

Exhibit No.:
Issue: Organizational Realignment and
Voluntary Separation Program
Witness: Kelly R. Murphy
Type of Exhibit: Direct Testimony
Sponsoring Party: KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company
Case No.: ER-2012-0175
Date Testimony Prepared: February 27, 2012

Filed
December 03, 2012
Data Center
Missouri Public
Service Commission

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO.: ER-2012-0175

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

KELLY R. MURPHY

ON BEHALF OF

KCP&L GREATER MISSOURI OPERATIONS COMPANY

**Kansas City, Missouri
February 2012**

GMO Exhibit No. 131
Date 10-29-12 Reporter XF
File No. ER-2012-0175

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

KELLY R. MURPHY

Case No. ER-2012-0175

1 **Q: Please state your name and business address.**

2 A: My name is Kelly R. Murphy. My business address is 1200 Main Street, Kansas City,
3 Missouri 64105.

4 **Q: By whom and in what capacity are you employed?**

5 A: I am employed by Kansas City Power & Light Company ("KCP&L") as Director –
6 Human Resources.

7 **Q: On whose behalf are you testifying?**

8 A: I am testifying on behalf of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company ("GMO") for
9 the territories served by St. Joseph Light & Power ("L&P") and Missouri Public Service
10 ("MPS").

11 **Q: What are your responsibilities?**

12 A: I have primary responsibility for the design and administration of the Company's
13 compensation, benefits, Human Resource ("HR") Information Systems, payroll,
14 organizational development, and HR Service Center.

15 **Q: Please describe your education, experience and employment history.**

16 A: I graduated from Bucknell University with a B.A. Degree in International Relations. I
17 have worked in a variety of HR positions since 1989. I began my career with KCP&L in
18 1999 and have served in a variety of roles in HR and have also spent two years in a Six
19 Sigma Black Belt role. Prior to joining KCP&L, I worked in HR in two international law

1 firms headquartered in New York, and for a short time for First Data Resources in
2 Omaha, Nebraska.

3 **Q: Have you previously testified in a proceeding before the Missouri Public Service**
4 **Commission (“MPSC” or “Commission”) or before any other utility regulatory**
5 **agency?**

6 A: No. I have not testified before the MPSC or any other regulatory agency prior to this
7 time.

8 **Q: What is the purpose of your testimony?**

9 A: The purpose of this testimony is two-fold: (1) to describe the Organizational
10 Realignment and Voluntary Separation (“ORVS”) Program implemented by KCP&L
11 during 2011; and (2) to support the rate case adjustment to defer the associated costs for
12 recovery over future years.

13 **Q: Please describe the ORVS Program.**

14 A: In March 2011, KCP&L announced ORVS to enhance organizational efficiency and to
15 assist in the management of overall labor costs.

16 **Q: Why was ORVS implemented?**

17 A: Consistent with its continuing efforts to implement process improvements, improve
18 overall efficiency, and reduce costs, the Company determined that an organizational
19 realignment was desirable. After a thorough review of all departments, 150 non-union
20 positions were identified for elimination. Although the positions were being eliminated,
21 the Company planned to utilize a voluntary separation program to achieve the desired
22 headcount reduction. Employees whose positions were eliminated would be eligible to

1 apply for jobs being vacated by those departing under the voluntary separation
2 component of ORVS.

3 **Q: Will ORVS result in only a temporary reduction of costs?**

4 A: No. The realigned organizational structure was determined to be the most appropriate
5 structure to meet the Company's continuing operational needs. The Company and its
6 customers will benefit over future years through the enhanced efficiencies and lower
7 overall full-time employee headcount.

8 **Q: How was the voluntary separation program designed to work?**

9 A: Under the voluntary separation program, any non-union employee could voluntarily elect
10 to separate and receive a severance payment equal to two weeks of salary for every year
11 of employment, with a minimum severance payment equal to fourteen weeks of salary.
12 Employees electing the program were also eligible for career transition services.

13 **Q: What level of employees participated in the program?**

14 A: There were 140 employees that made such elections and the majority separated on April
15 30, 2011.

16 **Q: What were the program costs?**

17 A: GPE recorded \$12.7 million for the twelve months ending September 30, 2011 related to
18 this voluntary separation program, excluding joint partner shares, which reflects
19 severance and related payroll taxes to employees who elected to voluntarily separate. A
20 small amount of expense related to career transition services also was recorded.

21 **Q: What were the expected benefits to customers?**

22 A: We anticipate both non-monetary and monetary benefits to our customers.

1 **Q: What are the non-monetary benefits?**

2 A: The Company strives to build a culture of innovation and process improvement. ORVS
3 provided many opportunities for employees who remained to take on new responsibilities
4 and think through existing processes to look for new ways to approach work. An
5 ongoing focus on valued services, streamlined processes, and products will benefit
6 customers.

7 **Q: What are the monetary benefits?**

8 A: As identified above, 140 employees elected to participate in the program. These
9 employees had a combined annual salary of \$12,471,500. This reduction in employees
10 was reflected in the Company's payroll annualization, supported by Company witness
11 John P. Weisensee in his direct testimony (adjustment CS-50). This reduction in the
12 number of employees also resulted in associated reductions in the cost of employee-
13 related benefits that would otherwise have occurred, bringing the total annual savings to
14 approximately \$20 million annually, including amounts capitalized.

15 **Q: How is the Company proposing to treat the ORVS Program costs for ratemaking?**

16 A: The Company is proposing to defer these costs into a regulatory asset and amortize the
17 deferred costs over five years. The annual amortization expense is included in Mr.
18 Weisensee's Schedule JPW-3, also Schedule JPW-4, adjustment CS-55. The Company is
19 not requesting rate base treatment.

20 **Q: Why did you choose a five-year amortization period?**

21 A: The Company believes that this program will provide benefits over a multi-year period.
22 Consequently, it did not believe that inclusion of the program costs in a single year was
23 appropriate. In Case No. ER-2007-0291, the Commission authorized Kansas City Power

1 & Light Company to use a five-year amortization period to recover the costs of its Talent
2 Assessment Program. A consistent amortization period was considered appropriate to
3 recover the costs of the ORVS Program.

4 **Q: Were there any other impacts for ratemaking purposes?**

5 A: Yes. Under the ratemaking method used for pensions, there was a \$16.6 million pension
6 settlement charge, excluding joint partner shares, that resulted from non-union pension
7 distributions in 2011, primarily due to the voluntary separation program. GMO deferred
8 its share of the charge as a regulatory asset. It expects to recover its deferred asset over
9 future periods pursuant to the Second Non-Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement
10 Regarding Pensions and other Post Employment Benefits approved in Case No. ER-
11 2010-0356. For the anticipated ratemaking treatment of these pension costs, see Mr.
12 Weisensee's direct testimony (adjustment RB-65/CS-65).

13 **Q: Does that conclude your testimony?**

14 A: Yes, it does.

