



Matters Impacting Metropolitan

U.S. Supreme Court Overturns Longstanding Chevron Deference Doctrine and Opens the Door to More Lawsuits Against Federal Agencies

On June 28, 2024, in a 6-3 decision in *Loper Bright Enterprises, Inc. v. Raimondo*, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned the longstanding Chevron doctrine, which required courts to defer to an administrative agency's reasonable interpretation of an ambiguous statute. Most recently, on July 1, 2024, in another 6-3 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court held in *Corner Post, Inc. v. Board of Governors* that the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) does not require lawsuits over EPA and other agencies' rules and "final agency action" to begin within six years of their promulgation but rather within six years of when a party was first injured by a particular policy. Courts had previously held that such suits must be brought within six years of when the rule was first promulgated.

The *Chevron* doctrine, also referred to as *Chevron* deference, was an administrative law principle established by the Supreme Court 40 years ago in *Chevron U.S.A. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984). However, writing for the majority in *Loper Bright*, Chief Justice Roberts held that the APA requires courts to exercise their independent judgment in deciding whether an agency has acted within its statutory authority, and courts may not defer to an agency interpretation of the law "simply because a statute is ambiguous." The majority opinion was joined by Justices Thomas, Alito, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Barrett. Justices Thomas and Gorsuch also filed concurring opinions. In his concurring opinion, Justice Thomas emphasized that *Chevron* deference violates the Constitution's separation of powers by curbing judicial authority and expanding agencies' executive power beyond constitutional limits. Justice Gorsuch wrote separately to explain that *stare decisis*—the judicial principle that courts should rely on their previous decisions when interpreting the law—supports overturning the *Chevron* doctrine, and that deference to administrative agencies is inconsistent with both the role of the judiciary and the mandate of the APA.

Justice Kagan filed a dissenting opinion in *Loper Bright* that was joined by Justices Sotomayor and Jackson. Justice Kagan wrote that "in one fell swoop, the majority today gives itself exclusive power over every open issue—no matter how expertise-driven or policy-laden—involving the meaning of regulatory law." In Justice Kagan's view, *Chevron* deference properly put authority to carry out Congressional intent in the hands of experts, who are appointed by the President and in turn face accountability for their policymaking decisions. As she explained, "Some interpretive issues arising in the regulatory context involve scientific or technical subject matter. Agencies have expertise in those areas; courts do not. Some demand a detailed understanding of complex and interdependent regulatory programs. Agencies know those programs inside-out; again, courts do not."

Chief Justice Roberts made clear that the *Loper Bright* majority's opinion does not "call into question prior cases that relied on the *Chevron* framework," and the holdings of those cases that specific agency actions are lawful are still good law. Even so, the majority's opinion in *Loper Bright* may impact all three branches of government, especially in light of the subsequent *Corner Post* decision. Writing for the dissent in *Corner Post*, Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson warned that the result of that decision could be a "tsunami of lawsuits" over older rules, particularly as it comes shortly after the Supreme Court overturned the *Chevron* precedent that guided many initial decisions on whether those regulations are lawful: "At the end of a momentous Term, this much is clear: The tsunami of lawsuits against agencies that the Court's holdings in this case and *Loper Bright* have authorized has the potential to devastate the functioning of the Federal Government."

As a result of these two decisions, courts will have more say over regulations in areas such as environmental protection, workplace safety, and energy, and may substitute their own judgment for that of an agency's. For example, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the



Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and other federal agencies may face more lawsuits regarding regulations and greater scrutiny by courts of new—and potentially existing—regulations. Agencies may also have a more difficult time defending their actions on appeal. In turn, Congress will have to either try to draft legislation to avoid ambiguity, or expressly delegate authority to the executive body to address areas of ambiguity.

As noted in *Loper Bright*, the decision may help provide more certainty and mitigate the whiplash that regulated entities experience when new administrations interpret statutes differently from prior administrations. One example is the

numerous definitions of the Clean Water Act term “waters of the United States” (WOTUS) proposed by various administrations over the years. However, the decision may also result in courts across the country reaching different conclusions about how to interpret the same statutory language. The Supreme Court may eventually resolve some of these disputes – like with WOTUS – but most lawsuits will not reach the Supreme Court. This means that the same statutory provision may be interpreted and applied differently in various parts of the country. Metropolitan staff will monitor the impact of these rulings.

Matters Concluded and/or Terminated

Supervisors Association v. Metropolitan (Public Employment Relations Board)

On December 11, 2023, The Supervisors Association of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, IBEW Local 11, Unit 76, filed an unfair practice charge with the Public Employment Relations Board regarding the discipline of one of its members. In the charge, the Association contended that Metropolitan disciplined one of its members due to union

activity. On February 5, 2024, PERB issued a complaint and the parties participated in a settlement conference. The parties subsequently agreed upon a settlement in which the Association member received the lesser discipline of a written reprimand and the member also agreed to participate in training. As a result of the settlement, the Association agreed to dismiss its PERB charge and submitted its withdrawal of the charge on June 25, 2024. The Legal Department represented Metropolitan.

Matters Received

<u>Category</u>	<u>Received</u>	<u>Description</u>				
Government Code Claims	3	(1) Claim that MWD vehicle tracked rocks from access road onto Claimant’s parking lot without sweeping up the rocks; and (2) two claims relating to motor vehicle accidents involving MWD vehicles				
Subpoenas	1	Deposition Subpoena for Production of Business Records, served by Defendants in the case <i>Jose Angel Santos v. Horizon Window Care, Inc., Mario Sanchez</i> , Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2306535, requesting employee records relating to plaintiff, who worked at various MWD field locations as a temporary employee from the Carpenters Union				
Requests Pursuant to the Public Records Act	7	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Requestor</u></th> <th><u>Documents Requested</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Center for Contract Compliance</td> <td>Bid results and contract documents for Live Oak Landscape and Tree Maintenance Services at Live Oak Reservoir</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>	Center for Contract Compliance	Bid results and contract documents for Live Oak Landscape and Tree Maintenance Services at Live Oak Reservoir
<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>					
Center for Contract Compliance	Bid results and contract documents for Live Oak Landscape and Tree Maintenance Services at Live Oak Reservoir					



<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>
Flatiron Construction Corp.	Proposals submitted by the prime contractors in response to the RFQ/RFP for the Progressive Design-Build Services for the Sepulveda Feeder Pump Station Project
JJ Property Maintenance Network	Current contract for janitorial supplies
Los Angeles Times (2 requests)	(1) Copy of Katano Kasaine's May 27, 2024 letter regarding General Manager, Adel Hagekhalil; and (2) documents during the time period January 1, 2023 and June 24, 2024 regarding (a) MWD contracts with Jeff Millman (Relay Team), Varouj Abkian (Abkian Management Group), Janine Hamner (J&J Consulting Group), and Mohsen Mortada (3 iStrategies); (b) reports from these consultants; and (c) communications between Katano Kasaine and Adel Hagekhalil and between Katano Kasaine and Mohsen Mortada relating to these consultants, the FY 23/24 and FY 24/25 budget process, LA City Watch articles, and CAMP4W discussions
MWD Supervisors Association	MWD board presentations regarding wage increases, lump sum payments, and financial costs to MWD for the increases and payments made to members of AFSCME Local 1902, MAPA/AFSCME Local 1001, Association of Confidential Employees, and Unrepresented Employees
Private Citizen	Employment contract, including all amendments, and related staff reports, for General Manager Adel Hagekhalil

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	
Subject	Status
<p>Delta Conveyance Project CEQA Cases</p> <p><i>City of Stockton v. California Department of Water Resources</i></p> <p><i>County of Butte v. California Department of Water Resources</i></p> <p><i>County of Sacramento v. California Department of Water Resources</i></p> <p><i>County of San Joaquin et al. v. California Department of Water Resources</i></p> <p><i>Sacramento Area Sewer District v. California Department of Water Resources</i></p> <p><i>San Francisco Baykeeper, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources</i></p> <p><i>Sierra Club, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources</i></p> <p><i>South Delta Water Agency and Rudy Mussi Investment L.P. v. California Department of Water Resources</i></p> <p><i>Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District v. California Department of Water Resources</i></p> <p>Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Acquisto)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWR is the only named respondent/defendant • All alleged CEQA violations • Most allege violations of the Delta Reform Act, Public Trust Doctrine and Delta and Watershed Protection Acts • Two allege violations of the fully protected bird statute • One alleges violations of Proposition 9 (1982) and the Central Valley Project Act • Second case management conference and hearing on motion for preliminary injunction re geotechnical work held May 31, 2024 • Deadline for DWR to prepare the administrative record extended to Sept. 30, 2024 • Next case management conference Oct. 18, 2024 • Ruling on motions for preliminary injunction re geotechnical work TBD June 20, 2024 trial court issued a preliminary injunction halting pre-construction geotechnical soil testing until DWR certifies that the DCP is consistent with the Delta Plan • <u>Aug. 19, 2024 deadline for DWR to appeal the injunction</u>
<p>Delta Conveyance Project Water Right Permit Litigation</p> <p><i>Central Delta Water Agency et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board</i></p> <p>Fresno County Superior Court (Judge Brickey <u>Whalen</u>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complaint filed April 16, 2024, alleges that the State Water Board must rule on DWR's 2009 petition to extend the time to perfect its State Water Project rights before the State Water Board may begin to adjudicate DWR's petition to change its water rights to add new points of diversion for the Delta Conveyance Project • July 17, 2024 hearing date for State Water Resources Control Board demurrer (motion to dismiss) <u>and motion to strike</u>



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 Kenneth C. Mennemeier)</p> <p>3d District Court of Appeal Case No. C100552</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validation Action • Final Judgment and Final Statement of Decision issued January 16, 2024 ruling the bonds are not valid • DWR, Metropolitan and other supporting public water agencies filed Notices of Appeal on or before the February 16, 2024 deadline • Eight opposing groups filed Notices of Cross Appeals by March 27, 2024 • April 16, 2024 DWR moved to dismiss the cross appeals as untimely • Motion to dismiss cross appeals denied without prejudice to renewing the motion in merits briefing Parties meeting and conferring on briefing schedule
<p>SWP-CVP 2019 BiOp Cases</p> <p><i>Pacific Coast Fed'n of Fishermen's Ass'ns, et al. v. Raimondo, et al.</i> (PCFFA)</p> <p><i>Calif. Natural Resources Agency, et al. v. Raimondo, et al.</i> (CNRA)</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 and CNRA</i> cases • Federal defendants reinitiated consultation on Oct 1, 2021 • March 28, 2024 order extending the Interim Operations Plan and the stay of the cases through the issuance of a new Record of Decision or December 20, 2024, whichever is first
<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.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative records certified in October 2023 • Parties are conferring on stipulation to delay setting a merits briefing schedule by 90 days and extending the time to bring the action to trial by six months



Subject	Status
<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>	
<p>CDWR Environmental Impact Cases Sacramento Superior Ct. Case No. JCCP 4942, 3d DCA Case No. C100302 (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 Arguelles)</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 • May 11, 2022, court of appeal reversed the trial court’s denial of attorney fees and costs • Coordinated cases remitted to trial court for re-hearing of fee motions consistent with the court of appeal’s opinion • Dec. 26, 2023 order denying fee motions • Six notices of appeal filed
<p>COA Addendum/ No-Harm Agreement</p> <p><i>North Coast Rivers Alliance v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Rockwell)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plaintiffs allege violations of CEQA, Delta Reform Act & public trust doctrine • Westlands Water District and North Delta Water Agency granted leave to intervene • Metropolitan & SWC monitoring • Deadline to prepare administrative record last extended to Nov. 18, 2022
<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



Subject	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="850 338 1430 422">• Dec. 20, 2022 DWR filed notice of certification of the administrative record and filed answers in both cases



<i>San Diego County Water Authority v. Metropolitan, et al.</i>		
Cases	Date	Status
2014, 2016	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	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.
	Feb. 22	Metropolitan and SDCWA each filed motions for summary adjudication.
	April 13	Hearing on Metropolitan’s and SDCWA’s motions for summary adjudication.
	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



Cases	Date	Status
2014, 2016, 2018 (cont.)		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 16-27	Trial occurred but did not conclude.
	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 filed proposed trial statements of decision.
	Dec. 21	SDCWA filed the parties’ stipulation and proposed order for judgment on Water Stewardship Rate claims for 2015-2020.
	Dec. 27	Court entered order for judgment on Water Stewardship Rate claims for 2015-2020 as proposed by the parties.
	March 14, 2023	Court issued tentative statement of decision (tentatively ruling in Metropolitan’s favor on all claims litigated at trial, except for those ruled to be moot based on the rulings in Metropolitan’s favor)



Cases	Date	Status
2014, 2016, 2018 (cont.)	March 14	Court issued amended order granting in part and denying in part SDCWA's motion for partial judgment (ruling that Metropolitan's claims for declaratory relief regarding cost causation are not subject to court review).
	March 29	SDCWA filed objections to tentative statement of decision
	April 3	Metropolitan filed response to amended order granting in part and denying in part SDCWA's motion for partial judgment (requesting deletion of Background section portion relying on pleading allegations).
	April 25	Court issued statement of decision (ruling in Metropolitan's favor on all claims litigated at trial, except for those ruled to be moot based on the rulings in Metropolitan's favor)
	Jan. 10, 2024	Parties filed joint status report and stipulated proposal on form of judgment
	Jan. 17	Court issued order approving stipulated proposal on form of judgment (setting briefing and hearing)
	April 3	Court entered final judgment
	April 3	Court issued writ of mandate regarding demand management costs
	April 3	SDCWA filed notice of appeal
	April 17	Metropolitan filed notice of cross-appeal
	May 3	Participating member agencies filed notice of appeal
	<u>May 31</u>	<u>Parties filed opening briefs on prevailing party</u>
	<u>June 28</u>	<u>Parties filed response briefs on prevailing party</u>
	July 18	Hearing on prevailing party
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
Albright, Yee & Schmit, APC	Employment Matter	211923	05/23	\$60,000
	<u>Employment Matter</u>	<u>216064</u>	<u>06/24</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>
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	\$1,316,937
	Delta Conveyance Project Bond Validation-CEQA Litigation	185899	09/21	\$250,000
	MWD Drone and Airspace Issues	193452	08/20	\$50,000
	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
BDG Law Group, APLC	Gutierrez v. MWD	216054	03/24	\$100,000
Best, Best & Krieger	Bay-Delta Conservation Plan/Delta Conveyance Project (with SWCs)	170697	08/17	\$500,000
	Environmental Compliance Issues	185888	05/20	\$100,000
	Grant Compliance Issues	211921	05/23	\$75,000
	Pure Water Southern California	207966	11/22	\$100,000
	Progressive Design Build	216053	04/24	\$250,000
Blooston, Mordkofsky, Dickens, Duffy & Prendergast, LLP	FCC and Communications Matters	110227	11/10	\$100,000
Buchalter, a Professional Corp.	Union Pacific Industry Track Agreement	193464	12/07/20	\$50,000



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP	Real Property – General	180192	01/19	\$100,000
	Labor and Employment Matters	180207	04/19	\$75,000
	General Real Estate Matters	180209	08/19	\$200,000
	Rancho Cucamonga Condemnation Actions (Grade Separation Project)	207970	05/22	\$100,000
Law Office of Alexis S.M. Chiu*	Bond Counsel	200468	07/21	N/A
Castañeda + Heidelman LLP	Employment Matter	216055	04/24	\$100,000
Cislo & Thomas LLP	Intellectual Property	170703	08/17	\$100,000
Curls Bartling P.C.*	Bond Counsel	200470	07/21	N/A
Duane Morris LLP	SWRCB Curtailment Process	138005	09/14	\$615,422
Duncan, Weinberg, Genzer & Pembroke	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
Erin Joyce Law, PC	Employment Matter	216039	11/23	\$100,000
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
Hanna, Brophy, MacLean, McAleer & Jensen, LLP	Workers' Compensation	211926	06/23	\$200,000
Hanson Bridgett LLP	SDCWA v. MWD	124103	03/12	\$1,100,000



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
	Finance Advice	158024	12/16	\$100,000
	Deferred Compensation/HR	170706	10/17	\$500,000
	Tax Issues	180200	04/19	\$50,000
	Alternative Project Delivery (ADP)	207961	10/22	\$250,000
	Ad Valorem Property Taxes	216042	11/23	\$100,000
Hausman & Sosa, LLP	Jones v. MWD	216056	05/24	\$100,000
Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP*	Bond Counsel	193469	07/21	N/A
Hemming Morse, LLP	Baker Electric v. MWD	211933	08/23	\$100,000
Horvitz & Levy	SDCWA v. MWD	124100	02/12	\$1,250,000
	General Appellate Advice	146616	12/15	\$200,000
	Colorado River	203464	04/22	\$100,000
	Delta Conveyance Bond Validation Appeal	216047	03/24	\$25,000
	PFAS Multi-District Litigation – Appeal	216050	03/24	\$200,000
Innovative Legal Services, P.C.	Employment Matter	211915	01/19/23	\$125,000
Internet Law Center	Cybersecurity and Privacy Advice and Representation	200478	04/13/21	\$100,000
	Systems Integrated, LLC v. MWD	201875	05/17/21	\$100,000
Amira Jackmon, Attorney at Law*	Bond Counsel	200464	07/21	N/A
Jackson Lewis P.C.	Employment: Department of Labor Office of Contract Compliance	137992	02/14	\$45,000
Jones Hall, A Professional Law Corp*	Bond Counsel	200465	07/21	N/A
Kronenberger Rosenfeld, LLP	Systems Integrated, LLC v. MWD	211920	04/23	\$250,000



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Kutak Rock LLP	Delta Islands Land Management	207959	10/22	\$10,000
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore	Labor and Employment	158032	02/17	\$240,821
	FLSA Audit	180199	02/19	\$50,000
	EEO Advice	216041	12/23	\$100,000
Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP	PFAS Multi-District Litigation	216048	03/24	\$200,000 \$100,000
Manatt, Phelps & Phillips	SDCWA v. MWD rate litigation	146627	06/16	\$4,400,000
	Raftelis-Subcontractor of Manatt, Agr. #146627: Per 5/2/22 Engagement Letter between Manatt and Raftelis, MWD paid Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc.	Invoice No. 23949		\$56,376.64 for expert services & reimbursable expenses in SDCWA v. MWD
Marten Law LLP	PFAS Multi-District Litigation	216034	09/23	\$550,000
Meyers Nave Riback Silver & Wilson	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	\$2,500,000
	Arvin-Edison v. Dow Chemical	203452	01/22	\$100,000
	Semitropic TCP Litigation	207954	09/22	\$75,000
	<u>Employment Matter</u>	<u>216063</u>	<u>06/24</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>
Nixon Peabody LLP*	Bond Counsel [re-opened]	193473	07/21	N/A \$100,000
	Special Finance Project	207960	10/22	\$50,000
Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP*	Bond Counsel	200466	07/21	N/A



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Olson Remcho LLP	Government Law	131968	07/14	\$400,000
	Executive Committee/Ad Hoc Committees Advice	207947	08/22	\$60,000
	Advice/Assistance re Proposition 26/Election Issues	211922	05/23	\$100,000
Pearlman, Brown & Wax, L.L.P.	Workers' Compensation	216037	10/23	\$100,000
Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch, LLP	CityWatch Los Angeles Public Records Act Request	216046	02/24	\$75,000
Rains Lucia Stern St. Phalle & Silver, PC	Employment Matter	211919	4/23	\$60,000
Renne Public Law Group, LLP	ACE v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1574-M)	203466	05/22	\$100,000
	ACE v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1611-M)	207962	10/22	\$50,000
	Employee Relations and Personnel Matters	216045	01/24	\$50,000
Ryan & Associates	Leasing Issues	43714	06/01	\$200,000
	Oswalt v. MWD	211925	05/23	\$100,000
Seyfarth Shaw LLP	Claim (Contract #201897)	201897	11/04/21	\$350,000
	Claim (Contract #203436)	203436	11/15/21	\$350,000
	Claim (Contract #203454)	203454	01/22	\$210,000
	Reese v. MWD	207952	11/22	\$750,000
	General Labor/Employment Advice	211917	3/23	\$100,000
	Civil Rights Department Complaint	211931	07/23	\$100,000
	Crawford v. MWD	216035	09/23	\$100,000
	Tiegs v. MWD	216043	12/23	\$250,000
	Zarate v. MWD	216044	01/24	\$250,000



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
	Lorentzen v. MWD	216036	09/23	\$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
Thompson Coburn LLP	NERC Energy Reliability Standards	193451	08/20	\$300,000
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
	Colorado River Issues	211924	05/23	\$100,000

*Expenditures paid by Bond Proceeds/Finance

**Expenditures paid by another group