Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

Office of the General Counsel

Monthly Activity Report – July 2025

Metropolitan Cases

AFSCME Local 1902 v. Metropolitan
(MOU grievance appeal)

In this hearing officer appeal, AFSCME Local 1902 contended that their member was entitled to standby pay when the employee was temporarily promoted into an interim team manager position. MWD contended that an employee who occupies the team manager classification, even on an interim basis, is not entitled to standby pay. The matter proceeded to hearing, and the hearing officer agreed with MWD's position, finding that the interim team manager was not entitled to standby pay during the temporary promotion. MWD's Legal Department handled the matter in house.

Ryan Tiegs v. Metropolitan
(Riverside County Superior Court)

As previously reported, on March 4, 2025, the Riverside County Superior Court granted Metropolitan's motion for summary judgment or, in the alternative, summary adjudication, dismissing the case in its entirety before trial. Judgment was entered in Metropolitan's favor on May 9, 2025. On July 8, 2025, plaintiff filed a notice of appeal with the California Court of Appeal.

Zarate v. Metropolitan
(Los Angeles County Superior Court)

Plaintiff filed suit against MWD alleging discrimination, retaliation, and failure to prevent discrimination. MWD filed a motion for summary judgment challenging all three causes of action. On July 29, 2025, the court issued an order granting MWD's motion for summary judgment and dismissing the case with prejudice. MWD is awaiting Plaintiff's decision whether to seek an appeal. Legal Department staff handled this matter in conjunction with special counsel.

Cases to Watch

Patz v. City of San Diego
(CA Court of Appeal, 4th Appellate District)

On July 30, 2025, the Fourth Appellate District of the California Court of Appeal issued an opinion in *Patz v City of San Diego*. The Court held the City's retail tiered water rates on the Single-Family-Residence (SFR) customer class violates Proposition 218, specifically, Article XIII D, section 6(b)(3) of the California Constitution. The City has five classes of customers but sets tiered rates only for the SFR class. The Court held the City failed to prove a cost basis for distinguishing between the customer classes, setting the breakpoints for each of the tiers, and for setting the rates charged for each tier. The City did not meet its burden to establish the substantial evidence required to support that the SFR tiered rates were cost based. The court ruled that setting rates to encourage conservation or compliance with water budgets based upon tiers of use does not reflect actual costs of service and is not sufficient to meet legal requirements.

The Court also addressed the applicability of Government Code §53750.6, added by the passage of AB1827 in 2024 and effective January 1, 2025. The new statute provides that retail water rates *may* consider incrementally higher costs of water service due to higher water usage demand of parcels, maximum potential water use, and projected peak water usage. The Court interpreted the statute as permitting such factors, so long as usage and cost data support those methodologies. The statute alone would not be sufficient to overcome the substantial evidence of cost required for the City to meet its burden to show compliance with Proposition 218.

The Court's holding affirmed the trial court judgment, but also remanded the damages award (refund of $79 million) to the trial court for application of Government Code §53758.5, enacted by the passage of SB1072 in 2024 and effective January 1, 2025. The new section provides that any overpayment in a Proposition 218 rates legal challenge must be applied as credits to customers' future bills and not refunded

in the form of damages unless another statute expressly provides a refund must be given. Rather than vacate the refund awarded by the trial court, the Court of Appeal remanded, directing the trial court to amend the judgment to reflect the new law. As a result, customers (and the class action lawyers) will not receive the $79 million payment.

In a rare occurrence, one justice issued a 61-page dissent questioning the level of scrutiny applied by the majority. The lengthy dissent suggests, presumably to the California Supreme Court, that there is a split in appellate decisions in Proposition 218 cases and that the Supreme Court must take up this case on review to provide clarification of the law. On August 12, the City of San Diego filed a petition with the appellate court requesting a rehearing.

Sierra Club et al. v. California Department of Water Resources
(Sacramento County Superior Court)

On July 18, 2025 the Sierra Club filed a petition for Writ of Mandate in the pending CEQA litigation challenging the environmental documentation of the Delta Conveyance Project (DCP). The Petition alleges DWR unlawfully "piecemealed" the CEQA review of the DCP because its petition to the State Water Resources Control Board for a time extension of its existing State Water Project water right permits has created uncertainty and the potential of a future expansion of the DCP. The Petition seeks an order requiring DWR to withdraw its time extension petition, asks the court to decertify the DCP EIR, rescind the CEQA findings and project approval, require DWR to prepare a subsequent EIR for the DCP, and prohibit DWR from issuing revenue bonds until it has certified a subsequent EIR.

Other Matters

Miscellaneous

On July 1, 2025, Metropolitan issued $131,930,000 of tax-exempt Water Revenue Refunding Bonds, 2025 Series A. The Bonds were issued to prepay $147,650,000 of outstanding Special Variable Rate Water Revenue Refunding Bonds, 2022 Series C-1, which were issued as Federally Taxable bond. The issuance of the Bonds limited variable rate exposure and provided significant savings. Legal Department staff attorneys worked with Finance, Engineering and Water Resources staff to prepare the official statement used to market the Bonds and assisted outside bond and disclosure counsel with the drafting and negotiation of several contracts and closing certificates.

On July 10, 2025, Metropolitan assisted the Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency Financing Authority (AVEK) in the issuance of $ 170,045,000 of tax-exempt Revenue Bonds, Series 2025A to fund the AVEK High Desert Water Bank Program. The Bonds are secured by a pledge and lien on Installment Payment to be made by Metropolitan. This is the first bond transaction for Metropolitan using a third-party Joint Powers Authority. Since 2023, Legal Department staff attorneys worked with Finance, Engineering, and Water Resources staff to structure the transaction and to prepare the official statement used to market the Bonds. Legal Department staff attorneys also assisted outside bond and disclosure counsel with the drafting and negotiation of several contracts and closing certificates.

Matters Impacting Metropolitan

EPA Asks 9th Circuit to Reverse California Judge in Fluoridation Case

On July 18, 2025, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) filed its opening brief with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, asking the court to reverse a California federal judge's ruling that the fluoridation of drinking water at levels typical in the United States poses an unreasonable risk of injury to public health within the meaning of the federal Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). EPA filed its appeal after the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California found on September 24, 2024, in *Food & Water Watch, Inc., et al. v. EPA*, that "fluoridation of water at 0.7 milligrams per liter (mg/L) – the

level presently considered 'optimal' in the United States – poses an unreasonable risk of reduced IQ in children." The judge cautioned, however, that "this finding does not conclude with certainty that fluoridated water is injurious to public health; rather, as required by . . . TSCA, the Court finds there is an unreasonable **risk** of such injury, a risk sufficient to require the EPA to engage with a regulatory response" (emphasis in original).

EPA's appeal provides three legal grounds for reversal. First, EPA argues that plaintiffs lack standing, which means they do not have the right to bring a lawsuit in court. The plaintiffs' only witness who can prove they have standing has drinking water that naturally contains fluoride at levels the judge found harmful. Thus, the remedy that plaintiffs seek under TSCA -- for EPA to ban the **addition** of fluoride to drinking water -- would not result in the **removal** of the naturally occurring fluoride. As a result, plaintiffs would continue to experience the harm they seek to avoid even if they win their lawsuit.

Second, EPA contends that the district court violated TSCA by allowing plaintiffs to rely on scientific evidence in court that they did not provide when they first petitioned EPA in 2016. In fact, evidence that both plaintiffs and the court later considered crucial to a finding of unreasonable risk (including a 2024 National Toxicology Program (NTP) monograph on fluoride's neurotoxicity) did not even exist when EPA denied plaintiffs' petition. This is contrary to TSCA's statutory requirement that petitioners present the facts for EPA to consider before going to court.

Third, EPA alleges that the district court's takeover of the case after closing arguments in the first trial was impermissible and an abuse of discretion. In particular, the judge refused to rule after the close of evidence in the first trial and was determined "to accumulate more evidence that it, rather than the parties, thought proper." This transformed the court "from a neutral arbiter into an advocate," and transformed TSCA's citizen-petition provision into "a license for judicial rulemaking."

In reaching its decision, the court relied on the recent NTP monograph which concluded that higher levels of fluoride exposure, such as drinking water containing more than 1.5 mg/L of fluoride, are "associated with reduced IQ in children." But the NTP warned that there were "insufficient data to determine if the low fluoride level of 0.7 mg/L currently recommended for U.S. community water supplies has a negative effect on children's IQ."

In this regard, the American Dental Association (ADA) stated the court's ruling "provides no scientific basis for the ADA to change its endorsement of community water fluoridation as safe and beneficial to oral health." Similarly, the California Department of Public Health said, "Community water fluoridation is the single most cost-effective, equitable, and safe public health measure to prevent tooth decay and improve oral health." On July 25, 2025, the ADA filed a proposed amicus brief in support of EPA's appeal in order to provide the Ninth Circuit with additional information on the safety of water fluoridation. The American Chemistry Council and the American Fluoridation Society, Inc. are also seeking to file amici briefs in support of EPA.

The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) announced in April 2025 that it is reconvening a task force to make a new recommendation on fluoridation of drinking water. EPA simultaneously announced that it will prepare an updated health effects assessment for fluoride that will inform any potential revisions to EPA's fluoride drinking water standard.

Plaintiffs' brief responding to EPA's appeal is due by September 17, 2025, and EPA's optional reply brief is due 21 days later. Metropolitan staff will continue to monitor the Food & Water Watch lawsuit and EPA's appeal, DHHS' recommendation on community water fluoridation, and EPA's regulation of fluoride in drinking water.

Matters Received

Category	Received	Description	
Government Code Claims	1	Employment-related claim by an MWD employee	
Subpoenas	3	Two Worker's Compensation Subpoenas for employment, wage, time, medical and claim records and a civil subpoena for employment, attendance, and payroll records for a matter unrelated to MWD	
Requests Pursuant to the Public Records Act	17	Requestor	Documents Requested
		AtkinsRéalis	Rating and scoring document for responses to Request for Qualifications for Engineering Services for Water Treatment Facilities, Conveyance and Distribution Facilities
		BHA	Drawing of waterline near street improvement project county of San Diego
		BSK Associates	MWD's contracts with Weck and Eurofins for analytical services
		Chandler Asset Management	Proposals, presentations, fee schedules and scorecards for Investment Management Services
		ConstructConnect	Contract information for Engineering Services for Water Treatment Facilities, Conveyance, Storage, and Distribution Facilities Conveyance, Storage, and Distribution Facilities
		Delta Conveyance Design & Construction Authority	Examples of bid documents, including scope of work and technical requirements for Environmental Phase I Assessments
		FMCIVIL Engineers	Map of existing water lines near proposed light industrial in the city of Perris
		Krieger & Stewart	MWD utility information near the project for the Western Cabazon I-10 Waterline Crossing for the Cabazon Water District in the city of Cabazon
		Laquer, Urban, Clifford & Hodge	Certified payroll records, payment bond, and notice of completion for K&S' work on the Hinds, Eagle Mountain, and Iron Mountain Pumping Plants Storage Buildings

Requestor	Documents Requested
Nation Analytics	Purchase order data including purchase order number, purchase order date, end date, detailed description, quantity, price, and vendor for purchase orders valued over $5,000 from January 1, 2021 to the present
Newport Group	Current base salaries and last incentives for MWD executive team
Private Citizens (2 requests)	(1) Emails regarding an MWD employee and/or a Worker's Compensation claim submitted in 2024; and (2) contact information for all landscaping contractors who applied for turf removal rebates within area code 562 from January 1, 2025 to July 15, 2025
Proactive Engineering Consultants	As-builts for existing 96" line in the city of Orange
San Francisco Water Power and Sewer	Records relating to data governance policies, data action plan annual reports, list of systems used to collect/store HR/employee data
TKE Engineering	Detailed maps of the San Diego Aqueduct in the city of Hemet
Water Line Integrity	Copy of the Request for Qualifications for Pipeline Inspections Services

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
Delta Conveyance Project CEQA Cases *Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District v. California Department of Water Resources* (case name for the consolidated cases) *City of Stockton v. California Department of Water Resources* *County of Butte v. California Department of Water Resources* *County of Sacramento v. California Department of Water Resources* *County of San Joaquin et al. v. California Department of Water Resources* *Sacramento Area Sewer District v. California Department of Water Resources* *San Francisco Baykeeper, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources* *Sierra Club, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources* *South Delta Water Agency and Rudy Mussi Investment L.P. v. California Department of Water Resources* *Sacramento County Superior Ct.* *(Judge Acquisto)* 3d District Court of Appeal Case No. C101878	• 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 • Deadline for DWR to prepare the administrative record extended to Jan. 31, 2025 • 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 • Aug. 19, 2024 DWR appealed the injunction • Oct. 24, 2024 cases ordered consolidated for all purposes under *Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District v. California Department of Water Resources* • April 9, 2025, trial court denied DWR's motion for stay of enforcement of injunction to allow the DCA to resume preconstruction geotechnical work • May 14, 2025 DWR's appeal of the preliminary injunction fully briefed and awaiting oral argument date • ~~Aug. 8~~Dec. 1, 2025 next case management conference • September 16, 2025 oral argument on DWR's appeal of the preliminary injunction halting preconstruction geotechnical soil testing
Delta Conveyance Project Water Right Permit Litigation *Central Delta Water Agency et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board* Fresno County Superior Court (Judge Maria Diaz)	• 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 • May 1, 2025 deadline for plaintiffs to file a First Amended Complaint, which plaintiffs missed • ~~July 30~~Sept. 10, 2025, hearing on State Water Contractors' motion to intervene and motion for protective order to limit the DCP change in point of diversion hearing to the change and

	not the extension of time for the State Water Project water rights • August 27, 2025 Case Management Conference
Sierra Club et al. v. California Department of Water Resources Sacramento County Super. Ct. (Judge Jennifer K. Rockwell)	• Filed July 18, 2025 • Alleges DWR unlawfully "piecemealed" CEQA review of the Delta Conveyance Project and its petition to the State Water Resources Control Board for a time extension of its existing State Water Project water right permits • Seeks an order requiring DWR to withdraw its time extension petition, decertify the DCP EIR, rescind the CEQA findings and project approval, prepare a subsequent EIR for the DCP, and prohibiting DWR from issuing revenue bonds until it has certified a subsequent EIR
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) 3d District Court of Appeal Case No. C100552	• **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 • Appeals and cross-appeals fully briefed as of May 12, 2025, and awaiting oral argument date
2025 Delta Conveyance Program Revenue Bond Validation *Department of Water Resources v. All Persons Interested, etc*. Sacramento County Superior Court (Judge for All Purposes TBD)	• Jan. 6, 2025, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) adopted a new bond resolution • Jan. 7, DWR filed a complaint seeking a judgment validating its authority to issue the bonds under the CVP Act • 15 answers filed, 10 in opposition and 5 in support • June 12, 2025 two motions to dismiss denied • Aug. 8, 2025 hearing on DWR's motion to assign the case for all purposes to Judge Mennemeier • Feb. 27, 2026 Case Management Conference
SWP-CVP 2019 BiOp Cases *Pacific Coast Fed'n of Fishermen's Ass'ns, et al. v. Raimondo, et al.* (*PCFFA*) *Calif. Natural Resources Agency, et al. v. Raimondo, et al.* (*CNRA*)	• SWC intervened in both *PCFFA and CNRA* cases • Federal defendants reinitiated consultation on Oct 1, 2021 and new BiOps issued in fall/winter 2024 • Cases stayed until further notice in light of new BiOps and new administration

Federal District Court, Eastern Dist. of California, Fresno Division (Judge Thurston)	• Aug. 15, 2025 Federal Defendants' motions to dismiss cases as moot due • Aug. 29, 2025 Defendant-Intervenors' briefs due • Oct. 29, 2025 Plaintiffs' opposition briefs due • Nov. 26, 2025 Federal Defendants' reply briefs due
2020 CESA Incidental Take Permit Cases **Coordinated Case Name *CDWR Water Operations Cases*, JCCP 5117 (Coordination Trial Judge Gevercer)** *Metropolitan & Mojave Water Agency v. Calif. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, et al*. (CESA/CEQA/Breach of Contract) *State Water Contractors & Kern County Water Agency v. Calif. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, et al*. (CESA/CEQA) *San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water Dist. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources, et al.* (CEQA/CESA/ Breach of Contract/Takings) *Sierra Club, et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources* (CEQA/Delta Reform Act/Public Trust)	• Administrative records certified in October 2023 • Order entered to delay setting a merits briefing schedule by 90 days and extending the time to bring the action to trial by six months • Deadline to bring all the coordinated cases to trial is now December 5, 2025 • December 2024 three petitioner groups filed requests for dismissal without prejudice • ~~Remaining petitioner groups meeting and conferring in light of the new, 2024 CESA Incidental Take Permit~~ • SF Baykeeper dismissed its case on March 18, 2025 • ~~July 11, 2025 Case Management Conference~~Metropolitan, SWC and San Bernardino Valley MWD filed requests to dismiss their cases in mid-July, 2025 based on the new ITP and entering a Memorandum of Understanding with CDFW and DWR to address the permitting process going forward
2024 CESA Incidental Take Permit Cases *San Francisco Baykeeper, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources* (CEQA, Delta Reform Act, Public Trust Doctrine) Sacramento County Superior Ct. Case No. 24WM000185 (Judge Arguelles) *California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources, et al.* (CEQA, CESA, Delta Reform Act, Public Trust Doctrine) Sacramento County Superior Ct. Case No. 24WM000181 (Judge Arguelles) *Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, et al. v. California Department Of Water Resources, et al.* (CEQA) Sacramento County Superior Ct. Case No. 24WM000183 (Judge Rockwell)	Cases challenge DWR's Final EIR and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's California Endangered Species Act Incidental Take Permit for the updated Long Term Operations plan for the State Water Project • ~~August 4, 2025~~ Case Management Conference in *Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources, et al.* taken off calendar

Central Delta Water Agency and South Delta Water Agency v. California Department of Water Resources (CEQA, Delta Reform Act, Watershed Protection Acts, Public Trust Doctrine) Sacramento County Superior Ct. Case No. 24WM000186 (Judge Acquisto)	
CDWR Environmental Impact Cases **Sacramento Superior Ct. Case No. JCCP 4942, 3d DCA Case No. C100302** **(20 Coordinated Cases)** Validation Action *DWR v. All Persons Interested* CEQA 17 cases CESA/Incidental Take Permit 2 cases (Judge Arguelles)	• 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 • Appellants' opening briefs and appendices filed Oct. 29 and Oct. 31 • Feb. 13, 2025 DWR filed its omnibus respondents' (opposition) brief • Appeals fully briefed as of June 6, 2025, and awaiting oral argument date
Water Management Tools Contract Amendment *California Water Impact Network et al. v. DWR* Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Acquisto) *North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. DWR* Sacramento County Super. Ct. (Judge Acquisto)	• 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 • Dec. 20, 2022 DWR filed notice of certification of the administrative record and filed answers in both cases

Outside Counsel Agreements

Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Albright, Yee & Schmit, APC	Employment Matter	222524	11/24	$75,000
	Employment Matter	222529	12/24	$50,000
	Employment Matter	222536	03/25	$50,000
	Employment Matter	222542	03/25	$50,000
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
Anzel Galvan LLP	Bond Issues	220411	07/24	N/A
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
	MWD MOU Negotiations**	201893	10/05/21	$100,000
	Ethics and EEO Investigation	222534	01/25	~~$25,000~~ $50,000
	PRA Issues	222539	02/25	$50,000
	Sanchez Job Audit Appeal	222551	03/25	$50,000
	Gutierrez Job Audit Appeal	222552	03/25	$50,000
	RFIs by AFSCME Local 1902	222554	03/25	$20,000
	EEO Investigation	226516	05/25	$25,000
BDG Law Group, APLC	Gutierrez v. MWD	216054	03/24	$250,000
	Hagekhalil Defense in Kasaine Litigation	222547	03/25	$250,000

Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
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	$250,000
	Pure Water Southern California	207966	11/22	$250,000
	Progressive Design Build	216053	04/24	$250,000
	Pure Water – SB 149 CEQA Record Preparation	222526	02/25	$150,000
	Rates and Taxes Advice	226517	05/25	$50,000
Blooston, Mordkofsky, Dickens, Duffy & Prendergast, LLP	FCC and Communications Matters	110227	11/10	$100,000
Brown White & Osborn LLP	Employment Matter	222523	10/24	$50,000
	Employment Matter	222525	11/24	$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	$75,000
	General Real Estate Matters	180209	08/19	$200,000
	Rancho Cucamonga Condemnation Actions (Grade Separation Project)	207970	05/22	$100,000
	Foothill Pump Station Condemnation	226522	06/25	$100,000
Law Office of Alexis S.M. Chiu*	Bond Counsel	200468	07/21	N/A
	Bond Counsel	220409	07/24	N/A
Castañeda + Heidelman LLP	Employment Matter	216055	04/24	$100,000
	Employment Matter	222530	11/24	$100,000
Cislo & Thomas LLP	Intellectual Property	170703	08/17	$100,000

Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Curls Bartling P.C.*	Bond Counsel	200470	07/21	N/A
Davis Wright Tremaine, LLP	Advice and Representation re Potential Litigation	220424	10/24	$250,000
	Kasaine v. MWD	222543	03/25	$250,000
Duane Morris LLP	SWRCB Curtailment Process	138005	09/14	$615,422
Duncan, Weinberg, Genzer & Pembroke	Power Issues	6255	09/95	$3,175,000
Erin Joyce Law, PC	Ethics Advice	216058	05/24	$100,000
Glaser Weil Fink Howard Jordan & Shapiro	Employment Matter	220395	7/24	$160,000
Greines, Martin, Stein & Richland LLP	SDCWA v. MWD	207958	10/22	$100,000
	Colorado River Matters	207965	11/22	$100,000
Hackler Flynn & Associates	Government Code Claim Advice	216059	5/24	~~$150,000~~ $200,000
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	$500,000
Hanson Bridgett LLP	Finance Advice	158024	12/16	$100,000
	Deferred Compensation/HR	170706	10/17	$600,000
	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
	Villavicencio v. MWD	220426	10/24	$100,000
	Jensen Operator Standby Removal	222522	10/24	$100,000
	Villa NOIS Appeal	222553	03/25	$50,000

Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
	Alberto NOID Appeal	226523	06/25	$100,000
Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP*	Bond Counsel	193469	07/21	N/A
	Bond Counsel	220405	07/24	N/A
Hemming Morse, LLP	Baker Electric v. MWD	211933	08/23	$175,000
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	$175,000
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
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP	Bond Counsel	220412	07/24	N/A
Kronenberger Rosenfeld, LLP	Systems Integrated, LLC v. MWD	211920	04/23	~~$250,000~~ $500,000
Kutak Rock LLP	Delta Islands Land Management	207959	10/22	$160,000
Lesnick Prince & Pappas LLP	Kidde-Fenwal Bankruptcy	216061	06/24	$50,000

Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore	Labor and Employment	158032	02/17	$244,741
	FLSA Audit	180199	02/19	$50,000
	EEO Advice	216041	12/23	$450,000
Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP	PFAS Multi-District Litigation	216048	03/24	$200,000
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
	PFAS-Related Issues (PWSC)	220414	08/24	$100,000
	Perris Valley Pipeline Project	220415	07/24	$100,000
	PFAS-Related Issues (General)	220413	10/24	$50,000
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	$3,250,000
	Arvin-Edison v. Dow Chemical	203452	01/22	$150,000
	Semitropic TCP Litigation	207954	09/22	$75,000
	Employment Matter	220417	08/24	$100,000

Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Nixon Peabody LLP*	Bond Counsel [re-opened]	193473	07/21	N/A
	Special Finance Project	207960	10/22	$50,000
	Bond Counsel	220404	07/24	N/A
Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP*	Bond Counsel	200466	07/21	N/A
	Bond Counsel	220407	7/24	N/A
	Pure Water Special Project Finance	226513	05/25	$200,000
Olson Remcho LLP	Government Law	131968	07/14	$600,000
	Advice/Assistance re Proposition 26/Election Issues	211922	05/23	$100,000
Robert P. Ottilie	Employment Matter	226514	05/25	$50,000
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
	Public Records Act Requests	220399	7/24	$75,000
Redwood Public Law, LLP	PRA and Conflicts Issues	222540	02/25	$150,000
Renne Public Law Group, LLP	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
	ACE v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1729-M)	220421	09/24	$35,000
	AFSCME v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1733-M)	220422	09/24	$35,000
	AFSCME v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1738-M)	220425	10/24	$35,000

Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
	SAMWD v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1745-M)	220527	11/24	$35,000
	AFSCME v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1746-M)	222528	11/24	$35,000
	AFSCME v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1774-M)	226515	05/25	$35,000
	AFSCME v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1775-M)	226519	05/25	$35,000
Melanie Ross Law P.C.	Tiegs v. MWD	222535	01/25	$25,000
Ryan & Associates	Leasing Issues	43714	06/01	$200,000
	Oswalt v. MWD	211925	05/23	$250,000
	Unlawful Encroachment on Metropolitan Rights-of-Way	216065	06/24	$100,000
Seyfarth Shaw LLP	~~Claim (Contract #201897)~~ Phan v. MWD	201897	11/04/21	$350,000
	Claim (Contract #203436)	203436	11/15/21	~~$350,000~~ $550,000
	Claim (Contract #203454)	203454	01/22	$210,000
	Reese v. MWD	207952	11/22	$900,000
	General Labor/Employment Advice	211917	3/23	$250,000
	Civil Rights Department Complaint	211931	07/23	$100,000
	Crawford v. MWD	216035	09/23	~~$525,000~~ $900,000
	Tiegs v. MWD	216043	12/23	$825,000
	Zarate v. MWD	216044	01/24	$500,000
Shaw Law Group, PC	Administrative Investigation	222531	12/24	$30,000
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP	Lorentzen v. MWD	216036	09/23	~~$250,000~~ $600,000
	Iverson v. MWD	222532	12/24	$200,000

Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth*	Bond Counsel	200471	07/21	N/A
	Bond Counsel	220408	7/24	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	$250,000
	Cajalco Road Widening Project	226509	04/25	$50,000

*Expenditures paid by Bond Proceeds/Finance
**Expenditures paid by another group