



Matters Impacting Metropolitan

EPA Proposes Listing Nine PFAS As RCRA Hazardous Constituents and Revising Definition of RCRA Hazardous Waste

On February 8, 2024, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposed two rules under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA): (1) to add nine per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) to RCRA's list of hazardous constituents (PFAS Listing Rule); and (2) to revise RCRA's regulatory definition of "hazardous waste" to clarify EPA's and authorized states' authority to require cleanup of the full range of substances that RCRA intended, including emerging chemicals of concern such as PFAS, that may present substantial hazards at permitted facilities (Definition Rule). Both rules were developed in response to a June 2021 petition filed by the governor of New Mexico requesting that EPA list PFAS as RCRA hazardous wastes either as a class of chemicals or individually.

PFAS Listing Rule

The PFAS Listing Rule proposes to classify nine PFAS -- perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS), perfluorobutanesulfonic acid (PFBS), hexafluoropropylene oxide-dimer acid (HFPO-A or GenX), perfluorononanoic acid (PFNA), perfluorohexanesulfonic acid (PFHxS), perfluorodecanoic acid (PFDA), perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA), and perfluorobutanoic acid (PFBA), as well as their salts and structural isomers -- as RCRA hazardous constituents. If this proposed rule is finalized, when RCRA corrective action requirements are imposed at a facility, these nine PFAS would be among the hazardous constituents expressly identified for consideration in RCRA facility assessments and, where necessary, further investigation and cleanup through the RCRA corrective action process at RCRA treatment, storage, and disposal facilities (TSDFs). Corrective action is a requirement under RCRA that facilities that treat, store, or dispose of hazardous wastes must investigate and clean up hazardous releases into soil, groundwater, surface water, and air.

Unlike hazardous wastes, hazardous constituents are not subject to RCRA's "cradle-to-grave" waste management system. Also, listing chemicals as RCRA hazardous constituents does not make them, or the wastes containing them, RCRA hazardous wastes, although EPA has described a hazardous constituent listing as "a step toward a potential hazardous waste listing." To list a waste as a RCRA hazardous waste, EPA must show that the waste contains a listed hazardous constituent and determine that it is capable of posing a substantial hazard. For these nine PFAS, EPA has not reached the hazardous waste step yet. Significantly, this means that the listed PFAS hazardous constituents would not be automatically designated as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) because they have not been listed as RCRA hazardous waste.

Definition Rule

Currently, RCRA's implementing regulations do not expressly apply RCRA's statutory definition of "hazardous waste." EPA's proposed Definition Rule would clarify EPA's longstanding position that it has the authority to require corrective action for the full array of substances meeting the statutory definition of "hazardous waste" and is not limited to the listed and identified "hazardous waste" and listed "hazardous constituents" specified in the regulations. The statutory definition of "hazardous waste" is more expansive than the regulatory definition and considers any waste that may cause or significantly contribute to an increase in mortality or serious illness, or pose a substantial hazard to human health or the environment, to be a "hazardous waste."

For any facility otherwise already subject to the RCRA corrective action regime, EPA could also rely on the more-expansive statutory "hazardous waste" definition to require additional corrective action measures for these specific PFAS, for other PFAS, and/or for non-PFAS emerging contaminants. Thus, while this proposed rule would not directly address PFAS, it would facilitate the use of RCRA corrective action authority to address emerging contaminants such as PFAS, if



they meet the statutory definition of “hazardous waste.”

EPA expects that its attention on addressing risks associated with PFAS under the PFAS Listing Rule will likely result in additional corrective action to address releases of these substances. Furthermore, EPA acknowledges that the Listing Rule could increase the number of permitted facilities engaging in corrective action. In turn,

these additional requirements could increase the time and cost for completing corrective action.

Comments on the proposed Definition Rule are due on or before March 26, 2024, and comments on the proposed PFAS Listing Rule are due on or before April 8, 2024. Metropolitan staff will continue to monitor EPA’s proposed rules and submit comments.

Other Matters

Continuing Education

On February 26 the Legal Department provided an MCLE presentation by JB Hamby, a member of the Imperial Irrigation District Board. His presentation was entitled “California’s Stake in the Colorado River”. He provided a history of the development of the Colorado River and an update on the current negotiations to develop new guidelines for the

allocation/use of Colorado River supplies going forward. It was a hybrid presentation with over 50 Metropolitan staff attending. The presentation was well received and JB stayed to respond to questions. The presentation was recorded, please see link below.

 [MCLE California's Stake in the Colorado River by JB Hamby 20240226.mp4](#)

Matters Received

<u>Category</u>	<u>Received</u>	<u>Description</u>
Government Code Claims	4	Claims relating to: (1) a tent collapsed onto claimant’s vehicle that was parked in MWD’s Eagle Rock parking lot; (2) nail punctured the tire of the vehicle belonging to an MWD employee who had to park on the dirt to work on the West Valley/Calabasas feeder shutdown; and (3) two motor vehicle accidents involving MWD vehicles
Subpoenas	3	Two Deposition Subpoenas for Production of Business Records, served by the two different defendants in the same case, Defendants Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. and Jaffray & Co., in the case <i>State of California es. Rel. Edelweise Fund, LLC v. JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A., et al.</i> , San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-14-540777 requesting documents relating to Variable Rate Demand Obligations (VRDOs) issued by MWD during the time period January 1, 2008 to present, including official statements, annual financial reports, lists of remarketing agents and VRDOs issued, agreements, interest rates, strategic business plans, MWD’s reliance on defendants’ representations, fees and charges, documents prepared by any financial advisor, policies and procedures for the issuance of variable rate debt, any litigation by MWD, any concerns that VRDO interest rates were inflated/distorted, excessive or unsupported fees and inflated interest rates Subpoena for employee’s personnel, wage, and medical records, and other employee’s files



Requests Pursuant to the Public Records Act	12	<u>Requestor</u>	<u>Documents Requested</u>
		AFSCME Local 1902	All communications relating to Tony Butka, CityWatch LA, and/or Los Angeles Times, and all records relating to Tony Butka
		CiviGrid	GIS data/map of MWD underground water utilities in MWD's service area
		Ph.D. Candidate in Economics, Imperial College Business School	Reversion study on residents who received rebates from 2014-2018 and converted to drought-tolerant landscapes, then later replaced the landscape by re-installing grass
		MWD Supervisors Association	Transcript, digital media, chats, and Q&A from the Coffee with the General Manager session on February 20, 2024
		Private Citizens (3 requests)	(1) MWD's taste and odor report on source water reservoirs; (2) last three contracts between MWD and BNSF; and (3) deed for land sale from Jose and Nellie Miranda to MWD around 1930 in the San Jacinto, Riverside County area
		Rangel Landscapes	Current contractor's rates and copies of the bids submitted for the past five years for Landscape Maintenance and Tree Trimming Services for the Henry J. Mills Filtration Plant
		SmartProcure	Purchase order data including purchase order number, purchase order date, line item details, line item quantity, line item price, vendor information from August 18, 2023 to current
		Towill	Proposals submitted in response to Request for Proposals for Pure Water Southern California Program - Conveyance Reaches 1 & 2
		vPrime Tech	Tabulation of bids for Annual Trend Micro Deep Security Software Maintenance Support
		WestWater Research	Data including recharge costs, recovery costs, O&M costs, storage losses, and number of banking partners for water banks led by MWD



Other Matters

1

Letter from the California Civil Rights Department forwarding a complaint filed by an MWD employee alleging discrimination, harassment and retaliation



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>City of Stockton v. California Department of Water Resources</i> <i>County of Butte v. California Department of Water Resources</i> <i>County of Sacramento v. California Department of Water Resources</i> <i>County of San Joaquin et al. v. California Department of Water Resources</i> <i>Sacramento Area Sewer District v. California Department of Water Resources</i> <i>San Francisco Baykeeper, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources</i> <i>Sierra Club, et al. v. California Department of Water Resources</i> <i>South Delta Water Agency and Rudy Mussi Investment L.P. v. California Department of Water Resources</i> <i>Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District v. California Department of Water Resources</i>	- 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 - All but South Delta Water Agency's case were filed in Sacramento County Superior Court - South Delta Water Agency filed in San Joaquin County Superior Court <u>First case management conference held in Sacramento County Superior Court February 16, 2024</u> <u>Second case management conference set for May 31, 2024</u> <u>Sacramento County Water Agency joined County of Sacramento's case when they filed a First Amended Petition on February 16, 2024</u> <u>July 23, 2024 Case Management Conference in the San Joaquin County Superior Court case of <i>South Delta Water Agency et al. v. DWR</i></u>
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) <i>DWR v. All Persons Interested</i> (Validation) Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Kenneth C. Mennemeier)	Validation Action - Metropolitan, Mojave Water Agency, Coachella Valley Water District, and Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency have filed answers in support - Kern County Water Agency, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, Oak Flat Water District, County of Kings, Kern Member Units & Dudley Ridge Water District, and City of Yuba City filed answers in opposition - North Coast Rivers Alliance et al., Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, Sierra Club et al., County of Sacramento & Sacramento County Water Agency, CWIN et al., Clarksburg Fire Protection District, Delta Legacy Communities, Inc, and South Delta



Subject	Status
	Water Agency & Central Delta Water Agency have filed answers in opposition • Case ordered consolidated with the DCP Revenue Bond CEQA Case for pre-trial and trial purposes • Trial on the merits held May 15-18, 2023 • Final Judgment and Final Statement of Decision issued January 16, 2024 ○ Judgment in DWR's favor on CEQA, Delta Reform Act, Public Trust Doctrine and jurisdictional causes of action or defenses ○ Bonds ruled not valid based on the broad definition of "Delta Program facilities" in the General Bond Resolution • <u>DWR, Metropolitan and other supporting public water agencies filed Notices of Appeal on or before the February 16, 2024 deadline</u>
SWP-CVP 2019 BiOp Cases <i>Pacific Coast Fed'n of Fishermen's Ass'ns, et al. v. Raimondo, et al. (PCFFA)</i> <i>Calif. Natural Resources Agency, et al. v. Raimondo, et al. (CNRA)</i> Federal District Court, Eastern Dist. of California, Fresno Division (Judge Thurston)	• SWC intervened in both <i>PCFFA</i> and <i>CNRA</i> cases • Federal defendants reinitiated consultation on Oct 1, 2021 • Nov. 16, 2023 parties filed a joint status report • Federal defendants and state plaintiffs seek another 1-year stay and proposed a 2024 Interim Operations Plan (IOP); PCFFA seeks to extend the 2023 IOP until the court rules on the 2024 IOP • Briefing on stay extension and 2024 IOP concludes March 6, 2024 • Dec. 29, 2023 order extended the stay and 2023 IOP until March 2024 or new order, whichever is earlier
CESA Incidental Take Permit Cases Coordinated Case Name <i>CDWR Water Operations Cases</i>, JCCP 5117 (Coordination Trial Judge Gevercer) <i>Metropolitan & Mojave Water Agency v. Calif. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, et al. (CESA/CEQA/Breach of Contract)</i> <i>State Water Contractors & Kern County Water Agency v. Calif. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, et al. (CESA/CEQA)</i>	• All 8 cases ordered coordinated in Sacramento County Superior Court • Stay on discovery issued until coordination trial judge orders otherwise • All four Fresno cases transferred to Sacramento to be heard with the four other coordinated cases • Certified administrative records lodged March 4, 2022 • State Water Contractors et al. granted leave to intervene in <i>Sierra Club, North Coast Rivers</i>



Subject	Status
<i>Tehama-Colusa Canal Auth., et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources</i> (CEQA)	Alliance, Central Delta Water Agency, and San Francisco Baykeeper cases by stipulation
<i>San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water Dist. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources, et al.</i> (CEQA/CESA/ Breach of Contract/Takings)	• SWC, et al. granted leave to intervene as respondents in <i>Tehama-Colusa Canal Auth., et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources</i> CEQA case
<i>Sierra Club, et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources</i> (CEQA/Delta Reform Act/Public Trust)	• SWC's renewed motion to augment the administrative records granted in part; a court-appointed referee will review withheld records to determine if the deliberative process privilege applies
<i>North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources</i> (CEQA/Delta Reform Act/Public Trust)	• Sept. 8, 2023 hearing on DWR's and CDFW's motion to modify the referral to exclude certain withheld records
<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)	• CDFW's motion denied, DWR's motion subject to the Court's in camera review of records proposed for exclusion
<i>San Francisco Baykeeper, et al. v. Calif. Dept. of Water Resources, et al.</i> (CEQA/CESA)	• Referee's recommendation is to grant in part, deny in part SWC parties' motion to augment the administrative records • Oct. 13, 2023 objections or responses to Referee's recommendation due • Oct. 27, 2023 court's ruling granting in part, and denying in part, the SWC parties' motion to augment DWR's and CDFW's administrative records became final • Parties are conferring on a merits briefing schedule



Subject	Status
CDWR Environmental Impact Cases Sacramento Superior Ct. Case No. JCCP 4942, 3d DCA Case No. C091771 (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 • Parties have appealed attorneys’ fees and costs rulings • May 11, 2022, court of appeal reversed the trial court’s denial of attorney fees and costs in an unpublished opinion • Opinion ordered published • Coordinated cases remitted to trial court for re-hearing of fee motions consistent with the court of appeal’s opinion • Sept. 15, 2023 re-hearing on fee motions • Dec. 26, 2023 order denying fee motions • Feb. 26, 2024 deadline to file notice of appeal • Six notices of appeal filed
COA Addendum/ No-Harm Agreement <i>North Coast Rivers Alliance v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Rockwell)	• Plaintiffs allege violations of CEQA, Delta Reform Act & public trust doctrine • USBR Statement of Non-Waiver of Sovereign Immunity filed September 2019 • 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



Subject	Status
SWP Contract Extension Validation Action Court of Appeal for the Third App. Dist. Case No. C096316 <i>DWR v. All Persons Interested in the Matter, etc.</i>	- DWR seeks a judgment that the Contract Extension amendments to the State Water Contracts are lawful - Metropolitan and 7 other SWCs filed answers in support of validity to become parties - Jan. 5-7, 2022 Hearing on the merits held with CEQA cases, below - Final statement of decision in DWR's favor filed March 9, 2022 - Final judgment entered and served - C-WIN et al., County of San Joaquin et al. and North Coast Rivers Alliance et al. filed notices of appeal - Validation and CEQA cases consolidated on appeal - Briefing completed May 30, 2023 - Oral argument held November 15, 2023 - January 5, 2024 court of appeal affirmed the trial court judgment - CWIN et al. NCRA et al.'s petitions for reconsideration denied <u>PCL et al. filed a petition for California Supreme Court review on validation grounds</u> <u>NCRA et al. and CWIN et al. filed petitions for California Supreme Court review on CEQA grounds</u>
SWP Contract Extension CEQA Cases Court of Appeal for the Third App. Dist. Case Nos. C096384 & C096304 <i>North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. DWR</i> <i>Planning & Conservation League, et al. v. DWR</i>	- Petitions for writ of mandate alleging CEQA and Delta Reform Act violations filed on January 8 & 10, 2019 - Deemed related to DWR's Contract Extension Validation Action and assigned to Judge Culhane - Administrative Record completed - DWR filed its answers on September 28, 2020 - Metropolitan, Kern County Water Agency and Coachella Valley Water District have intervened and filed answers in the two CEQA cases - Final statement of decision in DWR's favor denying the writs of mandate filed March 9, 2022 - Final judgments entered and served - North Coast Rivers Alliance et al. and PCL et al. filed notices of appeal



Subject	Status
	• Appeals consolidated with the validation action above
Delta Conveyance Project Soil Exploration Cases <i>Central Delta Water Agency, et al. v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Chang) <i>Central Delta Water Agency, et al. v. DWR (II)</i> , Sacramento County Super. Ct. (Judge Acquisto)	• Original case filed August 10, 2020; new case challenging the second addendum to the CEQA document filed Aug. 1, 2022 • Plaintiffs Central Delta Water Agency, South Delta Water Agency and Local Agencies of the North Delta • One cause of action alleging that DWR's adoption of an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for soil explorations needed for the Delta Conveyance Project violates CEQA • March 24, 2021 Second Amended Petition filed to add allegation that DWR's addendum re changes in locations and depths of certain borings violates CEQA • DWR's petition to add the 2020 CEQA case to the <i>Department of Water Resources Cases</i>, JCCP 4594, San Joaquin County Superior Court denied • Hearing on the merits held Oct.13, 2022 • Dec. 2, 2022 ruling on the merits granting the petition with respect to two mitigation measures and denying on all other grounds • Dec. 23, 2022 court order directing DWR to address the two mitigation measures within 60 days while declining to order DWR to vacate the IS/MND • March 27, 2023 court entered judgment and issued a writ after ordering and considering supplemental briefing • May 5, 2023 court granted DWR's motion to discharge the writ and dismiss the case • May 18, 2023 Notice of Appeal filed • <u>Hearing on motion for attorneys' fees continued to February 29, 2024</u>vacated • <u>Appeal dismissed after DWR settled on attorney fees</u>
Water Management Tools Contract Amendment <i>California Water Impact Network et al. v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Superior Ct. (Judge Aquisto)	• 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,



Subject	Status
<i>North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. DWR</i> Sacramento County Super. Ct. (Judge Aquisto)	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



<i>San Diego County Water Authority v. Metropolitan, et al.</i>		
Cases	Date	Status
2014, 2016	Aug. 28, 2020	SDCWA served first amended (2014) and second amended (2016) petitions/complaints.
	Sept. 28	Metropolitan filed demurrers and motions to strike portions of the amended petitions/complaints.
	Sept. 28-29	Member agencies City of Torrance, Eastern Municipal Water District, Foothill Municipal Water District, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, Three Valleys Municipal Water District, Municipal Water District of Orange County, West Basin Municipal Water District, and Western Municipal Water District filed joinders to the demurrers and motions to strike.
	Feb. 16, 2021	Court issued order denying Metropolitan's demurrers and motions to strike, allowing SDCWA to retain contested allegations in amended petitions/complaints.
	March 22	Metropolitan filed answers to the amended petitions/complaints and cross-complaints against SDCWA for declaratory relief and reformation, in the 2014, 2016 cases.
	March 22-23	Member agencies City of Torrance, Eastern Municipal Water District, Foothill Municipal Water District, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, Three Valleys Municipal Water District, Municipal Water District of Orange County, West Basin Municipal Water District, and Western Municipal Water District filed answers to the amended petitions/complaints in the 2014, 2016 cases.
	April 23	SDCWA filed answers to Metropolitan's cross-complaints.
	Sept. 30	Based on the Court of Appeal's Sept. 21 opinion (described above), and the Board's Sept. 28 authorization, Metropolitan paid \$35,871,153.70 to SDCWA for 2015-2017 Water Stewardship Rate charges under the Exchange Agreement and statutory interest.
2017	July 23, 2020	Dismissal without prejudice entered.
2018	July 28, 2020	Parties filed a stipulation and application to designate the case complex and related to the 2010-2017 cases, and to assign the case to Judge Massullo's court.
	Nov. 13	Court ordered case complex and assigned to Judge Massullo's court.
	April 21, 2021	SDCWA filed second amended petition/complaint.
	May 25	Metropolitan filed motion to strike portions of the second amended petition/complaint.



Cases	Date	Status
2018 (cont.)	May 25-26	Member agencies City of Torrance, Eastern Municipal Water District, Foothill Municipal Water District, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, Three Valleys Municipal Water District, Municipal Water District of Orange County, West Basin Municipal Water District, and Western Municipal Water District filed joinders to the motion to strike.
	July 19	Court issued order denying Metropolitan's motion to strike portions of the second amended petition/complaint.
	July 29	Metropolitan filed answer to the second amended petition/complaint and cross-complaint against SDCWA for declaratory relief and reformation.
	July 29	Member agencies City of Torrance, Eastern Municipal Water District, Foothill Municipal Water District, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, Three Valleys Municipal Water District, Municipal Water District of Orange County, West Basin Municipal Water District, and Western Municipal Water District filed answers to the second amended petition/complaint.
	Aug. 31	SDCWA filed answer to Metropolitan's cross-complaint.
	April 11, 2022	Court entered order of voluntary dismissal of parties' WaterFix claims and cross-claims.
2014, 2016, 2018	June 11, 2021	Deposition of non-party witness.
	Aug. 25	Hearing on Metropolitan's motion for further protective order regarding deposition of non-party witness.
	Aug. 25	Court issued order consolidating the 2014, 2016, and 2018 cases for all purposes, including trial.
	Aug. 30	Court issued order granting Metropolitan's motion for a further protective order regarding deposition of non-party witness.
	Aug. 31	SDCWA filed consolidated answer to Metropolitan's cross-complaints in the 2014, 2016, and 2018 cases.
	Oct. 27	Parties submitted to the court a joint stipulation and proposed order staying discovery through Dec. 8 and resetting pre-trial deadlines.
	Oct. 29	Court issued order staying discovery through Dec. 8 and resetting pre-trial deadlines, while the parties discuss the prospect of settling some or all remaining claims and crossclaims.
	Jan. 12, 2022	Case Management Conference. Court ordered a 35-day case stay to allow the parties to focus on settlement negotiations, with weekly written check-ins with the court; and directed the parties to meet and confer regarding discovery and deadlines.



Cases	Date	Status
2014, 2016, 2018 (cont.)	Feb. 22	Court issued order resetting pre-trial deadlines as proposed by the parties.
	Feb. 22	Metropolitan and SDCWA each filed motions for summary adjudication.
	April 13	Hearing on Metropolitan's and SDCWA's motions for summary adjudication.
	April 18	Parties filed supplemental briefs regarding their respective motions for summary adjudication, as directed by the court.
	April 18	Court issued order resetting pre-trial deadlines as proposed by the parties.
	April 29	Parties filed pre-trial briefs.
	April 29	Metropolitan filed motions in limine.
	May 4	Court issued order granting Metropolitan's motion for summary adjudication on cross-claim for declaratory relief that the conveyance facility owner, Metropolitan, determines fair compensation, including any offsetting benefits; and denying its motion on certain other cross-claims and an affirmative defense.
	May 11	Court issued order granting SDCWA's motion for summary adjudication on cross-claim for declaratory relief in the 2018 case regarding lawfulness of the Water Stewardship Rate's inclusion in the wheeling rate and transportation rates in 2019-2020; certain cross-claims and affirmative defenses on the ground that Metropolitan has a duty to charge no more than fair compensation, which includes reasonable credit for any offsetting benefits, with the court also stating that whether that duty arose and whether Metropolitan breached that duty are issues to be resolved at trial; affirmative defenses that SDCWA's claims are untimely and SDCWA has not satisfied claims presentation requirements; affirmative defense in the 2018 case that SDCWA has not satisfied contract dispute resolution requirements; claim, cross-claims, and affirmative defenses regarding applicability of Proposition 26, finding that Proposition 26 applies to Metropolitan's rates and charges, with the court also stating that whether Metropolitan violated Proposition 26 is a separate issue; and cross-claims and affirmative defenses regarding applicability of Government Code section 54999.7, finding that section 54999.7 applies to Metropolitan's rates. Court denied SDCWA's motion on certain other cross-claims and affirmative defenses.
	May 13	Pre-trial conference; court denied Metropolitan's motions in limine.
	May 16	Court issued order setting post-trial brief deadline and closing arguments.
	May 16-27	Trial occurred but did not conclude.



Cases	Date	Status
2014, 2016, 2018 (cont.)	May 23, June 21	SDCWA filed motions in limine.
	May 26, June 24	Court denied SDCWA's motions in limine.
	June 3, June 24, July 1	Trial continued, concluding on July 1.
	June 24	SDCWA filed motion for partial judgment.
	July 15	Metropolitan filed opposition to motion for partial judgment.
	Aug. 19	Post-trial briefs filed.
	Sept. 14	Court issued order granting in part and denying in part SDCWA's motion for partial judgment (granting motion as to Metropolitan's dispute resolution, waiver, and consent defenses; denying motion as to Metropolitan's reformation cross-claims and mistake of fact and law defenses; and deferring ruling on Metropolitan's cost causation cross-claim).
	Sept. 21	Metropolitan filed response to order granting in part and denying in part SDCWA's motion for partial judgment (requesting deletion of Background section portion relying on pleading allegations).
	Sept. 22	SDCWA filed objection to Metropolitan's response to order granting in part and denying in part SDCWA's motion for partial judgment.
	Sept. 27	Post-trial closing arguments.
	Oct. 20	Court issued order that it will rule on SDCWA's motion for partial judgment as to Metropolitan's cost causation cross-claim simultaneously with the trial statement of decision.
	Dec. 16	Parties 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)
	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).



Cases	Date	Status
	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)
	Jan. 26	Parties filed opening briefs on proposed form of judgment
	<u>Feb. 26</u>	<u>Parties filed response briefs on proposed form of judgment</u>
	March 13	Hearing on proposed form of judgment
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
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	\$1,277,187
	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
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
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
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	\$100,000
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
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
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
Kutak Rock LLP	Delta Islands Land Management	207959	10/22	\$10,000
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore	Labor and Employment	158032	02/17	\$229,724
	FLSA Audit	180199	02/19	\$50,000
	EEO Advice	216041	12/23	\$100,000



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
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	\$400,000
Martenson, Hasbrouck & Simon LLP	Employment Matter	211932	08/23	\$50,000
Meyers Nave Riback Silver & Wilson	Pure Water Southern California	207967	11/22	\$100,000
	PFAS Compliance Issues	207968	11/14/22	\$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
Nixon Peabody LLP*	Bond Counsel [re-opened]	193473	07/21	\$100,000
	Special Finance Project	207960	10/22	\$50,000
Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP*	Bond Counsel	200466	07/21	N/A
Olson Remcho LLP	Government Law	131968	07/14	\$400,000
	Executive Committee/Ad Hoc Committees Advice	207947	08/22	\$60,000
	Public Records Act	207950	08/22	\$54,000
	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



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
<u>Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch, LLP</u>	<u>CityWatch Los Angeles Public Records Act Request</u>	<u>216046</u>	<u>02/24</u>	<u>\$75,000</u>
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
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton	Rivers v. MWD	207946	07/22	\$250,000
	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



Firm Name	Matter Name	Agreement No.	Effective Date	Contract Maximum
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