



Metropolitan Cases

Dannelle-Mimi Phan v. Metropolitan (Los Angeles County Superior Court)

Phan, a current employee, filed suit against MWD alleging causes of action arising out of Phan's

employment at MWD. After settlement discussions, the parties agreed to terms and are in the process of finalizing the settlement. We anticipate the settlement will be finalized and the case dismissed within the next four to six weeks.

Matters Impacting Metropolitan

Ninth Circuit Panel Vacates and Sends Back to District Court Novel Fluoride Decision

On May 21, 2026, a Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals panel vacated (set aside) and sent back to the lower court a federal district judge's novel ruling in *Food & Water Watch, Inc., et al. v. EPA* that the fluoridation of drinking water at levels typical in the United States presents an unreasonable risk to human health. In September 2024, the district court judge, Judge Chen, had also determined the risk was sufficient to require the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to engage with a regulatory response in accordance with the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). However, a three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit unanimously found that Judge Chen overstepped his role when he allowed consideration of certain evidence, overruled the parties' stipulations on some studies, and refused to rule after a first trial and instead ordered a second trial. The Ninth Circuit panel's decision is based on procedural grounds and is not a ruling on the merits of the issue of water fluoridation.

The Ninth Circuit panel agreed with EPA that Judge Chen erred by taking over the case and holding a second bench trial in violation of the party presentation principle. Under the party presentation principle, the parties to a case, not judges, are responsible for framing the issues, their arguments, and the evidence. The panel found that Judge Chen abused his discretion when he: (1) refused to rule on the first trial record, despite the parties' agreement that he should; and (2) held the case in abeyance for 1-1/2 years to wait for the National Toxicology Program (NTP) monograph (which the parties had already agreed not to present at trial) to be completed. By doing so, the judge "rejected the parties' presentation of the case

and determined, on [his] own, that the NTP monograph was relevant and important." According to the Ninth Circuit panel, this was a "radical transformation" of the case which "went 'well beyond the pale.'" The panel sent the case back to Judge Chen to decide "based solely on the first trial record," which means he cannot consider the final NTP monograph that he relied on heavily for his ruling.

EPA had also argued that Judge Chen erred by reviewing evidence different from what the plaintiffs had presented to EPA in their original 2016 petition. However, the Ninth Circuit panel found that "*in these circumstances*," there was no error because both parties provided new evidence to Judge Chen during the first trial which went beyond the evidence presented in the 2016 petition. The panel also sent back to Judge Chen the issue of whether the plaintiffs have standing (or the right) to bring their case and EPA's request for judicial notice of a public water system's website that allegedly shows plaintiffs' water in Kansas contains naturally occurring fluoride. EPA had claimed that the case is about the addition of fluoride to drinking water supplies, but the drinking water of the only plaintiff supporting plaintiffs' standing naturally contains fluoride. Thus, because the website shows that naturally occurring fluoride will be in the plaintiffs' drinking water regardless of whether the water utility adds fluoride, EPA contends they do not have the right to bring their case. The panel reasoned that as the trier of fact, Judge Chen is in the best position to determine whether to take judicial notice of the facts offered by EPA and whether they affect plaintiffs' standing.

On June 1, 2026, the plaintiffs filed a motion asking the panel to clarify the scope of the evidence Judge Chen can consider on the standing issue. They



pointed out that the facts in EPA's judicial notice request were introduced after the first trial and after plaintiffs' only standing representative moved to Kansas. During the first trial, plaintiffs' representative was still living in San Francisco; thus, the background levels of fluoride in Kansas are not relevant to whether plaintiffs had standing in the first trial. Plaintiffs argue this creates an apparent tension with the panel's instruction that Judge Chen "rule based solely on the first trial record."

It is uncertain whether plaintiffs will seek review of the Ninth Circuit panel's decision. A petition for rehearing or a petition for rehearing en banc to the Ninth Circuit must be filed within 45 days after the May 21, 2026 decision. A petition for rehearing asks the original three-judge panel to reconsider its own decision, and a petition for rehearing en banc asks the full court to reconsider the appellate decision. Another option is a petition for certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court, which must be filed within 90 days after the May 21, 2026 decision or within 90 days after a petition for rehearing is denied.

Meanwhile, EPA has started an expedited review of fluoride in drinking water under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA). As part of its review, EPA released in January 2026 a "Fluoride Human Health Toxicity Assessment: Preliminary Assessment Plan and Literature Survey" which describes how EPA will identify, screen, and evaluate scientific evidence related to fluoride. EPA's final toxicity assessment will be used to inform potential revisions to EPA's fluoride drinking water regulations and will also support the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's recommendations regarding adding fluoride to drinking water. Under normal SDWA timelines, EPA's next comprehensive analysis of new scientific information on potential health risks of fluoride in drinking water would not be due until 2030, but EPA is accelerating its review.

Metropolitan staff will continue to monitor the *Food & Water Watch* lawsuit and EPA's regulation of fluoride in drinking water. (See General Counsel's January 2026 Board Report.)

EPA Proposes to Rescind Drinking Water Standards for Four PFAS and to Extend the Compliance Deadline for PFOA and PFOS

On May 18, 2026, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced two proposed rules which would: (1) rescind drinking water standards for four per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), and (2) allow individual public water systems (PWSs) to apply for up to two additional years to comply with the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) for PFOA and PFOS. The first proposed rule would rescind regulatory determinations, maximum contaminant levels (MCLs), and Maximum Contaminant Level Goals (MCLGs) for PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA (often referred to as GenX chemicals), and PFBS, including the novel Hazard Index MCL and MCLG for mixtures of any of the first three PFAS plus PFBS (collectively, the Hazard Index PFAS). EPA explains that this action is necessary "to correct the unlawful procedure under which these regulations were promulgated. Under the EPA's prior interpretation, the EPA proposed and finalized regulatory determinations and regulations for these PFAS simultaneously and in tandem." However, the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) does not authorize EPA to take such actions simultaneously. As a result, EPA proposes to rescind those regulatory determinations, MCLs, and MCLGs. If the proposed rule is finalized, EPA would then evaluate the Hazard Index PFAS for regulation under the SDWA, which EPA says could possibly result in more stringent requirements.

The second proposed rule relies on a SDWA exemption to extend the deadline for PWSs to comply with the MCLs of 4 parts per trillion (ppt) for PFOA and PFOS from April 26, 2029, to April 26, 2031. This exemption from the compliance deadline would not be automatic. Instead, PWSs would need to affirmatively seek the extension, submit certain information, and meet specific criteria. For example, a PWS would have to submit its most recent PFOA and PFOS sampling results, a statement that it cannot comply with the PFOA and PFOS MCLs by April 26, 2029, and a statement that it is taking all practicable steps to meet the MCLs. Also, PWSs with any PFOA or PFOS sample results of 12 ppt or more must implement at least two types of specified interim control measures during the extension period. Requests for extensions must be made within 180 days of when the rule is finalized. PWSs that do not apply for or receive an extension would remain



subject to the original April 26, 2029 compliance deadline.

To be eligible for the extension, a PWS must: (1) be subject to the requirements of EPA's 2024 drinking water regulations for PFOA and PFOS; (2) have been in operation on or before June 25, 2024 (the effective date of the PFOA and PFOS MCLs); (3) not have a SDWA variance for small systems for the PFOA and PFOS MCLs; and (4) be located in a state, territory, or Tribe that does not have primary enforcement authority (also known as "primacy") for EPA's 2024 PFAS drinking water regulations. PWSs that are located in a state, territory, or Tribe that does have primacy for EPA's 2024 PFAS drinking water regulations could request an exemption from their drinking water primacy agency. State, Tribal, and territorial primacy agencies that obtain primacy for EPA's 2024 PFAS drinking water regulations after EPA grants any federal exemptions can determine whether they will allow the federal exemption to continue to 2031, or they may choose to shorten or end a federal exemption when they receive primacy.

Both proposed rules were published in the *Federal Register* on May 20, 2026, triggering a 60-day public comment period. The deadline to submit

comments on the two rules is July 20, 2026. EPA will hold a virtual public hearing on both proposed rules on July 7, 2026.

In the meantime, litigation challenging EPA's MCLs and MCLGs for these six PFAS continues in federal court. In 2024, the American Water Works Association (AWWA), the Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies (AMWA), and several chemical industry associations asked a federal appellate court to decide whether EPA failed to comply with the SDWA when it set the MCLs and MCLGs for these six PFAS. The federal court denied both of EPA's motions and is now considering when to schedule oral argument. It is uncertain whether EPA will be able to finalize its proposed rules before the court hears oral argument and/or decides whether EPA failed to comply with the SDWA when it set the MCLs and MCLGs for some or all of the six PFAS.

Metropolitan staff will continue to monitor EPA's proposed rules and the litigation challenging EPA's MCLs and MCLGs for PFOA, PFOS, and the Hazard Index PFAS.



Matters Received

<u>Category</u>	<u>Received</u>	<u>Description</u>																		
Government Code Claims	2	Claims relating to: (1) MWD vehicle collision with rear of Claimant's vehicle near the intersection of Van Buren Boulevard and Bountiful Street in the City and County of Riverside; and (2) Cucamonga Valley Water District claim for damages alleged in complaint <i>Nikolas Fakhoury v. City of Rancho Cucamonga</i> (SBSC Case No. CIVRS2509398) related to properties located at 9720 Highland Avenue, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91701 and 9230 Highland Avenue, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91701																		
Requests Pursuant to the Public Records Act	20	<table><tr><th><u>Requestor</u></th><th><u>Documents Requested</u></th></tr><tr><td>ABC Drilling</td><td>Bid results and copies of the bids submitted for As-Needed Environmental Site Assessment project opened on February 5, 2021</td></tr><tr><td>BidAmerica (4 requests)</td><td>Bid documents for: (1) Landscape Maintenance and Tree Maintenance Services for MWD Live Oak Reservoir; (2) Julian Hinds Pumping Plant Interim Employee Housing Rehabilitation; (3) Eagle Mountain Pumping Plant Interim Employee Housing Rehabilitation; and (4) Gene Pumping Plant Interim Employee Housing Rehabilitation</td></tr><tr><td>BKF Engineers</td><td>As-built information for any utilities in project area in the city of Rancho Palos Verdes</td></tr><tr><td>Center for Contract Compliance</td><td>Contractor and Subcontractor Information, Bid Advertisement, and DIR Project ID for Henry Mills Water Treatment Plant Fiber Conduits</td></tr><tr><td>Deltek, Inc.</td><td>Bidders list for the Intramet Redesign</td></tr><tr><td>MWD Supervisors Association</td><td>All documents, emails, other electronic communication related to Electronic Annual Report (eAR)</td></tr><tr><td>Kathryn Sorensen, PhD, Director of Research & Professor of Practice at Arizona State University</td><td>ICS Certification Reports sent by MWD to USBR from 2007-2025</td></tr><tr><td>Krieger & Stewart</td><td>Utility Information for project for EMWD in the city of Menifee</td></tr></table>	<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>	ABC Drilling	Bid results and copies of the bids submitted for As-Needed Environmental Site Assessment project opened on February 5, 2021	BidAmerica (4 requests)	Bid documents for: (1) Landscape Maintenance and Tree Maintenance Services for MWD Live Oak Reservoir; (2) Julian Hinds Pumping Plant Interim Employee Housing Rehabilitation; (3) Eagle Mountain Pumping Plant Interim Employee Housing Rehabilitation; and (4) Gene Pumping Plant Interim Employee Housing Rehabilitation	BKF Engineers	As-built information for any utilities in project area in the city of Rancho Palos Verdes	Center for Contract Compliance	Contractor and Subcontractor Information, Bid Advertisement, and DIR Project ID for Henry Mills Water Treatment Plant Fiber Conduits	Deltek, Inc.	Bidders list for the Intramet Redesign	MWD Supervisors Association	All documents, emails, other electronic communication related to Electronic Annual Report (eAR)	Kathryn Sorensen, PhD, Director of Research & Professor of Practice at Arizona State University	ICS Certification Reports sent by MWD to USBR from 2007-2025	Krieger & Stewart	Utility Information for project for EMWD in the city of Menifee
<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>																			
ABC Drilling	Bid results and copies of the bids submitted for As-Needed Environmental Site Assessment project opened on February 5, 2021																			
BidAmerica (4 requests)	Bid documents for: (1) Landscape Maintenance and Tree Maintenance Services for MWD Live Oak Reservoir; (2) Julian Hinds Pumping Plant Interim Employee Housing Rehabilitation; (3) Eagle Mountain Pumping Plant Interim Employee Housing Rehabilitation; and (4) Gene Pumping Plant Interim Employee Housing Rehabilitation																			
BKF Engineers	As-built information for any utilities in project area in the city of Rancho Palos Verdes																			
Center for Contract Compliance	Contractor and Subcontractor Information, Bid Advertisement, and DIR Project ID for Henry Mills Water Treatment Plant Fiber Conduits																			
Deltek, Inc.	Bidders list for the Intramet Redesign																			
MWD Supervisors Association	All documents, emails, other electronic communication related to Electronic Annual Report (eAR)																			
Kathryn Sorensen, PhD, Director of Research & Professor of Practice at Arizona State University	ICS Certification Reports sent by MWD to USBR from 2007-2025																			
Krieger & Stewart	Utility Information for project for EMWD in the city of Menifee																			



	<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>
	Laquer, Urban, Clifford & Hodge	Notice of Completion, or equivalent, relating to Sepulveda, West Valley, and East Valley Feeders Upgrades
	Private Citizens (3 requests)	(1) Documents and information collected regarding Human Resources Manager position; (2) iCIMS Qualification Screening Data including copies of objective, non-deliberative administrative records; and (3) Transcripts of all and each Coffee with the GM meetings
	Tetra Tech	Proposals of top 3 rated incumbents for the On-Call Environmental Site Assessment Services contract issued in 2023
	Transparent California	MWD Employee Compensation Report for 2025
	The Allegro Coalition & the California Public Integrity Council (CPIC)	Records related to inspection trips, tours, travel, and gifts facilitated or funded by the MWD for officials, employees, and guests of the City of Diamond Bar and the Walnut Valley Water District (WVWD)
	The Allegro Coalition & Southern California Public Integrity (CPIC)	Records related to: (1) October 2025 SWP and Central Valley Agriculture inspection trip financials; (2) historical audits and manifests for all inspection trips or Colorado River/SWP tours involving the city of Diamond Bar or Walnut Valley Water District (WVWD); (3) MWD's Records Retention Schedule; and (4) Privilege Log
	X Engineering & Consulting	As-built Information for MWD pipeline in the city of Anaheim
Other Matters	2	Wage garnishment



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	
<i>Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District v. California Department of Water Resources</i> (case name for the consolidated cases)	- 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
<i>City of Stockton v. California Department of Water Resources</i>	Two allege violations of the fully protected bird statute
<i>County of Butte v. California Department of Water Resources</i>	One alleges violations of Proposition 9 (1982) and the Central Valley Project Act
<i>County of Sacramento v. California Department of Water Resources</i>	March 27, 2026 order denying DWR's motion to disqualify the Somach, Simmons & Dunn law firm
<i>County of San Joaquin et al. v. California Department of Water Resources</i>	March 30, 2026 preliminary injunction halting preconstruction geotechnical soil testing vacated, clearing the way for the Design and Construction Authority to resume work
<i>Sacramento Area Sewer District v. California Department of Water Resources</i>	April 2, 2026 Metropolitan and other supporting SWP contractors granted leave to intervene
<i>San Francisco Baykeeper, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources</i>	<u>May 18, 2026 DWR certified the administrative record</u>
<i>Sierra Club, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources</i>	<u>May 29, 2026 next Case Management Conference</u>
<i>South Delta Water Agency and Rudy Mussi Investment L.P. v. California Department of Water Resources</i>	<u>July 6, 2026 deadline to file motions to augment the administrative record</u>
<i>Sacramento County Superior Ct.</i> (Judge Acquisto)	<u>Dec. 31, 2026 deadline to file discovery motions</u>
3d District Court of Appeal Case No. C101878	<u>January 22, 2027 next Case Management Conference</u>
Supreme Court Case No. S294127	
Consolidated DCP Revenue Bond Validation Action and CEQA Case	
<i>Sierra Club, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources</i> (CEQA, designated as lead case)	Validation Action
<i>DWR v. All Persons Interested</i> (Validation)	Final Judgment and Final Statement of Decision issued January 16, 2024 ruling the bonds are not valid
<i>Sacramento County Superior Ct.</i> (Judge Kenneth C. Mennemeier)	DWR, Metropolitan and other supporting public water agencies filed Notices of Appeal on or before the February 16, 2024 deadline
3d District Court of Appeal Case No. C100552	Eight opposing groups filed Notices of Cross Appeals by March 27, 2024 Appeals and cross-appeals fully briefed as of May 12, 2025



Subject	Status
	November 19, 2025 oral argument Dec. 31, 2025 Court of Appeal opinion filed upholding trial court ruling the bonds are not valid Jan. 15, 2026 DWR filed a petition for rehearing Jan. 28, 2026 petition for rehearing denied, opinion modified to correct factual errors and add citations without changing the judgment Feb. 9, 2026 DWR and supporting SWP contractors filed a petition for California Supreme Court review and request to depublish the Dec. 31, 2025 opinion March 2, 2026 deadline to file an answer to the petition for review March 12, 2026 deadline to file a reply in support of petition for review April 15, 2026, Supreme Court denied review and depublication, terminating the case
2025 Delta Conveyance Program Revenue Bond Validation <i>Department of Water Resources v. All Persons Interested, etc.</i> Sacramento County Superior Court (Judge Kenneth C. Mennemeier)	- 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. 15, 2025 case assigned to Judge Mennemeier for all purposes - Sept.23, 2025 Case Management Conference - Dec. 5, 2025 opening trial briefs - Jan. 14, 2026 DWR filed a motion to stay the case pending exhaustion of appellate remedies in the 2020 bond validation case - Jan. 21, 2026 hearing on motion for stay and stay granted <u>May 2026 bond resolution rescinded and case dismissed</u>
2024 CESA Incidental Take Permit Consolidated Cases <i>California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources, et al.</i> (CEQA, CESA, Delta Reform Act, Public Trust Doctrine)	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 Oct. 8, 2025 minute order consolidating cases under the <i>California Sportfishing Protection Alliance</i> case name



Subject	Status
Sacramento County Superior Ct. Case No. 24WM000181 (Judge Arguelles) (Designated lead case for the consolidated cases) <i>San Francisco Baykeeper, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources</i> (CEQA, Delta Reform Act, Public Trust Doctrine) <i>Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources, et al.</i> (CEQA) <i>Central Delta Water Agency and South Delta Water Agency v. California Department of Water Resources</i> (CEQA, Delta Reform Act, Watershed Protection Acts, Public Trust Doctrine)	- Dec. 12, 2025, case management conference in the consolidated cases - June 12, 2026 case management conference
CDWR Environmental Impact Cases Sacramento Superior Ct. Case No. JCCP 4942, 3d DCA Case No. C100302 (20 Coordinated Cases) Validation Action <i>DWR v. All Persons Interested</i> 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 rehearing of fee motions consistent with the court of appeal's opinion Dec. 26, 2023 order denying fee motions Six notices of appeal filed Dec. 9, 2025 Court of Appeal decision upholding trial court denial of attorney fee motions Jan. 20, 2026 losing appellants filed three petitions for review in the California Supreme Court March 18, 2026 petitions for review denied, ending the cases
Water Management Tools Contract Amendment <i>California Water Impact Network et al. v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Acquisto) <i>North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. DWR</i> 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
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
	Ethics and EEO Investigation	222534	01/25	\$50,000
	PRA Issues	222539	02/25	\$110,000
	Sanchez Job Audit Appeal	222551	03/25	\$50,000
	Gutierrez Job Audit Appeal	222552	03/25	\$100,000
	RFIs by AFSCME Local 1902	222554	03/25	\$20,000
	EEO Investigation	226516	05/25	\$25,000
	Advice and Counsel – AB399 Issues	226533	01/26	\$50,000
	Employment Matter	226534	01/26	\$50,000
	Team Manager Leave Premiums Denial HO Appeal	226539	01/26	\$50,000
	Temporary Upgrade Assignment Denial HO Appeal	226540	01/26	\$50,000
	Temporary Upgrade Assignment Standby Denial HO Appeal	231484	01/26	\$50,000
	Desert Medical Credit HO Appeal	231487	01/26	\$50,000
	Employment Matter	231488	03/26	\$50,000
	Employment Matter	231491	04/26	\$50,000
	<u>Employment Matter</u>	<u>231496</u>	<u>05/26</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
	<u>Employment Matter</u>	<u>231497</u>	<u>5/26</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>
BDG Law Group, APLC	Gutierrez v. MWD	216054	03/24	\$900,000
	Hagekhalil Defense in Kasaine Litigation	222547	03/25	\$250,000
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	\$250,000
	Pure Water Southern California	207966	11/22	\$350,000
	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
	PWSC Construction Contracting Issues	226524	07/25	\$125,000
	Diamond Valley Lake Groundwater Basin Issues	231486	1/26	\$100,000
	Technology – Contracts and Related Matters	231489	03/26	\$35,000
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	\$150,000
	Foothill Pump Station Condemnation	226522	06/25	\$100,000
	Fakhoury, et al. v. City of Rancho Cucamonga, et al.	226528	12/25	\$100,000
	Ethics Office Investigations	226537	01/26	\$75,000



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Law Office of Alexis S.M. Chiu*	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
Davis Wright Tremaine, LLP	Advice and Representation re Potential Litigation	220424	10/24	\$250,000
	Kasaine v. MWD	222543	03/25	\$250,000 \$750,000
	Advice and Representation re Employment -Related Claims	226526	08/25	\$200,000
	Government Code Claim Investigation	226538	02/26	\$150,000
Erin Joyce Law, PC	Ethics Advice	216058	05/24	\$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	\$500,000
Hanson Bridgett LLP	Finance Advice	158024	12/16	\$100,000
	Deferred Compensation/HR	170706	10/17	\$600,000
	Alternative Project Delivery (ADP)	207961	10/22	\$250,000
	Lake Mathews Mining Issues	231485	01/26	\$100,000
Hausman & Sosa, LLP	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
	Alberto NOID Appeal	226523	06/25	\$100,000
Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP*	Bond Counsel	220405	07/24	N/A



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Horvitz & Levy	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
Internet Law Center	Cybersecurity and Privacy Advice and Representation	200478	04/13/21	\$100,000
	Systems Integrated, LLC v. MWD	201875	05/17/21	\$500,000
	General Advice and Counsel	222544	02/25	\$25,000
Jackson Lewis P.C.	Employment: Department of Labor Office of Contract Compliance	137992	02/14	\$45,000
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP	Bond Counsel	220412	07/24	N/A
Kronenberger Rosenfeld, LLP	Systems Integrated, LLC v. MWD	211920	04/23	\$500,000
Kutak Rock LLP	Delta Islands Land Management	207959	10/22	\$160,000
Lesnick Prince Pappas & Alverson LLP	Kidde-Fenwal Bankruptcy	216061	06/24	\$50,000
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore	Labor and Employment	158032	02/17	\$244,741
	EEO Advice	216041	12/23	\$450,000
Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP	PFAS Multi-District Litigation	216048	03/24	\$200,000
Marten Law LLP	PFAS Multi-District Litigation	216034	09/23	\$550,000
	PFAS-Related Issues (PWSC)	220414	08/24	\$150,000
	Perris Valley Pipeline Project	220415	07/24	\$100,000
	PFAS-Related Issues (General)	220413	10/24	\$50,000
<u>Milbank LLP</u>	<u>Colorado River</u>	<u>231490</u>	<u>04/26</u>	<u>\$250,000</u>



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius	Project Labor Agreements	200476	04/21	\$100,000
Musick, Peeler & Garrett LLP	Arvin-Edison v. Dow Chemical	203452	01/22	\$150,000
	Semitropic TCP Litigation	207954	09/22	\$75,000
	Employment Matter	220417	08/24	\$150,000
	Employment Matter	226535	01/26	\$50,000
Nixon Peabody LLP*	Bond Counsel	220404	07/24	N/A
Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP*	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
Pearlman, Brown & Wax, L.L.P.	Workers' Compensation	216037	10/23	\$100,000
Redwood Public Law, LLP	PRA and Conflicts Issues	222540	02/25	\$150,000
Renne Public Law Group, LLP	Employee Relations and Personnel Matters	216045	01/24	\$50,000
	ACE v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA CE 1729 M)	220421	09/24	\$70,000
	AFSCME v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1733-M)	220422	09/24	\$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-1772-M)	226518	05/25	\$35,000
	AFSCME v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1775-M)	226519	05/25	\$35,000



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
	AFSCME v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1776-M)	226520	05/25	\$35,000
	AFSCME v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1785-M)	226527	10/25	\$50,000
	Supervisors Association of MWD v. MWD (PERB Case No. LA-CE-1854-M)	226536	01/26	\$50,000
Ryan & Associates	Leasing Issues	43714	06/01	\$200,000
	Unlawful Encroachment on Metropolitan Rights-of-Way	216065	06/24	\$100,000
Seyfarth Shaw LLP	Phan v. MWD	201897	11/04/21	\$700,000
	Claim (Contract #203436)	203436	11/15/21	\$1,000,000
	General Labor/Employment Advice	211917	3/23	\$250,000
	Crawford v. MWD	216035	09/23	\$1,200,000
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP	Iverson v. MWD	222532	12/24	\$500,000
Snell & Wilmer LLP	Public Records Act Requests	226531	12/25	\$150,000
Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth*	Bond Counsel	220408	7/24	N/A
Theodora Oringer PC	Construction Contracts - General Conditions Update	185896	07/20	\$100,000
	Santa Monica Feeder Incident	226526	08/25	\$150,000
Thompson Coburn LLP	NERC Energy Reliability Standards	193451	08/20	\$600,000
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	\$500,000
	Cajalco Road Widening Project	226509	04/25	\$50,000



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
Wesierski & Zurek LLP	Eight-Vehicle Pile-Up Claims, Rancho Cucamonga	226529	12/25	\$150,000
	General Tort Claims and Litigation Defense Advice	226530	12/25	\$150,000

*Expenditures paid by Bond Proceeds/Finance

**Expenditures paid by another group