



## Metropolitan Cases

### ***Orange County Water District v. Northrop Corp., et al.; Northrop Grumman Systems Corp. v. Metropolitan, et al. (Orange County Superior Court)***

On October 27, 2022, the court dismissed this case without prejudice as to Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation and Northrop Corporation (collectively, Northrop), the only remaining defendants in the case. This brings 18 years of litigation to an end.

Orange County Water District (OCWD) originally filed this case in 2004 against multiple industrial defendants for contributing to contamination of the local groundwater basin. The industrial defendants filed cross-claims against Metropolitan alleging its deliveries of Colorado River water contained perchlorate, which contributed to the contamination. The defendants prevailed, and OCWD appealed. The appellate court affirmed that none of the industrial defendants, except Northrop, were liable to OCWD. In 2017, the case was remanded to the trial court. The case was stayed for much of the time since March 2018 to allow for settlement discussions.

After many extensions and a few short periods of discovery, trial was set for August 15, 2022. On August 10, OCWD and Northrop informed the court that they had reached a settlement resolving the matter. On October 12, OCWD asked the court to dismiss the case as to Northrop without prejudice, meaning OCWD could file a new lawsuit in the future if any claims arise. Subsequently, the court dismissed the case without prejudice on October 27. No details of the settlement were shared in the court files or in OCWD's board records.

OCWD is separately participating a related federal Superfund or CERCLA cleanup of the local groundwater basin, an administrative process led by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The Legal Department will continue to monitor this administrative proceeding.

### **2018 Delta Stewardship Council Case**

#### ***North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council (lead case), Central Delta Water Agency, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council, Friends of the River, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council and California Water Impact Network, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council (Sacramento County Superior Court)***

On November 4, 2022, the trial court denied all of Petitioners' claims in the four consolidated cases challenging the 2018 Delta Plan Amendments and the associated Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (Programmatic EIR). The State Water Contractors and federal contractors Westlands Water District and San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority intervened in the action. Metropolitan's Legal Department assisted in State Water Contractors' merits briefing.

Petitioners challenged the legality of two amendments in 2018 to the Delta Plan as inconsistent with the Delta Reform Act (Act). First, they challenged the Conveyance and Storage Amendment (CSO Amendment) and its recommendation that the state pursue a dual conveyance option for new Delta water conveyance infrastructure that would include one or more new intakes in the north Delta connected to existing State Water Project infrastructure in the south. Second, Petitioners challenged the Delta Plan's performance measures amendment, including the numeric target and achievement date for a long-term average reduction in Delta diversions. The court rejected their arguments that the Act requires substantial reductions in water exports, and ruled that the recommended dual conveyance approach is consistent with the coequal goal for the Delta of reliable water supplies and the statutory reduced reliance policy. Following a previous court of appeal holding in the *Delta Stewardship Council Cases*, the court also rejected Petitioners' argument that performance measures had to be adopted as enforceable regulations. In addition, the court rejected Petitioners' argument that the challenged CSO Amendments and performance measures violated the public trust doctrine.



Similarly, the court rejected Petitioners' numerous CEQA challenges to the Program EIR, including allegations that the Program EIR was required to study an alternative with drastic cuts in water exports and that the existing conditions environmental baseline should have excluded existing State Water Project and Central Valley Project operations.

In denying Petitioners' claims, the court expressly found that it made no ruling on the scope of the Council's authority over water exports, which was not before the court.

Appeals are anticipated once final judgments have been entered.

### **DCP Validation Case**

#### ***Sierra Club v. Cal. Dept. of Water Resources (consolidated with Department of Water Resources v. All Persons Interested, etc.) (Sacramento County Superior Court)***

On November 7, 2022, the court denied the Sierra Club's motion for a new trial and for summary judgment on one of its CEQA theories. At a hearing on November 18, the court denied Sierra Club's motion for reconsideration and summary judgment on a second CEQA theory and denied the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association's motion for summary adjudication regarding the scope of any future judgment in the Department of Water Resources' (DWR's) favor.

All three rulings are significant wins for DWR and help narrow the merits briefing. In addition, after several hours of oral argument, on November 18, the court took under submission DWR's motion for summary adjudication of various Delta Reform Act and public trust doctrine affirmative defenses and North Coast Rivers Alliance's cross-motion for summary judgment.

These two cases concern the DWR's adoption of bond resolutions authorizing issuance of revenue bonds to finance environmental review, planning, design, and, if a project is approved, construction of a new Delta conveyance facility. DWR filed a case seeking a judgment declaring the bonds to be valid known as the validation action, and Sierra Club and others filed a case alleging various violations of CEQA. The cases were consolidated for all purposes.

As reported, in January 2022, the trial court granted DWR's motion for summary judgment in the Sierra Club case and its motion for summary adjudication of the CEQA affirmative defenses in the validation action. Shortly after, the judge was elevated to the Court of Appeal, and a new judge was assigned last spring.

In August, Sierra Club moved for a new trial on the prior judge's ruling in DWR's favor on one of Sierra Club's CEQA claims, seeking summary judgment in its favor based on its argument that a provision in CEQA required DWR to certify a final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Delta Conveyance Project (DCP) before it could lawfully adopt the bond resolutions. Sierra Club also moved for reconsideration of the prior judge's ruling in DWR's favor based on new facts disclosed in DWR's Draft EIR published on July 27, 2022, arguing that the bond resolutions unlawfully narrowed the range of alternatives to be studied in the EIR. Concurrently, DWR moved for summary adjudication to eliminate various Delta Reform Act and public trust doctrine affirmative defenses, North Coast Rivers Alliance (NCRA) cross-moved for summary judgment on those defenses, and the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association moved for summary adjudication seeking a ruling that the issue whether future taxes used to repay any bonds issued per the bond resolutions are subject to Prop 13 is outside the scope of DWR's validation complaint and could not be included in any judgment affirming the validity of the bonds.

Metropolitan and other supporting water contractors joined DWR's motion and its opposition briefs. Although Metropolitan has retained special counsel to assist, the Legal Department has performed the majority of the work representing Metropolitan to date.

#### ***Reese v. Metropolitan (Riverside County Superior Court)***

On October 31, 2022, employee Darren Reese filed an employment lawsuit against Metropolitan in Riverside County Superior Court. The complaint was served on Metropolitan on November 14. The complaint alleges six causes of action under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act: race discrimination; race harassment; gender discrimination; gender harassment; retaliation; and failure to prevent harassment, discrimination, and retaliation. Plaintiff alleges that he was harassed and discriminated against based on his race and



gender, he was retaliated against because of his complaints, and Metropolitan failed to take reasonable steps to prevent these occurrences. Metropolitan’s answer or other responsive pleading is due on December 14, 2022. The law firm Seyfarth Shaw LLP is representing Metropolitan in the lawsuit, in conjunction with the Legal Department.

***Rick Faith v. Metropolitan, All Persons Interested, etc. (Los Angeles Superior Court)***

On October 14, 2022, an individual property owner from Orange County, Rick Faith, filed a reverse validation action alleging Metropolitan’s ad valorem property taxes for fiscal year 2022/23 are invalid pursuant to the constitutional provisions added by Propositions 13, 26, and 218. Plaintiff alleges

Metropolitan does not have authority to collect the taxes to pay the State Water Project expenses.

A validation or reverse validation action requires a validation summons be issued and published, as approved by the court. On November 17, plaintiff sought approval of its proposed validation summons for publication via an *ex parte* application in Department 15. Metropolitan filed an opposition and made a special appearance to oppose the application, because it had not yet been served with the complaint. The judge was unavailable in Department 15 and the matter was sent to another court which considered and denied Plaintiff’s application without hearing any oral argument.

Plaintiff served a copy of the complaint on Metropolitan on November 21, 2022.

**Matters Received**

<u>Category</u>	<u>Received</u>	<u>Description</u>
Action in which MWD is a party	2	Complaint in Validation in which Plaintiffs seek to invalidate MWD’s action on August 16, 2022 adopting Resolution 9317 levying ad valorem property taxes for the fiscal year July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023. filed in Los Angeles County Superior Court, in the case <i>Rick Faith v. MWD</i> , Case No. 22STCV33585 (See detailed summary above)
		Complaint for Damages (1) Race Discrimination, (2) Race Harassment, (3) Gender Discrimination, (4) Gender Harassment, (5) Retaliation in Violation of FEHA, and (6) Failure to Prevent Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation, filed in Riverside County Superior Court, in the case <i>Darren A. Reese v. MWD</i> , Case No. CVPS2204312 (See detailed summary above)
Government Code Claims	2	Claims relating to: (1) a trip and fall from a utility vault cover in the City of Los Angeles; and (2) an accident involving an MWD vehicle and several passengers in the other vehicle
Subpoenas	1	Civil Subpoena for Personal Appearance and Production of Documents, Electronically Stored Information, and Things at Trial or Hearing seeking an employee’s payroll records in a matter unrelated to MWD
Requests Pursuant to the Public Records Act	10	<u>Requestor</u>
		<u>Documents Requested</u>
		Agri-Pulse Communications
		Emails sent or received between September 1, 2022 to present by Bill Hasencamp relating to water shortages in the Colorado Basin, water use reduction plan for 2023, and 2023 operations for Lake Mead and Lake Powell



<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>
Center for Contract Compliance	Contract documents for landscape maintenance and tree trimming services at La Verne
Inter-Con Security Systems	Winning proposal for security services for MWD's facilities
LOR Geotechnical Group	Environmental assessment reports relating to the Inland Feeder Project at the Moreno Valley drill site
Midland Park Water Trust	Documents relating to MWD's grant to the city of Compton involving the property at Midland Park Water Trust Tract No. 4828
Moss & Associates	Appraisals and leases for telecom tower sites at MWD facilities at Lake Mathews and Yorba Linda
Pomona Public Works Department, Engineering Division	Facilities location maps/as-builts for MWD facilities within the city of Pomona's Capital Improvement Project for ADA Curb Ramps and Path of Travel
Private Citizen	Correspondence and public comments from the Board of Directors, MWD managers, and other agencies regarding MWD's turf replacement program
San Diego County Office of Audits and Advisory Services	MWD audited financial statements for year ended June 30, 2022
SmartProcure	Purchase order data including purchase order number, purchase order date, line item details, line item quantity, line item price, vendor information from August 22, 2022 to current



**PLEASE NOTE**

- ADDITIONS ONLY IN THE FOLLOWING TWO TABLES WILL BE SHOWN IN RED.
- ANY CHANGE TO THE *OUTSIDE COUNSEL AGREEMENTS* TABLE WILL BE SHOWN IN REDLINE FORM (I.E., ADDITIONS, REVISIONS, DELETIONS).



### Bay-Delta and SWP Litigation

**Consolidated DCP Revenue Bond Validation Action and CEQA Case**

*Sierra Club, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources* (CEQA, designated as lead case)

*DWR v. All Persons Interested* (Validation)

Sacramento County Superior Ct.  
 (Judge Kenneth C. Mennemeier)

**Validation Action**

- 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
- DWR’s motions for summary judgment re CEQA affirmative defenses granted; cross-motions by opponents denied
- August 25, 2022 North Coast Rivers Alliance filed motion for summary judgment on Delta Reform Act and public trust doctrine affirmative defenses; DWR filed motion for summary adjudication of all Delta Reform Act and public trust doctrine affirmative defenses; Metropolitan and other supporting water contractors joined DWR’s motion; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. filed motion for summary adjudication on scope of DWR’s complaint re Prop 13 applicability to future taxes that may be adopted to repay bonds
- Nov. 18, 2022 Hearing on dispositive motions
- [Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn.’s motion for summary adjudication denied](#)
- [Ruling on NCRA’s and DWR’s cross-motions re Delta Reform Act and public trust doctrine affirmative defenses pending](#)
- Dec. 9, 2022 Case Management Conference



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CEQA Case</b></li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Alleges DWR violated CEQA by adopting bond resolutions before certifying a Final EIR for the Delta Conveyance Project</li> <li>• Cases ordered consolidated for all purposes</li> <li>• DWR’s motion for summary judgment granted; Sierra Club’s motion denied</li> <li>• Aug. 23, 2022 Sierra Club filed motion for new trial or reconsideration on prior dismissal of its CEQA case and seeking entry of summary judgment in its favor</li> <li>• <a href="#">Nov. 4, 2022 hearing on motion for new trial re CEQA</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Nov. 7, 2022 motion for new trial denied</a></li> <li>• Nov. 18, 2022 hearing on motion for reconsideration re CEQA <a href="#">and ruling denying motion for reconsideration</a></li> <li>• Dec. 9, 2022 case management conference</li> </ul>
Subject	Status
<p><b>SWP-CVP 2019 BiOp Cases</b></p> <p><i>Pacific Coast Fed’n of Fishermen’s Ass’ns, et al. v. Raimondo, et al. (PCFFA)</i></p> <p><i>Calif. Natural Resources Agency, et al. v. Raimondo, et al. (CNRA)</i></p> <p>Federal District Court, Eastern Dist. of California, Fresno Division          (Judge Thurston)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWC intervened in both <i>PCFFA</i> and <i>CNRA</i> cases</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Federal defendants circulated administrative records for each of the BiOps</li> <li>• December 18, 2020 PCFFA and CNRA filed motions to complete the administrative records or to consider extra-record evidence in the alternative</li> <li>• Federal defendants reinitiated consultation on Oct 1, 2021</li> <li>• On Nov. 8, 2021, Federal Defendants and PCFFA plaintiffs stipulated to inclusion of certain records in the Administrative Records and to defer further briefing on the matter until July 1, 2022</li> </ul>



- On Nov. 12, 2021, SWC filed a motion to amend its pleading to assert cross-claims against the federal defendants for violations of the ESA, NEPA and WIIN Act; Court has yet to set a hearing date
- November 23, 2021, Federal Defendants filed a motion for voluntary remand of the 2019 Biological Opinions and NEPA Record of Decision and requesting that the Court issue an order approving an Interim Operations Plan through September 30, 2022; that the cases be stayed for the same time period; and that the Court retain jurisdiction during the pendency of the remand. State Plaintiffs filed a motion for injunctive relief seeking judicial approval of the Interim Operations Plan.
- December 16, 2021 – NGO Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction related to interim operations
- Motions fully briefed as of Jan. 24, 2022
- Hearing on motions held Feb. 11, 2022
- District court (1) approved the State and Federal Government's Interim Operations Plan (IOP) through September 30, 2022; (2) approved the federal defendants' request for a stay of the litigation through September 30, 2022; (3) remanded the BiOps without invalidating them for reinitiated consultation with the 2019 BiOps in place; (4) denied PCFFA's alternative request for injunctive relief; and (5) by ruling on other grounds, denied the state plaintiffs' motion for injunctive relief and the federal defendants' request for equitable relief
- September 30, 2022, Federal Defendants and State Plaintiffs filed a joint status report: 1) describing the status of the reinitiated CVP and SWP consultation; 2) recommending a plan for interim CVP and SWP operations to govern for the 2023 water year or some other interval of time, if consultation remains ongoing; and 3) requesting a continued stay or other path forward in the litigation
- [PCFFA et al. proposed an alternative 2023 interim operations plan](#)



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">December 22, 2022 conclusion of briefing re 2023 interim operations plan and potential stay</a></li> </ul>
<p><b>CESA Incidental Take Permit Cases</b></p> <p><b>Coordinated Case Name <i>CDWR Water Operations Cases, JCCP 5117</i> (Coordination Trial Judge Gevercer)</b></p> <p><i>Metropolitan &amp; Mojave Water Agency v. Calif. Dept. of Fish &amp; Wildlife, et al.</i> (CESA/CEQA/Breach of Contract)</p> <p><i>State Water Contractors &amp; Kern County Water Agency v. Calif. Dept. of Fish &amp; Wildlife, et al.</i> (CESA/CEQA)</p> <p><i>Tehama-Colusa Canal Auth., et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources</i> (CEQA)</p> <p><i>San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water Dist. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources, et al.</i> (CEQA/CESA/ Breach of Contract/Takings)</p> <p><i>Sierra Club, et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources</i> (CEQA/Delta Reform Act/Public Trust)</p> <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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All 8 cases ordered coordinated in Sacramento County Superior Court</li> <li>• Stay on discovery issued until coordination trial judge orders otherwise</li> <li>• All four Fresno cases transferred to Sacramento to be heard with the four other coordinated cases</li> <li>• SWC and Metropolitan have submitted Public Records Act requests seeking administrative record materials and other relevant information</li> <li>• Answers filed in the three cases filed by State Water Contractors, including Metropolitan's</li> <li>• Draft administrative records produced on Sept. 16, 2021</li> <li>• Certified administrative records lodged March 4, 2022</li> <li>• State Water Contractors et al. granted leave to intervene in Sierra Club, North Coast Rivers Alliance, Central Delta Water Agency, and San Francisco Baykeeper cases by stipulation</li> <li>• Sept. 9, 2022 fifth Case Management Conference</li> <li>• Sept. 9, 2022 Court ordered DWR and CDFW to produce privilege logs to the State Water Contractors et al. by Sept. 30, 2022 showing the basis for withholding hundreds of records from the administrative records on the deliberative process and official information privileges, then meet and confer; State Water Contractors et al. may renew their motion to augment if disputes remain</li> <li>• Sept. 29, 2022 State Water Contractors, et al.'s motion to intervene as petitioners in the <i>Tehama-Colusa Canal Auth., et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources</i> CEQA case denied without prejudice to re-filing a motion to intervene as respondents</li> </ul>





<p><b>CDWR Environmental Impact Cases</b> <b>Sacramento Superior Ct. Case No. JCCP 4942,</b> <b>3d DCA Case No. C091771</b> <b>(20 Coordinated Cases)</b></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> <p>(Judge TBD)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cases dismissed after DWR rescinded project approval, bond resolutions, decertified the EIR, and CDFW rescinded the CESA incidental take permit</li> <li>• January 10, 2020 – Nine motions for attorneys’ fees and costs denied in their entirety</li> <li>• Parties have appealed attorneys’ fees and costs rulings</li> <li>• May 11, 2022, court of appeal reversed the trial court’s denial of attorney fees and costs in an unpublished opinion</li> <li>• Opinion ordered published</li> <li>• Coordinated cases remitted to trial court for re-hearing of fee motions consistent with the court of appeal’s opinion</li> </ul>
<p><b>COA Addendum/ No-Harm Agreement</b></p> <p><i>North Coast Rivers Alliance v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Gevercer)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plaintiffs allege violations of CEQA, Delta Reform Act &amp; public trust doctrine</li> <li>• USBR Statement of Non-Waiver of Sovereign Immunity filed September 2019</li> <li>• Westlands Water District and North Delta Water Agency granted leave to intervene</li> <li>• Metropolitan &amp; SWC monitoring</li> <li>• Deadline to prepare administrative record extended to Nov. 18, 2022</li> </ul>
<p><b>Delta Plan Amendments and Program EIR</b> 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"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Allegations relating to “Delta pool” water rights theory and public trust doctrine raise concerns for SWP and CVP water supplies</li> <li>• Cases consolidated for pre-trial and trial under <i>North Coast Rivers Alliance v. Delta Stewardship Council</i></li> <li>• SWC granted leave to intervene</li> <li>• Metropolitan supports SWC</li> </ul> <p><b>2018 Cases</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Nov. 7, 2022 court ruled in favor of Delta Stewardship Council on all claims; final judgments pending</u></a></li> </ul>



<p><b>SWP Contract Extension Validation Action</b>          Court of Appeal for the Third App. Dist. Case No. C096316  <i>DWR v. All Persons Interested in the Matter, etc.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DWR seeks a judgment that the Contract Extension amendments to the State Water Contracts are lawful</li> <li>• Metropolitan and 7 other SWCs filed answers in support of validity to become parties</li> <li>• Jan. 5-7, 2022 Hearing on the merits held with CEQA cases, below</li> <li>• Final statement of decision in DWR’s favor filed March 9, 2022</li> <li>• Final judgment entered and served</li> <li>• C-WIN et al., County of San Joaquin et al. and North Coast Rivers Alliance et al. filed notices of appeal</li> <li>• <u>Parties have filed stipulation to consolidate the three appeals and set a briefing schedule</u></li> </ul>
<p><b>SWP Contract Extension CEQA Cases</b>          Court of Appeal for the Third App. Dist. Case Nos. C096384 &amp; C096304  <i>North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. DWR</i>  <i>Planning &amp; Conservation League, et al. v. DWR</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Petitions for writ of mandate alleging CEQA and Delta Reform Act violations filed on January 8 &amp; 10, 2019</li> <li>• Deemed related to DWR’s Contract Extension Validation Action and assigned to Judge Culhane</li> <li>• Administrative Record completed</li> <li>• DWR filed its answers on September 28, 2020</li> <li>• Metropolitan, Kern County Water Agency and Coachella Valley Water District have intervened and filed answers in the two CEQA cases</li> <li>• Final statement of decision in DWR’s favor denying the writs of mandate filed March 9, 2022</li> <li>• Final judgments entered and served</li> <li>• North Coast Rivers Alliance et al. and PCL et al. filed notices of appeal</li> <li>• <u>Parties have filed stipulation to consolidate the three appeals and set a briefing schedule</u></li> </ul>



<p><b>Delta Conveyance Project Soil Exploration Cases</b></p> <p><i>Central Delta Water Agency, et al. v. DWR</i>          Sacramento County Superior Ct.          (Judge Chang)</p> <p><i>Central Delta Water Agency, et al. v.. DWR (II)</i>,          Sacramento County Super. Ct.          (Judge Acquisto)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Original case filed August 10, 2020; new case challenging the second addendum to the CEQA document filed Aug. 1, 2022</li> <li>• Plaintiffs Central Delta Water Agency, South Delta Water Agency and Local Agencies of the North Delta</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• DWR's petition to add the 2020 CEQA case to the <i>Department of Water Resources Cases</i>, JCCP 4594, San Joaquin County Superior Court denied</li> <li>• Hearing on the merits held Oct.13, 2022</li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Dec. 2, 2022 ruling on the merits granting the petition with respect to two mitigation measures and denying on all other grounds</u></a></li> </ul>
<p><b>Water Management Tools Contract Amendment</b></p> <p><i>California Water Impact Network et al. v. DWR</i>          Sacramento County Superior Ct.          (Judge Aquisto)</p> <p><i>North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. DWR</i>          Sacramento County Super. Ct.          (Judge Aquisto)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Filed September 28, 2020</li> <li>• CWIN and Aqualliance allege one cause of action for violation of CEQA</li> <li>• NCRA et al. allege four causes of action for violations of CEQA, the Delta Reform Act, Public Trust Doctrine and seeking declaratory relief</li> <li>• Parties have stipulated to production of a draft administrative record by April 1, 2022 and to a timeline to attempt to resolve any disputes over the contents</li> <li>• SWC motion to intervene in both cases granted</li> </ul>



### San Diego County Water Authority v. Metropolitan, et al.

Cases	Date	Status
<b>2010, 2012</b>	Aug. 13-14, 2020	Final judgment and writ issued. Transmitted to the Board on August 17.
	Sept. 11	Metropolitan filed notice of appeal of judgment and writ.
	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. 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.
	Sept. 21	Court of Appeal issued opinion on Metropolitan's appeal regarding final judgment and writ, holding: (1) the court's 2017 decision invalidating allocation of Water Stewardship Rate costs to transportation in the Exchange Agreement price and wheeling rate applied not only to 2011-2014, but also 2015 forward; (2) no relief is required to cure the judgment's omission of the court's 2017 decision that allocation of State Water Project costs to transportation is lawful; and (3) the writ is proper and applies to 2015 forward.
	Mar. 17, 2022	Court of Appeal unpublished decision affirming orders determining SDCWA is the prevailing party in the Exchange Agreement and statutory costs.
	Mar. 21	Metropolitan paid SDCWA \$14,296,864.99 for attorneys' fees and \$352,247.79 for costs, including interest.
	July 27	Metropolitan paid SDCWA \$411,888.36 for attorneys' fees on appeals of post-remand orders.
<b>2014, 2016</b>	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.



Cases	Date	Status
<b>2014, 2016 (cont.)</b>	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.
	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.
	April 23	SDCWA filed answers to Metropolitan’s cross-complaints.
	Sept. 30	Based on the Court of Appeal’s Sept. 21 opinion (described above), and the Board’s Sept. 28 authorization, Metropolitan paid \$35,871,153.70 to SDCWA for 2015-2017 Water Stewardship Rate charges under the Exchange Agreement and statutory interest.
<b>2017</b>	July 23, 2020	Dismissal without prejudice entered.
<b>2018</b>	July 28, 2020	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.
	April 21, 2021	SDCWA filed second amended petition/complaint.
	May 25	Metropolitan filed motion to strike portions of the second amended petition/complaint.
	May 25-26	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 motion to strike.



Cases	Date	Status
<b>2018 (cont.)</b>	July 19	Court issued order denying Metropolitan’s motion to strike portions of the second amended petition/complaint.
	July 29	Metropolitan filed answer to the second amended petition/complaint and cross-complaint against SDCWA for declaratory relief and reformation.
	July 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 answers to the second amended petition/complaint.
	Aug. 31	SDCWA filed answer to Metropolitan’s cross-complaint.
	April 11, 2022	Court entered order of voluntary dismissal of parties’ WaterFix claims and cross-claims.
<b>2014, 2016, 2018</b>	June 11, 2021	Deposition of non-party witness.
	Aug. 25	Hearing on Metropolitan’s motion for further protective order regarding deposition of non-party witness.
	Aug. 25	Court issued order consolidating the 2014, 2016, and 2018 cases for all purposes, including trial.
	Aug. 30	Court issued order granting Metropolitan’s motion for a further protective order regarding deposition of non-party witness.
	Aug. 31	SDCWA filed consolidated answer to Metropolitan’s cross-complaints in the 2014, 2016, and 2018 cases.
	Oct. 27	Parties submitted to the court a joint stipulation and proposed order staying discovery through Dec. 8 and resetting pre-trial deadlines.
	Oct. 29	Court issued order staying discovery through Dec. 8 and resetting pre-trial deadlines, while the parties discuss the prospect of settling some or all remaining claims and crossclaims.
	Jan. 12, 2022	Case Management Conference. Court ordered a 35-day case stay to allow the parties to focus on settlement negotiations, with weekly written check-ins with the court; and directed the parties to meet and confer regarding discovery and deadlines.
	Feb. 22	Court issued order resetting pre-trial deadlines as proposed by the parties.
	Feb. 22	Metropolitan and SDCWA each filed motions for summary adjudication.



Cases	Date	Status
<b>2014, 2016, 2018 (cont.)</b>	April 13	Hearing on Metropolitan’s and SDCWA’s motions for summary adjudication.
	April 18	Parties filed supplemental briefs regarding their respective motions for summary adjudication, as directed by the court.
	April 18	Court issued order resetting pre-trial deadlines as proposed by the parties.
	April 29	Parties filed pre-trial briefs.
	April 29	Metropolitan filed motions in limine.
	May 4	Court issued order granting Metropolitan’s motion for summary adjudication on cross-claim for declaratory relief that the conveyance facility owner, Metropolitan, determines fair compensation, including any offsetting benefits; and denying its motion on certain other cross-claims and an affirmative defense.
	May 11	Court issued order granting SDCWA’s motion for summary adjudication on cross-claim for declaratory relief in the 2018 case regarding lawfulness of the Water Stewardship Rate’s inclusion in the wheeling rate and transportation rates in 2019-2020; certain cross-claims and affirmative defenses on the ground that Metropolitan has a duty to charge no more than fair compensation, which includes reasonable credit for any offsetting benefits, with the court also stating that whether that duty arose and whether Metropolitan breached that duty are issues to be resolved at trial; affirmative defenses that SDCWA’s claims are untimely and SDCWA has not satisfied claims presentation requirements; affirmative defense in the 2018 case that SDCWA has not satisfied contract dispute resolution requirements; claim, cross-claims, and affirmative defenses regarding applicability of Proposition 26, finding that Proposition 26 applies to Metropolitan’s rates and charges, with the court also stating that whether Metropolitan violated Proposition 26 is a separate issue; and cross-claims and affirmative defenses regarding applicability of Government Code section 54999.7, finding that section 54999.7 applies to Metropolitan’s rates. Court denied SDCWA’s motion on certain other cross-claims and affirmative defenses.
	May 13	Pre-trial conference; court denied Metropolitan’s motions in limine.
	May 16	Court issued order setting post-trial brief deadline and closing arguments.
	May 16-27	Trial occurred but did not conclude.
	May 23, June 21	SDCWA filed motions in limine.



Cases	Date	Status
<b>2014, 2016, 2018 (cont.)</b>	May 26, June 24	Court denied SDCWA's motions in limine.
	June 3, June 24, July 1	Trial continued, concluding on July 1.
	June 24	SDCWA filed motion for partial judgment.
	July 15	Metropolitan filed opposition to motion for partial judgment.
	Aug. 19	Post-trial briefs filed.
	Sept. 14	Court issued order granting in part and denying in part SDCWA's motion for partial judgment (granting motion as to Metropolitan's dispute resolution, waiver, and consent defenses; denying motion as to Metropolitan's reformation cross-claims and mistake of fact and law defenses; and deferring ruling on Metropolitan's cost causation cross-claim).
	Sept. 21	Metropolitan filed response to order granting in part and denying in part SDCWA's motion for partial judgment (requesting deletion of Background section portion relying on pleading allegations).
	Sept. 22	SDCWA filed objection to Metropolitan's response to order granting in part and denying in part SDCWA's motion for partial judgment.
	Sept. 27	Post-trial closing arguments.
	Oct. 20	Court issued order that it will rule on SDCWA's motion for partial judgment as to Metropolitan's cost causation cross-claim simultaneously with the trial statement of decision.
	Dec. 16	Parties' proposed trial statements of decision due.
<b>All Cases</b>	April 15, 2021	Case Management Conference on 2010-2018 cases. Court set trial in 2014, 2016, and 2018 cases on May 16-27, 2022.
	April 27	SDCWA served notice of deposition of non-party witness.
	May 13-14	Metropolitan filed motions to quash and for protective order regarding deposition of non-party witness.
	June 4	Ruling on motions to quash and for protective order.





<b>Outside Counsel Agreements</b>				
<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>Matter Name</b>	<b>Agreement No.</b>	<b>Effective Date</b>	<b>Contract Maximum</b>
Andrade Gonzalez LLP	MWD v. DWR, CDFW and CDNR Incidental Take Permit (ITP) CESA/CEQA/Contract Litigation	185894	07/20	\$250,000
Aleshire & Wynder	Oil, Mineral and Gas Leasing	174613	08/18	\$50,000
Atkinson Andelson Loya Ruud & Romo	Employee Relations	59302	04/04	\$1,214,517
	MWD v. Collins	185892	06/20	\$100,000
	Delta Conveyance Project Bond Validation-CEQA Litigation	185899	09/21	\$100,000
	MWD Drone and Airspace Issues	193452	08/20	\$50,000
	Equal Employee Opportunity Commission Charge	200462	03/21	\$20,000
	Public Employment Relations Board Charge No. LA-CE-1441-M	200467	03/21	\$30,000
	Representation re the Shaw Law Group's Investigations	200485	05/20/21	\$50,000
	DFEH Charge- (DFEH Number 202102-12621316)	201882	07/01/21	\$25,000
	AFSCME Local 1902 in Grievance No. 1906G020 (CSU Meal Period)	201883	07/12/21	\$30,000
	AFSCME Local 1902 v. MWD, PERB Case No. LA-CE-1438-M	201889	09/15/21	\$20,000
	MWD MOU Negotiations**	201893	10/05/21	\$100,000
	DFEH Charge- (DFEH Number 202106-13819209)	203439	12/14/21	\$15,000
DFEH Charge- (DFEH Number 202109-14694608)	203460	02/22	\$15,000	



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Best, Best & Krieger	Navajo Nation v. U.S. Department of the Interior, et al.	54332	05/03	\$185,000
	Bay-Delta Conservation Plan/Delta Conveyance Project (with SWCs)	170697	08/17	\$500,000
	Environmental Compliance Issues	185888	05/20	\$100,000
	Public Records Act Requests	203462	04/22	\$30,000
Blooston, Mordkofsky, Dickens, Duffy & Prendergast, LLP	FCC and Communications Matters	110227	11/10	\$100,000
Brown White & Osborn LLP	HR Matter	203450	03/22	\$50,000
Buchalter, a Professional Corp.	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
Law Office of Alexis S.M. Chiu*	Bond Counsel	200468	07/21	N/A
Cislo & Thomas LLP	Intellectual Property	170703	08/17	\$75,000
Cummins & White, LLP	Board Advice	207941	05/22	\$10,000
Curls Bartling P.C.*	Bond Counsel	174596	07/18	N/A
	Bond Counsel	200470	07/21	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



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Greines, Martin, Stein & Richland LLP	SDCWA v. MWD	207958	10/22	\$100,000
	<u>Colorado River Matters</u>	<u>207965</u>	<u>11/22</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>
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	\$ 400,000
	Tax Issues	180200	04/19	\$50,000
	<u>Alternative Project Delivery (ADP)</u>	<u>207961</u>	<u>10/22</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>
	<u>Faith v. MWD</u>	<u>207963</u>	<u>10/22</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>
Hausman & Sosa, LLP	MOU Hearing Officer Appeal	201892	09/21	\$95,000
	MOU Hearing Officer Appeal	207943	05/22	\$25,000
	MOU Hearing Officer Appeal	207949	07/22	\$25,000
Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP*	Bond Counsel	193469	07/21	N/A
Horvitz & Levy	SDCWA v. MWD	124100	02/12	<del>\$900,000</del> <u>\$1,250,000</u>
	General Appellate Advice	146616	12/15	\$100,000
	Colorado River	203464	04/22	\$100,000
Internet Law Center	Cybersecurity and Privacy Advice and Representation	200478	04/13/21	\$100,000
	Systems Integrated, LLC v. MWD	201875	05/17/21	\$65,000
Amira Jackmon, Attorney at Law*	Bond Counsel	200464	07/21	N/A
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
Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation*	Bond Counsel	200465	07/21	N/A
Kegel, Tobin & Truce	Workers' Compensation	180206	06/19	\$250,000
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
	FLSA Audit	180199	02/19	\$50,000
Manatt, Phelps & Phillips	SDCWA v. MWD rate litigation	146627	06/16	\$4,400,000
	Raftelis - Subcontractor of Manatt, Phelps & Phillips Agreement No. 146627: Pursuant to 05/02/22 Engagement Letter between Manatt, Phelps & Phillips and Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc., Metropolitan Water District paid Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc.	Invoice No. 23949		\$56,376.64 for expert services and reimbursable expenses in SDCWA v. MWD
Meyers Nave Riback Silver & Wilson	OCWD v. Northrop Corporation	118445	07/11	\$2,300,000
	<u>Pure Water Southern California</u>	<u>207967</u>	<u>11/22</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>
Miller Barondess, LLP	SDCWA v. MWD	138006	12/14	\$600,000
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius	SDCWA v. MWD	110226	07/10	\$8,750,000
	Project Labor Agreements	200476	04/21	\$100,000
Musick, Peeler & Garrett LLP	Colorado River Aqueduct Electric Cables Repair/Contractor Claims	193461	11/20	\$900,000
	Arvin-Edison v. Dow Chemical	203452	01/22	\$90,000
	Semitropic TCP Litigation	207954	09/22	\$75,000
Nixon Peabody LLP*	Bond Counsel	193473	07/21	N/A
Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP*	Bond Counsel	200466	07/21	N/A
Olson Remcho LLP	Government Law	131968	07/14	\$200,000



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
	Executive Committee/Ad Hoc Committees Advice	207947	08/22	\$60,000
	Public Records Act	207950	08/22	\$20,000
Renne Public Law Group, LLP	ACE v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1574-M)	203466	05/22	\$50,000
	MOU Hearing Officer Appeal	203948	07/22	\$25,000
	<u>ACE v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1611-M)</u>	<u>207962</u>	<u>10/22</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>
Ryan & Associates	Leasing Issues	43714	06/01	\$200,000
Seyfarth Shaw LLP	HR Litigation	185863	12/19	\$250,000
	Claim (Contract #201897)	201897	11/04/21	\$200,000
	Claim (Contract #203436)	203436	11/15/21	\$350,000
	Claim (Contract #203454)	203454	01/22	\$160,000
	Claim (Contract #203455)	203455	10/21	\$175,000
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP	Rivers v. MWD	207946	07/22	\$100,000
Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth*	Bond Counsel	200471	07/21	N/A
Theodora Oringher PC	Construction Contracts - General Conditions Update	185896	07/20	\$100,000
Thomas Law Group	<del>MWD v. DWR, CDFW, CDNR – Incidental Take Permit (ITP) CESA/CEQA/Contract Litigation</del>	<del>185891</del>	<del>05/20</del>	<del>\$250,000</del>
	Iron Mountain SMARA (Surface Mining and Reclamation Act)	203435	12/03/21	\$100,000
Thompson Coburn LLP	FERC Representation re Colorado River Aqueduct Electrical Transmission System	122465	12/11	\$100,000
	NERC Energy Reliability Standards	193451	08/20	\$100,000



<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>Matter Name</b>	<b>Agreement No.</b>	<b>Effective Date</b>	<b>Contract Maximum</b>
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

\*\*Expenditures paid by another group