

EVALUATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM SUMMER 2004 WORKSHOPS

PORTLAND, OREGON WORKSHOP EVALUATION	YES	NO	* NOT SURE
Overall, was this workshop helpful?	59	1	2
Was the information clear?	52	7	4
Were the topics well presented?	59	2	1
Were the topics covered adequately?	48	6	7
Were staff members well prepared?	58	1	2
Were questions fielded well?	56	3	2
Was the workshop long enough?	58	3	3
Was the workshop comprehensive enough?	50	3	10
Were your needs met?	46	5	11
Was enough time allocated to the various topics?	53	5	1
Would you like to continue to participate in future workshops?	57	0	4
Is the workshop format a helpful/effective way to interact with BPA?	59	1	1

*NOTE: A column was not provided for "NOT SURE", but some of the audience put a check mark on the line between yes and no, so those were counted as "not sure".

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Excellent facilitators.
- The PISCES format was vague, although perhaps it is still too early for an example. However, it would have been good to have a hierarchical view of how this will be structured. For example, have a computer set up and projected so the audience could see a rough example of screens, buttons, pull-down menus, etc.
- Topics well presented and staff reasonably well prepared – just some areas not fully thought through.
- Friday is a terrible day for a meeting.

EVALUATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM SUMMER 2004 WORKSHOPS

- Most of the information regards an upcoming event. There will be a need for a 2-day detailed working session to handle the final “nuts and bolts” of how to make the transition to new processes. We may need 6-8 different meetings to eliminate confusion. The key is having fully informed COTRs.
- We appreciate the opportunity to provide input – and the amount of time, effort, cost and forethought that went into putting the workshops together. You could have said “Here’s the new software – use it.” This is a work-in-progress that is being implemented well – good job.
- Additional workshops would be helpful. [Need] training on PISCES - hands-on.
- Being new to BPA, this workshop cleared up what was expected as well as needed. I am excited for PISCES to be up and running. Thanks for a very informative workshop!
- This really helped me. I am excited to try the new process. Milestone ratings will help with project status.
- It would have been good if PISCES was up and running.
- Due to the nature of my project, much of the info was hard to match up with what we are doing.
- Having a lead outline of the presentation e-mailed out and/or a stepwise direction of the new expectations might have added to the quality of the training.
- Seemed unclear on, and uninterested in tracking overhead. Work Elements list needs a lot of work.
- Very good overall – my frustrations probably lie with the fact that you are trying to describe how the system will work but since it is not in place you couldn’t always answer the question.
- I appreciate that COTRs will work with us as we move into this new process.
- Interactive level – very good!!
- My only strong feeling is that this switchover to PI and internally PISCES is premature by several months at best. The concept may be a good one but it is clear that points are still half-baked. Hence it should be delayed.
- There appear to be significant decisions [and] processes to be decided. Also, changes forthcoming from the workshops. Therefore, [I] feel it would be better to postpone implementing this change. Do a few prototypes; work out the kinks. Don’t make the same mistakes you made in changing to accrual accounting.

EVALUATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM SUMMER 2004 WORKSHOPS

- Would have been much more useful if new policies/procedures were developed including the PISCES software with an October 2006 rollout date.
- Would be more effective to have COTRs present if their project manager is on the registration list. Or, introduce available COTRs and solicit their input on project managers' questions.
- Workshop materials were presented well.
- It was very useful to have more time for questions and brainstorming.
- This was a helpful and effective way to interact with BPA, but very time-consuming.
- Fairly informative – examples of the old and new [Statements of Work translated into Work Elements] were very useful.
- Workshop provided good overview; however, due to new approach/complexity, many questions will arise when putting my project into new format. Would have been nice to have handout in one package with page numbers for easier reference. Thanks.
- Hard to evaluate some information without the information fully defined, but this was very helpful given where we are now.
- Good overview but definitely will need to follow up with COTR.
- Lots of info. for short time – but still, good coverage. It'll take time to adjust, but well done.
- Hopefully we'll get all of this in detail from our COTR.
- Still have some questions/concerns regarding the translation of existing contract and budget elements to the new work categories and elements. Additional work elements may be needed to reflect the full scope of project activities. Also have concerns about selecting contract agreement types that reflect project complexities. Will developing projects with multiple contract agreement types simplify or make things more complex?
- In all honesty I never often give such high marks. The direction of change you are taking looks great. I feel that I may be one of the few who are not afraid of change. Thank you.
- There needs to be an opportunity to work with the details and then perhaps get back together to discuss whatever issues come up, based on experience.

EVALUATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM SUMMER 2004 WORKSHOPS

- Do not start implementing a system that is still in development! I know you want to get moving, but invariably any new system needs to be tweaked. Start with a small handful of beta testers, see how it goes, what the problems and deficiencies are, and only after it is working, have people start using it.
- This is only one way BPA should be interacting with subcontractors. BPA needs to interact with its subcontractors in multiple ways.
- This is going to be an accounting nightmare for our financial system. Need help with this.
- The “theory” sounds good. We’ll hope for smooth implementation.
- I thought it was a good and helpful workshop. The moderator was excellent.
- Good job. Never exciting to hear about new tasks/changes, but good job.
- Help!
- More questions to come. Better to have additional workshops for additional depth. Email addresses [of PI team members on the agenda] are a plus to meet needs.
- The presenters were very well prepared and fielded questions very skillfully and thoughtfully.

EVALUATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM SUMMER 2004 WORKSHOPS

BOISE, IDAHO WORKSHOP EVALUATION	YES	NO	* NOT SURE
Overall, was this workshop helpful?	27	0	0
Was the information clear?	23	0	4
Were the topics well presented?	25	1	1
Were the topics covered adequately?	21	2	5
Were staff members well prepared?	27	0	0
Were questions fielded well?	25	0	1
Was the workshop long enough?	26	1	0
Was the workshop comprehensive enough?	23	2	2
Were your needs met?	20	4	2
Was enough time allocated to the various topics?	27	0	0
Would you like to continue to participate in future workshops?	23	2	2
Is the workshop format a helpful/effective way to interact with BPA?	27	0	0

*NOTE: A column was not provided for "NOT SURE", but some of the audience put a check mark on the line between yes and no, so those were counted as "not sure".

EVALUATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM SUMMER 2004 WORKSHOPS

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- It was a good idea to hold this because the changes were substantial, but holding too many workshops in a year will take up too much time so keep that in mind when thinking about frequency.
- Workshops are okay but we can only absorb so much before our eyes glaze. Being able to use this and see how it will work and come back with comments is the important part.
- [In answer to question “Was the information clear?”]: mostly clear, some confusion due to program still being developed.
- The portion comparing SOW’s went on far too long. After explaining a couple of tasks the rest were self-explanatory. This workshop was much better than the last one I went to. Hopefully, after we learn this new system, future workshops won’t be necessary.
- You have 3 (three) full time programmers working this transition. Are you funding help for us to implement the transition? Margin of error (5%) addressed in section H, Part B Special Guidance SP8 is unrealistic. What of Right-of-Way, contractor problems, etc.?
- Can’t really tell if coverage is adequate or if our needs were met until we actually try to put it into practice. So...I think we will volunteer to be an “Early Adopter.”
- Good workshop, lots to absorb. Best learning will come in working with system.
- BPA staff [were] extremely well prepared, fielded questions thoroughly, and seem to know the program. Great job.
- It would have been nice if my COTR [were] here.
- One-on-one with COTR and Financial/Accounting departments would also be helpful (but probably not cost-effective). Glad to know you are available when problems/issues arise.
- Thank you for the professionalism.
- Personally I think workshops targeting certain user groups would be helpful e.g. tribal or agency and smaller groups such as private or conservation districts. Or capital projects workshop or habitat projects. As stated during workshops each group has specific needs. (This was the best workshop where capital or acquisition projects didn’t dominate conversation.)
- Very glad BPA is working on process reform!

EVALUATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM SUMMER 2004 WORKSHOPS

- [In answer to question “Was the information clear?”]: fast – but really will be a learning process as we go. [There was] lots of info. – but will be easier when dealing with project manager.
- My concern is that BPA will try and hold us to our monthly spending estimates after we set them as an estimate.

SPOKANE, WASHINGTON WORKSHOP EVALUATION	YES	NO	* NOT SURE
Overall, was this workshop helpful?	55	4	3
Was the information clear?	39	12	12
Were the topics well presented?	54	7	3
Were the topics covered adequately?	44	19	7
Were staff members well prepared?	48	9	7
Were questions fielded well?	47	15	5
Was the workshop long enough?	53	7	0
Was the workshop comprehensive enough?	45	8	7
Were your needs met?	33	16	13
Was enough time allocated to the various topics?	54	6	2
Would you like to continue to participate in future workshops?	47	12	3
Is the workshop format a helpful/effective way to interact with BPA?	46	8	6

*NOTE: A column was not provided for “NOT SURE”, but some of the audience put a check mark on the line between yes and no, so those were counted as “not sure”.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Hopefully your software will be user friendly and easy to understand with the help of this workshop. Thank you!

EVALUATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM SUMMER 2004 WORKSHOPS

- Would be better to have COTRs at workshops. Also, would be nice to have several sample “old vs. new” contracts available to help us with our contract writing. Need more metrics info. Thank you!
- The [main speaker] was very good – articulate and knowledgeable. The other speakers, especially the budget person were not very helpful and didn’t provide much useful information and couldn’t provide any meaningful answers to questions. Although the workshop was generally helpful, the interaction with the COTR is the key, as much of the information is still unclear at this point.
- Training and travel needs to be funded by BPA for participation at these events. [BPA note: reimbursement for travel/participation is available; see http://www.efw.bpa.gov/cgi-bin/FW/Fish_Wildlife_Contracting_Workshops_July_August_2004.cgi or call 503-230-3501.]
- This is all still dependent upon a good COTR who understands field work and biology. If you have a bean-counter who sucks, this is all a waste of time. Our COTR does everything exactly the opposite of what your goals are, i.e.; he adds ‘no value’ to our contract. We need biologists as COTR’s, not accountants.
- Registration was poorly set up.
- I think this was more about what BPA requires, rather than Program needs. It would be nice if BPA’s actions after this workshop will be consistent with the statements made by BPA reps. today. Several comments have already been proven contradictory, i.e.; “scrutinizing an invoice does not add value”. I agree, it does not add value, but it does happen!
- I enjoyed the workshop! I have concerns with the public accessing the data. I suggest that no landowners’ names be used, but contract numbers. How many software CD’s will BPA give out? The presenters were great and hopefully the new approach software will be easy. Instructors seemed to be pushed all day to stay on schedule. Maybe the workshop needs to be 1-1/2 days.
- Reduce questions/comment specific to a particular project or situation. It’s time consuming and not helpful to all of the group. Have Project Managers/COTR’s meet with their contractors – preferably with the Project Management Manual available.
- The [main speaker] was a very good speaker. Subordinate speakers did not seem to be as well prepared. Sometimes even confusing attendees. Full impact of workshop will be seen when actually putting SOW/budget together.
- Good hotel accommodations. Is the Contract Manual going to be revised to include these proposed changes? How soon? It’s discouraging to know that you have elements and processes in written form, but verbally being told by BPA that you are not accepting these (rescheduling, 10% rule, etc.)

EVALUATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM SUMMER 2004 WORKSHOPS

- Suggest COTR's sit down with their contractors for next round so that the specificity of questions asked mean something to those present. In this venue, too many people asking too specific (project) questions that don't necessarily apply to majority.
- It would be nice to have some one-on-one time with our COTR.
- The main speaker especially did an excellent job. BPA staff really appeared to 1) understand project (field) issues, and (2) be seeking solutions to contractor/BPA contract problems.
- I could have learned just as much from reading the presentation. I wasted a lot of valuable time.
- Do workshops with video conferencing or in more locations to reduce travel time.
- Please continue workshops. They put us on the same playing field. The difference between contract types was confusing at best. I would like to have a follow-up after working through the process with my COTR to correct any misconceptions and fine tune.
- Many questions weren't answered.
- The contracting methods were unclear. PISCES well presented, the rest was confusing. Were we supposed to cover how BIOMETRICS would be incorporated? The person who presented the contracting types didn't know what kind of contract would apply to what situation. It is hard to know how sincere BPA is and whether this will be another cumbersome bureaucratic approach to project management. One comment that was made by the main presenter was some of the reasons that there are frequently so many contextual changes by BPA COTR's to projects and SOW once projects have been recommended, is that BPA has inherited so many "dog" projects from the council's recommendations. That comment was enormously offensive to those of us in this room who have had projects that have undergone significant and rigorous scientific reviews, but have still had COTR's who either change the project in scope, or want the contractor to employ scientific approaches of their COTR design rather than the methods approved by ISRP and other biologists. If BPA is really committed to their Process Improvement Initiative, than acknowledging that part of the problems are their COTR's would go a long way to give contractors faith they are sincere.
- Questions from audience were so often relevant only to them and their contracts. Possibly spend less time on questions.
- The initial talk used the right buzzwords to tell me what I wanted to hear. However, as the workshop continued and some of the details were provided, it was apparent that the improvements will only create more work for contracts and BPA has no clue how this will be implemented. Try this - Category A budget only plus SOW. Give us the money and I'll deliver a cost-effective product. Add complications and I need to

EVALUATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM SUMMER 2004 WORKSHOPS

hire more office help and accountants and the fish and resources suffer. I want what is best for the resources and what provides the most cost-effective mitigation for BPA. The new process does nothing more than take more money away from fish and wildlife mitigation. BPA can spend more on computers, software, project managers, and accounts appears to be what they believe provides fish and wildlife mitigation. It is not good and BPA should add considerable money to the fish and wildlife budget in the 2006-2009 rate case to cover all the additional contracting costs.

- Lots of things still underway and a lot of information needed wasn't available yet!!
- The staff members were well prepared on most topics, and the questions were fielded well on most topics.
- Good job on details and delivery. This process has taken a step up since last years' workshop. Your personnel were well prepared and obviously well versed in the details of the proposed system. Good job! I personally will need a little more time to get up to speed. Basically, more sessions later would help. Keep up the good work!
- The workshop was informative. Organization needs has yet to be determined. Comment you will receive in the future is project start-up payments need to be addressed; our organization does not have funds that can be utilized for BPA contract purchases legally. Therefore, start-up costs/advances need to be addressed.
- We won't know if the information was clear until it's applied.
- We don't know yet if our needs have been met.
- Not all of the information was clear. Some stuff is still being planned. Not all questions were answered – staff did not know. We'll need all the help we can get. This requires a lot of detail work. Information required for sub-contractors is creating more work before selecting. More information on financial requirements is needed. Assure all COTR's are consistent in applying this new system.
- Very uncomfortable chairs. Online tutorial is going to be a must for future. Thank you.
- Teleconference! It took 6 hours of drive time to be here today.
- Looks like you are on the right track. Keep it simple. Make sure it takes the place of other actions and creates net decrease in effort. Be careful not to replace tasks with work elements and end up with more complexity rather than less.

EVALUATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM SUMMER 2004 WORKSHOPS

- The workshop was kind of big. Might want to break out more. Everything I do will be lumped, i.e.; data collection. How will you actually know what I'm doing?
- Excellent presentations by everyone. Helpful and informative discussion and opportunity to interact with BPA staff.
- Should be provided by COTR.
- It might have been better to have workshop after the software was ready. Or, hold another workshop in a few months.
- Too many questions. The topics were fairly well presented. I would rather have local meetings with COTR. Need to get COTR's into the field, quarterly, semi-annual, at least.
- If 1) BPA gets involved on the front-end of project selection process (not nit-pick later throughout implementation period) in a collaborative manner with NPCC and CBFWA and, 2) we go to an automated PISCES system with contractors doing the input for proposals, sow, budget, work schedule and reports online, then BPA should show the improved process and cost-efficiencies by reducing their program admin costs and making this available to on-the-ground projects.
- The [main presenter] was clear, but the others were confusing. My needs were not completely met. I enjoy visual effects. More examples on PowerPoint maybe. Slow down when referring to document numbers. We need to find the document before you start going down the lists. Follow the handouts better, meaning in order. It's hard to flip back and forth.
- Presenters were professional and tried to help. You'll need to work with us on a case-by-case situation. This does not appear to satisfy a scientific approach to goals, objectives and tasks – laying out a road map of achieving a goal. It would help to have a standard worksheet for all to work off of. Visiting us will be good.
- Nice work. Need tables.
- The main speaker was impressive; presented info very well. [One presenter] was not able to answer questions fielded.
- It's apparent that BPA is trying to address contractor concerns of the complex process of BPA contracts and compliance issues. The process is still massive in time, scope, and detail required to participate.
- The direction that BPA is heading with project selection makes me very nervous. Especially when BPA's only interest is covering their "ESA butt". The intent of the Power Act is to enhance, protect and mitigate all fish and wildlife. BPA is a funding agency not a resource recovery manager. BPA needs to reassess their role in NW salmon/wildlife recovery effort.

EVALUATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM SUMMER 2004 WORKSHOPS

- Most of the information was clear, and the staff members were mainly prepared.
- Might have needed more time to follow examples. Remember the Power Act and Bi-op, not just the Bi-op.
- Need a mechanism that allows potential disagreements between COTR's and F&W contractors concerning objectives and tasks in sow to be resolved. Currently BPA's COTR's have too much discretion in these matters. Appreciate the Process Improvement's interest in having COTR's become more motivated with Project deliverables, currently too much focus on project budget.
- Some elements were not well defined or finalized. Lots of problems defining what projects are suitable for what contract types. Sometimes the questions were fielded well, and the topics were mostly covered adequately.
- The detail of the changed approach was presented okay. However, the intent, background, and how all of this fits into a collaborative regional approach among CBFWA, NPCC, NOAA, etc. was not provided. There are many basic questions remaining, such as how do the non-ESA metrics get cranked in as part of BPA's mission to implement the NPCC Fish and Wildlife Program?
- The information at this workshop was clear if you're an accountant, but not for ordinary people or biologists. Need field bios input on biometrics. !!No ifs/ands/or buts!! Don't pull BPA's "everyone's input is great". Never take input to the next level.
- Staff members were well prepared, but couldn't answer all the questions. It's hard to tell if the workshop was comprehensive enough until we start doing business this way. I'd like BPA to settle into one process that WORKS. We got consistent answers to our questions at the workshop (mostly). We'll see if it actually follows through when we begin to implement new protocols. There is a high level of distrust in this process and in BPA in general. Once again, BPA has began a process that has elements that are of great concern to us, because it looks like BPA may be playing games with the F&W program. Again, BPA chose individuals to present info that makes us as least try to understand and work with BPA. Let's hope we're not disappointed again!
- As a project manager, I will need to understand this new formatting. The topics were adequately covered in the morning. The afternoon was not nearly as well polished. The [main presenter] was well prepared and very knowledgeable. He was also forthright with the new system's limitations. There were so many unique projects that answers most often were not applicable for everyone. The workshop was too long. Provide background – finish with hands on examples. I think there should have been more COTR's in attendance. I think it would have been beneficial for the group to "walk-through" an example of PISCES on a computer screen. There often

EVALUATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM SUMMER 2004 WORKSHOPS

seems to be a disconnect in communication within all large agencies, including BPA (and [others]). I would suggest that other departments within BPA be familiar with the information that was presented to us today. I can assure there are employees within BPA that do not.

- The workshop was not really helpful, but I picked up some useful knowledge I could have gotten by reading on the web. The first presenter was clear, the second was not. The 3rd presenter was mixed. The first presenter was quick on his feet and did a good job. There was more detail given than needed. The bottom line is BPA needs to weigh in on the front end with CBFWA and ISRP and NPCC so they don't change the rules at the end. I probably won't attend future workshops. I'll read what I need in 30 minutes and save money. I'm happy to interact by e-mail/web/phone. I'm encouraged that BPA is making an effort to improve the system. I agree that outcomes are the best measure of progress and that projects need to be accountable. What bothers me is the number of steps project proponents must go through to get the work done. It also bothers me to think about the cost of having 75+ people travel to attend a workshop during field season. "Nero fiddles while Rome burns." Get your priority straight.