## STATE OF NEW YORK

## PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE 16-W-\_\_\_\_

## PROCEEDING ON THE MOTION OF THE COMMISSION AS TO THE RATES, CHARGES, RULES AND REGULATIONS OF NEW YORK AMERICAN WATER COMPANY, INC. FOR WATER SERVICE

**Direct Testimony of** 

Patrick L. Baryenbruch

April 29, 2016

1	1.	Q. Please state your full name, position and business address.
2		A. I am Patrick L. Baryenbruch, and my position is President, Baryenbruch &
3		Company, LLC, located at 2832 Claremont Road, Raleigh, North Carolina 27608.
4	2.	Q. Please describe your educational and professional background.
5		A. I received a Bachelor's degree in accounting from the University of Wisconsin-
6		Oshkosh in 1974 and a Master's in Business Administration degree from the
7		University of Michigan in 1979.
8		I am a management consultant, a Certified Public Accountant ("CPA") and a
9		Certified Information Technology Professional ("CITP"). I also hold a Global
10		Information Assurance Certification ("GIAC") in information and cyber-security
11		from the SANS Institute. I am a member of the American Institute of Certified
12		Public Accountants and the North Carolina Association of Certified Public
13		Accountants.
14		I began my career with Arthur Andersen & Company where I performed
15		financial audits of utilities, banks and finance companies. After three years I left to
16		pursue an M.B.A. degree. Upon graduation from business school, I worked with
17		the consulting firms of Theodore Barry & Associates and Scott Consulting Group
18		(now ScottMadden).
19		During my consulting career, I have performed consulting assignments for
20		more than 50 utilities and 10 public service commissions. I have participated as
21		project manager, lead or staff consultant for 24 commission-ordered management
22		and prudence audits of public utilities. Of these, I have been responsible for

1		evaluating the area of affiliate charges and allocation of corporate expenses in the
2		Commission-ordered audits of Connecticut Light and Power, Connecticut Natural
3		Gas, General Water Corporation (Pennsylvania Operations), Philadelphia Suburban
4		Water Company (now Aqua America), and Pacific Gas & Electric Company.
5		My firm has performed the commission-ordered audit of Southern California
6		Edison's 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 transactions with its non-regulated affiliate
7		companies.
8	3.	Q. What are your duties and responsibilities in your current position?
9		A. I am the President of my own consulting practice, Baryenbruch & Company, LLC,
10		which was established in 1985. In that capacity, I provide consulting services to
11		utilities and their regulators.
12	4.	Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
12 13	4.	<ul><li>Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?</li><li>A. I am presenting the results of my study evaluating the services provided by</li></ul>
	4.	
13	4.	A. I am presenting the results of my study evaluating the services provided by
13 14	4.	A. I am presenting the results of my study evaluating the services provided by American Water Works Service Company ("Service Company") during the 12
13 14 15	4.	A. I am presenting the results of my study evaluating the services provided by American Water Works Service Company ("Service Company") during the 12 months ended December 31, 2015 to New York American Water Company, Inc.
13 14 15 16	<b>4</b> . <b>5</b> .	<ul> <li>A. I am presenting the results of my study evaluating the services provided by American Water Works Service Company ("Service Company") during the 12 months ended December 31, 2015 to New York American Water Company, Inc. ("NYAW"). This study was undertaken in conjunction with NYAW's rate case and</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> </ol>		<ul> <li>A. I am presenting the results of my study evaluating the services provided by American Water Works Service Company ("Service Company") during the 12 months ended December 31, 2015 to New York American Water Company, Inc. ("NYAW"). This study was undertaken in conjunction with NYAW's rate case and is true to the best of my knowledge. The study is attached as Exhibit PLB-1.</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> </ol>		<ul> <li>A. I am presenting the results of my study evaluating the services provided by American Water Works Service Company ("Service Company") during the 12 months ended December 31, 2015 to New York American Water Company, Inc. ("NYAW"). This study was undertaken in conjunction with NYAW's rate case and is true to the best of my knowledge. The study is attached as Exhibit PLB-1.</li> <li>Q. What were the objectives of your study?</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> </ol>		<ul> <li>A. I am presenting the results of my study evaluating the services provided by American Water Works Service Company ("Service Company") during the 12 months ended December 31, 2015 to New York American Water Company, Inc. ("NYAW"). This study was undertaken in conjunction with NYAW's rate case and is true to the best of my knowledge. The study is attached as Exhibit PLB-1.</li> <li>Q. What were the objectives of your study?</li> <li>A. This study was undertaken to answer four questions. First, were the Service</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> </ol>		<ul> <li>A. I am presenting the results of my study evaluating the services provided by American Water Works Service Company ("Service Company") during the 12 months ended December 31, 2015 to New York American Water Company, Inc. ("NYAW"). This study was undertaken in conjunction with NYAW's rate case and is true to the best of my knowledge. The study is attached as Exhibit PLB-1.</li> <li>Q. What were the objectives of your study?</li> <li>A. This study was undertaken to answer four questions. First, were the Service Company's charges to NYAW during 2015 reasonable? Second, was NYAW</li> </ul>

1 Service Company's customer accounts services, including those of the National 2 Call Centers, comparable to those of other utilities? Fourth, are the services 3 NYAW receives from the Service Company necessary? 4 6. Q. What conclusions were you able to draw concerning question number 1, 5 whether the Service Company charges to NYAW during 2015 were 6 reasonable? 7 A. The Service Company's 2015 cost per NYAW customer is reasonable compared to 8 cost per customer for electric and combination electric/gas service companies. 9 During 2015, NYAW was charged \$59 per customer for administrative and general 10 ("A&G")-related services provided by the Service Company. This compares to an 11 average of \$108 per customer for service companies reporting to the Federal Energy 12 Regulatory Commission ("FERC"). Only 5 of the 24 utility service companies that 13 filed a FERC Form 60 for 2014 had a lower per-customer A&G cost than NYAW's 14 charges from the Service Company. 15 Q. What conclusions were you able to draw concerning question number 2, 7. 16 whether NYAW was charged the lower of cost or market services provided by 17 the Service Company? 18 A. I was able to draw the following conclusions: (1) NYAW was charged the lower of cost or market for managerial and 19 20 professional services during 2015. 21 (2) On average, the hourly rates for outside service providers are 57% higher than 22 the Service Company's hourly rates.

1 (3) The managerial and professional services provided by the Service Company 2 are vital and could not be procured externally by NYAW without careful 3 supervision on the part of NYAW. If these services were contracted entirely 4 to outside providers, NYAW would have to add at least three positions to 5 manage activities of outside firms. These positions would be necessary to 6 ensure the 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 2015, NYAW and its ratepayers would
  9 have incurred over \$5 million in additional expenses, as calculated in my
  10 report. This amount includes the higher cost of outside providers and the cost
  11 of one NYAW position needed to direct the outsourced work.
- 12 (5) The study's hourly rate comparison actually understates the cost advantages 13 that accrue to NYAW 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 16 when they work more hours. If all overtime hours of Service Company 17 personnel were factored into the hourly rate calculation, the Service Company 18 would have had an even greater annual dollar advantage than the \$5 million cited above. 19
- 20 (6) It would be difficult for NYAW to find local service providers with the same
   21 specialized water industry expertise as that possessed by the Service Company
   22 staff. Service Company personnel spend substantially all their time serving

# PATRICK L. BARYENBRUCH – DIRECT TESTIMONYCase 16-W-\_\_\_NEW YORK AMERICAN WATER COMPANY, INC.Case 16-W-\_\_\_

1		operating water companies. This specialization brings with it a unique
2		knowledge of water utility operations and regulation that is most likely
3		unavailable from local service providers.
4		(7) Service Company fees do not include any profit markup. Only its actual cost
5		of service is being recovered from NYAW ratepayers.
6	8.	Q. What is your conclusion regarding the reasonableness of the costs of the
7		national call center that provides service to NYAW?
8		A. I was able to determine that cost of the Service Company's customer accounts
9		services, including those provided by the National Call Centers, is well below the
10		average of the neighboring electric and combination electric/gas utility comparison
11		group. This group of companies provides a reasonable proxy group for comparison
12		to a regulated utility of the size and scope of the Service Company and NYAW.
13		During 2015, the customer accounts cost for NYAW customers was \$21.61
14		compared to the 2014 average of \$50.46 for neighboring electric and combination
15		electric/gas utilities. The highest comparison group per customer cost was \$109.96
16		and the lowest \$18.17.
17	9.	Q. What conclusions were you able to draw concerning the necessity of the
18		services NYAW receives from the Service Company?
19		A. I was able to draw the following conclusions:
20		(1) The services that the Service Company provides are necessary and would be
21		required even if NYAW were a stand-alone water utility.

## PATRICK L. BARYENBRUCH – DIRECT TESTIMONY NEW YORK AMERICAN WATER COMPANY, INC.

- (2) There is no redundancy or overlap in the services provided by the Service
- 2 Company to NYAW.
- 3 10. Q. Does this complete your testimony at this time?
- 4 A. Yes.