



Metropolitan Cases

Eastern Municipal Water District v. Metropolitan (Riverside County Superior Court)

A Metropolitan employee filed a complaint against Eastern Municipal Water District (Eastern) on March 5, 2020, seeking damages for alleged work-related injuries from an incident during the Colorado River Aqueduct Shutdown.

The incident involved an unplanned flow of water from a member agency's facility into Metropolitan's Perris Valley Siphon while Metropolitan employees were working inside the siphon. Metropolitan, as the employer, is currently paying workers' compensation benefits. The complaint against Eastern includes general damages beyond workers' compensation. Eastern filed a cross-complaint against Metropolitan on August 6, 2020, seeking reimbursement for these damages. The cross-complaint contains three causes of action for: (1) Equitable Indemnity; (2) Equitable Contribution and Apportionment; and (3) Declaratory Relief.

On November 9, Metropolitan filed a demurrer on the grounds that Labor Code Section 3864 bars actions for indemnity against the employer absent a written agreement executed prior to the injury to reimburse or hold a third party (in this case Eastern) harmless. On January 20, 2021, Metropolitan's demurrer was sustained with leave to amend. Eastern has 30 days to file an amended cross-complaint. The next case management conference is set for April 20, 2021. (See General Counsel's December 2020 Activity Report)

Williams v. Metropolitan Water District (USDC, District of Arizona) On January 22, 2021, Metropolitan received a complaint filed in federal district court in Phoenix, Arizona from James Lee Williams, who is representing himself. In his complaint, Mr. Williams alleges that Metropolitan is discriminating against him and others in his African American community and depriving them of their rights to Colorado River water on lands near Yuma, Arizona.

The land at issue is owned by the State of Arizona and rented to Mr. Williams and others in his

community. Although not named as parties, Mr. Williams alleges that U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), Congress, and the United States Supreme Court are complicit in perpetuating a system of institutional racism with the development of the law of the Colorado River that denied his community their water rights. This is similar to the complaint Mr. Williams filed in the same court in October 2017, which was appealed unsuccessfully to the Ninth Circuit and dismissed in March 2020.

In this case, unlike the 2017 action, Mr. Williams names only Metropolitan, and not Reclamation or the States of Arizona or California. In the prior case, the Ninth Circuit dismissed Mr. Williams' claim because he could not join an indispensable party, the State of Arizona, who refused to waive its sovereign immunity and refused to consent to the jurisdiction of the federal district court in this matter. This new complaint appears to be an improper attempt to get around this ruling by not naming Arizona. However, the law is clear that parties are barred from trying to relitigate the indispensability issue in another action. The complaint also fails to allege sufficient bases for jurisdiction in the Phoenix federal court and fails to state a viable claim for relief.

Metropolitan staff intends to file a motion to dismiss if Mr. Williams does not agree to dismiss his complaint. Metropolitan's response is due March 19, 2021.



Cases to Watch

***Food & Water Watch, Inc., et al. v. EPA, et al.*
(U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California)**

On January 13, 2021, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California denied in part the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) motion to dismiss this case seeking to prohibit the addition of fluoride to drinking water. Although the court refused to dismiss the case, it recognized that the question of plaintiffs’ standing remains. Accordingly, the court granted EPA’s motion in part and required plaintiffs to seek leave to amend their complaint if EPA denied their supplemental petition. The court explained: “In seeking leave to amend, Plaintiffs will have to justify their request, including addressing why any attempt to allege a new basis for standing following any denial by the EPA of their supplemental petition would not be futile.”

In 2016, a group of organizations and individuals, including plaintiffs, petitioned EPA under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) to prohibit the addition of fluoride to drinking water supplies. The petition was based on research allegedly linking fluoride exposure to neurotoxicity. EPA denied the petition, and plaintiffs filed their lawsuit in April 2017. After the case went to trial last June, the judge issued an order holding the case in abeyance and directing the plaintiffs to file a new petition with EPA. The judge stated that filing a new petition would enable plaintiffs to “address the serious standing issues” and “afford EPA an opportunity to consider the significant scientific

developments that have occurred since the original petition was filed.”

On October 28, 2020, EPA filed a “motion for relief” from the abeyance order. EPA argued that the court erred because it “should have dismissed this case for lack of jurisdiction, but instead has permitted Plaintiffs an opportunity to create standing where none exists.” On November 4, plaintiffs filed a supplemental petition with EPA and asked that EPA reconsider its earlier denial in light of new information. In opposing EPA’s motion, plaintiffs claimed their supplemental petition cured any standing issues by alleging that millions of Americans are at risk from fluoridated water, including members of Food & Water Watch who are currently pregnant, actively seeking to become pregnant, and/or mothers of infants. However, the court noted that none of these women are named plaintiffs in the original petition or in the complaint.

EPA responded to plaintiffs’ supplemental petition on January 19, 2021, declining to exercise its discretion to reopen the administrative record and reconsider its previous denial of plaintiffs’ petition. EPA found that neither the original petition nor the supplemental petition satisfied the legal requirements necessary for EPA to initiate a proceeding for a rulemaking under TSCA because, among other deficiencies, the scientific evidence submitted for evaluating the risk of neurotoxic effects from exposure to fluoride was insufficient for EPA to reach an informed risk determination.

Plaintiffs will now have to seek the court’s permission to amend their complaint. Metropolitan staff will continue to monitor the lawsuit.

Matters Received by the Legal Department

<u>Category</u>	<u>Received</u>	<u>Description</u>
Action in which MWD is a party	1	Complaint for a Civil Case, filed in United States District Court, District of Arizona, in the case <i>James Lee Williams v. MWD</i> , Case No. CV21-00030-PHX-DWL, in which plaintiff alleges long-term discrimination against an African American farming community living on lands near Yuma, Arizona by depriving them of their right to Colorado River water
Government Code Claims	2	Claims relating to (1) accident involving MWD vehicle and (2) tree falling onto a claimant’s property



Requests Pursuant to the Public Records Act	17	<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>
		Adkan Engineers	Maps of existing water line in the City of Temecula
		Dr. Tana M. Session, Consultant	Contract documents relating to the request for proposal for Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Consulting Services
		Finch, Thornton & Baird, LLP	Documents relating to the Colorado River Aqueduct Pumping Plants 6.9 kV Power Cable Replacement Project
		Inland Valley Development Consultants	Plat and legal descriptions for areas of the Colorado River Aqueduct that crosses through parcels located in the Lake Mathews/Temecula area in Riverside County
		KMEA	Documents relating to the Request for Qualifications for As-Needed Environmental Site Assessment
		Labor Management Compliance Council	Contract information for Eagle Mountain Pumping Plant General Repairs & Maintenance Contract
		Law Office of Abraham Tan0067	Records relating to capability statements for temporary engineering staffing agencies from November 1, 2010 through December 31, 2016
		Los Angeles Times (2 requests)	Records relating to misconduct and/or harassment claims
		Michael Baker International	Proposals submitted in response to the request for qualifications for Environmental Planning Services (On-Call)
		Robert D. Niehaus, Inc.	Proposals, evaluation materials and executed agreement relating to the Request for Proposal for a Rate Refinement Workgroup Facilitator
		Private Citizen	Proposals submitted for the current On-Call Services for As-Needed Environmental Site Assessment



<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>
Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency	Proposal documents relating to the Request for Proposal to Provide Land and Natural Resource Management and Related Services
SEIU – United Service Workers West	Proposals, contracts, and invoices pertaining to MWD's current security guard services
SmartProcure	Purchase order data for the period September 30, 2020 to current
Training Solutions	Contract documents relating to the request for proposal for Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Consulting Services
University of California, Irvine Student	Water quality data and description of type of treatment at Weymouth Water Treatment Plant



PLEASE NOTE

- ADDITIONS ONLY IN THE FOLLOWING TABLES WILL BE SHOWN IN RED.
- ANY CHANGE IN CONTRACT AMOUNTS WILL BE SHOWN IN REDLINE FORM (I.E., ADDITIONS, REVISIONS, DELETIONS).



Bay-Delta and SWP Litigation	
Subject	Status
<p>DCP Revenue Bond Validation Action <i>DWR v. All Persons Interested</i> Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Wood)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Filed August 6, 2020 • Metropolitan, Mojave Water Agency, Coachella Valley Water District, and Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency have filed answers in support • Kern County Water Agency, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, Oak Flat Water District, County of Kings, Kern Member Units & Dudley Ridge Water District, and City of Yuba City filed answers in opposition • North Coast Rivers Alliance et al., Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, Sierra Club et al., County of Sacramento & Sacramento County Water Agency, CWIN et al., Clarksburg Fire Protection District, Delta Legacy Communities, Inc, and South Delta Water Agency & Central Delta Water Agency have filed answers in opposition • DWR is seeking a stipulation has moved to consolidate the validation action with the CEQA case for purposes of trial because several answering parties have raised CEQA as an affirmative defense
<p>DCP Revenue Bond CEQA Case <i>Sierra Club, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources</i> Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Earl)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sierra Club, Center for Biological Diversity, Planning and Conservation League, Restore the Delta, and Friends of Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge filed a standalone CEQA lawsuit challenging DWR’s adoption of the bond resolutions • Alleges DWR violated CEQA by adopting bond resolutions before certifying a Final EIR for the Delta Conveyance Project • DWR is seeking a stipulation has moved to consolidate the validation action with the CEQA case for purposes of trial



Subject	Status
<p>SWP-CVP 2019 BiOp Cases</p> <p><i>Pacific Coast Fed’n of Fishermen’s Ass’ns, et al. v. Ross, et al. (PCFFA)</i></p> <p><i>Calif. Natural Resources Agency, et al. v. Ross, et al. (CNRA)</i></p> <p>Federal District Court, Eastern Dist. of California, Fresno Division (Judge Drozd)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWC intervened in both <i>PCFFA</i> and <i>CNRA</i> cases • Briefing on federal defendants’ motion to dismiss CNRA’s California ESA claim is complete; no hearing date set and may be decided on the papers • Federal defendants circulated administrative records for each of the BiOps • December 18, 2020 PCFFA and CNRA filed motions to complete the administrative records or to consider extra-record evidence in the alternative with a hearing date of March 2, 2021 • <u>Parties stipulated to extend briefing deadlines on motions to complete the administrative records with briefing complete on March 8</u>
<p>CESA Incidental Take Permit Cases</p> <p>Coordinated Case Name <i>CDWR Water Operations Cases, JCCP 5117</i> (Coordination Trial Judge Gevercer)</p> <p><i>Metropolitan & Mojave Water Agency v. Calif. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, et al. (CESA/CEQA/Breach of Contract)</i></p> <p><i>State Water Contractors & Kern County Water Agency v. Calif. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, et al. (CESA/CEQA)</i></p> <p><i>Tehama-Colusa Canal Auth., et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources (CEQA)</i></p> <p><i>San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water Dist. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources, et al. (CEQA/CESA/ Breach of Contract/Takings)</i></p> <p><i>Sierra Club, et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources (CEQA/Delta Reform Act/Public Trust)</i></p> <p><i>North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources (CEQA/Delta Reform Act/Public Trust)</i></p> <p><i>Central Delta Water Agency, et. al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources (CEQA/Delta Reform Act/Public Trust/ Delta Protection Acts/Area of Origin)</i></p> <p><i>San Francisco Baykeeper, et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources, et al. (CEQA/CESA)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 8 cases ordered coordinated in Sacramento County Superior Court • Stay on discovery issued until coordination trial judge orders otherwise • Deadlines to prepare the administrative records extended to Jan. 24 <u>March 1</u>, 2021 in the four cases originally filed in Fresno County Superior Court, including <i>MWD v. CDFW</i> • <u>All four Fresno cases transferred to Sacramento to be heard with the four other coordinated cases</u> • SWC and Metropolitan have submitted Public Records Act requests seeking administrative record materials and other relevant information



Subject	Status
<p>CDWR Environmental Impact Cases Sacramento Superior Ct. Case No. JCCP 4942, 3d DCA Case No. C091771 (20 Coordinated Cases)</p> <p>Validation Action <i>DWR v. All Persons Interested</i></p> <p>CEQA 17 cases</p> <p>CESA/Incidental Take Permit 2 cases</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cases dismissed after DWR rescinded project approval, bond resolutions, decertified the EIR, and CDFW rescinded the CESA incidental take permit • January 10, 2020 – Nine motions for attorneys’ fees and costs denied in their entirety • Parties have appealed attorneys’ fees and costs rulings • Reporter’s transcript filed December 23, 2020 • <u>Parties stipulated to extend briefing schedule with Appellants’ opening briefs due April 2, 2021</u>
<p>COA Addendum/ No-Harm Agreement</p> <p><i>North Coast Rivers Alliance v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Gevercer)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plaintiffs allege violations of CEQA, Delta Reform Act & public trust doctrine • USBR Statement of Non-Waiver of Sovereign Immunity filed September 2019 • Westlands Water District and North Delta Water Agency granted leave to intervene • Metropolitan & SWC monitoring • Deadline to prepare administrative record extended to January 22 <u>March 23</u>, 2021
<p>Delta Plan Amendments and Program EIR 4 Consolidated Cases Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Earl <u>TBD after reassignment to Judge Chang and peremptory challenge</u>)</p> <p><i>North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council</i> (lead case)</p> <p><i>Central Delta Water Agency, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council</i></p> <p><i>Friends of the River, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council</i></p> <p><i>California Water Impact Network, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cases challenge, among other things, the Delta Plan Updates recommending dual conveyance as the best means to update the SWP Delta conveyance infrastructure to further the coequal goals • Allegations relating to “Delta pool” water rights theory and public trust doctrine raise concerns for SWP and CVP water supplies • Cases consolidated for pre-trial and trial under <i>North Coast Rivers Alliance v. Delta Stewardship Council</i> • SWC granted leave to intervene • Metropolitan supports SWC • <u>Petitioners’ opening briefs due April 20, 2021</u> • Parties have stipulated to the three remaining <i>Delta Stewardship Council Cases</i> challenging the 2013 Program EIR under CEQA being heard with the four cases challenging the 2018 amendments and Program EIR • SWC and several individual members, including Metropolitan, SLDMWA and Westlands are intervenor-defendants in the three remaining <i>Delta Stewardship Council Cases</i>



Subject	Status
<p>SWP Contract Extension Validation Action Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Culhane) <i>DWR v. All Persons Interested in the Matter, etc.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWR seeks a judgment that the Contract Extension amendments to the State Water Contracts are lawful • Metropolitan and 7 other SWCs filed answers in support of validity to become parties • Four answers filed in opposition denying validity on multiple grounds raised in affirmative defenses • Case deemed related to the two CEQA cases below and assigned to Judge Culhane
<p>SWP Contract Extension CEQA Cases Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Culhane) <i>North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. DWR</i> <i>Planning & Conservation League, et al. v. DWR</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petitions for writ of mandate alleging CEQA and Delta Reform Act violations filed on January 8 & 10, 2019 • Deemed related to DWR’s Contract Extension Validation Action and assigned to Judge Culhane • Administrative Record completed • DWR filed its answers on September 28, 2020
<p>Delta Conveyance Project Soil Exploration Case <i>Central Delta Water Agency, et al. v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Chang)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Filed August 10, 2020 • Plaintiffs Central Delta Water Agency, South Delta Water Agency and Local Agencies of the North Delta • One cause of action alleging that DWR’s adoption of an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for soil explorations needed for the Delta Conveyance Project violates CEQA • <u>DWR’s motion to dismiss overruled</u>
<p>Water Management Tools Contract Amendment <i>California Water Impact Network et al. v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Earl) <i>North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Super. Ct. (Judge Earl)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Filed September 28, 2020 • CWIN and Aqualliance allege one cause of action for violation of CEQA • NCRA et al. allege four causes of action for violations of CEQA, the Delta Reform Act, Public Trust Doctrine and seeking declaratory relief • Deadline to prepare the administrative record extended to January 26, 2021 in CWIN v. DWR case and February 1, 2021 in NCRA v. DWR case • CWIN case reassigned to Judge Earl so both cases will be heard together



San Diego County Water Authority v. Metropolitan, et al.		
Cases	Date	Status
2010, 2012	Aug. 13-14, 2020	Final judgment and writ issued. Transmitted to the Board on August 17.
	Aug. 28, Sept. 1	SDCWA and Metropolitan filed memoranda of costs.
	Sept. 11	Metropolitan filed notice of appeal of judgment and writ.
	Sept. 14, 16	Metropolitan filed motion to strike SDCWA's costs memorandum, and SDCWA filed motion to strike or tax Metropolitan's costs memorandum.
	Oct. 28	Court of Appeal issued order that the matter will be heard and decided on an expedited basis.
	Nov. 12	Hearing on cross-motion for prevailing parties in 2010-2012. Tentative in SDCWA's favor. No final ruling; matter continued to December 16.
	Nov. 25	Parties filed a joint statement on court's jurisdiction to determine prevailing party after appeal filed.
	Dec. 16	Hearing on prevailing party, if any, as to attorneys' fees (postponed from Nov. 12). No ruling at hearing; court took matter under submission.
	Jan. 12, 2021	Hearing on motions to strike or tax costs memoranda.
	<u>Jan. 13</u>	<u>Court issued order finding SDCWA is the prevailing party on the Exchange Agreement, entitled to attorneys' fees and costs under the contract.</u>
	<u>Feb. 5</u>	<u>Last day for Metropolitan to file opening appellate brief regarding final judgment and writ.</u>
2014, 2016	Aug. 28, 2020	SDCWA served first amended (2014) and second amended (2016) petitions/complaints.
	Sept. 28	Metropolitan filed demurrers and motions to strike portions of the amended petitions/complaints.
	Sept. 28-29	Member agencies City of Torrance, Eastern Municipal Water District, Foothill Municipal Water District, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, Three Valleys Municipal Water District, Municipal Water District of Orange County, West Basin Municipal Water District, and Western Municipal Water District filed joinders to the demurrers and motions to strike.



Cases	Date	Status
2014, 2016 (cont.)	Nov. 12	Case Management Conference on 2014, 2016 cases; no substantive action.
	<u>Jan. 28, 2021</u>	<u>SDCWA filed oppositions to demurrers and motions to strike.</u>
	Feb. 10	Hearing on demurrers and motions to strike.
	March 3	Case Management Conference on 2014, 2016 and 2018 cases.
2017	July 23	Dismissal without prejudice entered.
2018	July 28	Parties filed a stipulation and application to designate the case complex and related to the 2010-2017 cases, and to assign the case to Judge Massullo's court.
	Nov. 13	Court ordered case complex and assigned to Judge Massullo's court.



Outside Counsel Agreements				
Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Andrade Gonzalez LLP	MWD v DWR, CDFW and CDNR Incidental Take Permit (ITP) CESA/CEQA/Contract Litigation	185894	07/20	\$100,000
Aleshire & Wynder	Oil, Mineral and Gas Leasing	174613	08/18	\$50,000
Atkinson Andelson Loya Ruud & Romo	Employee Relations	59302	04/04	\$1,159,763
	MWD v. Collins	185892	06/20	\$60,000
	MWD Drone and Airspace Issues	193452	08/20	\$50,000
Best, Best & Krieger	Navajo Nation v. U.S. Department of the Interior, et al.	54332	05/03	\$185,000
	Iron Mountain SMARA (Surface Mining and Reclamation Act)	158043	07/17	\$250,000
	Bay-Delta Conservation Plan/Delta Conveyance Project (with SWCs)	170697	08/17	\$500,000
	Environmental Compliance Issues	185888	05/20	\$50,000
Blooston, Mordkofsky, Dickens, Duffy & Prendergast, LLP	FCC and Communications Matters	110227	11/10	\$100,000
Buchalter, a Professional Corporation	Union Pacific Industry Track Agreement	193464	12/07/20	\$50,000
Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP	Real Property - General	180192	01/19	\$100,000
	Labor and Employment Matters	180207	04/19	\$50,000
	General Real Estate Matters	180209	08/19	\$100,000
	Delta Conveyance Project Validation Action	185893	07/20	\$100,000
Law Office of Alexis S.M. Chiu*	Bond Counsel	174595	07/18	N/A
Cislo & Thomas LLP	Intellectual Property	170703	08/17	\$75,000



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Curls Bartling P.C.*	Bond Counsel	174596	07/18	N/A
Duane Morris LLP	SWRCB Curtailment Process	138005	09/14	\$615,422
Duncan, Weinberg, Genzer & Pembroke PC	Power Issues	6255	09/95	\$3,175,000
Ellison, Schneider, Harris & Donlan	Colorado River Issues	69374	09/05	\$175,000
	Issues re SWRCB	84457	06/07	\$200,000
Haden Law Office	Real Property Matters re Agricultural Land	180194	01/19	\$50,000
Hanson Bridgett LLP	SDCWA v. MWD	124103	03/12	\$1,100,000
	Finance Advice	158024	12/16	\$100,000
	Deferred Compensation/HR	170706	10/17	\$300,000
	Food and Water Watch v. MWD	174612	09/18	\$200,000
	Tax Issues	180200	04/19	\$50,000
Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP*	Bond Counsel	174601	07/18	N/A
Horvitz & Levy	SDCWA v. MWD	124100	02/12	\$600,000
	General Appellate Advice	146616	12/15	\$100,000
	Food and Water Watch v. MWD Appeal	185862	09/19	\$60,000
Hunt Ortmann Palfy Nieves Darling & Mah, Inc.	Construction Contracts/COVID-19 Emergency	185883	03/20	\$40,000
Internet Law Center	HR Matter	174603	05/18	\$60,000
Jackson Lewis P.C.	Employment: Department of Labor Office of Contract Compliance (OFCCP)	137992	02/14	\$45,000
Kegel, Tobin & Truce	Workers' Compensation	180206	06/19	\$100,000
Lesnick Prince & Pappas LLP	Topock/PG&E's Bankruptcy	185859	10/19	\$30,000



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore	Labor and Employment	158032	02/17	\$201,444
	EEO Investigations	180193	01/19	\$100,000
	FLSA Audit	180199	02/19	\$50,000
	EEO Investigation	180205	05/19	\$50,000
Manatt, Phelps & Phillips	In Re Tronox Incorporated	103827	08/09	\$540,000
	SDCWA v. MWD rate litigation	146627	06/16	\$2,900,000
Meyers Nave Riback Silver & Wilson	OCWD v. Northrop Corporation	118445	07/11	\$2,300,000
	IID v. MWD	185900	08/20	\$100,000
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius	SDCWA v. MWD	110226	07/10	\$8,750,000
Musick, Peeler & Garrett LLP	Colorado River Aqueduct Electric Cables Repair/Contractor Claims	193461	11/20	\$100,000
Nixon Peabody LLP*	Bond Counsel	174600	07/18	N/A
Olson Remcho LLP	Government Law	131968	07/14	\$200,000
	Ethics Office	170714	01/18	\$350,000
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan	Appellate	174598	04/18	\$100,000
Ryan & Associates	Leasing Issues	43714	06/01	\$100,000
Seyfarth Shaw LLP	HR Litigation	185863	12/19	\$250,000
Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth*	Bond Counsel	174599	07/18	N/A
	Financial Disclosure	185880	06/21	N/A
Theodora Oringer PC	OHL USA, Inc. v. MWD	185854	09/19	\$700,000
	Construction Contracts - General Conditions Update	185896	07/20	\$50,000
Thomas Law Group	MWD v. DWR, CDFW, CDNR – Incidental Take Permit (ITP) CESA/CEQA/Contract Litigation	185891	05/20	\$250,000



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Thompson Coburn LLP	FERC Representation re Colorado River Aqueduct Electrical Transmission System	122465	12/11	\$100,000
	NERC Energy Reliability Standards	193451	08/21	\$25,000
Van Ness Feldman, LLP	General Litigation	170704	07/18	\$50,000
	Colorado River MSHCP	180191	01/19	\$50,000
	<u>Bay-Delta and State Water Project Environmental Compliance</u>	<u>193457</u>	<u>10/15/20</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>
<u>Western Water and Energy</u>	<u>California Independent System Operator Related Matters</u>	<u>193463</u>	<u>11/20/20</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>

*Expenditures paid by Bond Proceeds/Finance