2, 2017; and
- y. *Omlin, et al v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562320, filed November 6, 2017;
- z. *Roger Bubel d/b/a Ben & Jerry's v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562668, filed November 22, 2017;
- aa. *Charlotte Wood v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562667, filed November 22, 2017;
- bb. *Monica Udell d/b/a Seasons of Skin Day Spa v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562666, filed November 22, 2017;
- cc. *Quyen Tran d/b/a Queen Nail Spa v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562665, filed November 22, 2017;
- dd. *Kristina Olson d/b/a Apples N Carrots Tack v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562664, filed November 22, 2017;
- ee. *Periliss Estate Vineyards, LLC v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562648, filed November 2, 2017;
- ff. *Perry Butler d/b/a Juslyn Vineyards v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San

1 Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562647, filed November 22,
2 2017;

3 gg. *Wilson, et al v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court,
4 Case No. CGC-17-562458, filed November 14, 2017;

5 hh. *Jordan, et al v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court,
6 Case No. CGC-17-562457, filed November 14, 2017;

7 ii. *Hay, et al v. PG&E Corp., et al.*, County of San Francisco Superior Court,
8 Case No. CGC-17-562456, filed November 14, 2017;

9 jj. *Wilson, et al v. PG&E Corp., et al*; Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No.
10 SCV-261535; filed November 14, 2017;

11 kk. *Meyer, individually and d/b/a Ravenswood Bernese Mountain Dogs v. PG&E*
12 *Corp., et al*; Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-261534, filed
13 November 14, 2017;

14 ll. *Taylor Waldon v. v. PG&E Corp., et al*; Sonoma County Superior Court, Case
15 No. SCV-261591, filed November 30, 2017.

16 The Included Actions are filed in three (3) Superior Courts of this state, including
17 Sonoma County (17 actions), Napa County (1 action), and the County of San
18 Francisco (20 actions), though because some of the above Complaints do not
19 indicate which fire caused the respective Plaintiffs' damages, Petitioner is unable
20 to conclusively show which of these cases filed in San Francisco by the Robins
21 Cloud law firm from Houston, Texas involves damages caused by the Tubbs Fire
22 specifically, as opposed to one of the other Northern California wildfires also
23 beginning on or about October 8, 2017.

24 5. The Included Actions involving the Tubbs Fire specifically are complex, as
25 defined in C.C.P. Sections 400 and 400.1 and California Rule of Court Section
26 3.400, because they will require specialized management to avoid placing
27 unnecessary burdens on the court or litigants involving 18 actions pending before
28

1 3 separate Superior Courts of this state.

2 6. The Included Actions allege identical and/or similar overlapping claims against
3 Pacific Gas & Electric Company and PG&E Corporation arising from their acts
4 and failures to act, which are alleged to have caused the Tubbs Fire. All of the
5 actions involving the Tubbs Fire include causes of action for negligence and
6 violations of California's Public Utilities Code. Each of the Included Actions
7 allege facts arising from the Tubbs fire specifically, beginning on October 8, 2017
8 in Napa County, California near Calistoga, and spreading into Sonoma County,
9 and burning more than 6,600 homes and businesses, killing 24 persons and
10 injuring many others in Sonoma County near Santa Rosa, California. Actions
11 brought by plaintiffs who suffered property damage caused by the Tubbs fire
12 specifically, include causes of action for inverse condemnation, trespass, and
13 private nuisance.
14

15 7. The actions sought to be coordinated, which involve the Tubbs fire specifically,
16 each meet the standards described in California Code of Civil Procedure §404.1
17 and California Rule of Court 3.400.
18

19 a. Common questions of law and fact predominate and are significant to the
20 litigation involving the Tubbs Fire specifically.

21 i. Each of the Included Actions alleges facts arising from the
22 devastating Tubbs Fire, beginning on October 8, 2017 in Napa
23 County, California near Calistoga, and spreading into Sonoma
24 County, and burning more than 6,600 homes and businesses, killing
25 24 persons and injuring many others in Sonoma County near Santa
26 Rosa, California.

27 ii. Plaintiffs in all Included Actions allege that the Tubbs Fire was
28

1
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

started when electrical infrastructure and equipment owned, operated, and maintained by PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas & Electric Company (“PG&E”) failed as a result of PG&E’s negligent acts or omissions and/or came into contact with vegetation improperly inspected and maintained by PG&E.

- iii. The Tubbs Fire caused extensive damages within Sonoma County and neighboring Napa County.
- iv. On information and belief, the Tubbs Fire burned more than 245,000 acres and destroyed more than 6,600 structures, including over 5,130 houses and almost 1,500 other business structures.
- v. On information and belief, the Tubbs Fire caused the death of at least 24 people and injured many others.
- vi. The causes of action alleged with respect to the Tubbs Fire specifically in each Included Action are substantially identical. The only differences arise from the specific damages suffered by an individual plaintiff. For example, Complaints involving the Tubbs Fire that arise from the death of an individual in the fires include wrongful-death and survival causes of action, whereas Complaints involving the Tubbs Fire that arise from property damage include causes of action such as inverse condemnation, trespass, and private nuisance.
- vii. On information and belief, the Tubbs Fire specifically killed at least 24 people and destroyed at least 6,600 structures in Sonoma County alone. Assuming three members per household, there are more than 15,000 individuals in Sonoma County who are potential witnesses

1
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

in this case involving the Tubbs Fire. Arguably, any one of Santa Rosa’s approximately 175,000 residents who witnessed the Tubbs Fire could be a witness in this case.

viii. This case will require the management of a large number of separately represented parties. There are already 273 plaintiffs represented by twenty-one (21) law firms in the Included Actions.

b. Coordination of these Included Actions involving the Tubbs Fire specifically will serve the convenience of the parties, witnesses, and counsel because discovery in these overlapping actions is likely to be duplicative if they proceed separately. Coordination of these actions involving the Tubbs Fire will prevent repetitive and redundant depositions regarding the same issues by the same witnesses.

c. Absent coordination, redundant and duplicative discovery and motion practice in these overlapping actions involving the Tubbs Fire would waste litigant and judicial resources. In addition, the need to take the same depositions in each of these actions involving the Tubbs Fire will increase the expense for all parties and likely increase travel costs for all the litigants’ counsel.

d. Failure to coordinate these actions involving the Tubbs fire specifically creates a risk of inconsistent or duplicative judgments and orders. Without coordination, two separate courts will decide essentially the same or overlapping issues and may render different or conflicting rulings on liability and other issues relating to the Tubbs Fire. Coordination of these actions involving the Tubbs Fire specifically in a single court would avoid this possibility.

1 8. Robins Cloud LLP, Baron & Budd PC, Singleton Law Firm APC, Dixon Diab &
2 Chambers LLP, and Edgar Law Firm represent plaintiffs in certain Included
3 Actions filed in the Superior Court of the County of San Francisco. These firms
4 seek coordination of these actions involving the Tubbs Fire together with
5 unrelated actions arising from four other fires – the Redwood fire, the Pocket fire,
6 the Nuns fire and the Atlas fire, in San Francisco County.
7

8 9. To date, seventeen (17) of the Included Actions have been filed in Sonoma
9 County Superior Court, twenty (20) of the Included Actions have been filed in the
10 Superior Court of the County of San Francisco, and one (1) of the Included
11 Actions has been filed in the Superior Court of Napa County. Ten (10) of the
12 Included Actions filed in San Francisco have been filed by the same five law firms
13 who appear to be working together on all their cases, while seeking coordination
14 of these proceedings in San Francisco.
15

16 10. Although the number of actions filed in Sonoma County and San Francisco are
17 similar today, one cannot determine which cases filed in San Francisco relate to
18 the Tubbs Fire specifically, as opposed to the four other unrelated fires.
19 Moreover, I expect a significant number of related actions involving the Tubbs
20 Fire specifically to be filed in Sonoma County over the next several weeks and
21 months.
22

23 11. On information and belief, in Sonoma County, the Tubbs Fire killed at least 24
24 people and destroyed 6,600 structures, including 5,130 homes. Assuming three
25 members per household, there are more than 15,000 individuals in Sonoma
26 County with a property damage claim against PG&E involving the Tubbs Fire
27 specifically. Sonoma County businesses that were destroyed or forced to close for
28 evacuation also have claims against PG&E involving the Tubbs Fire, as do

1 employees of those businesses who lost wages due to their closure. I estimate that
2 there are well over 20,000 victims of the Tubbs Fire specifically in Sonoma County
3 alone. On information and belief, most of these victims would choose to file suit
4 in their home county—the county where the injury occurred due to the Tubbs fire
5 specifically —rather than in San Francisco, where PG&E is headquartered.
6

7 12. Indeed, I intend to file suit against PG&E in Sonoma County on behalf of
8 additional clients victimized by the Tubbs Fire specifically over the next several
9 weeks and months. Likewise, Santa Rosa law firms, including the Hansen &
10 Miller Law Firm and attorney Noreen Evans, a former California State Senator,
11 are signing up Santa Rosa fire victims as clients and referring them to me and my
12 co-counsel, Watts Guerra LLP. All of these anticipated add-on cases will be filed
13 in Sonoma County Superior Court.

14 13. All of the Included Actions involving the Tubbs fire specifically have been filed
15 within the last month. To the best of my knowledge, PG&E has not filed a
16 responsive pleading in any of the Included Actions involving the Tubbs Fire, and
17 instead has informally sought a stay of any requirement to do so, pending
18 resolution of the JCCP motions, to which my firm has agreed . Moreover, I expect
19 a significant number of additional related lawsuits involving the Tubbs Fire to be
20 filed in Sonoma County in the next several weeks and months.
21

22 14. On information and belief, and according to Judicial Council of California court
23 statistics for 2016, in San Francisco County, for the fiscal year 2014-15, 4,036 cases
24 were filed “per judicial position” in that county—one of the highest ratios in the
25 state. In Sonoma County, only 3,218 cases were filed “per judicial position.” The
26 total number of civil filings in San Francisco County—15,577—is far greater than
27 that of Sonoma County—6,403.
28

1 15. The Tubbs Fire, while starting in Napa County, spread south and west,
2 devastating Sonoma County. Thus, on information and belief, virtually all of the
3 relevant witnesses and evidence involving the Tubbs Fire are located in or close
4 to Sonoma County, rather than in San Francisco County.

5 16. On information and belief, the infrastructure and equipment owned, operated,
6 and maintained by PG&E in both Napa and Sonoma Counties will be key
7 evidence in this litigation involving the Tubbs Fire. Plaintiffs allege that the
8 Tubbs Fire was started when electrical infrastructure and equipment owned,
9 operated, and maintained by PG&E came into contact with vegetation inspected
10 and maintained by PG&E. On information and belief, this infrastructure and
11 equipment is located in either Napa or Sonoma County. On information and
12 belief, the PG&E employees and contractors who operated and maintained the
13 relevant infrastructure and equipment are located in and around Sonoma
14 County. On information and belief, the relevant PG&E employees and contractors
15 who inspected and maintained vegetation surrounding the relevant
16 infrastructure and equipment are located in Napa and Sonoma Counties. On
17 information and belief, eyewitnesses to the failure of PG&E infrastructure and
18 equipment on the night of the fires are located in Napa and Sonoma Counties.
19 On information and belief, individuals who reported downed power lines,
20 exploding transformers, and other equipment failures on the night of the fires are
21 located in and around Napa and Sonoma Counties. On information and belief,
22 individuals who received reports of downed power lines, exploding
23 transformers, and other PG&E equipment failures on the night of the fires are
24 located in Napa and Sonoma Counties. Witnesses with respect to the spread of
25 the fire from the Calistoga area south and west into Sonoma County will be
26
27
28

1 located in and close to Sonoma County.

2 17. On information and belief, eyewitnesses to the Tubbs Fire specifically, and to
3 damages caused by this particular fire, will also be key witnesses in this litigation
4 involving the Tubbs Fire. On information and belief, virtually all of these
5 witnesses are located in or close to Sonoma County. On information and belief,
6 virtually all of the fire victims of the Tubbs Fire specifically live in or close to
7 Sonoma County. On information and belief, many of the first responders to the
8 Tubbs Fire specifically live in or close to Sonoma County. On information and
9 belief, witnesses relating to the Tubbs Fire specifically who can testify to the lost
10 value of property and the cost of repairs, such as claims adjusters and contractors,
11 are located in or close to Sonoma County. On information and belief, witnesses
12 who can testify to personal injury damages caused by the Tubbs Fire specifically,
13 such as paramedics, doctors, and nurses are located in or close to Sonoma
14 County. Witnesses as to property damage caused by the Tubbs Fire specifically,
15 whether documenting the same, or calculating the lost value or the cost to repair
16 such property, will be located in or close to Sonoma County

17
18
19 18. On information and belief, it takes on average one-and-a-half hours to travel by
20 car from Santa Rosa, California to the courthouse in San Francisco—even longer
21 during rush hour. I have also lived in Northern California for most of the past
22 thirty-eight years and am very familiar with the drive times from the greater Bay
23 Area to Sonoma County. I have made the drive at least fifty times in the past ten
24 years and believe the stated travel times are accurate.

25 19. Based upon information and belief, accommodations in San Francisco are much
26 more expensive than comparable accommodations in Sonoma County, where the
27 Plaintiffs, the fire eyewitnesses and damages witnesses involving the Tubbs Fire
28

1 specifically will be coming from.

2 20. Plaintiffs in the Included Actions, as well as future plaintiffs in related actions,
3 involving the Tubbs Fire specifically, live and work in or close to Sonoma
4 County. Businesses destroyed or forced to close by the Tubbs Fire have their
5 principal place of business in or close to Sonoma County. Likewise, by
6 information and belief, those relevant entities involving the Tubbs Fire with
7 which PG&E contracted for tree trimming and equipment maintenance, are based
8 in and around Sonoma County. PG&E is found in and around Sonoma County.
9

10 21. This factor - the Most Convenient Venue for the Vast Majority of Parties and
11 Witnesses – does not require this Court to take into account the airport
12 convenience of lawyers traveling in from their offices in Houston and Dallas.
13 While the Memorandum of those seeking for those cases arising in Sonoma
14 County to be coordinated in San Francisco states that “San Francisco
15 International Airport is the seventh-busiest airport in the [sic] North America,
16 and all major airlines provide air service to San Francisco” and that “the city of
17 San Francisco has a sufficient number of hotels to accommodate those traveling
18 to hearings or other court appearances,”¹ no one victimized by the Tubbs Fire
19 cares about out-of-state lawyers’ flight and hotel preferences; they care about
20 their own convenience. This factor relates to the convenience of the parties and
21 the witnesses, not of lawyers seeking to represent them who are traveling in
22 from out of state or from the other end of the state, and does not justify those
23 lawyers’ proposed gerrymandering the venue of their Tubbs Fire clients’ cases
24 from Sonoma County, where the underlying events and damages occurred, to a
25 venue far away from where the Tubbs Fire tragedy occurred, simply because
26

27 _____
28 ¹ Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Petition for Coordination for Pre-trial
Purposes, filed October 31, 2017, §V, p. 11, lines 23-26.

1 San Francisco's airport and its hotels are more convenient for out-of-state
2 lawyers from Houston and Dallas. If this were the test, this Court should
3 coordinate the Tubbs Fire cases involving damages in Santa Rosa, California, to
4 Houston, Texas, where Robins Cloud is based, or to Dallas, Texas, where Baron
5 & Budd is based, or down to the southern part of this state, where many of the
6 other lawyers working with Robins Cloud are based. This is a Sonoma County
7 tragedy involving Sonoma County Plaintiffs and witnesses, and this case
8 involving the Tubbs fire specifically should be coordinated in Sonoma County.
9

10 22. In this regard, the Santa Rosa airport offers a fine alternative. For those flying in
11 from Texas, it is closer than San Francisco, and 20 flights a day arrive from
12 Phoenix and other connecting destinations. With respect to the fine hotels of San
13 Francisco, surely the comfort and convenience of those actually victimized by the
14 fires – literally burned out of house and home in Sonoma County - is a more
15 relevant consideration than the comfort and convenience of those out-of-state and
16 out-of-town lawyers seeking to represent them, while seeking to avail themselves
17 of the airport and hotels in San Francisco. The only party whose principal place
18 of business is in San Francisco is the defendant PG&E, but that is only with
19 respect to its corporate base.
20

21 23. Plaintiffs in the Included Actions are represented by twenty-one (21) law firms,
22 and four (4) of these firms have offices in Sonoma County. While I have an office
23 in Oakland, I also have an office in Santa Rosa. The Hansen & Miller Law Firm,
24 which is referring its fire-victim clients to me and my co-counsel, also is located in
25 Santa Rosa. By contrast only one of the law firms representing any of the
26 plaintiffs in the Included Actions have offices in Santa Rosa. Instead, a Houston-
27 based firm - Robins Cloud LLP - with an office in southern California, in Santa
28

1 Monica, a Dallas-based firm – Baron & Budd P.C., with an office in Solano Beach,
2 another firm, the Singleton Law Firm, APC, with an office also in Salono Beach,
3 and another firm – Dixon Diab & Chambers LLP – based in San Diego, seek
4 consolidation in San Francisco, even though the firm they have tasked with
5 signing up Tubbs Fire cases is from Sonoma County – the Edgar Law Firm, is
6 itself based in Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California. By contrast, the Petitioners
7 here – Law Offices of John Cox, PC, Hansen & Miller Law Firm, Noreen Evans,
8 and Watts Guerra LLP, all now have offices in Santa Rosa, Sonoma County,
9 California, where the destruction caused by the Tubbs Fire specifically occurred,
10 and where coordination is sought herein.

12 24. Counsel seeking coordination of these proceedings in San Francisco are identified
13 on their pleadings as having offices in Santa Monica, Solana Beach, San Diego,
14 and Santa Rosa.

15 25. Evidence of options for travel and accommodations is easily accessible online. A
16 search on the travel search engine kayak.com reveals daily flights on American
17 Airlines and United Airlines between Houston and Santa Rosa, daily flights on
18 American Airlines, United Airlines, and Alaska Airlines between Los Angeles
19 and Santa Rosa, daily flights on American Airlines, United Airlines, and Alaska
20 Airlines between Dallas and Santa Rosa, and daily flights on American Airlines,
21 United Airlines, and Alaska Airlines between San Diego and Santa Rosa. A search
22 on hotels.com for accommodations in or near Santa Rosa results in 252 hotels and
23 vacation rentals.

25 26. The citizens of Sonoma County deserve to have a say in deciding who was at
26 fault in causing the Tubbs Fire that devastated their community. On information
27 and belief, in the event these proceedings were to be coordinated in San
28

1
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

Francisco, there would be outrage within the local community.

27. Litigation of this kind of complex case creates a significant amount of work for the community in which it is located. The use of local court reporters, videographers, copy centers, hotels, rental properties, and restaurants, would provide a badly needed economic benefit to Sonoma County, which has been recently devastated by the Tubbs Fire specifically.

28. Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of the page <http://www.pressdemocrat.com/news/7597510-181/new-data-show-sonoma-county?artslide=0> (Eloisa Ruano Gonzalez, *New Data Shows Sonoma County Fire Damage by Community*, *The Press Democrat*, November 3, 2017).

29. Attached hereto as Exhibit D is a true and correct copy of the page https://www.pge.com/includes/docs/pdfs/myhome/customerservice/smartmeter/optout/PGE_Local-Office_List.pdf (PG&E Offices by Location).

30. Attached hereto as Exhibit E is a true and correct copy of the page https://www.pge.com/en_US/about-pge/company-information/profile/profile.page (PG&E Company Profile Page).

31. Attached hereto as Exhibit F is a true and correct copy of the page http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/CivilCaseCoord_2005toPresent_JCCPLo g.pdf (Judicial Council of California - Civil Case Coordination Proceeding (JCCP) Log – 2005 - Present).

32. Attached hereto as Exhibit G is a true and correct copy of the page http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/CivilCaseCoordArchive_2004andOlder_JCCPLo g.pdf (Judicial Council of California - Civil Case Coordination Proceeding (JCCP) Log for cases 2004 and Older).

33. Attached hereto as Exhibit H is a true and correct copy of the page

1
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

<https://www.sfmta.com/getting-around/parking/parking-garages/civic-center-garage> (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency website, "Civic Center Garage").

34. Attached hereto as Exhibit I is a true and correct copy of the page https://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/morning_call/2015/07/san-francisco-most-expensive-hotel-rooms-tourism.html (Jahna Berry, *Updated: Tourism Group Blasts Report that S.F. Hotel Rooms are World's Priciest*, San Francisco Business Times, July 1, 2015).

35. Attached hereto as Exhibit J is a true and correct copy of the page <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/2016-Court-Statistics-Report.pdf> (2016 Court Statistics Report, *Statewide Caseload Trends 2005-2006 through 2014-2015*, Judicial Council of California).

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

Dated: December 1, 2017


John C. Cox