



FILED

08-13-12

04:31 PM

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

1

Application of California-American Water Company (U210W) for Authorization to increase its Revenues for Water Service by \$4,134,600 or 2.55% in the year 2011, by \$33,105,800 or 19.68% in the year 2012, by \$9,897,200 or 4.92% in the year 2013, and by \$10,874,600 or 5.16% in the year 2014.	A.10-07-007 (Filed July 1, 2010)
And Related Matter	A.11-09-016 (Filed September 23, 2011)

**INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF NRDC
AND DECISION ON INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF NRDC**

2

Claimant: Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)	For contribution to D.12-06-016
Claimed (\$): \$ 19,617.06	Awarded (\$):
Assigned Commissioner: Michael Peter Florio	Assigned ALJ: Linda R. Rochester and Douglas M. Long
I hereby certify that the information I have set forth in Parts I, II, and III of this Claim is true to my best knowledge, information and belief. I further certify that, in conformance with the Rules of Practice and Procedure, this Claim has been served this day upon all required persons.	
Signature:	/s/Doug Obegi
Date: August 13, 2012	Printed Name: Doug Obegi

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

3

A. Brief Description of Decision:	D.12-06-016 addresses issues in the general rate case for California-American Water Company, including: (1) approval of a multi-party settlement agreement recommending reporting and reducing nonrevenue water (water loss); and, (2) approval of portions of a settlement agreement between NRDC and the company recommending monthly meter reading and billing. The Decision denies approval of other portions of the settlement agreement between NRDC and the company on other issues, such as changes to billing format and developing a study of the costs and benefits of investing in advanced metering infrastructure. In addition, D.12-06-016 deferred rate design and increasing the low income surcredit to Phase II of this proceeding, and NRDC will participate in Phase II on those two topics.
--	---

B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Claimant	CPUC Verified	
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):			
4	1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	August 26, 2010	
	2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	n/a	
	3. Date NOI Filed:	September 24, 2010	
	4. Was the NOI timely filed?		
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):			
5	5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.09-08-009	
	6. Date of ALJ ruling:	January 28, 2010	
	7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
	8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):			
6	9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.11-05-017 et al.	
	10. Date of ALJ ruling:	October 28, 2011	
	11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
	12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):			
7	13. Identify Final Decision:	D.12-06-016	
	14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	June 14, 2012	
	15. File date of compensation request:	August 13, 2012	
	16. Was the request for compensation timely?		

C. Additional Comments on Part I (use line reference # as appropriate):

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
8	3 Part I A. Brief Description of Decision		<p>Decision 12-06-016 adopts the revenue requirement for this general rate case and takes action on several motions to adopt settlement agreements, including approving a multiparty settlement agreement on reporting and reducing nonrevenue water, approving monthly meter reading and billing (Special Request #1), and disapproving a settlement agreement on billing format, advanced metering infrastructure, volumetric wastewater pricing, and other issues.</p> <p>As such, NRDC is requesting compensation herein for work performed in A.10-07-007 that contributed to the final decision in this proceeding (D.12-06-016), including work on the multiparty settlement agreement on nonrevenue water,</p>

			monthly meter reading, and monthly billing format.
3	Part I A. Brief Description of Decision		NRDC has <u>not</u> requested compensation for time spent in this proceeding on issues relating to rate design or increasing the low income surcredit, since D.12-06-016 moved consideration of those issues to phase II of this proceeding.

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION (to be completed by Claimant except where indicated)

A. In the fields below, describe in a concise manner Claimant’s contribution to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059). (For each contribution, support with specific reference to the record.)

9

	Contribution to D.12-06-016	Specific References to Claimant’s Presentations and to Decision	Showing Accepted by CPUC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following italicized headers correspond to the substantive issue areas used to categorize the timesheets. Where no page numbers are indicated, the entire document (or a majority of the document) supports the substantive claim. 		
	<p><i>1. Water Loss Reporting (Non Revenue Water) (A)</i></p> <p>NRDC submitted testimony on the need to improve California-American Water Company’s accounting for water losses and to reduce such water losses. NRDC supported the company’s request that non-revenue water be based on volume instead of percentages, but NRDC opposed other elements of Special Request #15. After substantial negotiations, NRDC reached a partial settlement agreement with the company that included provisions on water loss reporting. Subsequently, NRDC reached a settlement agreement with the company and the Division of Ratepayer Advocates on accounting for, and taking steps to reduce, non-revenue water. This settlement agreement will better account for water losses and implement cost-effective measures to reduce such losses, which should benefit ratepayers and improve water use efficiency, which benefits the environment.</p>	<p>In D.12-06-016, the Commission approved the majority of the settlement agreement between the company, DRA, and NRDC. However, the Commission did not approve the portion of the Settlement that authorized the company to only report water losses as volumes (instead of percentages) (Special Request #15), and instead the Commission required reporting of both volume and percentage. In addition, the Commission did not approve portions of the settlement with respect to nonrevenue water in the Monterey District for ratemaking purposes and the Monterey County District penalty/reward mechanism, but the Commission did approve revisions to the Monterey County District penalty/reward mechanism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>D.12-06-016, pp. 19-22, 25-32, 71</i> <i>Testimony of the Natural Resources Defense Council On California-American Water Company’s Proposed Rate Design, Water Conservation Rates, and Related Policy Issues (“NRDC Exhibit 1”), February 4, 2011, chapter 1, pp.10-12.</i> <i>Partial Settlement Agreement Between the Natural Resources Defense Council and California-American Water Company on Issues Presented in the General Rate Case, May 19, 2011, pp. 12-15.</i> 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Partial Settlement Agreement Between the Division of Ratepayer Advocates, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and California-American Water Company on Non-Revenue Issues in the General Rate Case, July 28, 2011.</i> 	
<p>2. <i>Monthly billing and changes to Billing Format (B)</i></p> <p>NRDC submitted testimony providing qualified support for the Company’s request to implement monthly billing and meter reading, provided that the costs for additional meter readers were not greatly disproportionate to the benefits. In addition, NRDC recommended specific changes to billing format. Particularly under a tiered rate structure, monthly billing and meter reading provides customers with early warning of water leaks and helps customers better understand the relationship between their water use and bills. The billing format changes that we recommended were intended to strengthen the customer’s understanding of how their water consumption affects their bill, including clear information about the amount of consumption and the billing rate. NRDC reached a settlement agreement with the company that included changes to billing format and approval of monthly meter reading and billing (Special Request #1).</p>	<p>In D.12-06-106, the Commission approved the request for monthly meter reading and billing that was included in the partial settlement agreement between the company, DRA, and NRDC. However, the Decision rejected the settlement provisions regarding billing format.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>D.12-06-016 at pp. 12, 32-33, 81.</i> • <i>NRDC Exhibit 1, chapter 1, pp. 7-8</i> • <i>Partial Settlement Agreement Between the Natural Resources Defense Council and California-American Water Company on Issues Presented in the General Rate Case, May 19, 2011, pp. 2-3, 4-5.</i> 	
<p>3. <i>Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) (C)</i></p> <p>NRDC submitted testimony recommending the company evaluate the business case for investment in advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) in its next GRC. AMI systems involve automated data acquisition from customer meters, and AMI is being implemented by water utilities across California. AMI provides utilities with better information about customer water usage, including leaks. NRDC reached a settlement agreement with the company recommending that the Commission authorize and direct the company to conduct a study of AMI for use in the next general rate case.</p>	<p>The Commission denied approval of this portion of the settlement agreement between NRDC and the company; in its Decision, the Commission found that the proposal was not supported by the record but specifically noted that the Decision did not address the merits of this proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>D.12-06-016 at pp. 4, 32-33, 81</i> • <i>NRDC Exhibit 1, chapter 1, pp. 8-9</i> • <i>Partial Settlement Agreement Between the Natural Resources Defense Council and California-American Water Company on Issues Presented in the General Rate Case, May 19, 2011, pp. 5-6.</i> 	
<p>4. <i>Volumetric Pricing of Wastewater Service</i></p>	<p>The Commission denied approval of this portion</p>	

<p>(D)</p> <p>NRDC submitted testimony recommending that the company begin charging for wastewater service through a volumetric charge, rather than a flat rate. Volumetric pricing of wastewater service effectively doubles the price signal for water use efficiency, and it can reduce future infrastructure requirements for sewer service. NRDC pointed out that as a signatory to the California Urban water Conservation Council, the company has an obligation to implement a volumetric pricing scheme for wastewater service in the Monterey Wastewater District and to work in good faith with wastewater providers in its other districts so those sewage districts adopt volumetric pricing structures.</p> <p>NRDC reached a settlement agreement with the company which recommends that the Commission direct the company to develop and submit a proposal for a volumetric pricing structure for wastewater customers in the Monterey Wastewater District in its next GRC, and to take certain other steps to advance volumetric pricing of wastewater in other districts.</p>	<p>of the settlement agreement between NRDC and the company; in its Decision, the Commission found that the proposal was not supported by the record but specifically noted that the Decision did not address the merits of this proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>D.12-06-016 at pp. 4, 32-33, 81</i> • <i>NRDC Exhibit 1, chapter 1, pp. 8-9</i> • <i>Partial Settlement Agreement Between the Natural Resources Defense Council and California-American Water Company on Issues Presented in the General Rate Case, May 19, 2011, pp. 9-11.</i> 	
<p>5. <i>Sacramento WRAM (Special Request #5)</i> (E)</p> <p>NRDC submitted testimony strongly supporting effective WRAM/MCBI mechanisms and providing specific recommendations for how to improve on the current WRAM/MCBI mechanism. NRDC reached a partial settlement agreement with the company that recommended that the Commission authorize creation of a WRAM and MCBI in the Sacramento District (Special Request #5). NRDC supported this request because an effective WRAM/MCBI mechanism is a necessary component of an effective conservation program and should provide protection to both the customer and the company.</p>	<p>The Commission denied approval of this portion of the settlement agreement between NRDC and the company, and directed that issues relating to the Sacramento WRAM be moved to Phase II of this proceeding. Due to resource limitations NRDC will not be participating in the Phase II proceedings on this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>D.12-06-016 at pp.4, 34-35, 74, 82.</i> • <i>NRDC Exhibit 1, chapter 2, pp. 3-6.</i> • <i>Partial Settlement Agreement Between the Natural Resources Defense Council and California-American Water Company on Issues Presented in the General Rate Case, May 19, 2011, pp. 8-9.</i> 	
<p>6. <i>Irrigation Rates (F)</i></p> <p>NRDC submitted testimony which generally supported the company's request to establish irrigation rates for dedicated irrigation customers in the Larkfield, San Diego County,</p>	<p>The Commission denied approval of this portion of the settlement agreement between NRDC and the company; in its Decision, the Commission found that the proposal was not supported by the record but specifically noted that the</p>	

and Ventura County Districts, and in the Toro Service Area, at a rate comparable to the top residential tier rate. NRDC further testified that the company should identify all dedicated irrigation accounts in these districts and service area. We supported this request in order to send a strong price signal that encourages greater efficiency and conservation for nonessential, outdoor water use.	Decision did not address the merits of this proposal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>D.12-06-016 at pp. 4, 32-33, 81</i> • <i>NRDC Exhibit 1, chapter 1, pp. 9-10.</i> • <i>Partial Settlement Agreement Between the Natural Resources Defense Council and California-American Water Company on Issues Presented in the General Rate Case, May 19, 2011, pp.3-4.</i> 	
---	--	--

B. Duplication of Effort (§§ 1801.3(f) & 1802.5):

10

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) a party to the proceeding?	Yes	
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	
c. If so, provide name of other parties: The Utility Reform Network (TURN)		
d. Describe how you coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party: Whenever possible, NRDC worked cooperatively with other parties to write joint comments and develop joint stipulations, as well as to coordinate participation in pre-hearing conferences to avoid duplication of effort. NRDC participated in multiparty settlement discussions to try to resolve as many issues outside the formal proceeding, which contributed to a settlement agreement that was approved in this Decision (D.12.06-016 at 19-22, 25-32, 71). As a result of the efforts described above, NRDC’s compensation in this proceeding should not be reduced for duplication of the showing of other parties. In addition, NRDC took steps to ensure no duplication of work within our organization by assigning specific issues, tasks, and workshops/meetings to one team member.		

C. Additional Comments on Part II (use line reference # or letter as appropriate):

11

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
9			

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION (to be completed by Claimant except where indicated)

A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 & 1806):

12

a. Concise explanation as to how the cost of Claimant’s participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation (include references to record, where appropriate)

CPUC Verified

Throughout A.10-07-007, NRDC advocated for Commission adoption of policies and programs that ensure that California-American Water Company increases water conservation and efficiency by the company and by its customers, while also ensuring affordable water supplies for essential levels of water use and particularly for low income communities. Several elements of NRDC’s recommendations were explicitly adopted in settlement agreements approved by the Commission in D.12-06-016, including settlement provisions recommending specific activities to report and reduce water losses (nonrevenue water) and to implement monthly meter reading and billing.

While the Commission disapproved other elements of the settlement agreement between NRDC and California-American Water Company, the Decision explicitly finds that disapproval was not based on the merits of those recommendations but instead on the lack of an adequate record. One or more of those issues will be taken up in Phase II of this proceeding, and other elements may be taken up in the next general rate case.

NRDC’s participation substantially contributed to the final decision that will improve water efficiency by California-American Water Company and its customers. Reducing the cost of delivering water, as well as reducing individual customer usage, will directly benefit customers by reducing nonrevenue water and the need to purchase costly additional water supplies.

b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed. *NRDC’s Claims are Reasonable and Conservative*

The substantial contributions to the Decision described above would not have been possible without the individual contributions of each of the two main members the NRDC team. Edward R. Osann, who has over 25 years of relevant experience, provided technical expertise and knowledge of best practices on urban water use efficiency and water loss reporting. He drafted testimony, testified in prehearing conferences, and negotiated settlement agreements on these issues. Doug Obegi, an attorney with more than 5 years of legal experience and several years of policy experience focused on water use efficiency, drafted settlement agreements and motions, represented NRDC in prehearing conferences with the ALJ, participated in settlement negotiations, and drafted comments on the proposed Decision. Copies of Mr. Osann’s and Mr. Obegi’s resumes are attached.

NRDC maintained detailed time records indicating the number of hours that were devoted to proceeding activities. All hours represent substantive work related to this proceeding. When staff ‘reviewed’ other staff work, this involved detailed comments, additional language, clarity of position, and effectiveness of recommendations, to ensure that the work product delivered to the Commission was substantive and useful. This activity was not merely grammar checking, but added significant value to the end product. Likewise, when staff ‘coordinated’, this involved developing NRDC positions on substantive issues and identifying key issues NRDC would emphasize in testimony, in comments, or in settlement agreements. When we claim two staff for attending the same meeting (either internal or external), we do so because each staff member possesses a distinct area

of expertise.

The amounts claimed are conservative for the following reasons: (1) No time was claimed for pure coordination among the staff, only for discussions of substantive issues to outline comments and define advocacy strategy; (2) we do not claim time for informal conversations with CPUC staff or other stakeholders throughout the proceeding (unless over 2 hours); (3) we claim half time for each staff person present for a substantive internal conversation; and (4) we do not request all hours for prepping this claim. In addition, we did not claim any time for work done by Jeremy Brown (an attorney who worked for NRDC in 2010 on this proceeding) or for time spent by NRDC's consultants on these issues.

In sum, NRDC made numerous and significant contributions which required extensive research and analysis. We took every effort to coordinate with other stakeholders to reduce duplication and increase the overall efficiency of the proceeding. Since our work was efficient, hours conservative, and billing rates low, NRDC's request for compensation should be granted in full.

c. Allocation of Hours by Issue:

Letter	Issue Area	%
A	Water Loss (Nonrevenue water)	31%
B	Billing (Monthly meter reading and billing, Billing Format)	12%
C	Advanced Metering Infrastructure	8%
D	Wastewater Volumetric Pricing	12%
E	Sacramento WRAM	8%
F	Irrigation Rates	9%
G	General	20%

B. Specific Claim:

13

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
D.Obegi	2010	0.5	\$ 220.00	Res ALJ 267	\$ 110.00			
D.Obegi	2011	7.30	\$ 280.00	Res ALJ 267	\$ 2,044.00			
D.Obegi	2012	5.55	\$ 280.00	Res ALJ 267	\$ 1,554.00			
E.Osann	2010	20.05	\$ 180.00	Res ALJ 267	\$ 3,609.00			
E.Osann	2011	41.25	\$ 190.00	D.08-04-010 (p.8)	\$ 7,837.00			
E.Osann	2012	10.95	\$ 190.00	D.08-04-010 (p.8)	\$ 2,080.00			

	Subtotal:						Subtotal:	

OTHER FEES

Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):

15

Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
LA-SF-LA Airfare	2010			Southwest receipt	\$ 119.40			
LV-SF Airfare	2011			Portion of Southwest receipt	\$119.40			
SF Hotel (2 nights)	2011			Mark Twain Hotel receipt	\$385.76			
	Subtotal:					n/a	Subtotal:	

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **

16

Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
D. Obegi	2012	8.00	\$ 140.00	Res ALJ 267 1/2 of normal rate	\$ 1,120.00			
E. Osann	2010	.75	\$ 90.00	Res ALJ 267 1/2 of normal rate	\$ 67.50			
E. Osann	2012	6.00	\$ 95.00	Res ALJ 267 1/2 of normal rate	\$ 570.00			
	Subtotal:					\$ 1,757.50	Subtotal:	

COSTS

17

#	Item	Detail	Amount	Amount
	n/a			
	Subtotal:		n/a	Subtotal:
TOTAL REQUEST \$:				TOTAL AWARD \$:

When entering items, type over bracketed text; add additional rows as necessary.

*If hourly rate based on CPUC decision, provide decision number; otherwise, attach rationale.

**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at 1/2 of preparer's normal hourly rate.

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III (Claimant completes; attachments not attached to final Decision):

18

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Staff time records (include allocation of time by issue)
Comment 1	Rationale for Edward R. Osann's rate 2010 Rate: We propose \$180 for Edward R. Osann. The rate proposed for Mr. Osann is at the

	<p>low end of the range adopted in Res ALJ-267 for experts with more than 13 years of experience (\$155-\$390). Mr. Osann has over 25 years of experience as a water use efficiency expert.</p> <p><u>2011 Rate:</u> For work done in 2011, we propose one 5% step for 2011 work based on D.08-04-010 (p.8), which states “Step increases: limited to two annual increases of no more than 5% each year within any given level of experience for each individual.” We therefore propose a rate of \$190, which is less than a 5% annual increase.</p> <p><u>2012 Rate:</u> For work done in 2012, we propose a rate of \$190, the same rate as in 2011.</p> <p>Mr. Osann has extensive expertise and experience on urban water use efficiency, and represents NRDC before the Department of Energy, CPUC, state legislature, and in other fora. Mr. Osann ran a private consulting firm on water and energy efficiency for 13 years after. Mr. Osann joined NRDC in 2010, after consulting with NRDC for many years on water conservation issues. A copy of Mr. Osann’s resume is attached.</p>
<p>Comment 2</p>	<p>Rationale for Doug Obegi’s rate</p> <p><u>2010 Rate:</u> We propose \$220 for Doug Obegi. The rate proposed for Mr. Obegi is in the middle of the range adopted in Res ALJ-267 for attorneys with three to four years of experience for 2010 (\$200-\$235). Mr. Obegi was a fourth-year water attorney at NRDC in 2010.</p> <p><u>2011 Rate:</u> In 2011, Mr. Obegi was a fifth-year attorney. We accordingly request a rate of \$280 here, which is the lowest end of the range of Attorneys with 5-7 years of experience (\$280-300) adopted in Res ALJ-267. Per D.08-04-010, intervenors can qualify for a rate increase when “moving to a higher experience level: where additional experience since the last authorized rate moved a representative to a higher level of experience.” (D.08-04-010, p.8)</p> <p><u>2012 Rate:</u> Mr. Obegi is now a sixth year attorney. We accordingly request a rate of \$280 here, which is the lowest end of the range of Attorneys with 5-7 years of experience (\$280-300) adopted in Res ALJ-267.</p> <p>Mr. Obegi represents NRDC at state and local fora to promote water use efficiency, including in rulemaking proceedings before the CPUC and Department of Water Resources, and he represents NRDC in federal court litigation. Mr. Obegi holds a B.A. from Brown University and a J.D. from University of California, Hastings College of the Law. A copy of his resume is attached.</p>

D. CPUC Disallowances, Adjustments, and Comments (CPUC completes):

19

#	Reason

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS
 Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff
 or any other party may file a response to the Claim (see § 1804(c))

(CPUC completes the remainder of this form)

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	
---	--

If so:

Party	Reason for Opposition	CPUC Disposition

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(2)(6))?	
---	--

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Disposition

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Claimant [has/has not] made a substantial contribution to Decision (D.) _____.
2. The requested hourly rates for Claimant’s representatives [,as adjusted herein,] are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses [,as adjusted herein,] are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable contribution is \$_____.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, [satisfies/fails to satisfy] all requirements of Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. Claimant is awarded \$_____.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, _____ shall pay Claimant the total award. [for multiple utilities: “Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, ^, ^, and ^ shall pay Claimant their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional [industry type, for example, electric] revenues for the ^ calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated.”] Payment of the award shall include interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning _____, 200__, the 75th day after the filing of Claimant’s request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today’s decision [is/is not] waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

Attachment 1 - Staff Time records and A.10-07-007 and Allocation of Time by Issue

Letter	Issue Area	%	Total Hours
A	Water Loss (Nonrevenue water)	31%	26.93
B	Billing (Monthly meter reading and billing, Billing Format)	12%	10.175
C	Advanced Metering Infrastructure	8%	6.825
D	Wastewater Volumetric Pricing	12%	10.225
E	Sacramento WRAM	8%	7.025
F	Irrigation Rates	9%	7.925
G	General	20%	16.75
		Total Hrs	85.85

Date	Description	Hrs
Intervenor Comp Prep - NOI (E. Osann)		
9/24/2010	Prepare NOI	0.75
Total Claim		\$ 67.50 0.75
Intervenor Comp Prep - Claim (D. Obegi)		
8/2/2012	Draft claim	1.75
8/3/2012	Draft claim	2
8/3/2012	Prepare spreadsheet for submittal	2.25
8/13/2012	Finalize claim and spreadsheet	2
Total Claim		\$ 1,120.00 8
Intervenor Comp Prep - Claim (E. Osann)		
8/9/2012	Prepare spreadsheet for submittal	4
8/13/2012	Prepare spreadsheet for submittal	2
Total Claim		\$ 570.00 6
Total Intervenor Compensation prep		\$1,757.50

E. Osann									
Date	Description	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Total Hours
8/25/2010	review CalAm's initial filing to prepare for pre-hearing conference with the ALJ							4	4
8/26/2010	attend pre-hearing conference with the ALJ; confer with Cal Am prior to conference							4	4
8.26/2010	introductory conference with Cal Am introducing NRDC's staff and consultants and identifying keys interests in the case.							1	1
8/26/2010	round trip air and ground travel time from Santa Monica to San Francisco (claiming 1/2 time)							2	2
9/2/2010	discussion of the strategy of the case with J. Brown, attorney							0.25	0.25
9/7/2010	discussion of initial NRDC information request to Cal Am with J. Brown							0.25	0.25
9/10/2010	conference call with consultants and J. Brown regarding scope, procedure, and issues to include in information request							1.5	1.5
9/12/2010	research and draft second NRDC information request to Cal Am	1	0.75	0.25	0.5		0.25		2.75
9/14/2010	discussion of Cal Am's verbal responses to NRDC's information requests with J. Brown							0.25	0.25
9/20/2012	conference call with CalAm to go over the NRDC information request	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.3		0.2		1.5
9/25/2010	discussion of delays in Cal Am response to information request and possible remedies with J. Brown							0.25	0.25
9/30/2010	discovery document review; discussion with consultant pertaining to the key components of document review	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.3		0.2		1.5
10/4/2010	discussion with L. Fransen, DRA to discuss strategy and status of case, how to collaborate, and what actions to take next	0.1							0.1
10/26/2010	additional discovery document review; discussion with consultant to outline next steps		0.1				0.1		0.2
11/18/2010	Conference call with D. Obegi and consultants regarding strategy, issues and responsibilities for the preparation of testimony, and expected schedule of filings by parties	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05		0.05		0.25
12/27/2010	Conference call with D. Obegi and consultants regarding substance and preparation of testimony	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05		0.05		0.25
\$ 3,609.00	EO Total (2010 Hours - claimed \$180/hr)	2.2	1.55	0.75	1.2	0	0.85	13.5	20.05
1/11/2011	teleconference with consultant on testimony preparation	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05		0.05		0.25
1/18/2011	participate in DRA-hosted conference call for intervenors to identify issues and ask questions of DRA	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1		0.1		0.5
1/26/2011	teleconference w/ consultants to outline high level positions, assign topics, and schedule for preparation of NRDC	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1		0.1		0.5
1/29/2011	analysis and evaluation of Cal Am water loss audit reports received in discovery in preparation for testimony	3							3
1/30/2011	prepare testimony	0.5	1.5	0.25	1.5		0.25		4
1/31/2011	prepare testimony		1.5		1.5				3
2/1/2011	conference call with D. Obegi and consultants to review and revise NRDC testimony	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05		0.3
2/3/2011	complete preparation of testimony	2.25		1.5			1.5		5.25
2/18/2011	teleconference with D. Obegi and consultants to review next steps and coverage of community meetings							0.5	0.5
3/30/2011	teleconference with M. Gomberg, DRA regarding strategy and opportunities to collaborate pertaining to non-revenue water	1							1
5/2/2011	review and response to written proposal from Cal Am regarding potential settlement of monthly billing, billing formats, irrigation rates, advanced metering infrastructure (AMI), low income surcredit, water loss, and	0.2	0.2	0.1		0.2	0.2		0.9
5/3/2011	teleconference with Cal Am regarding potential settlement of water loss, monthly billing, billing formats, irrigation rates, AMI, low income surcredit, water loss, and Sacramento WRAM	0.2	0.1	0.1		0.1	0.1		0.6
5/3/2011	air and ground travel to SF to attend settlement conference							2	2
5/4/2011	settlement conference with Cal Am and other parties	1.5	0.25			0.5			2.25
5/5/2011	settlement conference with Cal Am and other parties	0.5				0.25			0.75
5/7/2011	review of Cal Am's 80-page report and accompanying technical appendices non-revenue water in the Monterey District	1.25							1.25
5/10/2011	preparation of settlement proposal to Cal Am and DRA on accounting for non-revenue water and implementing water loss reduction measures	0.75							0.75
5/11/2011	consultation with J Steingass, DRA, regarding points to include in a settlement of non-revenue water and water loss issues.	0.5							0.5
5/11/2011	preparation of settlement proposal to Cal Am and DRA on accounting for non-revenue water and implementing water loss reduction measures	1.5							1.5
5/12/2011	Conference call with D. Obegi, consultants and D. Wang regarding potential settlement agreements	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2		1.2
5/13/2011	distribution and discussion via teleconference with Cal Am of specific elements of NRDC's settlement proposal for non-revenue and discussion of volumetric pricing for the Monterey Wastewater District for inclusion in the settlement.	0.75	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1		1.25
5/16/2011	Review draft of partial settlement agreement between NRDC and Cal Am and exchange proposed edits with Cal Am via e-mail.	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2		1.2
5/17/2011	Review and revise final draft of partial settlement agreement between NRDC and CalAm and the accompanying draft motion to adopt the partial settlement	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2		1.4
5/18/2011	coordinate final review and approval of partial settlement with Cal Am via e-mail with S. Leeper	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05		0.3
5/19/2011	Review and provide signature for final settlement agreement with CalAm and draft motion to adopt settlement	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1		0.6
5/24/2011	Review the revised hearing schedule for late June distributed by DRA and strategize with D. Obegi to determine whether NRDC or Cal Am witness testimony is needed or expected regarding the NRDC-Cal Am partial settlement							0.25	0.25
6/20/2011	Review of comments filed by Mark West Area Community Services Committee on the Proposed Partial Settlement between NRDC and Cal Am					0.5			0.5
7/13/2011	review draft DRA-CalAm settlement on non-revenue water; participate in teleconference, providing recommendations for improvements in draft settlement language	3.5							3.5
7/27/2011	review and comment on draft NRW motion and settlement (CalAm-DRA-NRDC)	0.5							0.5
7/28/2011	review, comment, and provide final approval of draft NRW motion and settlement (CalAm-DRA-NRDC)	1.25							1.25
8/25/2011	review of ALJ Ruling regarding scheduling an evidentiary hearing, and discussion with D. Obegi								0
9/1/2011	consultation with Doug on schedule and content of pre-hearing conference/evidentiary hearing								0
9/7/2011	consultation with Doug; preparation for pre-hearing conference/evidentiary hearing								0
9/8/2011	participation via teleconference in initial portion of pre-hearing conference/evidentiary hearing, stressing need to allow prompt resolution on non-Monterey issues								0
9/13/2011	Consult with D. Obegi regarding WRAM issues raised at pre-hearing conference					0.25			0.25
9/17/2011	review of transcript of prehearing conference of Sept. 8.								0
12/12/2011	review of ALJ's scoping order; communication with atty. and consultants						0.25		0.25
\$ 7,837.50	EO Total (2011 Hours - claimed \$190/hour)	20.3	4.7	3.1	4.25	2.7	3.45	2.75	41.25

E. Osann									
2/13/2012	review of ALJ's evidentiary ruling	0.5							0.5
2/17/2012	e-mail communication with L. Bilir, DRA, regarding a proposed response to the question in the ALJ's evidentiary ruling about costs associated with action plans for non-revenue water as specified in the Cal Am-DRA-NRDC Settlement on Non-Revenue Water.	0.25							0.25
2/21/2012	e-mails to S. Leeper and J. Dana, Cal Am, providing comment and approval to the proposed joint response of Cal Am, DRA, and NRDC to the question in the ALJ's evidentiary ruling about costs associated with action plans for non-revenue water.	0.5							0.5
4/17/2012	teleconference with D. Brooks, DRA on rate design and WRAM issues					0.25			0.25
4/23/2012	review of ALJ's Proposed Decision	0.05	0.1	0.05	0.1	0.1	0.05		0.45
4/24/2012	consultation via e-mail with D. Obegi and consultant regarding points in dispute with the Proposed Decision	0.05	0.1	0.05	0.1	0.1	0.05		0.45
4/25/2012	review of ALJ's Proposed Decision; consultation with other parties; teleconference with D. Obegi and consultant; e-mail to DRA	0.1	0.4	0.25	0.4	0.4	0.25		1.8
5/1/2012	teleconference with D. Brooks, DRA, to discuss possible responses to disputed points in the Proposed Decision, including billing formats, AMI, wastewater volumetric pricing, Sacramento WRAM, and low income assistance.	0	0.1	0.05	0.1	0.1			0.35
5/10/2012	teleconference with attorney and Cal Am to discuss Proposed Decision	0	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1		0.8
5/13/2012	prepare comments on Proposed Decision denying approval of partial settlement agreement between NRDC and CalAm	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.5	1		3
5/14/2012	editing and approving NRDC comments on Proposed Decision focusing on cost recovery issues.	0	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1		0.6
6/4/2012	e-mail and teleconference with D. Obegi and consultant to prepare for forthcoming ex parte meeting	0	0.1	0.05	0.1	0.1	0.05		0.4
6/4/2012	ex parte meeting via teleconference with M. Poirier, Commissioner's staff, prepare memo on same to D. Obegi	0	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1		0.8
6/7/2012	review of Revised Proposed Decision	0	0.1	0.05	0.1	0.1	0.05		0.4
6/7/2012	review of NRDC's draft ex parte filing and e-mailing of comments to D. Obegi	0	0.1	0.05	0.1	0.1	0.05		0.4
\$ 2,080.50	EO Total (2012 Hours - claimed \$190/hr)	1.65	2	1.15	2.1	2.25	1.8	0	10.95
\$ 13,527.00	TOTAL ALL HOURS	24.15	8.25	5	7.55	4.95	6.1	16.25	72.25

Doug Obegi - 2010-2012									
Date	Description	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Total Hours
11/18/2010	Conference call with E. Osann and consultants regarding strategy, preparation of testimony, and schedule	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05		0.05		0.25
12/27/2010	Conference call with E. Osann and consultants regarding substance and preparation of testimony	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05		0.05		0.25
\$ 110.00	DO Total (2010 Hours - claimed \$220/hr)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0	0.1	0	0.5
2/1/2011	conference call with E. Osann and consultants to review and revise NRDC testimony	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05		0.3
2/3/2011	Review and revise NRDC testimony	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15		0.9
2/18/2011	teleconference with E. Osann and consultants to review next steps and coverage of community meetings							0.5	0.5
5/12/2011	Conference call with E. Osann, consultants and D. Wang regarding proposed settlement agreement; review testimony	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2		1.2
5/16/2011	Review and revise draft settlement agreement with CalAm; review CPUC Rules regarding settlements	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125		0.75
5/19/2011	Review and revise draft settlement agreement with CalAm and draft motion to adopt settlement	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2		1.2
5/24/2011	Review revised hearing schedule; call with E. Osann re witness testimony on partial Cal Am settlement	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05		0.3
5/25/2011	Emails with counsel for CalAm re: witness presentation on partial settlement agreement	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05		0.3
6/20/2011	Review comments on CalAm/NRDC settlement agreement	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1		0.6
7/28/2011	Review and revise draft motion to adopt partial settlement agreement with CalAm and DRA	0.75							0.75
9/12/2011	Review transcript of pre-hearing conference; email E. Osann and consultant regarding ALJ questions on settlement agreement terms on volumetric pricing of wastewater				0.5				0.5
9/13/2011	Consult with E. Osann regarding WRAM issues raised at pre-hearing conference					0.25			0.25
\$ 2,044.00	DO Total (2011 Hours - claimed \$280/hour)	1.675	0.925	0.925	1.425	1.175	0.925	0.5	7.3
2/13/2012	Review ALJ's evidentiary ruling; email E. Osann regarding response to ALJ on water loss settlement	0.5							0.5
5/10/2012	Telephone conference with CalAm and E. Osann re: proposed decision (disapproval of partial settlement agreement)	0	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1		0.8
5/14/2012	Prepare and revise comments on draft Decision denying approval of partial settlement agreement between NRDC and CalAm	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.75	0.5	0.5		3.25
6/4/2012	Prepare notice of ex parte communication		0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2		1
\$ 1,554.00	Do Total (2012 Hours - claimed \$280/hr)	1	0.9	0.8	1.15	0.9	0.8	0	5.55
\$ 3,708.00	TOTAL ALL HOURS	2.775	1.925	1.825	2.675	2.075	1.825	0.5	13.35



Thank you!
Your Confirmation is DFC4RP

- ✓ Automatic Advanced Check-In*
 - ✓ Improved Seat Selection
 - ✓ Earlier Access to Overhead Storage
- Get it Now**
[Learn More >](#)

- Book a Car**
- Book a Hotel**
- Book a Flight**

Air

Adult 1: EDWARD OSANN

Acc#: 00001044356456

Confirmation # DFC4RP

AIR ITINERARY

DEPART	Los Angeles, CA to San Francisco, CA	#264	Depart Los Angeles, CA (LAX)	7:00 AM
AUG 26	Thursday, August 26, 2010 Travel Time 1 h 15 m (Nonstop) Add EarlyBird Check-in		Arrive in San Francisco, CA (SFO)	8:15 AM
RETURN	San Francisco, CA to Los Angeles, CA	#3936	Depart San Francisco, CA (SFO)	8:50 PM
AUG 26	Thursday, August 26, 2010 Travel Time 1 h 15 m (Nonstop) Add EarlyBird Check-in		Arrive in Los Angeles, CA (LAX)	10:05 PM

YOU JUST SAVED UP TO \$120 ROUNDTRIP!



BAG FEES = \$0.00

Bags Fly Free on Southwest.

First and second checked bags. Weight and size limits apply.

BILLING

Purchaser Name	Billing Address	City, State & Zip
Edward Osann	5475 31st Street NW	Washington, DC 20015

Form of Payment	Number	Amount Applied	Remaining Balance
Visa	XXXXXXXXXXXX-7347	\$119.40	N/A

AIR PRICING

Passenger Type	Trip	Routing	Fare Type	Base Fare	Govt. Taxes and Fees	Quantity	Total
Adult	Depart	LAX-SFO	Wanna Get Away	\$45.58	\$14.12	1	\$59.70
Adult	Return	SFO-LAX	Wanna Get Away	\$45.58	\$14.12	1	\$59.70

Please read the fare rules associated with this purchase.

Effective January 28, 2011, unused travel funds may only be applied toward the purchase of future travel for the individual named on the ticket.	\$91.16	\$28.24	1	\$119.40
--	----------------	----------------	----------	-----------------

TRIP GRAND TOTAL: \$119.40



Your Receipt

Hotels.com Confirmation Number: 60384931

Booked: Online - May 2, 2011 9:47:26 PM CDT

Guest Name: Edward Osann
Billing Address: 5475 31 Street NW
Washington, DC
20015
US

Booking Details

Hotel Details: Hotel Mark Twain, a C-Two Hotel
345 Taylor St
San Francisco, CA
94102
US

Check-in: 05/03/11

Check-out: 05/05/11

Number of Nights: 2

Number of Rooms: 1

Room Type: Standard Queen

Sub-total: \$338.00

Taxes & fees: \$47.76

Total Price: \$385.76

This receipt was printed on: May 2, 2011 9:48:15 PM CDT

Cancellation Policy

We understand that sometimes plans fall through. We do not charge a change or cancel fee. However, this property (Hotel Mark Twain, a C-Two Hotel) imposes the following penalty to its customers that we are required to pass on: Cancellations or changes made after 3:00 PM ((GMT-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada); Tijuana) on May 2, 2011 are subject to a 1 Night Room & Tax penalty. The property makes no refunds for no shows or early checkouts.

Please note that if you make changes in your booking, they could result in charges applicable by policy and availability.

Please see the website for Terms and Conditions:

http://www.hotels.com/customer_care/terms_conditions.html?pos=HCOM_US&locale=en_US

Hotels.com, LP 10440 N. Central Expressway, Suite 400, Dallas, Texas 75231 USA



Thank you for your purchase!

Los Angeles, CA - LAX to Las Vegas, NV - LAS to San Francisco, CA - SFO

AIR

Confirmation # **WL7XZR**

Air Total: **\$264.40**

Amount Paid
\$264.40

Trip Total
\$264.40

MAY

3 05/03/11 - Las Vegas

AIR

Los Angeles, CA - LAX to Las Vegas, NV - LAS to San Francisco, CA - SFO

05/03/2011

Confirmation # **WL7XZR**

Adult Passenger(s)

EDWARD OSANN

Rapid Rewards #

00001044356456

DEPART MAY 3	8:00 AM Los Angeles, CA (LAX) to 9:00 AM Las Vegas, NV (LAS)	Flight #1277	Tuesday, May 3, 2011 Travel Time 1 h 00 m (Nonstop)
RETURN MAY 3	7:40 PM Las Vegas, NV (LAS) to 9:20 PM San Francisco, CA (SFO)	Flight #1451	Tuesday, May 3, 2011 Travel Time 1 h 40 m (Nonstop)

Passenger Type	Trip	Routing	Fare Type	Base Fare	Govt. Taxes and Fees	Quantity	Total
Adult	Depart	LAX-LAS	Wanna Get Away	\$45.58	\$14.12	1	\$59.70
Adult	Return	LAS-SFO	Wanna Get Away	\$180.47	\$24.23	1	\$204.70
Please read the fare rules associated with this purchase.				\$226.05	\$38.35	1	\$264.40

Rapid Rewards points will be deposited into the Member's account once the entire ticket has been flown, exchanged, or refunded (if applicable).

Air Total:
\$264.40

Purchaser Name

Edward Osann

Billing Address

5475 31 Street NW
Washington, DC 20015

Edward R. Osann

1307 Ninth Street, # 3
Santa Monica, CA 90401
<eosann@nrdc.org>

EXPERIENCE

December 2009
to present

Natural Resources Defense Council, Santa Monica, CA
Senior Policy Analyst

- Team Leader – Water Use Efficiency
- Directing interdisciplinary team of eight to develop and advance policies and procedures to improve the efficiency of water use across the urban, agricultural, and industrial sectors. Responsible for review and approval of testimony, white papers, and external communications regarding water use efficiency; research on technologies and policies to improve water use efficiency; testimony before local, state, and federal government agencies; comment on local, state, and federal codes, standards, and regulations.
- Co-Chair, Utility Operations Committee, California Urban Water Conservation Council.
- Member, Green Technical Committee, International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials.

March 1996
to November 2009

Private consulting practice, Washington, DC
President Potomac Resources, Inc.

- Provided advocacy and analysis of energy and water resource issues at the state (Maryland, California) and federal levels on behalf of diverse clients. Services include coalition development and coordination, issue analysis, direct lobbying, media strategy, and grass roots communication.
- Coordinator, WaterSense & Water Efficient Products Committee, Alliance for Water Efficiency.

October 1995
to March 1996

Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs,
U. S. Department of State, Washington, DC
Special Assistant to the Director of the Office of Ecology and Terrestrial
Conservation (short-term detail from the Department of the Interior)

- Responsible for outreach to the business community on such issues as sustainable fishing practices and the International Coral Reef Initiative.

October 1993
to October 1995

Bureau of Reclamation, U. S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC
Director of Policy & External Affairs (Schedule C)

- Senior advisor to the Commissioner of Reclamation and manager of Reclamation programs for Congressional Affairs, Public Affairs, and International Affairs. Responsible for review and approval of Congressional testimony, agency budget submissions, proposed regulations and guidelines,

speeches by the Commissioner, press releases, and policy guidance to Reclamation staff.

EXPERIENCE (continued)

- Represented the Secretary of the Interior in State-Federal negotiations on the restoration of habitat for endangered species in the Platte River Basin, 1994.
- Member of U. S. delegation to the Water Working Group of the Multilateral Negotiations, Middle East Peace Process, Amman, Jordan, June 1995.

March 1993
to October 1993 **Senior Director for Institutional Affairs**
National Wildlife Federation, Washington, DC

- Principal advocate on legislation regarding postal rates, unrelated business income taxation (UBIT), and lobby disclosure. Responsible for: development of legislative strategy; coordination with state affiliate leaders; drafting and presentation of testimony; and representation of NWF to Members of Congress and Executive Branch officials.

1977 to March 1993 **Director, Water Resources Program**

- Manager of interdisciplinary team advocating legislative and administrative reform of the Federal water resources development program and improved management of coastal and riverine resources. Responsible for: development of program objectives; allocation of staff and monetary resources; coordination with volunteer activists; development of legislative strategy; drafting and presentation of testimony; representation of NWF to Members of Congress and Executive Branch officials; negotiation with opposing interests; development of materials for the press; and review of environmental impact statements, related planning documents, and proposed rules.
- Served as Coordinator for the Coalition for Water Project Review, consisting of 23 national environmental organizations interested in water resources projects and policy, 1978-83.

1974 -- 1976
Washington Representative
Save the Dunes Council, Inc., Beverly Shores, Indiana 46301

- Represented citizen conservation organization, drafting and advocating legislation to protect, enlarge, and maintain the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

EDUCATION

Graduate
George Washington University, Washington, DC
Master of Urban and Regional Planning

Undergraduate
Georgetown University, Washington, DC
B. S., International Affairs

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS, ORGANIZATIONS, & ACTIVITIES

American Water Resources Association, National Capital Section
President, 1997-98

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS, ORGANIZATIONS, & ACTIVITIES (continued)

Anthony Williams for Mayor '98 Transition, Infrastructure Action Team
Volunteer, Nov. 1998-Jan. 1999

California Urban Water Conservation Council
Steering Committee, 1992-93, 2001 to 2005
Utility Operations Committee, Co-Chair, 2003 to date

Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana
Board of Directors, 1991-93

Friends of the Earth Action
Board of Directors, 1999 to date

Low Impact Hydropower Institute
Governing Board, 1999 to 2009

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

... AT POTOMAC RESOURCES

- Coordinated a successful national campaign to establish a national voluntary water-efficient product labeling program at the U. S. EPA, 2003-2006, and to organize stakeholder input to EPA's program design decisions and new product efficiency criteria, 2006-to date.
- Represented non-profit members of the Healthy Air Coalition in the successful campaign to establish stringent new emission standards for coal burning power plants in Maryland, 2005-06.
- Conceived and implemented successful state campaigns for Maryland's first-in-the-nation tax incentives for *Energy Star* purchases and investments in renewable energy, 1999-2000, the \$25 million Maryland Green Building Income Tax Credit Act, 2000-01, and the Maryland Energy Efficiency Standards Act, 2002-04.
- Coordinated a successful national campaign to maintain water efficiency standards promulgated by ASME and the U.S. Department of Energy, 1997-2000.
- Coordinated a successful national campaign to maintain appliance energy efficiency standards promulgated by the U.S. Department of Energy, 1996-97.

... AT THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

- Managed a staff of 25 and a budget of \$3 million.

– Negotiated a “Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Platte River Basin Endangered Species Habitat,” signed by the Governors of Wyoming, Nebraska, and Colorado and the Secretary of the Interior in June 1994, committing state and Federal agencies to develop a habitat conservation plan for the Platte River.

– Led final negotiations that resulted in the 1994 Hoover Powerplant Implementation Agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation, the Western Area Power Administration, and the 15

ACCOMPLISHMENTS (continued)

contractors receiving hydroelectric power from Hoover Dam. This agreement addresses a number of complex management issues, including the scheduling of major replacements, the recovery of costs associated with replacements, interagency billing practices, and the disposition of Hoover Dam's working capital fund.

– Led successful interdisciplinary efforts to reform agency policy on significant, diverse issues, including:

- dam safety emergency coordination with downstream communities;
- transfer of title to Federal water projects to non-Federal interests;
- water conservation planning by Reclamation customers;
- energy and water conservation at Federal facilities;
- economic analysis of Federal investment in irrigation.

– Directed legislative initiatives resulting in enactment of new authority to:

- improve water quality in the Colorado River Basin (\$75 million), 1995;
- restore salmon in the Yakima River Basin, Washington (\$110 million), 1994.

– Recruited and retained committed and motivated staff.

... AT THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

– Managed a staff of eight and a budget of \$350,000.

– Initiated and managed a multiyear, multistate campaign to establish water conservation requirements for plumbing products, culminating in the Energy Policy Act of 1992 containing national water efficiency standards that greatly reduce indoor water use.

– Led efforts to expand the Federal Energy Management Program to include requirements for cost-effective water conservation measures at Federal facilities, enacted as part of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

– Served as a principal negotiator and environmental strategist for successful legislative efforts to reformulate the Central Utah Project, Glen Canyon Dam, Central Arizona Project, and the Garrison Diversion.

– Developed key provisions and strategies for the enactment of major improvements in cost-sharing, user charges, and fish and wildlife mitigation and enhancement in the Water Resources Development Acts of 1986 and 1990.

- Advocated successfully for stronger protection of fish and wildlife habitat and recreational resources during the licensing of hydroelectric power projects, as included in the Electric Consumer Protection Act of 1986.
- Coordinated participation of environmental organizations in more than 50 floor votes in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.
- Launched a successful reform campaign for the Federal Flood Insurance Program to broaden coverage and improve local flood plain management.

PUBLICATIONS

Protecting a Shared Future: Assessing and Advancing the Sustainable Management of the Great Lakes through Water Conservation and Efficiency, Natural Resources Defense Council, June 2011, co-author.

North Carolina's Energy Future: Electricity, Water, and Transportation Efficiency, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, March 2010, co-author.

South Carolina's Energy Future: Minding its Efficiency Resources, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, November 2009, co-author.

Energy Efficiency as a Resource in the PJM Capacity Market, paper for presentation at the International Energy Program Evaluation Conference, Portland, OR, August 2009, co-author.

Powerful Priorities: Updating Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential Furnaces, Commercial Air Conditioners, and Distribution Transformers, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy and Appliance Standards Awareness Project, September 2004, co-author.

National Multiple Family Submetering and Allocation Billing Program Study, Aquacraft, Inc. and East Bay Municipal Utility District, August 2004, contributor.

An Environmental Agenda for the District of Columbia 1999, DC Environmental Network, 1999, editor and contributor.

Saving Water, Saving Dollars: Efficient Plumbing Products and the Protection of America's Waters, Potomac Resources, Inc., 1998.

Water & Wastewater Billing of Federal Agencies in the District of Columbia: Impediments to Water Use Efficiency, Potomac Resources, Inc., 1997.

"The New Bureau of Reclamation and You," *Hydata News & Views*, American Water Resources Association, Vol. 14, No. 1, January 1995.

"Water Resources: The Central Utah Project Completion Act," *Environment*, 34(2), 1992.

Gathering Dust: The Bureau of Reclamation's Failure to Enforce Statutory Water Conservation Requirements, National Wildlife Federation, February 1991.

"Saving Our Way Out of Water Crisis," Perspective, *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, Sunday, March 5, 1989.

Shortchanging the Treasury: The Failure of the Department of the Interior to Comply with the Inspector General's Audit Recommendations to Recover the Costs of Federal Water Projects, National Wildlife Federation, May 1984.

"Utility Rate Reform: Environmental Issues for Consumers of Electricity," *Conservation News*, Vol. 43, No. 6, March 1, 1978.

"Rounding Out the Indiana Dunes," *National Parks and Conservation Magazine*, November 1973.

Douglas Obegi

542 61st Street
Oakland, CA 94609

Email: dobegi@nrdc.org

Education

University of California Hastings College of the Law J.D., May 2006
Graduated Magna Cum Laude, and elected to the Order of the Coif
Class Rank 7/409, GPA: 3.665
Articles Editor, Hastings West-Northwest Journal of Environmental Law & Policy
Student Note, "Is there a Constitutional Right to Fish in a Marine Protected Area?" published in
the Fall 2005 volume of West-Northwest Journal

Brown University Bachelor of Arts, Philosophy, 1997
GPA: 3.3

The School for Field Studies, Bamfield, British Columbia Fall 1996
Semester-long study abroad program focusing on environmental policy and science.

Professional Experience

Natural Resources Defense Council April 2008 - Present
Staff Attorney

Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger September 2006 – April 2008
Environmental Law Fellow

University of California Hastings College of the Law Fall 2004 - Winter 2005
Research Assistant for Professor John Leshy

Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger Summer 2005
Legal Intern

Earthjustice Environmental Law Clinic at Stanford University Summer 2004
Legal Intern

The Ocean Conservancy May 1998 - June 2003
Project Manager, Pacific Ecosystem Protection
Drafted bills and amendments in the California legislature and lobbied on their behalf, prepared
and submitted comments on state and federal regulatory actions, and assisted outside counsel in
CEQA litigation.