#### BEFORE THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF NEW JERSEY-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY, INC. FOR APPROVAL OF INCREASED TARIFF RATES AND CHARGES FOR WATER AND WASTEWATER SERVICE, CHANGE IN DEPRECIATION RATES AND OTHER TARIFF MODIFICATIONS

BPU Docket No. WR1709\_\_\_\_

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF PATRICK L. BARYENBRUCH

**Exhibit PT-17** 

| 1 | 1. | Q. | Please state | your name | e and | business | address. |
|---|----|----|--------------|-----------|-------|----------|----------|
|---|----|----|--------------|-----------|-------|----------|----------|

A. Patrick L. Baryenbruch, 2832 Claremont Road, Raleigh, North Carolina 27608.

#### 3 2. Q. Please describe your educational and professional background.

A. I received a Bachelors degree in Accounting from the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh in 1974 and a Masters in Business Administration degree from the University of Michigan in 1979.

I am a Certified Public Accountant (CPA) with an active license from the state of Wisconsin (license number 5343-1). I am a Certified Information Technology Professional (CITP), an accreditation awarded by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants to CPA professionals who demonstrate expertise in Information Technology management. I also hold a Global Information Assurance Certification (GIAC) in cybersecurity from the SANS Institute. I am a member of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and the North Carolina Association of Certified Public Accountants.

I began my career with Arthur Andersen & Company where I performed financial audits of utilities, banks and finance companies. After three years I left to pursue an M.B.A. degree. Upon graduation from business school, I worked with the consulting firms of Theodore Barry & Associates and Scott, Madden & Associates.

During my consulting career, I have performed consulting assignments for approximately 50 utilities and 10 public service commissions. I have participated as project manager, lead or staff consultant for 24 commission-ordered management and prudence audits of public utilities. Of these, I have been responsible for evaluating the area of affiliate charges and allocation of corporate expenses in the Commission-ordered

| 1  |    |    | audits of Connecticut Light and Power, Connecticut Natural Gas, General Water             |
|----|----|----|---|
| 2  |    |    | Corporation (Pennsylvania Operations), Philadelphia Suburban Water Company (now           |
| 3  |    |    | Aqua America) and Pacific Gas & Electric Company.   |
| 4  |    |    | My firm has performed the commission-ordered audit of Southern California                 |
| 5  |    |    | Edison's 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 transactions with its non-regulated affiliate          |
| 6  |    |    | companies.  |
| 7  | 3. | Q. | What are your duties and responsibilities in your current position?                       |
| 8  |    | A. | I am the President of my own consulting practice, Baryenbruch & Company, LLC, which       |
| 9  |    |    | was established in 1985. In that capacity, I provide consulting services to utilities and |
| 10 |    |    | their regulators.   |
| 11 | 4. | Q. | Please describe the reason for your testimony in this case.                               |
| 12 |    | A. | I am presenting the results of my study which evaluated the services provided by          |
| 13 |    |    | American Water Service Company (Service Company) during the 12 months ended               |
| 14 |    |    | March 31, 2017 to New Jersey American Water Company (NJAWC). This study was               |
| 15 |    |    | undertaken in conjunction with NJAWC's rate case and is true to the best of my            |
| 16 |    |    | knowledge and belief. The study is attached as Schedule PLB-1.                            |
| 17 | 5. | Q. | What were the objectives of your study?   |
| 18 |    | A. | This study was undertaken to answer four questions concerning the services provided by    |
| 19 |    |    | the Service Company to NJAWC, each of which bears on the reasonableness of those          |
| 20 |    |    | charges as incurred during the 2017 test period. First, were the Service Company's        |
| 21 |    |    | charges to NJAWC during the 12 months ended March 31, 2017 reasonable? Second,            |
| 22 |    |    | was NJAWC charged the lower of cost or market value for managerial and professional       |
| 23 |    |    | services provided by the Service Company during the 12 months ended March 31, 2017?       |

| 1  |       | Third, were the 12 months ended March 31, 2017 costs of the Service Company's            |
|----|-------|--|
| 2  |       | customer accounts services, including those of the National Call Centers, comparable to  |
| 3  |       | those of other utilities? Fourth, are the services NJAWC receives from the Service       |
| 4  |       | Company necessary?   |
| 5  | 6. Q. | What conclusions were you able to draw concerning question number 1, whether             |
| 6  |       | the Service Company charges to NJAWC were reasonable?                                    |
| 7  | A.    | The Service Company's 12 months ended March 31, 2017 cost per NJAWC customer is          |
| 8  |       | reasonable compared to cost per customer for electric and combination electric/gas       |
| 9  |       | service companies. During the 12 months ended March 31, 2017, NJAWC was charged          |
| 10 |       | \$58 per customer for administrative and general (A&G)-related services provided by the  |
| 11 |       | Service Company. This compares to an average of \$113 per customer for service           |
| 12 |       | companies reporting to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Nineteen         |
| 13 |       | of the 25 utility service companies that filed a FERC Form 60 for 2016 had a higher per- |
| 14 |       | customer A&G cost than NJAWC's charges from the Service Company.                         |
| 15 | 7. Q. | What conclusions were you able to draw concerning question number 2, whether             |
| 16 |       | NJAWC was charged the lower of cost or market services provided by the Service           |
| 17 |       | Company?   |
| 18 | A.    | I was able to draw the following conclusions:  |
| 19 |       | (1) NJAWC was charged the lower of cost or market for managerial and professional        |
| 20 |       | services during the 12 months ended March 31, 2017.                                      |
| 21 |       | (2) On average, the hourly rates for outside service providers are 36% higher than       |
| 22 |       | the Service Company's hourly rates.  |

| 1  | (3) | The managerial and professional services provided by the Service Company are      |
|----|-----|---|
| 2  |     | vital and could not be procured externally by NJAWC without careful               |
| 3  |     | supervision on the part of NJAWC. If these services were contracted entirely to   |
| 4  |     | outside providers, NJAWC would have to add at least 3 positions to manage         |
| 5  |     | activities of outside firms. These positions would be necessary to ensure the     |
| 6  |     | quality and timeliness of services provided.                                      |
| 7  | (4) | If all the managerial and professional services now provided by the Service       |
| 8  |     | Company had been outsourced during the 12 months ended March 31, 2017,            |
| 9  |     | NJAWC and its ratepayers would have incurred almost \$16.2 million in             |
| 10 |     | additional expenses. This amount includes the higher cost of outside providers    |
| 11 |     | and the cost of three NJAWC positions needed to direct the outsourced work.       |
| 12 | (5) | This study's hourly rate comparison actually understates the cost advantages that |
| 13 |     | accrue to NJAWC from its use of the Service Company. Outside service              |
| 14 |     | providers generally bill for every hour worked. Service Company exempt            |
| 15 |     | personnel, on the other hand, charge a maximum of 8 hours per day even when       |
| 16 |     | they work more hours. If all overtime hours of Service Company personnel were     |
| 17 |     | factored into the hourly rate calculation, the Service Company would have had     |
| 18 |     | an even greater annual dollar advantage than the \$16.2 million cited above.      |
| 19 | (6) | It would be difficult for NJAWC to find local service providers with the same     |
| 20 |     | specialized water industry expertise as possessed by the Service Company staff.   |
| 21 |     | Service Company personnel spend substantially all their time serving operating    |

water companies. This specialization brings with it a unique knowledge of water

22

| 1  |           | utility operations and regulation that is most likely unavailable from local service    |
|----|-----------|---|
| 2  |           | providers.  |
| 3  | (7)       | Service Company fees do not include any profit markup. Only its actual cost of          |
| 4  |           | service is being recovered from NJAWC ratepayers.                                       |
| 5  | 8. Q. Wha | at conclusions were you able to draw concerning question number 3, whether              |
| 6  | the       | 2010 costs of the Service Company's customer account services, including                |
| 7  | thos      | e of the National Call Centers, were reasonable?  |
| 8  | A. The    | cost of the Service Company's customer accounts services, including those provided      |
| 9  | by th     | ne National Call Centers, is well below the average of the neighboring electric utility |
| 10 | com       | parison group. As will be explained further herein, this group of companies provides    |
| 11 | a rea     | asonable proxy group for comparison to a regulated utility of the size and scope of     |
| 12 | the S     | Service Company and NJAWC. During 12 months ended March 31, 2017, the cost              |
| 13 | of cu     | ustomer accounts services for NJAWC customers was \$20.92 compared to the 2016          |
| 14 | aver      | age of \$48.58 for neighboring electric utilities. The highest comparison group per     |
| 15 | custo     | omer cost was \$103.52 and the lowest \$12.71.  |
| 16 | 9. Q. Wha | at conclusions were you able to draw concerning question number 4, whether              |
| 17 | the s     | services NJAWC receives from the Service Company are necessary?                         |
| 18 | A. I wa   | s able to draw the following conclusions:   |
| 19 | (1)       | The services that the Service Company provides are necessary and would be               |
| 20 |           | required even if NJAWC were a stand-alone water utility.                                |
| 21 | (2)       | There is no redundancy or overlap in the services provided by the Service               |
| 22 |           | Company to NJAWC.   |

- 1 **10. Q. Does this complete your testimony?**
- 2 A. Yes.