



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 but 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: (1) Equitable Indemnity; (2) Equitable Contribution and Apportionment; and (3) Declaratory Relief. On November 9, 2020, 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 filed a first amended cross-complaint on February 19 (FACC). Metropolitan demurred again on the same basis since the FACC still alleged: (1) Partial Equitable Indemnification; (2) Apportionment; and (3) Declaratory Relief. The court ruled that Eastern's FACC could move forward. Metropolitan answered the FACC on

May 3. Eastern has amended its Government Code Claim to include a recently discovered 1984 letter is sufficient to be an indemnity agreement. (See General Counsel's January 2021 Activity Report)

Andrew Hawgood v. Metropolitan (Los Angeles Superior Court)

Former probationary Metropolitan employee Andrew Hawgood sued Metropolitan alleging race and disability discrimination in response to his probationary release from employment. Metropolitan entered into a settlement with Mr. Hawgood. As part of the settlement, Mr. Hawgood will receive a payment within delegated settlement authority limits and the lawsuit will be dismissed with prejudice. Mr. Hawgood is no longer employed by Metropolitan. The Legal Department represented Metropolitan in the case.

AFSCME Local 1902 v. Metropolitan (Public Employment Relations Board)

AFSCME Local 1902 filed an unfair practice charge in March 2020. Local 1902 claims Metropolitan failed to meet and confer adequately regarding job posting descriptions for various engineering positions. Metropolitan contends that the job postings were consistent with the class specifications. The Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) issued a complaint in March 2021, and an informal settlement conference is scheduled at PERB for May 6, 2021. The Legal Department is representing Metropolitan with assistance from Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo.

Matters Impacting Metropolitan

The Navajo Nation v. United States Department of the Interior (U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit)

On April 28, 2021, the Ninth Circuit issued an opinion reversing and remanding the decision of the district court, and finding that the Navajo Nation

can state a claim for breach of trust against the United States. This is the second appeal to the Ninth Circuit in this action that started in 2003.

As reported in November 2019, the federal district court in Arizona issued its order on August 23, 2019, denying the Navajo Nation's motion to file an



amended complaint against the United States for breach of fiduciary duty. In reaching this decision, the district court held that no statute or regulation cited by the Navajo Nation created an actionable trust duty, and that no actionable trust duty arose out of the implied water rights that attach to waters appurtenant to federal reservations. The district court further held that to the extent the Navajo Nation based its claim on allegedly appurtenant rights in the mainstream of the Colorado River, the court lacked jurisdiction to hear these claims because the U.S. Supreme Court retained continuing, exclusive jurisdiction in its Consolidated Decree in *Arizona v. California*, 547 U.S. 150, 166-167 (2006). Thus, the district court dismissed the action. The Navajo Nation appealed the matter to the Ninth Circuit.

Metropolitan participated in the briefing with Intervenor, the State of Arizona, Coachella Water District, and Imperial Irrigation District. Oral argument was heard on October 16, 2020 before the Ninth Circuit.

In its April 28, 2021 opinion, the Ninth Circuit found that “the complaint properly stated a breach of trust claim premised on the Nation’s treaties with the United States and the Nation’s federally reserved *Winters* rights, especially when considered along with the Federal Appellees’ pervasive control over the Colorado River.” The Court held that the United States has “an irreversible and dramatically important trust duty requiring them to ensure adequate water for the health and safety of the Navajo Nation’s inhabitants in their permanent

home reservation.” The Court also found “under *Winters*, [the United States has] a duty to protect the Nation’s water supply that arises, in part, from specific provisions in the 1868 Treaty that contemplated farming by the members of the Reservation.” In reaching this opinion, the Court does not identify any statute or regulation that specifically creates this trust obligation. The decision appears to create a new theory of implied trust obligations for the federal government based on treaties and common law.

The Court also held that, because the Nation’s complaint did not seek a judicial quantification of rights to the Colorado River, the panel need not decide whether the U.S. Supreme Court alone must decide the action under the exclusive jurisdiction it retained in *Arizona v. California* to allocate supplies from the mainstem of the Colorado River.

In a concurring opinion, Justice Lee notes the Third Amended Complaint’s “proposed injunctive relief should not be construed as implicitly authorizing a reassessment of the rights to the Colorado River mainstream.”

It is not clear what water supplies, other than the Colorado River mainstream, exist to serve the Nation. The defendants and intervenors may petition for en banc rehearing, (i.e., a hearing by a larger panel of eleven judges on the Ninth Circuit), or appeal the decision to the U.S. Supreme Court via a petition for writ of certiorari. Staff will continue to report on this matter.

Matters Received by the Legal Department

<u>Category</u>	<u>Received</u>	<u>Description</u>
Government Code Claims	2	(1) Claim by Eastern Municipal Water District relating to an incident on March 18, 2019 from the Perris Valley Siphon Leak Repair during the Colorado River Aqueduct shutdown that involved an unplanned flow of water into MWD’s Perris Valley Siphon; and (2) Claim by Baker Electric for unpaid contract balance and extras relating to its work on the Colorado River Aqueduct Pumping Plants 6.9kV Power Cable Replacement



Requests Pursuant to the Public Records Act	25	<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>
		AFSCME Local 1902 (6 requests)	(1) Records relating to safety incidents/accidents from January 1, 2017 to the present; (2 and 3) records relating to two threat assessments; (4) list of all agreement administrators since January 1, 2019; and (5) records relating to employee petition/survey; (6) records relating to the General Management recruitment, agreements and communications with Patricia Mulroy, Willie Pelote, and Don Attore, and communications on legislative matters
		California Chemical	Bid results for chemical supply for water treatment
		Center for Contract Compliance	Contract information re Colorado River Aqueduct Overhead Crane Replacement
		Connect Solutions Engineering	Drawings that show any water line locations near project in the City of Sana Ana
		Deltek	Information regarding the current On-Call Environmental Services Contract
		FREY Environmental	As-built information for MWD water mains located in the City of Santa Ana
		Jacobs Engineering	As-builts for Foothill Feeder Line from Castaic Lake to Jensen Water Treatment Plant for use for a hydrological study near Santa Clarita
		Labor Management Compliance Council	Notice of Completion for Orange County Region Service Center
		Lee & Ro	Records relating to the Request for Proposal for the Garvey Rehabilitation Project
		Los Angeles Times (2 requests)	(1) Records relating to current and former directors' expenses paid for by MWD from April 7, 2011 through April 7, 2021; and (2) records relating to any law enforcement investigation relating to an employee



<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>
Private Citizen (4 requests)	(1) Paintings by California artists that show the construction of the Colorado River Aqueduct and related structures; (2) records relating to the Palo Verde Irrigation District/MWD Forbearance and Fallowing Program; (3) information relating to MWD's access to aqueduct from Bureau of Reclamation land; and (4) information on static pressure for main water line serving a home in the City of Duarte
SmartProcure	Purchase order data from January 8, 2021 to current
United States Bureau of Reclamation	Records relating to MWD water quality sampling, including sampling plans, locations, frequency and duration, and list of analytes analyzed
University of California, Davis Student	Underlying cost data supporting calculations in the 2015 Integrated Water Resources Plan (IRP) Appendix 12 and new data for the 2020 IRP
Uppsala University in Sweden Student	Geospatial data that shows water demand and/or water use distributed over neighborhoods in Los Angeles
V3IT	Winning proposal for the Request for Qualifications for On-Call Consulting Services for Microsoft Azure Application



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>Consolidated DCP Revenue Bond Validation Action and CEQA Case</p> <p><i>Sierra Club, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources</i> (CEQA, designated as lead case)</p> <p><i>DWR v. All Persons Interested</i> (Validation)</p> <p>Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Earl)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validation Action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • Case ordered consolidated with the DCP Revenue Bond CEQA Case for pre-trial and trial purposes and assigned to Judge Earl for all purposes • CEQA Case <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 • Cases ordered consolidated for pre-trial and trial purposes



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 • Federal defendants sought and obtained an <u>additional 30-day</u> extension in the administrative record briefing schedule with briefing complete on <u>July 9</u>, 2021 • Federal defendants and CVP intervenors responded to Judge Drozd's question whether he should rule on the motion to dismiss CNRA's CESA claim saying hold off for now and promising a further update on or before May 11, 2021
<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>	<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 April 15, 2021 in the four cases originally filed in Fresno County Superior Court, including <i>MWD v. CDFW</i> • All four Fresno cases transferred to Sacramento to be heard with the four other coordinated cases • SWC and Metropolitan have submitted Public Records Act requests seeking administrative record materials and other relevant information • Initial Case Management Conference held March 19, 2021 at 2:00 p.m. • Next Case Management Conference set for May 7, 2021 at 1:30 p.m. <u>to address timing of administrative records</u> • May 7, 2021 Hearing on DWR's motion to bifurcate and stay the water contractors' breach of contract and takings claims • May 7, 2021 Hearing on water contractors' motion to lift the discovery stay re breach of



<p><i>North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources</i> (CEQA/Delta Reform Act/Public Trust)</p> <p><i>Central Delta Water Agency, et. al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources</i> (CEQA/Delta Reform Act/Public Trust/ Delta Protection Acts/Area of Origin)</p> <p><i>San Francisco Baykeeper, et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources, et al.</i> (CEQA/CESA)</p>	<p>contract and takings and potential motion for leave to file second amended complaints</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Subject</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Status</p>
<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>Appellants’ opening briefs filed April 27, 2021; opposition briefs due July 26, 2021; reply briefs due 60 days after opposition briefs are filed</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 May 24, 2021
<p>Delta Plan Amendments and Program EIR 4 Consolidated Cases Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Gevercer)</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



<p>Delta Stewardship Council Cases 3 Remaining Cases (CEQA claims challenging original 2013 Delta Plan EIR) (Judge Chang)</p> <p><i>North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council</i></p> <p><i>Central Delta Water Agency, 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"> • Petitioners’ opening briefs due April 20, 2021 • <u>2013 and 2018 cases to be heard separately due to peremptory challenge</u> • SWC and several individual members, including Metropolitan, SLDMWA and Westlands have dismissed their remaining 2013 CEQA claims but remain intervenor-defendants in the three remaining <i>Delta Stewardship Council Cases</i> • <u>Initial Case Management Conference for the four consolidated cases challenging the 2018 Delta Plan update set for June 25, 2021 before Judge Gevercer to discuss briefing schedule and other matters</u> • Briefing and hearing schedule for three remaining 2013 cases TBD after February 25, 2021 Case Management Conference
Subject	Status
<p>SWP Contract Extension Validation Action Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Culhane)</p> <p><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 • Parties meeting and conferring on Administrative Record disputes
<p>SWP Contract Extension CEQA Cases Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Culhane)</p> <p><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



Subject	Status
<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 • March 24, 2021 Second Amended Petition filed to add allegation that DWR's addendum re changes in locations and depths of certain borings violates CEQA • Deadline to prepare the administrative record extended to April 9, 2021
<p>Water Management Tools Contract Amendment <i>California Water Impact Network et al. v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Earl)</p> <p><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 May 28, 2021 in <i>CWIN v. DWR</i> case and June 1, 2021 in <i>NCRA v. DWR</i> case • <i>CWIN</i> 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.
	Jan. 13, 2021	Court issued order finding SDCWA is the prevailing party on the Exchange Agreement, entitled to attorneys' fees and costs under the contract.
	Feb. 4	Metropolitan filed opening appellate brief regarding final judgment and writ.
	Feb. 10	Court issued order awarding SDCWA statutory costs, granting SDCWA's and denying Metropolitan's related motions.
	Feb. 16	Per SDCWA's request, Metropolitan paid contract damages in 2010-2012 cases judgment and interest. Metropolitan made same payment in Feb. 2019, which SDCWA rejected.
	Feb. 25	Metropolitan filed notice of appeal of Jan. 13 (prevailing party on Exchange Agreement) and Feb. 10 (statutory costs) orders.
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.
	Feb. 16, 2021	Court issued order denying Metropolitan's demurrers and motions to strike, allowing SDCWA to retain contested allegations in amended petitions/complaints.



Cases	Date	Status
2014, 2016 (cont.)	March 22	Metropolitan filed answers to the amended petitions/complaints and cross-complaints against SDCWA for declaratory relief and reformation, in the 2014, 2016 cases.
	March 22-23	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 answers to the amended petitions/complaints in the 2014, 2016 cases.
	<u>April 23</u>	<u>SDCWA filed answers to Metropolitan's cross-complaints.</u>
2017	July 23, 2020	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.
All Cases	March 17, 2021	Case Management Conference on 2010-2018 cases (postponed from March 3); no substantive action.
	April 15	Case Management Conference on 2010-2018 cases. <u>Court set trial in 2014, 2016, and 2018 cases on May 16-27, 2022.</u>
	<u>May 17</u>	<u>Next Case Management Conference on 2010-2018 cases.</u>



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 <u>\$1,214,517</u>
	MWD v. Collins	185892	06/20	\$60,000
	MWD Drone and Airspace Issues	193452	08/20	\$50,000
	<u>Equal Employee Opportunity Commission Charge</u>	<u>200462</u>	<u>03/21</u>	<u>\$20,000</u>
	<u>Public Employment Relations Board Charge No. LA-CE-1441-M</u>	<u>200467</u>	<u>03/21</u>	<u>\$30,000</u>
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



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Law Office of Alexis S.M. Chiu*	Bond Counsel	174595	07/18	N/A
Cislo & Thomas LLP	Intellectual Property	170703	08/17	\$75,000
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	\$900,000
	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



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Kegel, Tobin & Truce	Workers' Compensation	180206	06/19	\$100,000
Lesnick Prince & Pappas LLP	Topock/PG&E's Bankruptcy	185859	10/19	\$30,000
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	\$70,000
LiMandri & Jonna LLP	Bacon Island Subrogation	200457	03/21	\$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	\$200,000
	IID v. MWD (Contract Litigation)	193472	02/21	\$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



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth*	Bond Counsel	174599	07/18	N/A
	Financial Disclosure	185880	06/21	N/A
Theodora Oringher 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
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
	Bay-Delta and State Water Project Environmental Compliance	193457	10/15/20	\$50,000
Western Water and Energy	California Independent System Operator Related Matters	193463	11/20/20	\$100,000

*Expenditures paid by Bond Proceeds/Finance