

**BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

Joint Application of American Water Works Company, Inc., Essential Utilities, Inc., Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc., Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater, Inc., Peoples Natural Gas Company LLC, and Alpha Merger Sub, Inc. for a Certificate of Public Convenience under Sections 1102(a)(3) and 2210(c) of the Public Utility Code and All Other Necessary Approvals to Effect a Change of Control of Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc., Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater, Inc., and Peoples Natural Gas Company LLC

Case Nos.:

A-2025-3058927

A-2025-3058928

A-2025-3058929

**INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS LOCAL 542'S PETITION TO AMEND IT'S PREHEARING MEMORANDA**

On April 6 2026, The International Union of Operating Engineers Local 542 (Union) filed a prehearing memoranda in this matter. The Union seeks to amend the previous prehearing memorandum as follows:

1. The title of the previous memo's title referred to the Utility Workers Union. This was likely because counsel for the Operating Engineers copied the caption from a Utility Workers petition. The Union seeks to amend the title of its previous memorandum to:  
**PREHEARING MEMORANDUM OF INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS LOCAL 542.**
2. The Union would like to attach as Exhibit A an impact statement titled The Essential Utilities–American Water Merger: Implications for Consumers and Workforce. This was prepared by the Union's research department.
3. The Union would like to add a witness to its witness list. The Union would like to add Adam Warner who prepared Exhibit A. He would basically testify regarding the contents of Exhibit A.

4. This amendment will not prejudice any party and will not delay any proceedings.

Wherefore, the Union, international Union of Operating Engineers Local 542 respectfully submits that the Union should be allowed to amend its Pre-hearing Memo.



---

Louis Agre, Esquire  
PA ID# 52428  
P.O. Box 35144  
Philadelphia PA, 19128  
[LouAgreLaw@gmail.com](mailto:LouAgreLaw@gmail.com)  
(215) 852 -6548

DATED: May 4, 2026

**BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

Joint Application of American Water Works Company, Inc., Essential Utilities, Inc., Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc., Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater, Inc., Peoples Natural Gas Company LLC, and Alpha Merger Sub, Inc. for a Certificate of Public Convenience under Sections 1102(a)(3) and 2210(c) of the Public Utility Code and All Other Necessary Approvals to Effect a Change of Control of Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc., Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater, Inc., and Peoples Natural Gas Company LLC

Case Nos.:  
A-2025-3058927  
A-2025-3058928  
A-2025-3058929

**PROPOSED ORDER**

AND NOW this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2026, upon consideration of the Petition to Amend its Prehearing Memo filed by the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 542, it is hereby ordered that said Joint Petition is hereby granted.

Dated:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mary D. Long  
Administrative Law Judge

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Louis Agre, certify that I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing International Union of Operating Engineers Local 542's Petition to Amend It's Prehearing Memoranda on all interested parties in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code §§ 1.54 by electronic mail to the individuals listed below.

The Honorable Mary D. Long  
Administrative Law Judge Pennsylvania Public  
Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
[malong@pa.gov](mailto:malong@pa.gov)

Allison Kaster, Esquire  
PA PUC BIE Legal Technical  
400 North Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor West  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
[akaster@pa.gov](mailto:akaster@pa.gov)

Kimberly A. Joyce, Esquire  
Alexander R. Stahl, Esq.  
Essential Utilities Inc.  
762 W. Lancaster Ave  
Bryn Mawr, PA 19010  
[kajoyce@aquaamerica.com](mailto:kajoyce@aquaamerica.com)  
[astahl@aquaamerica.com](mailto:astahl@aquaamerica.com)

Harrison W. Breitman, Esquire  
Joel Cheskis, Esquire  
Johnathan M. Longhurst, Esquire  
Crystal Zook, Esquire  
PA Office of Consumer Advocate  
Forum Place  
555 Walnut Street, 5th Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
[pawcaquaexternal@paoca.org](mailto:pawcaquaexternal@paoca.org)  
[hbreitman@paoca.org](mailto:hbreitman@paoca.org)  
[jlonghurst@paoca.org](mailto:jlonghurst@paoca.org)  
[jcheskis@paoca.org](mailto:jcheskis@paoca.org)  
[czook@paoca.org](mailto:czook@paoca.org)

Kenneth M. Kulak, Esquire  
Mark A. Lazaroff, Esquire  
Catherine G. Vasudevan, Esquire  
Brooke E. McGlenn, Esquire  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP  
2222 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-3007  
[ken.kulak@morganlewis.com](mailto:ken.kulak@morganlewis.com)  
[mark.lazaroff@morganlewis.com](mailto:mark.lazaroff@morganlewis.com)  
[catherine.vasudevan@morganlewis.com](mailto:catherine.vasudevan@morganlewis.com)  
[brooke.mcglenn@morganlewis.com](mailto:brooke.mcglenn@morganlewis.com)

Anthony D. Kanagy, Esquire  
Garrett P. Lent, Esquire  
Hayley E. Wilburn, Esquire  
Emily S. Grecu, Esquire  
Post & Schell P.C.  
17 North Second Street, Suite 500  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
[akanagy@postschell.com](mailto:akanagy@postschell.com)  
[glent@postschell.com](mailto:glent@postschell.com)  
[hwilburn@postschell.com](mailto:hwilburn@postschell.com)  
[egrecu@postschell.com](mailto:egrecu@postschell.com)

Thomas Wyatt, Esquire  
Matthew Olesh Esquire  
Matthew Selmasska Esquire  
Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel, LLP  
Centre Square West  
1500 Market Street, Suite 3400  
Philadelphia, PA 19102  
[thomas.wyatt@obermayer.com](mailto:thomas.wyatt@obermayer.com)  
[matthew.olash@obermayer.com](mailto:matthew.olash@obermayer.com)  
[matthew.selmasska@obermayer.com](mailto:matthew.selmasska@obermayer.com)

Ria Pereira, Esquire  
Lauren Berman, Esquire  
Elizabeth R. Marx, Esquire  
John Sweet, Esquire  
Levi Phillips, Esquire  
PA Utility Law Project  
118 Locust Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
[rpereira@pautilitylawproject.org](mailto:rpereira@pautilitylawproject.org)  
[lberman@pautilitylawproject.org](mailto:lberman@pautilitylawproject.org)  
[emarx@pautilitylawproject.org](mailto:emarx@pautilitylawproject.org)  
[jsweet@pautilitylawproject.org](mailto:jsweet@pautilitylawproject.org)  
[lphillips@pautilitylawproject.org](mailto:lphillips@pautilitylawproject.org)

Maureen B. Carlton, Esquire  
Andrew Griffin, Esquire  
Aaron Nelson, Esquire  
Curtin & Heefner, LLP 1040  
Stony Hill Road Yardley,  
PA 19067  
[mbc@curtinheefner.com](mailto:mbc@curtinheefner.com)  
[apg@curtinheefner.com](mailto:apg@curtinheefner.com)  
[adn@curtinheefner.com](mailto:adn@curtinheefner.com)

Meagan Moore, Esquire  
PNG Companies, LLC  
375 North Shore Drive, Suite 600  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212  
[meagan.moore@peoples-gas.com](mailto:meagan.moore@peoples-gas.com)

Steven C. Gray, Esquire  
Office of Small Business  
Advocate Forum Place  
555 Walnut Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
[sgray@pa.gov](mailto:sgray@pa.gov)

Michael Maddren, Esquire  
Murphy Maddren, LTD  
6 Dickinson Drive, Suite 115  
Chadds Ford, PA 19317  
[mike@murphymaddren.com](mailto:mike@murphymaddren.com)

Alex J. Baumler, Esquire  
Lamb McErlane PC  
24 East Market Street, Box 565  
West Chester, PA 19381  
[alex@skilkennylaw.com](mailto:alex@skilkennylaw.com)

Joseph W. Jesiolowski, Esquire  
Kevin D. Kent, Esquire  
Clark Hill PLC  
Clark Hill Two Commerce Square  
2001 Market Street, Suite 2620  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
[jjesiolowski@clarkhill.co](mailto:jjesiolowski@clarkhill.co),  
[kkent@clarkhill.com](mailto:kkent@clarkhill.com)

Samuel J. Pasquarelli, Esquire  
Sherrard, German & Kelly, PC  
535 Smithfield Street, Suite 300  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222  
[samuel.pasquarelli@sgkpa.com](mailto:samuel.pasquarelli@sgkpa.com)

Alexander R. Stahl, Esquire  
Kimberly Joyce, Esquire  
762 West Lancaster Avenue  
Bryn Mawr PA 19010  
[astahl@aquaamerica.com](mailto:astahl@aquaamerica.com)  
[kajoyce@aquaamerica.com](mailto:kajoyce@aquaamerica.com)

Scott B. Granger Esquire  
Pa PUC Bureau of Investigation &  
Enforcement  
400 North Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor West Harrisburg  
PA 17120  
[sgranger@pa.gov](mailto:sgranger@pa.gov)

*Louis Agre*

---

Louis Agre, Esquire

PA ID# 52428

P.O. Box 35144

Philadelphia PA, 19128

[LouAgreLaw@gmail.com](mailto:LouAgreLaw@gmail.com)

(215) 852 -6548

DATED: April 6, 2026

# **EXHIBIT**

**A**

## **The Essential Utilities–American Water Merger: Implications for Consumers and Workforce**

The proposed merger of Essential Utilities and American Water Works Company, Inc. has concerning implications for Pennsylvania private water workers and consumers. In Pennsylvania, the private water market has grown such that one in every three water customers are serviced by a private provider. Aqua PA and Pennsylvania American Water Company, two regional subsidiaries to the companies, are the largest private water companies in the state, serving a total of 4.1 million water and wastewater companies – approximately 19 times the customer base of the next-largest private provider in the state. This document assesses the merger’s likely implications for consumer rates, the structure of Pennsylvania’s private water market and the workforce that operates the affected systems. The analysis draws on the companies’ acquisition record, the surcharge and valuation mechanisms that govern private water pricing, and key studies on mergers with specialized workforces.

### **Merger Overview:**

On November 26, 2025, two of the largest investor-owned water utilities, Essential Utilities, Inc, and American Water Works Company, Inc., filed a joint application with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PUC) for a change of control of Essential Utilities’ Pennsylvania operations: Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc, Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater, Inc., and Peoples Natural Gas Company LLC.<sup>1</sup>

Pennsylvania represents the largest customer base for both Essential Utilities (Aqua PA) and American Water (Pennsylvania American Water, PAWC). Essential Utilities and American Water Company, through their subsidiaries, serve the most customers out of all private water utility companies in the state. According to self-reporting, Aqua PA serves a total of 1.6 million customers,<sup>2</sup> and Pennsylvania American Water serves a total of 2.5 million water and wastewater customers.<sup>3</sup> Comparatively, the two largest competitors to Aqua and American Water Company in the state, Veolia and York Water Company,<sup>4</sup> serve 200,000<sup>5</sup> and 214,000<sup>6</sup> water and wastewater customers, respectively. The proposed merger of American Water

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.puc.pa.gov/pdocs/1917185.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.aquawater.com/about-aqua/states-we-serve/aqua-pennsylvania>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/pennsylvania-american-water-invests-722-million-to-strengthen-water-and-wastewater-service-in-2025-302732821.html>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.puc.pa.gov/pdocs/1899812.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.veolianorthamerica.com/media/press-releases/veolia-expands-financial-assistance-program-now-serves-customers-pennsylvania>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.yorkwater.com/community/about-york-water/>

Company and Essential Utilities, Inc. has meaningful implications for competition and market consolidation in Pennsylvania's private water market.

### **Pennsylvania's Private Water Market**

While private water companies have operated in Pennsylvania for centuries,<sup>7</sup> privatization of Pennsylvania's water systems has accelerated since the 1990s, due to changes in policy and economic conditions that incentivized public authorities to outsource municipally operated water services. Since the 1990s, municipalities have sought privatization due to budget constraints and decreased federal funding for public water systems.<sup>8</sup> At the same time, the passage of industry-lobbied legislation improved the profitability of privatization in the state, leading incumbent private water companies to expand their service area through the acquisition of smaller publicly owned water systems.

According to a testimony of Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PUC) Chairman, Stephen DeFrank, 22 private acquisitions of public water systems were approved by PA PUC, from 2016 to 2023.<sup>9</sup> By 2022, one in three water customers in Pennsylvania received their water from a private provider.<sup>10</sup> Of the approved PUC acquisition applications from 2016 to 2023, all but two were sold to American Water or Aqua Pennsylvania (Essential Utilities' PA subsidiary).<sup>11</sup>

The concurrent trends of consolidation and privatization in the water market raise concerns for consumers and labor market outcomes. Private water utilities increase their profitability primarily through the acquisition of additional water systems, which expand the rate base — the value of utility property on which the company is permitted to earn a regulated return. These acquisitions and the rate increases that have followed them are driven by two Pennsylvania policy mechanisms, discussed in the next section: the fair market valuation methodology established by Act 12, and Distribution System Improvement Charges. Together, these mechanisms create the incentives and the recovery vehicles that make consolidation profitable for private water companies and costly for their customers.

Additionally, the proposed merger may affect the private water utility workforce. The private water utility market in Pennsylvania is already highly concentrated, with four main private providers. The combined customer base of Essential Utilities and American Water Company

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.yorkwater.com/community/about-york-water/#history-timeline>

<sup>8</sup> <https://inthepublicinterest.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/0624-Water-Report.f2.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> [https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11\\_091351\\_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf](https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11_091351_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.thenation.com/article/environment/pennsylvania-water-privatization/>

<sup>11</sup> [https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11\\_091351\\_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf](https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11_091351_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf)

in PA would be 19 times the size of the next largest private provider in the state. Due to the skilled and specialized nature of water utility work, empirical research suggests that reduced competition in an already consolidated private market could lead to wage stagnation and a reduction in the labor force's bargaining power. This presents additional problems for labor recruitment in an industry already facing an aging workforce.

## **Water System Valuation**

Two key Pennsylvania policies have a direct bearing on consumer impacts: Distribution Service Improvement Charges (DSIC), and Act 12. Both policies represent significant modifications to water system valuation under private ownership and operation.

### *Distribution Service Improvement Charges*

In 1996, Pennsylvania became the first state to authorize the use of Distribution Service Improvement Charges (DSIC).<sup>12</sup> According to the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC), "Distribution System Improvement Charges allow for nonrevenue producing improvements to be funded through interim rate increases which are separate from formal rate case decisions."<sup>13</sup> Through the use of DSICs, private water utility companies can add automatic surcharges to customer bills prior to PA PUC approval of rate base increases. The introduction of DSICs had noticeable effects on private water providers' rates in Pennsylvania. According to *In the Public Interest*, between 1997 and 2010, "automatic surcharges inflated [Essential Utilities'] base rates by between 7 and 14 percent a year."<sup>14</sup> DSICs allow water companies to increase their rates up to 7.5% of the customer bill without PUC approval.<sup>15</sup>

### *Act 12: Fair Market Value*

In 2016, Pennsylvania passed Act 12, amending the Public Utility Code by adding Section 1329. Historically, water systems have been valued using a cost approach, where the value of the system is equal to cost of assets minus depreciation.<sup>16</sup> Act 12 changed the previous water system valuation method to the "fair market value" approach whereby bidders and sellers estimate the appraised value of water systems, which accounts for planned costs of improvements. This method of water system valuation motivates private companies to inflate the value of system improvements to increase the purchase price. For example, in the sale of Limerick's public water system, "Aqua's \$75.1 million bid was 63 percent greater than

---

<sup>12</sup> <https://inthepublicinterest.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/0624-Water-Report.f2.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> <https://pubs.naruc.org/pub/7B2FB17C-CF7A-CAA6-CF94-7813F0C43C27>

<sup>14</sup> <https://inthepublicinterest.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/0624-Water-Report.f2.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> See 66 Pa. C.S. § 1358(a)(1)-(2). see *McCloskey v. Pa. PUC*, 2021 Pa. LEXIS 3071 (Pa. 2021) ("*McCloskey*")

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.phila.gov/media/20210505154831/Combine-May-4-2021-2.pdf>

the system's depreciated cost, or book value, and \$23 million more than the next closest bid."<sup>17</sup>

The new valuation method for private water systems affects the calculation of rate base. Rate base is "the value of property upon which a utility is permitted to earn a specified rate of return."<sup>18</sup> Under fair market valuation, for newly acquired systems in Pennsylvania, the accepted purchase price becomes the rate base, subject to negotiation by the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission.<sup>19</sup> Using the example above, even following downward negotiation of the rate base during Limerick Township's water system acquisition, the approved rate base was \$64,373,378, still \$6,546,378 higher than the next closest bid for the system, and \$29,026,380.37 more than the system's depreciated cost.<sup>20</sup>

### **Claimed Benefits of Merger<sup>21</sup>**

#### *Rate freeze*

The joint applicants have stated several assurances of consumer protection under the merger. For example, the joint applicants asserted that "[t]he proposed Merger will not have any adverse impact on Aqua PA's or Peoples' rates." Their justification for their position is that "[t]he Commission-approved rates, rules and regulations, and the terms and conditions of service in effect when the Merger closes will not change as a result of the Merger."<sup>22</sup>

The above statement fails to reference American Water's November 2025 application for a rate increase, filed with the Pennsylvania PUC on 11/14/2025. According to the PUC, the rate increase "would increase PAWC's total annual operating revenue for water service by approximately \$152.4 million, or 16.1%."<sup>23</sup> American Water's application for a rate increase came weeks after American Water and Essential Utilities, Inc. publicly announced the merger.<sup>24</sup> American Water's rate increase application is currently being investigated by the Pennsylvania PUC.<sup>25</sup> The proposed rate, which PUC believes "may be unlawful, unjust,

---

<sup>17</sup> <https://chesterwater.com/a-pa-law-sets-off-a-feeding-frenzy-for-public-water-systems-will-customers-pay-the-cost/>

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.nasuca.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/Rate-Base-Overview-Slide-Deck-NASUCA-Feb-2025-2025.02.24-v2.0.pdf>

<sup>19</sup> <https://inthepublicinterest.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/0624-Water-Report.f2.pdf>

<sup>20</sup> [https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11\\_091351\\_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf](https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11_091351_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf)

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.puc.pa.gov/pdocs/1904170.pdf>

<sup>22</sup> <https://www.puc.pa.gov/pdocs/1904170.pdf>

<sup>23</sup> <https://www.puc.pa.gov/pdocs/1904829.pdf>

<sup>24</sup> <https://www.essential.co/node/28781/html>

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.puc.pa.gov/press-release/2025/puc-to-investigate-pa-american-water-s-rate-increase-request-for-water-and-wastewater-service-12-4-2025>

unreasonable, and contrary to public interest,”<sup>26</sup> may have been affected by plans of the merger.

Further, the claim that rates cannot increase because Commission-approved rates will not change fails to consider the alternative means of increasing rates that are available to private companies, such as Distribution Service Improvement Charges.<sup>27</sup> Automatic surcharges may still increase up to 7.5% of the customer bill, absent approval of the PUC. Therefore, while Aqua Pennsylvania and American Water Company have stated that their rates will not increase due to the merger, once merged, charges to customers may still increase through unregulated automatic surcharges.

### *Future Rates*

While Aqua PA claims that their rates will not be adversely affected, the historical pattern suggests that rate increases follow from mergers. As previously explained, acquisitions affect the growth of base rates. Since the passage of Act 12, private companies have been able to bid at high rates for water systems. Private companies can pass off the costs associated with pricey acquisitions to consumers through higher rates.<sup>28</sup>

Aqua Pennsylvania and American Water Company have increased their market power and consumer base in Pennsylvania’s water utility market, while also continuing to increase their rates. The pattern of rate increases seen in Aqua PA and PAWC water and wastewater systems contradicts their claims of affordability, which have justified consolidation efforts. Notably, 18 of the 20 American Water and Aqua PA wastewater and water system acquisitions reviewed during the 2023 Testimony of PUC Chairman DeFrank had at least one rate increase from 2016 to 2023. The average yearly rate increase for these systems was 23%. The cumulative average rate increase for these systems from 2016 to 2023 was 95.11%, with one system’s rates increasing as much as 166.60% over a four-year period.<sup>29</sup>

### *Scale Efficiencies*

The joint applicants made additional claims that “the Merger will enable them to achieve efficiencies in the future, the benefit of which will accrue to Aqua PA and Peoples and ultimately flow to customers in future rate cases.”

While scale efficiencies are often invoked in discussions of privatization and market consolidation in the water utility industry, review of Aqua PA and American Water’s systems

---

<sup>26</sup> <https://www.puc.pa.gov/pdocs/1904829.pdf>

<sup>27</sup> <https://inthepublicinterest.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/0624-Water-Report.f2.pdf>

<sup>28</sup> <https://inthepublicinterest.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/0624-Water-Report.f2.pdf>

<sup>29</sup> [https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11\\_091351\\_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf](https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11_091351_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf)

in practice contradicts this claim. Larger water systems do not always lead to lower rates for customers. This can be seen through the York City Sewer System, which was sold to Pennsylvania American Water Company in July of 2021.<sup>30</sup> At the time of Stephen DeFrank’s 2023 testimony, the York City Sewer System was the largest public system acquired by a private company following the passage of Act 12. The system serviced 13,747 customers, the most customers out of all the water and wastewater systems reviewed. However, due to the high purchase price of \$235,000,000, and the approved rate base at 99% of the purchase price, the York City Sewer System had the highest rate base per customer (RBPC) of all the private systems reviewed. Following American Water’s acquisition of the system, customers’ bills increased 84.20%, for an average yearly increase of 42%. See *Table* (page 9-11) for data on rate increases from 2016 to 2023 resulting from the acquisition of public systems by American Water Company and Aqua Pennsylvania.<sup>31</sup>

According to Essential Utilities’ CEO, in discussion of the merger filed with the SEC, the company’s rate base growth “will be driven primarily by investment in our existing systems and supplemented by our water and wastewater system acquisition programs.”<sup>32</sup> Through merging, Essential Utilities and American Water Company—already the two dominant water utility companies in Pennsylvania—will have virtually no competition for the acquisition of public water systems in the state. The combined customer base of Essential Utilities and American Water Company in PA is 19 times the size of the next largest private provider in the state.<sup>33</sup> Their combined market power will allow them to increase their rate base through further acquisitions, which they can pass on to customers through high rate increases, following the initial fixed rate period. Essential Utilities and American Water leadership have claimed that the combination of the companies will benefit customers by spreading price increases across their customer base.<sup>34</sup> However, when looking at Pennsylvania American Water Company and Aqua Pennsylvania Water acquisitions, systems with the most customers had some of the highest resulting RBPC, and correspondingly high rate increases.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> [https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11\\_091351\\_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf](https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11_091351_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf)

<sup>31</sup> [https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11\\_091351\\_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf](https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11_091351_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf)

<sup>32</sup> <https://www.essential.co/node/28786/html>

<sup>33</sup> Based on self-reported customer metrics from PA American Water, Aqua PA, and York Water Company websites, see *supra* notes 2-6.

<sup>34</sup> <https://www.essential.co/node/28786/html>

<sup>35</sup> [https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11\\_091351\\_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf](https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11_091351_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf)

### *Labor Force Outcomes from Mergers and Acquisitions*

The water utility workforce, those who maintain, repair, and replace water systems, require training that is industry specific, with specialized skills and knowledge developing on the job. According to a Brookings report, “Employed across 212 different occupations, including plumbers, electricians, and instrument technicians, water workers embody many of the skilled trades.”<sup>36</sup> The water utility workforce must also adapt their skills to keep up with system demands given the volatility of water supply and quality due to climate change, pollution and aging infrastructure.

The specialized nature of water utility work makes the threats of an aging workforce for this crucial industry even more pronounced. The median age for water occupations is above the national median, and a Brookings Institution analysis predicted that water utilities “must fill 9,200 water treatment operator jobs annually” to keep up with the retirement rate.<sup>37</sup> According to the EPA, “Currently, water utilities face challenges in recruiting, training, and retaining employees. These challenges are exacerbated with roughly one-third of the water sector workforce eligible to retire in the next 10 years.”<sup>38</sup>

While there have been no comprehensive studies of the effects of water utility companies’ mergers on outcomes for workers, Prager & Schmidt (2021) evaluated wage effects from mergers in an industry with another specialized skilled workforce—the hospital industry.<sup>39</sup> Workers with skills tied to industry are seen to be negatively affected by mergers and acquisitions because of the reduction in bargaining power. As explained by Shampine et al. (2022), “In the labor context, for example, an employee who quits might know that a firm across the street is hiring. If, however, that outside firm disappears, the employee’s next best option might be inferior, worsening his or her bargaining position. This could happen in a merger if, for example, the merger eliminated an attractive alternative source of employment for some employees.”<sup>40</sup> Prager & Schmidt found that wage stagnation is attenuated by the effects of unionization, concluding that “high levels of unionization appear to meaningfully attenuate the estimated post-merger reductions in wage growth.”<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/water-workforce/>

<sup>37</sup> <https://uswateralliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/Toward-a-Strong-and-Equitable-Water-Workforce.pdf>

<sup>38</sup> <https://www.epa.gov/sustainable-water-infrastructure/water-infrastructure-sector-workforce>

<sup>39</sup> <https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publications/antitrust/magazine/2022/june/workers-wages-mergers.pdf>

<sup>40</sup> <https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publications/antitrust/magazine/2022/june/workers-wages-mergers.pdf>

<sup>41</sup> <https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publications/antitrust/magazine/2022/june/workers-wages-mergers.pdf>

Prager & Schmidt (2021) found that the effects of market concentration on wage stagnation held true in mergers in the top 25% of changes in concentration. The merger of American Water and Essential Utilities is likely to produce a significant effect on concentration due to the current consolidated nature of Pennsylvania's private water utility market. Given the highly skilled and specialized nature of water utility work, combined with the industry's aging workforce, a significant change in market concentration could negatively affect wage growth for utility workers. Any reduction in bargaining power resulting from the merger could worsen existing challenges in recruiting and replacing the aging workforce. This is particularly applicable if the merged company fails to honor existing labor relations.

Pennsylvania Water Utility Bill Analysis for Private Acquisitions of Water and Waste Water systems, 2016 - 2023<sup>42</sup>

| date filed | buyer       | seller  | purchase price | approved rate base | customers | RBPC      | Cumulative Bill Difference (\$) <sup>43</sup> | % Change in bill <sup>44</sup> | bill difference (yearly average) \$ <sup>45</sup> | bill difference (yearly average) % <sup>46</sup> |
|------------|-------------|---|----------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|---|--------------------------------|---|--|
| 12/19/2016 | APW         | New Garden Township Municipal Authority       | 29,500,000     | 29,500,000         | 2,106     | 14,007.60 | 61.42   | 93.80%                         | 8.77  | 13%  |
| 5/22/2017  | APW         | Limerick Township                             | 75,100,000     | 64,373,378         | 5,434     | 11,846.41 | 39.27   | 113.80%                        | 6.56  | 19%  |
| 5/25/2017  | PAWC-<br>WD | Municipal Authority of the City of McKeesport | 159,000,000    | 158,000,000        | 12,780    | 12,363.07 | 65.10   | 130.60%                        | 10.85   | 22%  |

<sup>42</sup> Columns 1-7 sourced from *Table 1: Filed Section 1329 Application Information* and columns 8-9 sourced from *Table 2: Section 1329 Application Bill Analysis*, “Stephen DeFrank Testimony before a public hearing of the Pennsylvania House Consumer Protection, Technology & Utilities Committee”, December 12, 2023, [https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11\\_091351\\_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf](https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11_091351_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf)

<sup>43</sup> The bill difference is the difference between the initial water utility bill for the system pre-acquisition and the most recent utility bill for the system post-acquisition at the time of testimony (December 2023). Difference in bill calculated in *Table 2: Section 1329 Application Bill Analysis*, [https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11\\_091351\\_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf](https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11_091351_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf)

<sup>44</sup> Cumulative % change in bill is the percentage change in bill from date filed to date of testimony, calculated in *Table 2: Section 1329 Application Bill Analysis*, [https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11\\_091351\\_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf](https://www.pahouse.com/files/Documents/Testimony/2023-12-11_091351_Testimony%20on%201862,%201863,%201864,%201865.pdf)

<sup>45</sup> The yearly average bill difference takes the bill difference described in *supra note 41*, and divides it by the years of change (year of testimony (2023) – year of date filed (column 1))

<sup>46</sup> Bill difference (yearly average) % takes the percent change in rates given the yearly average bill increase described in *supra note 43*.

|           |             |                                  |            |            |        |           |       |         |       |     |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------------------|------------|------------|--------|-----------|-------|---------|-------|-----|
| 5/2/2018  | APW         | East Bradford Township           | 5,000,000  | 5,000,000  | 1,248  | 4,006.41  | 30.60 | 44.90%  | 6.12  | 9%  |
| 6/7/2018  | PAWC-<br>WD | Sadsbury Township                | 8,600,000  | 8,300,000  | 998    | 8,316.63  | 40.30 | 54.00%  | 8.06  | 11% |
| 9/26/2018 | PAWC-<br>WD | Exeter Township                  | 93,500,000 | 92,000,000 | 9,015  | 10,205.21 | 71.82 | 166.60% | 14.36 | 33% |
| 1/2/2019  | PAWC        | Steelton Borough Authority       | 21,750,000 | 20,500,000 | 2,472  | 8,292.88  | 44.23 | 149.20% | 11.05 | 37% |
| 3/13/2019 | APW         | Cheltenham Township              | 50,250,000 | 44,558,258 | 10,219 | 4,360.33  | 23.57 | 68.20%  | 5.89  | 17% |
| 7/30/2019 | APW         | East Norriton Township           | 21,000,000 | 20,750,000 | 4,966  | 4,178.41  | 27.36 | 77.60%  | 6.84  | 19% |
| 12/2/2019 | PAWC-<br>WD | Kane Borough Municipal Authority | 17,560,000 | 17,560,000 | 2,019  | 8,697.37  | 62.49 | 122.50% | 15.62 | 31% |
| 7/14/2020 | PAWC-<br>WD | Royersford Borough               | 13,000,000 | 13,000,000 | 1,620  | 8,024.69  | 22.70 | 75.70%  | 7.56  | 25% |
| 10/9/2020 | PAWC        | Valley Township                  | 7,325,000  | 7,325,000  | 1670   | 4,386.23  | 27.04 | 93.40%  | 9.01  | 31% |
| 10/9/2020 | PAWC-<br>WD | Valley Township                  | 13,950,000 | 13,950,000 | 3,125  | 4,464.00  | 54.14 | 89.10%  | 18.04 | 30% |

|            |             |                              |             |             |        |           |       |        |       |     |
|------------|-------------|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|-------|-----|
| 11/24/2020 | PAWC-<br>WD | Upper Pottsgrove<br>Township | 13,750,000  | 13,750,000  | 1,600  | 8,593.75  | 41.00 | 63.10% | 13.66 | 21% |
| 7/1/2021   | PAWC-<br>WD | York City Sewer<br>Authority | 235,000,000 | 231,500,000 | 13,747 | 16,840.04 | 27.00 | 84.20% | 13.5  | 42% |

**PAWC** = Pennsylvania American Water Company; **APW** = Aqua Pennsylvania Water; **WD** = Waste Division