1 2 3 4 5	GREGORY L. JAMES (055760) Attorney at Law 1839 Shoshone Drive Bishop, California 93514 (760) 760-873-8381 (760) 760-873-8479 (fax) Attorney for Plaintiff and the Class	
6 7		
8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
10 11	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION PROCEEDING NO. 4408
12 13	This Pleading Relates to Included Action: REBECCA LEE WILLIS and DAVID ESTRADA, on behalf of themselves and all	Case No. BC 364553
<ol> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ol>	others similarly situated, <i>Plaintiff,</i> v. LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; CITY OF LANCASTER; CITY OF LOS ANGELES; CITY OF PALMDALE; PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT; LITTLEROCK CREEK IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PALM RANCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT; QUARTZ HILL WATER DISTRICT; ANTELOPE VALLEY WATER CO.; ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT; and DOES 1 through 1,000; <i>Defendants.</i>	DECLARATION OF GREGORY L. JAMES IN SUPPORT OF WILLIS CLASS' SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES Date: March 21, 2016 Time: 1:30 P.M. Place: San Jose Superior Court 191 North First Street San Jose, CA 95113 Judge: Hon. Jack Komar
25	I, GREGORY L. JAMES declare:	
26 27		tion are based on my personal knowledge and
28	if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify thereto under oath. As to those	

matters that reflect and opinion, they reflect my personal opinion and judgment upon the 2 matter.

2. This Declaration is made in support of the Willis Class' Second Supplemental Motion for an Award of Attorneys' Fees.

3. Since April 4, 2008, I have served as consulting attorney and attorney, on water law and other issues involved in this litigation, to Krause, Kalfayan, Benink & Slavens LLP, attorneys for the Plaintiff Class.

4. I am an attorney admitted to practice before all courts of the State of California, the United States Supreme Court, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, the Federal District Court for the Central District of California, the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of California and the Federal District Court for the Southern District of California.

5. My office is located in Bishop, California where my practice includes representation of public agencies, individuals and organizations.

6. I am a 1972 graduate of the University of California Los Angeles, School of Law.

7. Since 1977, a large part of my practice has been devoted to water rights and water resources law. From 1977 to 2004, I primarily represented the County of Inyo in litigation with the City of Los Angeles concerning water rights and water resources issues in the Owens Valley of California. I also represented the County of Inyo on other water rights and water resources issues including proposals for the export of groundwater from the Eastern Sierra region and applications by the Southern Nevada Water District to extract and export groundwater from Southern and Eastern Nevada. During this period, I served as a Deputy District Attorney-Civil, Assistant County Counsel, County Counsel and Special Counsel for Natural Resources. From 1981 until 2004, in addition to serving as an attorney for the County of Inyo, I served as Director of the Inyo County Water Department.

8. At the end of 2004, I retired as the Director of the Inyo County Water 26 Department; however, since then, I have continued to represent the County of Inyo on water 27 rights and water resource issues involving the City of Los Angeles and other as well as on 28

25

1

3

2

other natural resource and environmental issues. Also, since 2004, I have represented other organizations and individuals on water rights, water resource, environmental and other issues.

9. Krause, Kalfayan, Benink & Slavens' ability to recover the reasonable value of their services is contingent upon this Court awarding a fully compensatory fee award. Consequently, the financial arrangements between me and Krause, Kalfayan, Benink & Slavens are primarily contingent. In accepting work in this litigation, I understood that Krause, Kalfayan, Benink & Slavens had limited financial resources to pay the costs and fees associated with this litigation. Krause, Kalfayan, Benink & Slavens' ability to pay the reasonable market value of my services is contingent upon this Court awarding a fully compensatory fee award.

10. I was aware that, due to Krause, Kalfayan, Benink & Slavens' limited ability to pay, the only way that I would be fairly compensated for my work on this litigation was to achieve a successful result in the litigation that conferred a substantial public benefit. Thus, I recognized in accepting work on this litigation that there was a risk of sustaining financial losses if the Plaintiff Class did not prevail. Despite the risk involved in accepting work on this litigation, I decided to accept the work because of the public interest nature of the litigation and the importance of the issues in the litigation.

11. With regard to public interest litigation dependent upon a contingent fee with which I have been involved, beginning in 2005, I served as co-counsel in the case of *Save Our Peninsula v. County of Monterey*. This large land development case involved violations of the California Environmental Quality Act, the California General Planning Law, and involved water and other issues. My co-counsel and I received no fees from our client, and the payment of attorneys' fees was contingent on an award of fees under section 1021.5 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. In 2008, the case settled, and I received a fee payment of approximately \$52,000.00 based upon an hourly rate of \$435.00 per hour.

12. In non-contingency, non-litigation legal matters, since 2004, my legal fees for assisting, mutual water companies, community service districts supplying water and large land owners on water rights issues have ranged from \$150.00 per hour to \$225.00 per hour.

13. On June 13, 2011, pursuant to CCP 638, I was appointed as a referee by the Inyo County Superior Court to hear and determine all issues in a water rights case involving multiple parties. At the conclusion of the case, I recommended to the Court that the Court adopt a physical solution that I had drafted. The physical solution was adopted by the Court as its judgment and was upheld on appeal by the Fourth Appellate District, Division Two. In this non-contingency matter, I was paid \$275.00 per hour.

14. Since January 1, 2014, I have been involved in a number of activities in this litigation, including factual and legal investigations, document preparation, discovery issues, communications with counsel, settlement discussions, and a presentation to the Court.

15. The summary attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a detailed account of the amount of time spent by me on this litigation from January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2015. The account is based upon time summaries taken from daily time sheets that I have maintained since commencing work on this litigation on April 4 2008. Time expended on this litigation was tracked in increments of one-tenth of an hour. Based upon the information contained in the daily time summaries, I have spent 298.9 hours on this litigation since January 1, 2014.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct in all respects and that if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify thereto.

Executed this 22nd day of January, 2016 at Bishop, California.

vy Hames