Exhibit No.:

Issue: Incentive Compensation;

Executive Compensation

Witness: David Cross

Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony

Sponsoring Party: Kansas City Power & Light Company

Case No.: ER-2006-0314

Date Testimony Prepared: September 8, 2006

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO.: ER-2006-0314

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

DAVID CROSS

ON BEHALF OF

KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

Kansas City, Missouri September 2006

**" Designates that "Highly Confidential" Information has been Removed. "Highly Confidential" Information has been Removed from Certain Schedules Attached to this Testimony Designated ("HC") Pursuant To The Standard Protective Order.

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

DAVID CROSS

Case No. ER-2006-0314

1	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
2	A.	My name is David Cross. My business address is 1717 Arch St. 27th Floor, Philadelphia,
3		Pennsylvania 19103.
4	Q.	By whom and in what capacity are you employed?
5	A.	I am employed by Mercer Human Resource Consulting in the Human Capital Advisory
6		Services business. Within that business I am a Principal and senior consultant.
7	Q.	What are your responsibilities?
8	A.	I am the senior consultant working with Mercer clients in the area of executive
9		compensation. Specifically, I provide consulting services to senior executives and
10		Boards of Directors regarding issues related to the level and character of executive
11		compensation programs. To be even more specific, I specialize in providing such
12		services to the utility industry where I have worked with over 50 companies in that
13		industry. This includes utilities in electric and gas operations in both the regulated and
14		non-regulated environments.
15	Q.	Please describe your education, experience and employment history.
16	A.	I earned my B.A. in Political Science from Cleveland State University in 1983. I have
17		also completed all coursework towards a Ph. D. in Political Science from the University
18		of Maryland. I began my career in Human Resources when I was hired as the Manager

of Human Resource Information at the Edison Electric Institute ("EEI") in 1987. In that capacity I was responsible for the development and administration of all compensation and benefit surveys for the investor-owned utility industry. Subsequent to my work at EEI, I was hired in 1993 by Towers Perrin in Washington, DC and then transferred to their office in Philadelphia. My role at Towers Perrin was as an Associate with responsibility for project management on executive compensation related consulting assignments. In 1998 I left Towers Perrin and joined Mercer Human Resource Consulting (then known as William M. Mercer) as a Senior Associate. In 1999 I was promoted to Principal which meant I was the primary or most senior consultant on Mercer engagements. As a senior consultant at Mercer I am the firm's senior and most experienced consultant on issues related to executive compensation within the utility industry.

- Q. Have you previously testified in a proceeding at the Missouri Public Service
 Commission ("MPSC") or before any other utility regulatory agency?
- 15 A. I have never testified before the MPSC, but I have testified before the Illinois Public
 Utility Commission.
- 17 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

18 A. I am providing rebuttal testimony to MPSC Staff's proposed disallowance of short-term
19 and long-term incentive compensation in the rate structure of Kansas City Power & Light
20 Company ("KCPL" or "Company"). In my professional opinion, the use of incentives
21 for both executives and broad base employee populations is a tremendously powerful tool
22 to ensure operational efficiency, which clearly serves the interests of utility customers.
23 The use of financial measures is a very effective way to reflect performance on a broad

range of customer service measures and is why financial metrics such as earnings, Return on Equity and Total Shareholder Return are the most common measures used in incentive plans across the utility industry.

4 Q. Please describe the Incentive Compensation issue.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

21

22

23

- A. In short, I disagree with Staff witness Harris' assertion that the measures in KCPL's incentive plans do not support customer interests. In my professional opinion and in support of KCPL, I disagree with the Staff's disallowance of performance-based incentive compensation that is awarded on the basis of achieving financial goals tied to earnings per share ("EPS") or in the use of equity as part of the Long-Term Incentive component. Staff witness Harris appears to believe that achieving financial objectives does not significantly benefit customers and does not improve utility operations as a whole.
- Q. Why do you disagree with the Staff's proposed disallowance of incentive
 compensation that is based on financial goals tied to earnings per share?
- 15 A. I disagree with the Staff's proposed disallowance of incentive compensation that is based
 16 on the financial goals tied to EPS because a financially sound and stable company
 17 provides a direct benefit to all stakeholders including, employees, customers,
 18 shareholders and the community in which the company operates.
- 19 Q. Please explain how customers benefit from KCPL achieving financial objectives.
- 20 A. Customers benefit in a number of ways by KCPL achieving its financial objectives:
 - 1) KCPL must provide a market competitive compensation plan to attract and retain highly qualified and experienced employees. It is to the benefit of the customers to provide a competitive salary package, including incentives, to build a strong management

team and a team of highly qualified employees who are driven to provide high levels of customer service and who deliver safe and reliable electric service. If KCPL fails to hire highly qualified people, the Company's operations would most certainly suffer which would have a direct impact on customers.

- 2) Because of KCPL's solid financial performance from an earnings perspective, it is in a position to undertake the Comprehensive Energy Plan, directly benefiting the customers and the community. The Plan will supply predictable, low-cost, clean and efficient energy to meet the needs of the growing Kansas City area for years to come, and maintain the region's ability to retain and create jobs through continued economic growth. The Plan also reduces the potential that KCPL will have to rely on the volatile wholesale energy market to meet future demand.
- 3) Customers benefit when the Company is strong financially as the Company is able to raise the capital needed to fund the ongoing construction projects associated with the Comprehensive Energy Plan. A solid financial foundation means that the Company receives more favorable rates on capital, reducing the overall costs that ultimately get charged to customers.
- In my view, a utility can only deliver strong financial success through strong operational performance. In effect, by measuring financial performance you are measuring operational performance. I have worked with many utilities that have built their incentive plans to be based on financial performance because there is the explicit recognition that such measures reflect the performance of a wide range of operations.

 One common set of financial measures provides a simple incentive structure while reflecting the kind of operational performance that KCPL customers want.

KCPL takes a balanced approach in their incentive plan goals. The Company strives to be strong both financially and operationally, therefore the Company uses a mix of scorecard goals to focus results on these two areas. It is to the benefit of KCPL's customers for the Company to provide solid financial results to help maintain a high level of performance in key operational measures such as customer satisfaction, system reliability, plant availability and safety. What incentive compensation plans does KCPL offer to its employees?

Q.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

17

18

19

20

21

22

A.

8 A. KCPL and its parent company, Great Plains Energy ("GPE"), provided the following 9 annual or short-term incentive compensation plans to its employees in 2005: (i) GPE / 10 KCPL Annual Incentive Plan - Company Executives ("Officer Plan"); (ii) ValueLink 11 Incentive Plan – management (non-union) employees ("ValueLink"); (iii) PMG Incentive 12 Plan – management (non-union) employees in the Power Sales & Services department 13 ("PMG"); and (iv) Rewards Incentive Plan – bargaining unit (union) employees 14 ("Rewards"). The Company also provides a long-term incentive plan ("LTIP") for 15 Company executives.

16 Q. Why does the Company offer incentive compensation?

GPE / KCPL is a performance driven company. As such, it strives to have a compensation system that rewards high levels of performance. The Company's compensation philosophy is designed to recognize and reward outstanding performance, support the Company's goals for employees, customers and shareholders and to support the Company's strategic intent to demonstrate leadership in supplying and delivering electricity and energy solutions to meet customer needs.

In order to support and fulfill its strategic intent, the Company must attract and retain highly qualified and experienced employees and align pay with performance. To do this, the Company offers a market competitive total compensation package that includes base pay, short-term incentives and employee benefits. For officers, the Company includes a long-term incentive plan as well.

Incentive compensation is 'at-risk,' which means that it is not guaranteed. The Company requires employees to achieve strong financial and operations results in order to earn this portion of their overall compensation. If employees do not meet these goals, no incentive compensation is paid. The absence of these incentive plans would put GPE / KCPL at a competitive disadvantage in the marketplace in which it competes for talent. The Company believes that in the absence of these incentive plans, it would have to increase base wages to remain competitive, which would add to fixed costs and would decrease the emphasis on key business objectives.

Q. How common is the use of incentive compensation?

A.

The use of incentive compensation is a common practice in the utility industry and in general industry. As noted before, I specialize in the utility industry and am not currently aware of any public investor-owned utility that does not offer base salary, annual incentives, and some type of long-term (multi-year) incentive plan as part of its standard executive package. Furthermore, it is common for utilities to offer annual incentive plans to non-executive employees. Based on our surveys of incentive practices, for employees below the officer level, we find that over 90% of all utilities provide annual incentives for Directors and Managers and approximately 65% of technical staff have such programs.

Q. How are the short-term incentive plans funded?

1	A.	The 2005 Officer, ValueLink and Rewards plans were funded based on GPE EPS.
2		Funding was based on a sliding scale from a threshold level of ** **, target
3		level of ** and a maximum level of ** The plan would
4		fund at 50% of target at the threshold level, 100% of target at the target level and 150%
5		of target at the maximum level. Unless the EPS threshold level of ** was
6		met, there would not have been a payout under the plans. The 2005 plan funded at the
7		maximum level based on an EPS of ** ** By using EPS as the funding
8		mechanism, the Company must be profitable in order to pay a short-term incentive.
9	Q.	On p. 7, lines 6-9, of his direct testimony, witness Harris compares KCPL's EPS and
10		ROE to that of GPE. Please comment.
11	A.	I do not understand the reason for this comparison. Of course the EPS and ROE of the
12		two companies will be different. Mr. Harris notes that had KCPL's EPS been used in the
13		benchmark, no KCPL employee would have received incentive compensation in 2005.
14		KCPL's EPS did not fund the plan, but was, in fact, used as a financial scorecard goal in
15		the KCPL employees' incentive plans.
16	Q.	Once the plans were funded, how did participants earn an incentive award?
17	A.	Once the plan has been funded, participants in the Officer, ValueLink, and Rewards
18		incentive plans earned the incentive based on their incentive target established for their
19		position, achievement of selected key GPE and KCPL scorecard goals and their
20		individual performance.
21		The scorecard goals are taken from a set of performance metrics, which KCPL
22		uses to track performance. These performance metrics were not designed specifically for
23		use in the Company incentive plans, contrary to Mr. Harris' statement of p. 9, line 22 of

his direct testimony. Rather the performance metrics are used to measure business performance in other contexts as well. Because the Company is a performance-driven company, the decision was made to use a select number of key financial and operational goals from the GPE, KCPL and Divisional scorecards in the incentive plan to motivate employees to achieve these key goals and to align the focus of the goals at all levels of the organization. By using these measures the Company proposes that strong operational performance across a wide range of measures will lead to financial success – but central to the definition of performance are sound customer-oriented measures.

9 Q. What were the plan goals and weights for the 2005 incentive plans?

10 A: Plan goals and weights for the Officer plan were:

GPE Officers:		KCPL Officers:		
GPE Scorecard Goals	80%	GPE Scorecard Goals	20%	
Individual	20%	KCPL Scorecard Goals	60%	
		Individual	20%	

GPE COO / KCPL CEO (W.H. Downey):

GPE Scorecard Goals 40%

KCPL Scorecard Goals 40%

Individual 20%

Plan goals and weights for the ValueLink and Rewards plans:ValueLink:Rewards:KCPL Scorecard Goals40%KCPL Scorecard Goals50%Division Scorecard Goals40%Division Scorecard Goals50%Individual Performance20%

Plan goals and weights for the PGM Incentive plan:						
Generation Division Scorecard Goals	Either 40% Generation and 40% PMG					
PMG Net Profit	Profit or 20% Generation and 60% PMG Profit depending on the position.					
Individual Performance 20%	1 2 1					

The scorecard goals for the GPE, KCPL and Divisional levels reflected a balanced mix of goals from each of the four scorecard driver categories: Financial, Customer, Internal and Learning & Innovation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Individual performance contributed to the remaining incentive earned and was weighted at 20% for all short term plans except the Rewards plan. Individual performance was earned based on the employee's contribution to plan goals and their demonstration of core competencies (e.g., commitment to the customer, leadership, teamwork). In the case of the ValueLink and PMG incentive plans, the individual performance incentive was directly linked to the employee's overall performance rating from their yearly performance appraisal.

- 11 Q. Explain what happened with funded but 'unearned' incentive dollars.
- 12 A. Incentive dollars that were funded but 'unearned' were redistributed back to plan 13 participants. The redistribution was based on scorecard goal achievement. Those 14 individuals or divisions that had higher levels of scorecard achievement receive a higher 15 proportion of the redistributed funds. The redistribution in the ValueLink and Rewards 16 plans were minimal as the cumulative achievement of the KCPL scorecard goals were 17 100% met and a majority of divisions achieved 100% of their scorecard goals. 18 Redistribution within the Officer plan was fairly evenly distributed with the GPE officers 19 receiving a proportionally higher share based on a slightly higher level of overall 20 scorecard achievement.
- Q. One of Mr. Harris' criticisms is that "EPS is the primary goal for all of the GPE and KCPL incentive plans." (p. 6, line 18). How much weight did the EPS scorecard goal carry in the overall incentive?

A. On the GPE Scorecard, the financial category included four goals equally weighted at 10% for a total weight of 40%. GPE EPS was one of the four goals in the financial category. On the KCPL Scorecard, KCPL EPS was the only financial goal weighted at 40%.

For GPE officers, the GPE EPS goal represented only 8% of the overall incentive, (80% GPE Scorecard times 10% GPE EPS goal weight). For KCPL officers, EPS (GPE and KCPL) represented 26% of the overall incentive, (20% GPE Scorecard times 10% GPE EPS goal weight, plus 60% KCPL Scorecard times 40% KCPL EPS goal weight). For Mr. Downey, EPS (GPE and KCPL) represented 20% of the overall incentive, (40% GPE Scorecard times 10% GPE EPS goal weight, plus 40% KCPL Scorecard times 40% KCPL EPS goal weight).

In the Valuelink Plan KCPL EPS represented 16% of the overall incentive 40% times 40% and in the Rewards Plan, KCPL EPS represented 20% of the overall incentive, 50% times 40%.

While EPS was a primary goal by weight for most groups, it was not <u>the</u> primary goal for all of the GPE and KCPL incentive compensation plans. For example, the KCPL JD Powers Customer Satisfaction Index from the Customer category of the GPE Scorecard goal actually carried a greater weight, at 10% total (80% GPE Scorecard times 12.5% goal weight), for GPE officers than did GPE EPS. In the Valuelink and Rewards plans, the Net Generation goal carried a total weight of 22% and 27.5%, respectively, for employees in the Generation Services group. Aside from the Rewards plan, individual performance carried a greater total weight than EPS.

Q. Has the plan design changed for the 2006 short-term incentive plans?

1 A. Yes, the plan design has changed for all short-term incentive plans. KCPL evaluates the
2 incentive plans annually, making changes as appropriate to ensure that they continue to
3 support the Company's performance and strategic goals.

4 Q. Can you please explain the plan design changes for 2006?

A. For the Officer plan, EPS will no longer fund the entire plan. EPS will still be a component of the plan to ensure the financial strength of the Company, but the incentive plan will fund independently based on achievement of plan goals. The plan design is as follows:

GPE Officers:	KCPL Officers:
50% - Financial Objectives (GPE Core EPS)	50% - Financial Objectives (KCPL Core EPS)
30% - Key Business Objectives	30% - Key Business Objectives
20% - Individual Performance	20% - Individual Performance

The key business objectives consist of six select scorecard goals focused on operational excellence, reliability, customer satisfaction and a commitment to the Company's strategic intent. There are no EPS-specific goals included in the Key Business Objectives.

For the ValueLink and Rewards plans, EPS will continue to fund the plan, but EPS has been eliminated as a specific scorecard plan goal. As stated earlier, using EPS as the funding mechanism simply means that KCPL must be profitable in order to pay a short-term incentive. For 2006, KCPL EPS will fund the plan for all KCPL employees to enhance the plan by basing it on measures which people believe they can more directly impact. We typically refer to this concept as 'line of sight'.

The scorecard weighting will remain the same for 2006.

ValueLink:		Rewards:	
KCPL Scorecard Goals	40%	KCPL Scorecard Goals	50%
Division Scorecard Goals	40%	Division Scorecard Goals	50%
Individual Performance	20%		

A.

The selected goals from the 2006 KCPL and Divisional scorecards are focused on operational excellence, reliability, customer satisfaction and a commitment to the Company's strategic intent.

Why does KCPL disagree with the Staff's proposed disallowance of incentive compensation that is based on individual performance?

Even if the Commission were to agree with Staff's theory that an incentive plan tied to EPS does not benefit customers, the Commission should reject Staff's adjustment concerning individual performance. Individual performance is a key component of the Company's compensation philosophy. Performance pay enables the Company to recognize and reward the outstanding performance of its officers and employees. The individual performance piece of incentive compensation provides motivation for executives and employees to achieve strong short-term and long-term financial and operational goals. It helps align management interests with those of our stakeholders, including fellow employees, customers and the community at-large.

While no formal objectives were identified for the individual component of the 2005 Officer Plan, officers earned this piece of the incentive through their demonstrated commitment to achieving their division's operational goals, their commitment to creating a winning culture, their contributions to the Comprehensive Energy Plan and their community commitment. Board members made a determination, with input from the CEO, of not just what was achieved, but how it was achieved.

The Officers' commitment to creating a winning culture enhances employees' involvement and engagement, creating an environment where the employee is encouraged to act on behalf of the customers by providing a high level of customer service and by promoting teamwork and innovative thinking in maintaining reliable electric service.

A key component of the community strategy is engaging our officers in efforts that help improve the communities in our service territory. Officers are encouraged to take leadership roles with agencies that support the Community Strategy focus areas. They dedicate their time as board and committee members offering their expertise in many areas as well as assisting groups with ongoing programming needs.

The objectives used to pay the individual performance piece of the ValueLink plan are very well defined. An employee's year-end performance rating is directly linked to the award an employee receives for the individual performance component. An employee's performance is assessed annually against predetermined and specific individual performance goals and core Company competencies. Please see Schedule DC-1 and Schedule DC-2 for examples of actual individual performance plan goals. There is a direct link between these performance goals and a benefit to customers. These performance-based goals serve as the core of the performance pay philosophy and align with Company and division scorecard goals, reflecting a balanced mix of financial, customer, operational and developmental goals related to KCPL business objectives.

1		There are six rating categories used to assign an overall rating for employees.
2		The ratings from top to bottom are:
3		Distinguished
4		• Successful +
5		• Successful
6		• Successful –
7		Needs Improvement
8		Unacceptable
9		The plan has established a targeted incentive level based on the employee's
10		position and overall performance. While management has some discretion available to
11		them in determining individual awards, they generally must follow a set of published
12		guidelines that ensure that the approximate target level of individual incentive is
13		achieved. See Schedule DC-3 for a copy of these guidelines. These decisions are
14		typically made by a group of Division Managers and are approved by senior
15		management.
16		The individual performance component is tied to specific performance goals that
17		are outlined in an annual performance plan. Because these goals are linked to key
18		operational and customer goals, they directly benefit customers as well as shareholders.
19		Therefore, the costs associated with this piece of the incentive should not be disallowed.
20	Q.	Do you have any comments regarding Staff's testimony regarding the Long-Term
21		Incentive Plan under review?
22		Yes, I do. The comments I wish to make relate to the importance of Long-Term
23		Incentives for KCPL and that these incentives should be in the regulated rate structure.

In our survey information, Long-Term Incentives are the most prominent element of executive compensation. Long-Term Incentives make up 40% to 60% of an executive's Total Direct Compensation (salary and short-term incentives make up the balance of Direct Compensation). If Long-Term Incentive is excluded, GPE / KCPL will clearly be at a competitive disadvantage in the Company's ability to attract and retain high caliber executive talent. Having the right talent could have an even greater impact on the Company's ability to support its customers' needs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The balance of my comments are, to a great extent, similar to those made related to the Short-Term Incentive Plan and incentives in general. Long-Term Incentive plans by their nature are more complex than annual plans because they are typically denominated in stock. Because of that complexity, I believe Staff witness Harris misunderstands several aspects of the plan that need additional clarity here. First, as I testified earlier, the application of financial metrics in any incentive plan is good for a number of reasons: strong financial performance can best be achieved in a utility environment by strong, sustained operational performance – this benefits customers. Furthermore, financial measures across an entire executive population are appropriate to ensure a common performance focus. Virtually all regulated utilities recognize the need for Long-Term Incentive Plans as a necessary cost of doing business and is why our survey information suggests that over 80% of all utilities have such plans and 100% of the utilities we reviewed in our review for KCPL. Secondly, Mr. Harris testifies that since Long-Term Incentives are delivered in stock, it is not cash and thus should be disallowed. The view that this is not cash may be accurate, but there is clearly an expense to any equity grant in today's corporate environment. In short, just because a

plan is delivered in stock does not mean that there is no associated cost. Third, Mr. Harris states that the expense in the review year reflects a 'double' payment, which again may be accurate, but it is misleading. The 'double' payment is reflective of the fact that there was no equity payment to GPE / KCPL executives in 2004 and the double payment was for both 2004 and 2005. The reason for the missed payment year was due to the development of a new plan and to ensure that this new plan was both reasonable and appropriate for GPE / KCPL customers and shareholders alike. It was responsible to KCPL customers and shareholders that the Company not hastily put in a plan in 2004 until it was clearly recognized as being right for all stakeholders. This meant waiting through 2004 and putting the plan in place in 2005, which in fairness to KCPL executives warrants a 'double' payment.

- 12 Q. Does that conclude your testimony?
- 13 A. Yes, it does.

MO Schedule DC - 1

NAME:	TITLE: Shift Foreman	REVIEW PERIOD		
DEPT:	LOCATION:	FROM:	TO:	
EVALUATOR:		DIVISION: Generation Services		
	Performance Re	view		
Objectives (50%)				

		Ob	jective		
 Station nor Station cap Contribute repairs. Sp Maintain a 	n-fuel O&M ¢/kwh and stat bital actual within 10% of G to the development of the pecific emphasis is on the 2	tion O&M actual within 5% Sen. Services Operating I capital and O&M budget 2007/2008 budget cycle. atus of station budget (O&	% of Gen. Services Ope Budget by identifying justifiable kM and Capital). Use th	precard. Measures and examperating Budget e projects and system/equipment awareness in decision-male	ent upgrades and
Mid-Year Resul	(S		Year-End Res	ults	
☐ Distinguished	☐ Successful +	Successful	☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
	. National Report of the Control of				
Customer (Customer focus	ed initiatives)		Weight:	
		Ob	jective		
 Ensure po expected r Ensure pro Ensure ac Ensure ac Ensure un 	eturn to full load. oper action is taken to main curate and timely NERC re- curate and time plant incid	l of load reductions/de-ra ntain environmental comp eporting is completed. lent reports are complete e @ outage scheduled sta	tes in a timely manner. pliance at all time for ai d. art time (i.e., cool-down	es are: Also ensure the power dispat r, water and waste policies an , holds placed, boiler doors of	d regulations.
Mid-Year Resul			Year-End Res	ults	
☐ Distinguished	☐ Successful +	☐ Successful	☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable



nternal (Process improvements and efficiencies) Weight:						
		Obje	ctive			
 Ensure week Ensure timel Monitor and Take action to cycle chemis Participate in Contribute to timely fashion Consistently 	ly equipment changes are y, accurate and thorough waintain and awareness on o optimize station heat rate o minimize EAL due BTF. try limits, etc.) the weekly planning procumaximizing station net gent	done. work requests are submitt of controllable losses and e. (ex, control unit ramp ra ess. en. & EAF. (ex., identify ea	ted. take action to minimi ate, ensure sound so- quip. problems before	improvements. Examples income improvements. Examples income improvements. Examples income improvements. Examples income improvements income improvements. Examples income improvements. Ex	H & RH temps.,maintain unit to full load in a	
Mid-Year Results			Year-End Res	ults		
☐ Distinguished	☐ Successful +	Successful	☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable	
Learning & I	nnovation (Em			ent) Weight:		
Contribute to learning and innovation for the station. Examples of activities include: Identify and complete one training objective. Participate in activities that support training and safety such as DCS enhancements, PID updates, automated hold program, etc. Attend fire brigade leader and confined space rescue refresher training. Conduct effective shift briefings and provide other safety management actions (impromptu meetings, counseling, sponsor personal safety awareness program, etc.) that ensures an OSHA incident rate of 3.18 or less. Ensure supplemental training is scheduled and completed in accordance with JATC guidelines. Improve and enhance internal communications. Examples of this include communication across shifts, communication with other station departments, providing updates on status of the station, division and corporate balanced scorecard, etc. Conduct and document an annual employee safety review for each employee you are assigned. Coordinate with Plant Services representatives any required training that is identified through this process Submit and complete one approved safety recommendation. Attend a minimum of 11 Monthly Safety Meetings and participate in other safety initiatives (PPE Audits, Accident & Near Miss investigations, OSHA type inspections, and other safety training programs).						
Mid-Year Results			Year-End Res	ults		
Distinguished	☐ Successful +	Successful	☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	Unacceptable	



Competencies (50%)

IDEAL

${ m I}$ Inspired Lead	ership		Weight 10%		
• F • L • E • C	Preserves values that dem leads by example and obt incourages honesty and o creates an environment will decomes less adverse to r	ains results through teamy openness here trust can grow	work		
Mid-Year Result	DATE DEPENDENT DE POPULAÇÃO DE PROPERTICA DE PROPERTICA DE POPULAÇÃO DE POPULAÇÃO DE POPULAÇÃO DE POPULAÇÃO DE		Year-End Resi		
☐ Distinguished	☐ Successful +	☐ Successful	Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable
Disciplined	Performance Mana		Weight 10%		
• [• (Develops long-term skills, Considers the impact of in Has a clear understanding	dividual work beyond one'	, necessary to improve s own group	e performance through training their work and organizationa	
Distinguished	☐ Successful +	Successful	☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable
E Engaged			Weight 10%		
Everyone at Great PI balance. This means	s the employee: Works across departments Has a "Let's try this" attitud Creates an environment o	s to create customer-drive	n solutions ss	the Company, and strives for	r a healthy work-life
Mid-Year Result			Year-End Res		
Distinguished	☐ Successful +	Successful	☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable



$oldsymbol{A}$ Accountabili	ity.		Weight 10%		
excellence. This mea A D S F		core values nat supports straight talk a al behavior and performand n solutions and team-drive	nd face-to-face commo ce and holds self acco	ountable	s of integrity and
Mid-Year Result			Year-End Resu	ilts	
Distinguished	☐ Successful +	☐ Successful	☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable
L Loyalty			Weight 10%		
relationships with cus C C F F	t Plains Energy commit to stomers, communities and Develops and maintains an Cultivates loyal, dedicated Preserves practices that should be something the community of cultivating the community of cultivations and communities are communities and communities and communities and communities and communities and communities are communities and communities and communities and communities are communities and communities and communities and communities and communities are communities and communities and communities and communities and communities are communities and communities and communities are communities and communities and communities and communities are communities and communities and communities are communities and communities and communities and communities are communities and communities and communities and communities are communities.	shareholders. This means environment of loyal, ded hard-working professionals low our commitment to cor al commitments	s the employee: icated employees s	encourages employee growth	h and strengthens
Mid-Year Result			Year-End Resi	ilts	
Distinguished	☐ Successful +	□ Successful	☐ Successful —	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable

MO Schedule DC - 2

NAME:	TITLE: Field Construction Supervisor	REVIEW	REVIEW PERIOD	
DEPT:	LOCATION:	FROM:	то:	
EVALUATOR:		DIVISION: Distribution Oper	rations	

Performance Review

Objectives (50%)

Financial (Cost control and financial responsibility)				Weight: 12.5%	
		Ob	jective		
Implement our work	plans in Field Operations to	achieve the financial m	etrics in our Distribution	Scorecard:	
O&M Cost per Custo Total Cost per Custo					
Mid-Year Resul	ls		Year-End Res	ilts	
☐ Distinguished	☐ Successful +	Successful	☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable
Customer (Customer focuse	ed initiatives)		Weight: 12.5%	
		Ot	jective		
JD Powers Rating (F	Res) : 97 - 101 RMS) In-Service Dates Achi	•	and manage crews to a	achieve the following Customo	er Satisfaction Goals:
Mid-Year Resul			Year-End Res	ults	
☐ Distinguished ☐ Successful + ☐ Successful			☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	Unacceptable



Internal (Pro	rocess improvements and efficiencies) Weight: 12.5%				
		Оъ	ective		
Spend 1 day/quarter i	n field with scheduling coc	ordinator and planning su	pv to review projects a		
efficiency rating of 80	%.		viii improve productivity	y of KCPL crews and contracte	ors by creating a crew
Report crew productiv	rity measures to all employ	rees.			
Mid-Year Result			Year-End Res	ults	
☐ Distinguished	☐ Successful +	☐ Successful	☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable
Learning &	Innovation (Em	ployee developme	ent and involvem	ent) Weight: 12.5%	
		Ob	jective		
(Build a Winning Culte training and learning	ure within Field Operations will build personal morale	s that promotes Safety as and confidence to help a	s a central value to our chieve the GPE IDEAL	daily lives. Help employees t	to identify areas where
	s engrained at all levels of safety checks each month		upon the DuPont safet	y initiatives. Reinforce the val	lue of field safety by
	erform joint audits with Sup sident rate at or below 4.0.		4 days/year; Supv/Unio	on Safety Rep perform joint au	idits 2 days/year
L2.1 Develop leaders	hip skills by implementing	innovation project to 75%	6 completion.		
Engage our employee		tive things and tie that ba	ick to "GPE IDEAL" an	do on a daily basis that impact id the "Winning Culture" we ar	
Participate in three cl	asses and or seminars to	strengthen my managem	ent skills.		
Mid-Year Result	S		Year-End Res	ults	
Distinguished	☐ Successful +	☐ Successful	☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable



Competencies (50%)

IDEAL

I Inspired Lead	ership		Weight 10%		
• P • L • E • C	s guide with a passionate serves values that demonence and obtain courages honesty and operates an environment who becomes less adverse to ristincourages innovation at all	nstrate high integrity ins results through team enness ere trust can grow sk	work		
Mid-Year Result			Year-End Resu	menging it i taging na araw araw araw araw araw araw araw a	
		enssao greni, nasana sa na			
☐ Distinguished	☐ Successful +	☐ Successful	Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable
D Disciplined	Performance Manag	ement	Weight 10%		
• (Considers the impact of ind las a clear understanding o	vidual work beyond one	s own group	performance through training their work and organizationa ults	
☐ Distinguished	☐ Successful +	Successful	☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable
E Engaged			Weight 10%		
balance. This means • \ • \ • \ • \ • \ • \ • \ • \ • \ •	ains Energy takes pride in the employee: Works across departments Has a "Let's try this" attitude Creates an environment of Endeavors to create an env	to create customer-drive e diversity and inclusivene	n solutions	the Company, and strives for	a healthy work-life
Mid-Year Result			Year-End Resi		
☐ Distinguished	☐ Successful +	☐ Successful	☐ Successful	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable



A Accountability		Weight 10%			
excellence. This mea		core values that supports straight talk al behavior and performa en solutions and team-dri	and face-to-face commince and holds self according	ountable	s of integrity and
Mid-Year Results		Year-End Results			
□ Distinguished	☐ Successful +	☐ Successful	☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable
L Loyalty			Weight 10%		
relationships with cus	at Plains Energy commit to stomers, communities and Develops and maintains an Cultivates loyal, dedicated Preserves practices that sl Follows through on persor Pulls together in times of c	shareholders. This mean environment of loyal, do hard-working profession how our commitment to dial commitments	ns the employee: edicated employees als	encourages employee growt t and safety	h and strengthens
Mid-Year Resul	IS		Year-End Res	ults	
☐ Distinguished	⊠ Successful +	Successful	☐ Successful –	☐ Needs Improvement	☐ Unacceptable

SCHEDULE DC-3

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

)

In the Matter of the Application of Kansas City

Power & Light Company to Modify Its Tariff to Begin the Implementation of Its Regulatory Plan Case No. ER-2006-0314)
AFFIDAVIT OF DAVID CROSS
STATE OF MISSOURI)
COUNTY OF JACKSON) ss
David Cross, being first duly sworn on his oath, states:
1. My name is David Cross. I work in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and I am
employed by Mercer Human Resource Consulting an am a Principal with the firm.
2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my Rebuttal Testimore Sixteen (16) on behalf of Kansas City Power & Light Company consisting of **********(************************(****
been prepared in written form for introduction into evidence in the above-captioned docket.
3. I have knowledge of the matters set forth therein. I hereby swear and affirm that
my answers contained in the attached testimony to the questions therein propounded, including
any attachments thereto, are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and
belief. David Cross
Subscribed and sworn before me this 7 th day of September 2006. Selva Selley Notary Public
My commission expires:
BELVA FELKER REG. No. 5075306 NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF NEW YORK QUALIFIED IN STEUBEN COUNTY My Commission Expires March 31, 2007