



Metropolitan Cases

Save the Colorado v. United States Department of Interior, et al., (U.S. District Court, District of Arizona)

On December 23, 2022, the federal court in Arizona granted summary judgment in favor of the U.S. Department of Interior (DOI) and other Colorado River stakeholder intervenors, including Metropolitan, and dismissed the 2019 challenge by Save the Colorado and Center for Biological Diversity to DOI's 2016 approval of Long-Term Experimental Management Plan (LTEMP) for Glen Canyon Dam.

Save the Colorado and Center for Biological Diversity (collectively, plaintiffs) sought to force DOI to do further analysis and projections on the impacts of climate change on the operation of the Colorado River. Plaintiffs argued that DOI's analysis pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA was insufficient because it did not fully consider more extreme climate change impacts and alternatives, such as decommissioning Glen Canyon Dam or allowing the natural flow of the Colorado River or the run-of-the-river alternative. If successful, this challenge could have interfered with routine river operations and impacted downstream water uses. For these reasons, in 2020, numerous Colorado River stakeholders intervened to challenge the merits of the action, including Metropolitan who partnered with Southern Nevada Water Authority and Central Arizona Project to jointly intervene and join in DOI's motions.

DOI and the Colorado River intervenors argued that plaintiffs challenge was improper as it sought to challenge the annual releases approved by DOI in 2007, and not the LTEMP, which only provides a framework for monthly releases and adaptive management subject to the existing annual releases. Essentially, plaintiffs were trying to re-open the approval of the 2007 Interim Guidelines for Lower Basin Shortages and Coordinated Operation for Lake Powell and Lake Mead (2007 Interim Guidelines) by challenging the LTEMP approval. DOI also argued it made a reasonable analysis of the potential impacts of climate change and adequately assessed the alternatives based on climate change projections.

Between November 2021 and March 2022, the parties filed cross motions for summary judgment, each side arguing it was correct. A lengthy hearing was held on October 27, 2022.

On December 23, 2022, in a 66-page order, the court sided with DOI and the intervenors, holding that plaintiffs' challenge was improper, and that DOI had adequately addressed the potential impacts of climate change and considered adequate alternatives when it approved the LTEMP in 2016. The court also refused to take judicial notice of current drought conditions.

Plaintiff tried to use the current drought to their advantage but the court properly refused to question the prior analysis based on current facts. The proper focus is whether DOI did an adequate analysis at the time the decision was made.

It is not clear whether plaintiffs will appeal the decision or simply focus their efforts on the current NEPA process. Metropolitan will continue to participate in this case to protect its Colorado River water interests.

Hearing Officer Appeal Matter - Discipline

After conducting an EEO investigation, Metropolitan found that a subject employee engaged in multiple EEO-related policy violations against a complainant employee. Metropolitan issued discipline and AFSCME Local 1902 filed an appeal on behalf of the subject employee. The parties completed three days of administrative hearing. Metropolitan anticipates two additional days of hearing in February 2023, depending on the schedules of the parties and hearing officer, as well as post-hearing briefing by the parties. After reviewing the briefing, the Hearing Officer will issue a decision on whether the alleged disciplinary allegations are true and whether the level of discipline imposed was appropriate.



PERB Unfair Labor Practice Charge

ACE filed an unfair practice charge alleging that Metropolitan created a new unrepresented EEO Section Manager Classification and two new unrepresented Chief EEO Investigator classifications without first meeting and conferring with ACE. On December 5, 2022, Metropolitan filed a response in which it explained that it was under direction from the California State Auditor to reorganize and expand its EEO functions on a very tight timeline and therefore created these positions to meet the State's direction. Metropolitan also noted in its brief that it notified ACE of its decision and held several meetings with ACE regarding these issues. PERB is now considering the matter and will decide whether to issue a complaint based upon ACE's charge.

Reese v. Metropolitan (Riverside County Superior Court)

On December 14, 2022, Metropolitan filed its answer to employee Darren Reese's complaint. The lawsuit was filed on October 31 in Riverside County Superior Court and served on Metropolitan on November 14. The complaint alleges six causes of action against Metropolitan 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.

Matters Impacting Metropolitan

EPA and Army Corps of Engineers Release a Final Pre-publication Version of New Proposed Definition of "Waters of the United States"

On December 30, 2022, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) (collectively, the Agencies) released a final pre-publication version of the revised "Waters of the United States" (WOTUS) rule under the Clean Water Act (CWA). The term "waters of the United States" defines the scope of waters subject to the requirements of the CWA. The rule replaces the prior definition set forth in the 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule (NWPR) and adopts a WOTUS definition that the Agencies state is "founded" on the pre-2015 WOTUS definition (the 1986/88 regulations defining WOTUS).

The new definition of WOTUS is broader in scope than the NWPR and the pre-2015 definition. Under the final rule, jurisdictional waters include traditional navigable waters, territorial seas, interstate waters, impoundments of water, and tributaries and adjacent wetlands that are either relatively permanent, standing, or continuously flowing waters connected to more traditional navigable waters or waters with a "significant nexus" to traditionally navigable waters.

The Agencies' definition of "waters of the United States" does not affect the longstanding activity-based permitting exemptions provided to the agricultural community by the Clean Water Act. Additionally, the final rule codifies eight exclusions

from the definition of "waters of the United States" in the regulatory text to provide clarity, consistency, and certainty to a broad range of stakeholders. The eight exclusions are prior converted cropland, waste treatment systems, ditches, artificially irrigated areas, artificial lakes or ponds, artificial reflecting pools or swimming pools, water-filled depressions, swales, and erosional features.

The final rule is expected to be published in the *Federal Register* shortly and will become effective 60 days thereafter. Multiple challenges by industry and states are likely. Furthermore, the U.S. Supreme Court's pending decision in *Sackett v. EPA* may impact the constitutionality of the new definition. Metropolitan staff is evaluating the impacts of the new rule and will continue to track ongoing and future litigation.



Matters Concluded and/or Terminated

Metropolitan Claim Against the Federal Government

At the October 2022 board meeting, the Board authorized a \$300,000 settlement of Metropolitan claims against the federal government for the recovery of costs resulting from damages to Metropolitan’s infrastructure due to the crash of a military helicopter striking Metropolitan’s high-voltage transmission ground lines about 10 miles northwest of Gene and Intake Pumping Plants. On December 21, 2022 Metropolitan received payment in full of the settlement amount.

standby backpay in the amount of \$4,528.39 to one impacted employee, and \$4,349.35 to a second impacted employee. In addition, Metropolitan and 1902 negotiated a standby schedule for the impacted employees going forward. As a result, the matter was fully resolved and 1902 withdrew the appeal.

Hearing Officer Appeal Matter - Grievance

AFSCME Local 1902 filed an appeal alleging that certain employees were not being placed on standby in violation of the MOU. The matter was set for hearing; however, Metropolitan and 1902 engaged in settlement discussions. The parties reached a settlement on December 8, 2022. As part of the settlement, Metropolitan agreed to pay

PERB Unfair Labor Practice Charge

AFSCME Local 1902 filed an unfair practice charge with the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) alleging that Metropolitan had unilaterally changed how housing was assigned at remote facilities without meeting and conferring with 1902. Metropolitan denied the allegations but PERB issued a complaint. Metropolitan and 1902 engaged in settlement discussions and reached an agreement on what information can be considered in connection with the assignment of employee housing. As a result, the dispute was resolved and 1902 withdrew its PERB charge and PERB dismissed the matter on December 16, 2022.

Matters Received

<u>Category</u>	<u>Received</u>	<u>Description</u>	
Government Code Claims	3	Claims relating to: (1) reimbursement of mileage while working for MWD as an annuitant; and (2) two separate accidents involving MWD vehicles	
Subpoenas	1	Deposition Subpoena for Production of Business Records seeking an employee’s personnel, disability, and payroll records in a matter unrelated to MWD	
Requests Pursuant to the Public Records Act	10	<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>
		Center for Contract Compliance (2 requests)	Contract documents for Landscape Maintenance and Tree Trimming at (1) Live Oak Reservoir; and (2) north Orange County
		Coory Engineering	MWD’s survey benchmark list
		Denver Water	Current contract for the electronic payment processing system used by MWD for customer payments
		Orange County Water District	General Mineral and Physical Analysis of MWD’s Water Supplies for the period July 2021 through June 2022



<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>
Pacific Advanced Civil Engineering (PACE)	Drawings of any existing MWD facilities near the project in the City of Lynwood
Private Citizen	Winning proposals relating to the on-call engineering services contract awarded by the Board on October 10, 2022
The Solis Group	Evaluation materials prepared in the course of MWD's selection process for Project Labor Agreement (PLA) Administration
UC Hastings College of Law	Template for MWD board action letters for awarding contracts
Utility Design Services	Record maps detailing MWD's aqueduct near Southern California Edison's project in Temecula



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
- Dec. 9, 2022 Case Management Conference
- Dec. 9, 2022 DWR’s motion for summary adjudication of Delta Reform Act and public trust doctrine affirmative defenses granted;



	<p><u>NCRA's motion for summary judgment re same denied</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Trial on the merits set for May 15-18, 2023</u> • 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 all purposes • DWR's motion for summary judgment granted; Sierra Club's motion denied • 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 • Nov. 4, 2022 hearing on motion for new trial re CEQA • Nov. 7, 2022 motion for new trial denied • Nov. 18, 2022 hearing on motion for reconsideration re CEQA and ruling denying motion for reconsideration • Dec. 9, 2022 case management conference
Subject	Status
<p>SWP-CVP 2019 BiOp Cases</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"> • SWC intervened in both <i>PCFFA</i> and <i>CNRA</i> cases • Federal defendants reinitiated consultation on Oct 1, 2021 • 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 • 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



	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 16, 2021 – NGO Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction related to interim operations • 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 • December 22, 2022 conclusion of briefing re 2023 interim operations plan and potential stay • Jan. 6, 2023 case management statement due re any requests for hearing on the 2023 interim operations plan
<p>CESA Incidental Take Permit Cases</p> <p>Coordinated Case Name <i>CDWR Water Operations Cases, JCCP 5117</i> (Coordination Trial Judge Gevercer)</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



<p><i>Metropolitan & Mojave Water Agency v. Calif. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, et al.</i> (CESA/CEQA/Breach of Contract)</p> <p><i>State Water Contractors & Kern County Water Agency v. Calif. Dept. of Fish & 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"> All four Fresno cases transferred to Sacramento to be heard with the four other coordinated cases Certified administrative records lodged March 4, 2022 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 Sept. 9, 2022 fifth Case Management Conference 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 <u>SWC, et al. granted leave to intervene as respondents in Tehama-Colusa Canal Auth., et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources CEQA case</u> <u>Feb. 10, 2023 hearing on SWC’s renewed motion to augment the administrative records</u>
<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> <p>(Judge TBD)</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 May 11, 2022, court of appeal reversed the trial court’s denial of attorney fees and costs in an unpublished opinion Opinion ordered published Coordinated cases remitted to trial court for re-hearing of fee motions consistent with the court of appeal’s opinion
<p>COA Addendum/ No-Harm Agreement</p> <p><i>North Coast Rivers Alliance v. DWR Sacramento County Superior Ct.</i> (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



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westlands Water District and North Delta Water Agency granted leave to intervene • Metropolitan & SWC monitoring • Deadline to prepare administrative record extended to Nov. 18, 2022
<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>2018 Cases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nov. 7, 2022 court ruled in favor of Delta Stewardship Council on all claims • <u>Orders denying all claims and final judgments entered Nov. 22, 2022</u> • <u>Notices of entry of judgment filed Dec. 20, 2022</u>



<p>SWP Contract Extension Validation Action 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"> • 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 • Jan. 5-7, 2022 Hearing on the merits held with CEQA cases, below • Final statement of decision in DWR’s favor filed March 9, 2022 • Final judgment entered and served • C-WIN et al., County of San Joaquin et al. and North Coast Rivers Alliance et al. filed notices of appeal • Validation and CEQA cases consolidated on appeal • Briefing schedule set by stipulation with estimated completion in April or May 2023
<p>SWP Contract Extension CEQA Cases Court of Appeal for the Third App. Dist. Case Nos. C096384 & C096304 <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 • Metropolitan, Kern County Water Agency and Coachella Valley Water District have intervened and filed answers in the two CEQA cases • Final statement of decision in DWR’s favor denying the writs of mandate filed March 9, 2022 • Final judgments entered and served • North Coast Rivers Alliance et al. and PCL et al. filed notices of appeal • Appeals consolidated with the validation action above



<p>Delta Conveyance Project Soil Exploration Cases</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"> • Original case filed August 10, 2020; new case challenging the second addendum to the CEQA document filed Aug. 1, 2022 • 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 • 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 • Hearing on the merits held Oct.13, 2022 • Dec. 2, 2022 ruling on the merits granting the petition with respect to two mitigation measures and denying on all other grounds • <u>Dec. 23, 2022 court order directing DWR to address the two mitigation measures within 60 days while declining to order DWR to vacate the IS/MND</u>
<p>Water Management Tools Contract Amendment</p> <p><i>California Water Impact Network et al. v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Acquisto)</p> <p><i>North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Super. Ct. (Judge Acquisto)</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 • SWC motion to intervene in both cases granted • <u>Dec. 20, 2022 DWR filed notice of certification of the administrative record and filed answers in both cases</u>



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.
	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.
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.



Cases	Date	Status
2014, 2016 (cont.)	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.
2017	July 23, 2020	Dismissal without prejudice entered.
2018	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
2018 (cont.)	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.
2014, 2016, 2018	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
2014, 2016, 2018 (cont.)	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
2014, 2016, 2018 (cont.)	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	<u>The parties' filed</u> proposed trial statements of decision- due .
	<u>Dec. 21</u>	<u>SDCWA filed the parties' stipulation and proposed order for judgment on Water Stewardship Rate claims for 2015-2020</u>
All Cases	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.



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	\$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
	<u>Pure Water Southern California</u>	<u>207966</u>	<u>11/22</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>
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
	Colorado River Matters	207965	11/22	\$100,000
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	\$ 400,000
	Tax Issues	180200	04/19	\$50,000
	Alternative Project Delivery (ADP)	207961	10/22	\$100,000
	Faith v. MWD	207963	10/22	\$100,000
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	\$1,250,000
	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
Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corporation*	Bond Counsel	200465	07/21	N/A



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Kegel, Tobin & Truce	Workers' Compensation	180206	06/19	\$250,000
Kutak Rock LLP	Delta Islands Land Management	207959	10/22	\$10,000
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
	Pure Water Southern California	207967	11/22	\$100,000
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
	Executive Committee/Ad Hoc Committees Advice	207947	08/22	\$60,000



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
	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
	ACE v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1611-M)	207962	10/22	\$50,000
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	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



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
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