FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (Sum of all Reclamation SPOs).

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported	
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements in FY 2011	***2853***		
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***1049***		Note: 285 of these Service Agreements were less than $10,000.
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***$42,987,623***		
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***992***		
	Calculation		94.6%	
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***992***		
	Calculation		94.6%	
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***$38,938,976***		
	Calculation		90.6%	
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***$39,531,629***		
	Calculation		92.0%	
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports	***406***		Note: Completion reports are not required for Service Agreements less than $10,000.
	Calculation		53.1%	Therefore % calculation = 406/(1049-285)
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$152,892,060***		Represents the value of work performed on Service Agreements (completed or non-completed) in FY 2011. (Note: Not all of this work is programmed to be accomplished in FY 2011.)

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

MP Region

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (MP Region)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported
II.A	Total Number of Active Service Agreements in FY 2011	***76***	
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***44***	
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***$2,979,260***	
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date **Calculation**	***42***	95.5%
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget **Calculation**	***41***	93.2%
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date **Calculation**	***$2,485,812***	83.4%
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget **Calculation**	***$2,375,812***	79.7%
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports **Calculation**	***9***	20.5%
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$5,043,310***	

*Of this total, MIAD ($780k) & Folsom SOD ($660k) work performed was without signed SAs.

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

MP Region

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization - NOTE: The sum of these 3 columns will equal 100%.

SOPs II.C.1 II.C.2 II.C.3	**Name**	**Category**	**Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %**	**Objective measure of time working on program accounts (WRR and P&A) in %**	**Objective measure of time worked on overhead (K-accounts) in %**
	MP Region		***58***	***33***	***9***
		By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
	MP-200		***78***	***9***	***13***
	MP-157		***20***	***77.5***	***2.5***

MP-Region: FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery - Division of Design & Construction (MP-200)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported
II.A	Total Number of Active Service Agreements in FY 2011	***66***	
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***34***	
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***$2,295,085***	
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***32***	
	Calculation		94.1%
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***31***	
	Calculation		91.2%
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***$1,801,637***	
	Calculation		78.5%
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***$1,691,637***	
	Calculation		73.7%
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports	***9***	
	Calculation		26.5%
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$4,359,135***	

*Of this total, MIAD ($780k) & Folsom SOD ($660k) work performed was without signed SAs.

MP-Region: FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization - NOTE: The sum of these 3 columns will equal 100%.

SOPs II.C.1 II.C.2 II.C.3 Name	Category	Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %	Objective measure of time working on program accounts (WRR and P&A) in %	Objective measure of time worked on overhead (K-accounts) in %
MP-200	By your Service Provider Organization (SPO)	***78***	***9***	***13***
	By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Design		***90***	***5***	***5***
Geology	25% of work performed without a signed SA.	***60***	***10***	***5***
Surveys		***70***	***20***	***10***
SOD		***84***	***20***	***11***
Management		***10***	***5***	***85***
	By positions/individuals within your SPO? (Insert positions/names (optional) and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Regional Engineer		***10***	***5***	***85***
Senior Project Manager		***40***	***40***	***20***
Senior Project Manager (Environmental)		***100***	***0***	***0***
Chief Geologist		***60***	***10***	***20***
Senior Level Geologist		***70***	***20***	***5***
Senior Level Geologist		***10***	***20***	***5***
Senior Level Geologist		***80***	***15***	***5***
Senior Level Geologist		***85***	***10***	***5***
Journeyman Level Geologist		***90***	***5***	***5***
Journeyman Level Geologist		***85***	***10***	***5***
Journeyman Level Geologist		***80***	***15***	***5***
Journeyman Level Geologist		***70***	***10***	***5***
Journeyman Level Geologist		***90***	***5***	***5***
Chief, Surveys and Mapping		***60***	***15***	***25***
Regional Surveyor		***70***	***20***	***10***
Senior Cartographic Technician		***80***	***15***	***5***
Junior Cartographic Technician		***80***	***15***	***5***

Engineering Branch Chief, GS-13	*70*	*5*	*25*
Civil Engineer PL, GS-12	*90*	*5*	*5*
Civil Engineer PL, GS-12	*65*	*5*	*30*
Electrical Engineer PL, GS-12	*90*	*5*	*5*
Mechanical Engineer PL, GS-12	*90*	*5*	*5*
Electrical Engineer PM, GS-12	*84*	*1*	*15*
Civil Engineer, GS-11	*90*	*5*	*5*
Civil Engineer, GS-11	*90*	*5*	*5*
Civil Engineer, GS-11	*90*	*5*	*5*
Civil Engineer, GS-11	*90*	*5*	*5*
Civil Engineer, GS-11	*90*	*5*	*5*
Mechanical Engineer, GS-11	*90*	*5*	*5*
Mechanical Engineer, GS-9	*90*	*5*	*5*
Civil Engineer, GS-7	*90*	*5*	*5*
Secretary, GS-5	*5*	*5*	*90*
Safety of Dams Chief	*75*	*5*	*20*
Senior Safety of Dams Project Manager	*93*	*5*	*2*

MP-Region: FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Customer Satisfaction with the overall project

SOP II.B

Service Provider Organization (SPO) Code List (used for sorting/reporting by SPO)

Technical Service Center =	TSC
PN Regional Office =	PN
GP Regional Office =	GP
MP Regional Office =	MP
LC Regional Office =	LC
UC Regional Office =	UC
Provo Area Office =	PAO
Four Corners Construction Office =	FCCO
Mid-Pacific Construction Office =	MPCO
Drill Crew =	DC
Outsourced Contractor =	OC

Note: Key success factors and challenges should accompany all ratings.

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
1	***MP-230***	***Battle Creek Excavation***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Ongoing team interaction and cooperation.***	***Unforeseen events, such as rock fall, which created a need for immediate responsiveness.***
		Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
		Activity Understanding	***5***			
		Timeliness	***5***			
		Technical Knowledge	***5***			
		Problem Solving	***5***			
		Responsiveness	***5***			
		Calculation	30	5.0		

MP-Region: FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
2	***MP-230***	***BF Sisk Spillway Geology Report***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***The total job, this work and work that was performed prior to 1/1/2011, was actually completed $11,127 under budget. Nice work!***	
		Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
		Activity Understanding	***5***			
		Timeliness	***5***			
		Technical Knowledge	***5***			
		Problem Solving	***5***			
		Responsiveness	***5***			
		Calculation	30	5.0		
	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
3	***MP-230***	***Folsom South Canal - Semiannual Monitoring Pro***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Chip was able to answer all my questions before issuing the service agreement, so I was well aware of what was being done and what to expect as a deliverable.***	
		Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
		Activity Understanding	***5***			
		Timeliness	***5***			
		Technical Knowledge	***5***			
		Problem Solving	***5***			
		Responsiveness	***5***			
		Calculation	30	5.0		

MP-Region: FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
4	***MP-230***	***San Felipe Division - San Justo Dam Groundwater Monitoring***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Service, understanding of the activity, technical ability to address unforseen problems and responsiveness of staff.***	***None.***
		Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
		Activity Understanding	***5***			
		Timeliness	***4***			
		Technical Knowledge	***5***			
		Problem Solving	***5***			
		Responsiveness	***5***			
		Calculation	29	4.8		
	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
5	***MP-230***	***Solano - Annual Report & Monitoring***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***MP-200 staff have been great to work with in accomplishing this task. They have been very responsive to any questions or concerns expressed by CCAO and were even very helpful in***	***Field conditions can potentially be challenging for this task. MP-200 staff have demonstrated they are well equipped and prepared to handle the range of field conditions that may be experienced. In addition to***
		Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
		Activity Understanding	***5***			
		Timeliness	***5***			
		Technical Knowledge	***5***			
		Problem Solving	***5***			
		Responsiveness	***5***			

					accommodating CCAO staff on a day trip around the project area to visit many well locations and get a feel for the project region.	***field conditions, local land owners could potentially be hard to deal with but MP-200 staff have demonstrated their ability to maintain positive personal relationships with locals and land owners.***
		Calculation	30	5.0		
	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
6	***MP-230***	***Solano GW Information & Reporting***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
		Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
		Activity Understanding	***5***			
		Timeliness	***5***			
		Technical Knowledge	***5***			
		Problem Solving	***5***			
		Responsiveness	***5***			
		Calculation	30	5.0		

MP-Region: FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
7	***MP-210***	***Folsom Fixed Wheel Gate Rehabilitation (ARRA)***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Ability to work as a team through the challenges.***	***T4C of contract & then contractor using Congress to bully Reclamation.***
		Cost Effectiveness	***4***			
		Activity Understanding	***4***			
		Timeliness	***4***			
		Technical Knowledge	***4***			
		Problem Solving	***4***			
		Responsiveness	***4***			
		Calculation	24	4.0		
	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
8	***MP-220***	***Stampede SOD Modification - Surveys & Mapping Support***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Responsiveness of staff is key to the success of this service provider. Clear lines of communication - email, phone, meetings.***	
		Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
		Activity Understanding	***5***			
		Timeliness	***5***			
		Technical Knowledge	***5***			
		Problem Solving	***5***			
		Responsiveness	***5***			
		Calculation	30	5.0		

MP-Region: FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
9	***MP-230***	***Klamath River Sediment Sampling***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Prior knowledge of staff about project, and ability to respond in a timely manner.***	***Project location is privately-owned vs. government-owned. Project results considered highly influential under OMB guidelines. Impacts to peer review rigor required additional communication.***
		Cost Effectiveness	***4***			
		Activity Understanding	***4***			
		Timeliness	***4***			
		Technical Knowledge	***4***			
		Problem Solving	***4***			
		Responsiveness	***4***			
		Calculation	24	4.0		

	Cost Effectiveness	Activity Understanding	Timeliness	Technical Knowledge	Problem Solving	Responsiveness
1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
4	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
7	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
9	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
TOTAL	**4.8**	**4.8**	**4.7**	**4.8**	**4.8**	**4.8**

MP-Region: FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

MP-157 ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING BRANCH

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (MP-157)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	*Data Reported*	Results Reported
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements in FY 2011	***10***	
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***10***	
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***$684,175***	
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***10***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***10***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***$684,175***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***$684,175***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports	***0***	
	Calculation		0.0%
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$684,175***	

MP-Region: FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization

SOPs
II.C.1
II.C.2
II.C.3

Name	**MP-157 Environmental Monitoring Branch**	**Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %**	**Objective measure of time working on program accounts (WRR and P&A) in %**	**Objective measure of time worked on overhead (K-accounts) in %**
	MP-157	***20***	***77.5***	***2.5***
	By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Monitoring	Environmental Monitoring	***10***	***90***	***0***
QA	Quality Assurance	***5***	***95***	***0***
Data Mgt	Data Management	***4***	***94***	***2***
Hazmat	Hazardous Materials	***1***	***87***	***12***
	By positions/individuals within your SPO? (Insert positions and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
GS-13	Supervisory Physical Scientist (Branch Chief)	***0***	***96***	***4***
GS-12	Supervisory Physical Scientist (Quality Assurance Team)	***20***	***80***	***0***
GS-11	Physical Scientist (Quality Assurance Team)	***80***	***20***	***0***
GS-9	Physical Scientist (Quality Assurance Team)	***40***	***60***	***0***
GS-12	Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist (Hazmat Team)	***20***	***80***	***0***
GS-12	Natural Resource Specialist (Hazmat Team)	***0***	***60***	***40***
GS-12	Physical Scientist (Hazmat Team)	***20***	***80***	***0***
GS-7	Natural Resource Specialist (Hazmat Team)	***4***	***96***	***0***
GS-12	Supervisory Physical Scientist (Monitoring Team)	***10***	***90***	***0***
GS-9	Physical Scientist (Monitoring Team)	***4***	***96***	***0***
GS-11	Physical Scientist (Monitoring Team)	***10***	***90***	***0***
GS-11	Physical Scientist (Monitoring Team)	***90***	***10***	***0***
GS-11	Physical Scientist Tech (Monitoring Team)	***10***	***90***	***0***
GS-11	Supervisory IT Specialist (Data Management Team)	***4***	***96***	***0***
GS-7	Computer Assistant (Data Management Team)	***10***	***90***	***0***

GS-7	Computer Assistant (Data Management Team)	***10***	***90***	***0***
GS-7	Computer Assistant (Data Management Team)	***0***	***90***	***10***
GS-6	Computer Assistant (Data Management Team)	***10***	***90***	***0***

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (PN-RTS)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported
II.A	Total Number of Active Service Agreements in FY 2011	***151***	
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***34***	
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***$2,529,372***	
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date **Calculation**	***12***	35.3%
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget **Calculation**	***15***	44.1%
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date **Calculation**	***$829,183***	32.8%
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget **Calculation**	***$1,170,589***	46.3%
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports **Calculation**	***20***	58.8%
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$7,130,432***	

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization - NOTE: The sum of these 3 columns will equal 100%.

SOPs II.C.1 II.C.2 II.C.3 Name	Category	Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %	Objective measure of time working on program accounts (WRR and P&A) in %	Objective measure of time worked on overhead (K-accounts) in %
PN RTS	By your Service Provider Organization (SPO)	***17%***	***53%***	***30%***
	By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Construction Engineering, PN-3500		**90%**	**7%**	**3%**
Geology & River Systems Analysis, PN-3600		**63%**	**32%**	**5%**
River and Reservoir Operations, PN-6200		**15%**	**75%**	**10%**
Land Resources, PN-3900		**11%**	**8%**	**82%**
Repayment & Acreage Limitation, PN-3300		**0%**	**87%**	**13%**
Ecosystems Analysis, PN-6500		**3%**	**92%**	**5%**
Liaision & Coordination, PN-3800		**6%**	**81%**	**13%**
Facility O&M, PN-3200		**1%**	**93%**	**6%**
Power O&M, PN-6100		**0%**	**40%**	**60%**
Contracts, PN-3700		**9%**	**77%**	**14%**
Water Rights & Acquisition, PN-3100		**0%**	**72%**	**28%**
Design, PN-3400		**39%**	**52%**	**9%**
Property and Office Services, PN-6600		**0%**	**8%**	**92%**
Safety, PN-3040		**0%**	**20%**	**80%**
Note: Sum of columns above may not equal 100% due to rounding of values in formulas.				
	By positions/individuals within your SPO? (Insert positions/names (optional) and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Facility O&M, PN-3200				
O&M Group Manager, GS-13		**0%**	**81%**	**19%**
SOD Program Manager, GS-13		**0%**	**100%**	**0%**
Civil Engineer, GS-12		**0%**	**98%**	**2%**
Civil Engineer, GS-12		**0%**	**99%**	**1%**
Civil Engineer, GS-12		**0%**	**96%**	**4%**

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

Civil Engineer, GS-12	0%	94%	6%
Civil Engineer, GS-11	0%	99%	1%
Mechanical Engineer, GS-11	0%	96%	4%
Emergency Manager, GS-11	8%	92%	0%
Editorial Assistant, GS-7	2%	79%	19%
Repayment & Acreage Limitation, PN-3300			
Program Manager, GS-13	0%	92%	8%
Repayment Contracts Assistant, GS-5	0%	28%	72%
Economist, GS-12	0%	97%	3%
Economist, GS-12	0%	91%	9%
Economist, GS-12	0%	98%	2%
Regional Acreage Limitation Coordinator, GS-12	0%	99%	1%
Compliance Specialist, GS-12	0%	93%	7%
Compliance Specialist, GS-12	0%	99%	1%
Land Resources, PN-3900			
Program Manager, GS-13	0%	37%	63%
GIS Program Manager, GS-13	0%	23%	77%
GIS Specialist, GS -13	0%	2%	98%
GIS Specialist, GS -12	29%	1%	70%
GIS Specialist, GS -12	76%	8%	16%
*Cartographic Technician, GS-7 ** *	25%	6%	69%
Archeologist GS 12	0%	0%	100%
Realty Specilist GS 13	0%	4%	96%
Realty Specilist GS 12	0%	3%	97%
Realty Specialist GS 12	0%	4%	96%
Outdoor Recreation GS 12	0%	4%	96%
Outdoor Recreation GS 11	0%	0%	100%
Water Rights & Acquisition, PN-3100			
Program Manager, GS-13	0%	72%	28%

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

Paralegal Specialist, GS-12	0%	45%	55%
Water Rights Analyst, GS-13	0%	98%	2%
Ecosystems Analysis, PN-6500			
Program Manager, GS-13	0%	54%	46%
Fish Biologist , GS-13	0%	100%	0%
Biologist, GS-12	0%	97%	3%
Fish Biologist, GS-12/13	44%	55%	1%
Fish Biologist, GS-12	0%	95%	5%
Environmental Specialist - NEPA, GS-12	0%	99%	1%
Natural Resource Specialist, GS-11/12	0%	93%	7%
Secretary, GS-06	0%	99%	1%
Chemist, GS-12	0%	95%	5%
Chemist, GS-11	0%	98%	2%
Chemist, GS-7/9/11	0%	98%	2%
Physical Science Tech, GS-04	0%	98%	2%
Physical Science Tech, GS-04	0%	100%	0%
Physical Science Tech, GS-04	0%	97%	3%
Physical Science Tech, GS-04	0%	97%	3%
Physical Science Tech, GS-03	0%	100%	0%
Construction Engineering, PN-3500			
Program Manager/Supervisory Civil Engineer, GS-14	90%	7%	3%
Supervisory Field Engineer (Civil), GS-13	90%	7%	3%
Supervisory Field Engineer (Electrical), GS-13	90%	7%	3%
Supervisory Civil Engineer, GS-13	90%	7%	3%
Civil Engineer, GS-12	90%	7%	3%
Supervisory Civil Engineering Technician/Supervisory Contract Administrator, GS	90%	7%	3%
Supervisory Civil Engineering Technician/Supervisory Contract Administrator, GS	90%	7%	3%
Supervisory Construction Control Representative (Electrical), GS-12	90%	7%	3%
Safety & Occupational Health Specialist/Safety Officer, GS-12	90%	7%	3%

Civil Engineering Technician/Contract Administrator, GS-11	90%	7%	3%
Civil Engineering Technician/Contract Administrator, GS-11	90%	7%	3%
Construction Inspector/Construction Control Representative, GS-11	90%	7%	3%
Construction Inspector/Construction Control Representative, GS-11	90%	7%	3%
Construction Inspector/Construction Control Representative, GS-11	90%	7%	3%
Construction Inspector/Construction Control Representative, GS-11	90%	7%	3%
Construction Inspector/Construction Control Representative, GS-11	90%	7%	3%
Construction Inspector/Construction Control Representative, GS-11	90%	7%	3%
Construction Inspector/Construction Control Representative, GS-11	90%	7%	3%
Construction Inspector/Construction Control Representative (Civil), GS-10	90%	7%	3%
Engineering Technician/Contract Administrator, GS-8	90%	7%	3%
Civil Engineer, GS-7	90%	7%	3%
Civil Engineer, GS-7	90%	7%	3%
Engineering Technician/Contract Administrator, GS-7	90%	7%	3%
Engineering Technician/Contract Administrator, GS-7	90%	7%	3%
Administrative Support Assistant, GS-6	90%	7%	3%
River and Reservoir Operations, PN-6200			
Program Manager, GS-0810-14	0%	80%	20%
Supervisory Civil Engineer GS-0810-13	0%	95%	5%
Supervisory Civil Engineer (Hydro) GS-0810-13	0%	98%	2%
Information Tech Specialist GS-2210-12	0%	99%	1%
Geologist GS-1315-12	20%	76%	4%
Civil Engineer (Hydro) GS-0810-12	50%	48%	2%
Civil Engineer (Hydro) GS-0810-12	0%	98%	2%
Information Tech Specialist GS-2210-12	0%	97%	3%
Hydrologist GS-1315-12	7%	90%	3%
Hydrologist GS-1315-12	0%	98%	2%
Civil Engineer (Hydro) GS-0810-12	70%	18%	12%
Civil Engineer (Hydro) GS-0810-12	41%	52%	7%

Civil Engineer (Hydro) GS-0810-11	60%	13%	27%
Electronics Technician GS-0856-11	0%	99%	1%
Student Trainee (CE) GS-0899-07	0%	99%	1%
Secretary (Ofc Automation) GS-0318-05	0%	20%	80%
Hydrologic Technician GS-1316-04	0%	99%	1%
Design, PN-3400			
Program Manager, GS-13	25%	47%	28%
Supv. Civil Engineer, GS-13	33%	46%	21%
Supv. Civil Engineer, GS-13	7%	77%	16%
Civil Engineer, GS-12	7%	79%	14%
Civil Engineer, GS-12	31%	65%	4%
Civil Engineer, GS-12	60%	34%	6%
Civil Engineer, GS-12	81%	18%	1%
Civil Engineer, GS-12	38%	53%	9%
Civil Engineer, GS-12	22%	76%	2%
Civil Engineer, GS-12	8%	92%	0%
Civil Engineer, GS-12	60%	39%	1%
Civil Engineer, GS-11	58%	40%	2%
Civil Engineer, GS-7	72%	15%	13%
Civil Engineer, GS-07	51%	46%	3%
General Engineer, GS-12	31%	67%	2%
Mechanical Engineer, GS-12	20%	75%	5%
Engineering Technician, GS-11 Weddle	24%	70%	6%
Engineering Technician, GS-9 Hope	79%	17%	4%
Engineering Technician, GS-9 Ward	48%	49%	3%
Engineering Technician, GS-7 Korthals	36%	45%	19%
Engineering Technician (student), GS-7 Boekweg	52%	48%	0%
Engineering Technician, GS-6 Hatch	44%	52%	4%
Engineering Technician (student), GS-5 Thomas	55%	45%	0%

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

Technical Writer (engineering) GS-9	21%	49%	30%
IT Specialist GS-11	53%	9%	38%
Office Automation Clerk GS-4	4%	96%	0%
Liasion & Coordination, PN-3800			
Program Manager, GS-13	0%	92%	8%
Resource Mgmt Coordinator & Activity Manager, GS-13	0%	100%	0%
Activity Manager, GS-12	0%	90%	10%
Activity Manager, GS-12	0%	97%	3%
Activity Manager, GS-12	57%	43%	0.1%
Activity Manager, GS-12	15%	85%	0.4%
Activity Manager, GS-12	0%	99%	1%
Water Conservation Program Specialist, GS-12	1%	96%	3%
Supervisory Technical Writer, GS-13	0%	54%	46%
Technical Publisher Writer/Editor, GS-12	0%	99%	1%
Technical Publisher Writer/Editor, GS-11	0%	92%	8%
Technical Publisher Writer/Editor, GS-11	0%	17%	83%
Technical Publisher Writer/Editor, GS-11	10%	80%	10%
Technical Publisher Writer/Editor, GS-11	2%	92%	6%
Geology & River Systems Analysis, PN-3600			
Program Manager, GS-13	9%	40%	51%
Activity Coordinator, GS-12	18%	81%	1%
Geologist, GS-12	78%	20%	0%
Geologist, GS-12	71%	28%	2%
Cartographic Technician, GS-8	Employee deployed for FY 2011, position maintained		
Geomorphologist, GS-13	53%	44%	3%
Geologist, GS-12	67%	33%	0%
Geologist, GS-12	68%	31%	1%
Geologist, GS -12	73%	24%	3%
Geologist, GS -12	79%	18%	3%

Hydraulic Engineer, GS-13	57%	40%	3%
Hydraulic Engineer, GS-12	78%	20%	2%
Hydraulic Engineer, GS-12	73%	27%	1%
Hydraulic Engineer, GS-12	56%	39%	5%
Drill Crew	97%	0%	3%
Power O & M, PN-6100			
O&M Group Manager, GS-14	0%	*10%*	*90%*
Supervisory General Engineer GS-13	0%	*46%*	*54%*
Electrical Engineer GS-12	0%	*65%*	*35%*
NERC/WECC Program Manager GS-13	0%	*0%*	*100%*
Electrical Engineer GS-11	0%	*48%*	*52%*
Civil Engineer GS-12	0%	*83%*	*17%*
Environmental Protection Specialist GS-12	0%	*0%*	*100%*
Mechanical Engineer, GS-7	0%	*74%*	*26%*
Electrical Engineer GS-12	0%	*43%*	*57%*
Electrical Engineer GS-12	0%	*67%*	*33%*
Editorial Assistant, GS-7	0%	*6%*	*94%*
Contracts, PN-3700			
Contracts Program Manager GS-14	7%	85%	8%
Supervisory Contract Specialist GS-13	59%	31%	10%
Contract Specialist GS-12	9%	90%	1%
Contract Specialist GS-12	2%	96%	2%
Contract Specialist GS-12	25%	72%	3%
Contract Specialist GS-12	0.4%	81%	19%
Contract Specialist GS-12	3%	95%	2%
Contracts Specialist GS-11	0%	97%	3%
Contracts Specialist GS-9	5%	63%	32%
Financial Assistant Officer GS-12	0%	88%	12%
Procurement Analyst GS-11	1%	63%	36%

Purchasing Agent GS-07	5%	78%	17%
Purchasing Agent GS-07	3%	75%	22%
Procurement Technician GS-07	18%	82%	0%
Interagency Acquisition Technician GS-07	1%	56%	43%
Property and Office Services, PN-6600			
Program Manager, GS-13	0%	36%	64%
Supervisory Supply Management, GS-12	3%	12%	85%
Program Support Assistant, GS-7	0%	10%	90%
File Clerk, GS-5	0%	0%	100%
Space Management Specialist, GS-12	0%	0%	100%
Supply Management Specialist, GS-11	0%	4%	96%
Facility Operations, GS-9	0%	2%	98%
Transportation Assistant, GS-7	0%	3%	97%
Illustrator, GS-11	0%	33%	67%
Illustrator, GS-11	0%	15%	85%
Illustrator, GS-09	0%	5%	95%
Records Management Specialist, GS-11	0%	0%	100%
FOIA/PA Specialist, GS-9	0%	0%	100%
Mail Assistant, GS-6	0%	1%	99%
Office Automation Clerk, GS-4	0%	0%	100%
Safety, PN-3040			
Safety and Occupational Health Manager GS-13	0%	20%	80%
Safety and Occupational Health Specialist, GS-9	0%	20%	80%

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Customer Satisfaction with the overall project

SOP II.B

Service Provider Organization (SPO) Code List (used for sorting/reporting by SPO)

Technical Service Center =	TSC
PN Regional Office =	PN
GP Regional Office =	GP
MP Regional Office =	MP
LC Regional Office =	LC
UC Regional Office =	UC
Provo Area Office =	PAO
Four Corners Construction Office =	FCCO
Mid-Pacific Construction Office =	MPCO
Drill Crew =	DC
Outsourced Contractor =	OC

Note: Key success factors and challenges should accompany all ratings.

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
RRTS	***Averaged Rating for all the activities with completion reports (21 activities)***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Good communication at the start of the activity lead to apropriate data collection in the field.***	***Delayed identification of a project sponsor slowed the activity that was on a complex schedule. This frustrated the landowner who eventually decided to not allow the project to occur within his property.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***4.25***		***Consultation and review during report writing provided documentation covering all of the client's concerns.***	***Change in Program***

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	Activity Understanding	***4.78***		***Team offered quick turnaround and effective communcation.***	***Manager (client) changed the scope of the activity causing some delay in completing the final products.***
	Timeliness	***4.5***		***Sharing information regarding limited budget and sideboards at the beginning of the activity helped focus the design process thus reducing the scope of the activity.***	***Program Office was delayed in providing a cost authority for the work.***
	Technical Knowledge	***4.63***		***Early notification of potential delays and reasons for schedule slip resulting in no impact to overall program.***	***Senior engineer was not able to start the activity due to other commitments. Activity was passed to a new engineer providing a good learning experience.***
	Problem Solving	***4.5***		***Engineer on the activity provide a unique solution to a problem that ultimately will reduce maintenance costs and eliminate potential problems associated with furture system replacement.***	***Changes in key staff and cooperators during the activity lead to additional effort in reviews of products.***
	Responsiveness	***4.75***			
	Calculation	27.41	4.6		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

GP Region

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (GP Region)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported
II.A	Total Number of Active Service Agreements in FY 2011	***63***	
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***27***	
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***$1,546,481***	
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***27***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***24***	
	Calculation		88.9%
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***$1,546,481***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***$1,464,581***	
	Calculation		94.7%
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports	***10***	
	Calculation		37.0%
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$3,864,760***	

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

GP Region

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization - NOTE: The sum of these 3 columns will equal 100%.

SOPs II.C.1 II.C.2 II.C.3	**Name**	**Category**	**Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %**	**Objective measure of time working on program accounts (WRR and P&A) in %**	**Objective measure of time worked on overhead (K-accounts) in %**
	GP-2000		***47***	***28.2***	***24.8***
		By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
	GP-2200		***29.5***	***18.5***	***52***
	GP-2300		***13***	***73***	***14***
	GP-2600		***88.3***	***3.4***	***8.3***

GP-2200, Design

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (GP-2200, Design)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported
II.A	Total Number of Active Service Agreements in FY 2011	***29***	
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***18***	
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***$633,046***	
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***18***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***16***	
	Calculation		88.9%
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***$633,046***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***$585,346***	
	Calculation		92.5%
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports	***2***	
	Calculation		11.1%
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$990,346***	

GP-2200, Design

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization - NOTE: The sum of these 3 columns will equal 100%.

SOPs II.C.1 II.C.2 II.C.3 Name	Category	Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %	Objective measure of time working on program accounts (WRR and P&A) in %	Objective measure of time worked on overhead (K-accounts) in %
GP-2200		***29.5***	***18.5***	***52***
	By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Design		***26***	***37***	***37***
Eng. Support		***33***	***0***	***67***
	By positions/individuals within your SPO? (Insert positions/names (optional) and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Supervisory Civil Engineer, GS-13		***8***	***26***	***66***
Vice Landscape Arch., GS-12		***0***	***37***	***63***
Civil Engineer, GS-12		***13***	***45***	***42***
Civil Engineer, GS-12		***22***	***60***	***18***
Civil Engineer, GS-12		***39***	***56***	***5***
Civil Engineer, GS-12		***40***	***25***	***35***
Civil Engineer, GS-13		***50***	***43***	***7***
Civil Engineer, GS-12		***4***	***3***	***93***
Civil Engineer, GS-12		***42***	***6***	***52***
Engineering Techncian (Civil), GS-8		***72***	***0***	***28***
Graphic Technology Specialist, GS-9		***19***	***0***	***81***
Vice Engineering Technician (Civil), GS-9		***0***	***0***	***100***
Supervisory Engineering Technician (Civil), GS-12		***0***	***0***	***100***
Engineering Technician (Civil), GS-7		***52***	***0***	***48***
Graphics and Electronic Information Tech, GS-5		***50***	***0***	***50***
Engineering Technician (Civil), GS-9		***64***	***0***	***36***
Engineering Technician (Civil), GS-7		***0***	***0***	***100***
Vice Regional GIS Data Analyst, GS-12		***20***	***0***	***80***

GP-2200, Design

This section is intended to measure Customer Satisfaction with the overall project

SOP II.B

Service Provider Organization (SPO) Code List (used for sorting/reporting by SPO)

Technical Service Center =	TSC
PN Regional Office =	PN
GP Regional Office =	GP
MP Regional Office =	MP
LC Regional Office =	LC
UC Regional Office =	UC
Provo Area Office =	PAO
Four Corners Construction Office =	FCCO
Mid-Pacific Construction Office =	MPCO
Drill Crew =	DC
Outsourced Contractor =	OC

Note: Key success factors and challenges should accompany all ratings.

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
GP-2200		***1 (poor) to 5***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness	***3***			
	Activity Understanding	***3***			
	Timeliness	***4***			
	Technical Knowledge	***3***			
	Problem Solving	***3***			
	Responsiveness	***4***			
	Calculation	20	3.3		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

GP-2600, Construction

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (GP-2600, Construction)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported
II.A	Total Number of Active Service Agreements in FY 2011	***29***	
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***4***	
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***$344,800***	
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***4***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***3***	
	Calculation		75.0%
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***$344,800***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***$310,600***	
	Calculation		90.1%
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports	***3***	
	Calculation		75.0%
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$2,305,779***	

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization - NOTE: The sum of these 3 columns will equal 100%.

SOPs II.C.1 II.C.2 II.C.3 Name	Category	Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %	Objective measure of time working on program accounts (WRR and P&A) in %	Objective measure of time worked on overhead (K-accounts) in %
GP-2600		***88.3***	***3.4***	***8.3***
	By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Construction (GP-2600)		***88.3***	***3.4***	***8.3***
	By positions/individuals within your SPO? (Insert positions/names (optional) and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
	Construction Services (GP-2600)			
Civil Engineering Tech, GS-12		***95.3***	***0***	***4.7***
Civil Engineer, GS-12		***63.3***	***14.6***	***22.1***
Civil Engineer, GS-12		***79.6***	***0***	***20.4***
Supervisory Civil Engineer (Resident Engineer), GS-13		***88.8***	***0***	***11.2***
Civil Engineering Tech, GS-11		***97.7***	***0***	***2.3***
Supervisory Civil Engineer (Resident Engineer), GS-13		***72.6***	***17.2***	***10.2***
Construction Control Representative, GS-10		***97.1***	***0***	***2.9***
Construction Control Representative, GS-10		***100***	***0***	***0***
Secretary, GS-4		***94.4***	***0***	***5.6***
Vice Construction Control Representative, GS- 12		***96.7***	***0***	***3.3***
Vice Supervisory Civil Engineer (Resident Engineer), GS-13		***86.7***	***0.3***	***13***
Civil Engineering Tech, GS-12		***96***	***0***	***4***
Construction Control Representative, GS-10		***98.3***	***0***	***1.7***
Civil Engineer, GS-12		***78.2***	***11.1***	***10.7***
Supervisory Civil Eng. (Regional Construction Eng.), GS-14		***63.8***	***8.9***	***27.3***
Construction Control Representative, GS- 10		***98.7***	***0***	***1.7***
Civil Engineering Tech, GS-9		***83.5***	***4.8***	***11.7***
Construction Control Representative, GS- 10		***98.8***	***0***	***1.2***
Construction Control Representative, GS- 10		***85.1***	***12***	***2.9***
Occupational Safety & Health Specialist, GS-11		***91.9***	***0***	***8.1***

This section is intended to measure Customer Satisfaction with the overall project

SOP II.B

Service Provider Organization (SPO) Code List (used for sorting/reporting by SPO)

Technical Service Center =	TSC
PN Regional Office =	PN
GP Regional Office =	GP
MP Regional Office =	MP
LC Regional Office =	LC
UC Regional Office =	UC
Provo Area Office =	PAO
Four Corners Construction Office =	FCCO
Mid-Pacific Construction Office =	MPCO
Drill Crew =	DC
Outsourced Contractor =	OC

Note: Key success factors and challenges should accompany all ratings.

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
GP-2600		***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Excellent Inspectors***	
	Cost Effectiveness	***2.67***			
	Activity Understanding	***3.33***			
	Timeliness	***4***			
	Technical Knowledge	***3.67***			
	Problem Solving	***3.33***			
	Responsiveness	***4***			
	Calculation	21	3.5		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

GP-2300, Geology

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (GP-2300, Geology)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported
II.A	Total Number of Active Service Agreements in FY 2011	***5***	
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***5***	
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***$568,635***	
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date **Calculation**	***5***	100.0%
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget **Calculation**	***5***	100.0%
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date **Calculation**	***$568,635***	100.0%
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget **Calculation**	***$568,635***	100.0%
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports **Calculation**	***5***	100.0%
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$568,635***	

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization - NOTE: The sum of these 3 columns will equal 100%.

SOPs II.C.1 II.C.2 II.C.3 Name	Category	Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %	Objective measure of time working on program accounts (WRR and P&A) in %	Objective measure of time worked on overhead (K-accounts) in %
GP-2300		***13***	***73***	***14***
	By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Drill Crew		***33***	***59***	***8***
Geology		***3***	***80***	***17***
	By positions/individuals within your SPO? (Insert positions/names (optional) and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Supervisory Geologist, GS-13		***52***	***6***	***42***
Secretary GS -5		***0***	***0***	***100***
Geologist, GS-12		***4***	***93***	***4***
Geologist, GS-12		***0***	***97***	***3***
Vice Geologist, GS-12		***15***	***85***	***0***
Supervisor Drill Crew, WS-11		***31***	***54***	***14***
Driller, WG-10		***12***	***81***	***7***
Vice Drill Helper, WG-5		***43***	***46***	***11***
Drill Helper, WG-8		***48***	***45***	***7***
Driller, WG-10		***51***	***46***	***3***
Drill Helper, WG-5		***38***	***58***	***4***
Drill Helper, WG-5		***46***	***45***	***9***
Drill Helper, WG-5		***9***	***86***	***5***
Vice Drill Helper, WG-5		***6***	***51***	***43***
Vice Drill Helper, WG-5		**15**	**62**	**24**

This section is intended to measure Customer Satisfaction with the overall project

SOP II.B

Service Provider Organization (SPO) Code List (used for sorting/reporting by SPO)

Technical Service Center =	TSC
PN Regional Office =	PN
GP Regional Office =	GP
MP Regional Office =	MP
LC Regional Office =	LC
UC Regional Office =	UC
Provo Area Office =	PAO
Four Corners Construction Office =	FCCO
Mid-Pacific Construction Office =	MPCO
Drill Crew =	DC
Outsourced Contractor =	OC

Note: Key success factors and challenges should accompany all ratings.

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	*Rating*		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
GP-2300		***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Prior Planning and knowledge of the type of work by GP and Area Office staff. Multiple lines of communication were used to keep work on schedule.***	***Job specific specialized equipment modifications were required. Specialized equipement was needed at times that was not known in advance. Rockfall at Kortes Dam, WY, required additional mob/demob.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***4.4***			
	Activity Understanding	***4.8***			
	Timeliness	***4.8***			
	Technical Knowledge	***4.8***			
	Problem Solving	***4.8***			
	Responsiveness	***4.8***			
	Calculation	28.4	4.7		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (TSC)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported	
II.A	Total Number of Active Service Agreements in FY 2011	***2318***		
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***864***		
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***$27,676,189***		
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***839***		
	Calculation		97.1%	
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***836***		
	Calculation		96.8%	
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***$26,613,677***		
	Calculation		96.2%	
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***$26,713,216***		
	Calculation		96.5%	
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports	***579***		579 is the number of TSC service agreements completed greater than $10,000.
	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Report Survey Responses	***291***		Note: Completion reports are not required for Service Agreements less than $10,000.
	Calculation		50.3%	Therefore % calculation = 291/579
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$98,829,185***		Represents the value of work performed on service agreements (completed and non-completed) in FY 2011.

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization - NOTE: The sum of these columns will equal 100%.

II.C.1
II.C.2
II.C.3

Name	Category	Objective measure of time working under service agreements in %	Objective measure of time working on overhead accounts (K88) in %
TSC	By your Service Provider Organization (SPO)	***88.1%***	***11.9%***
	By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)		
	Client Sppt & Tech Pres	75.4%	24.6%
	Structural Analysis	94.9%	5.1%
	Plant Structures	92.3%	7.7%
	Waterways/Concrete Dams	91.2%	8.8%
	Water Conveyance	92.9%	7.1%
	Est, Specs, & Constr Mgmt	94.4%	5.6%
	Materials Engineering Lab	91.2%	8.8%
	Water Resource Planning	89.7%	10.3%
	Economics/Resource Planning	93.1%	6.9%
	Environmental Applic/Research	82.0%	18.0%
	Water Treatment Engineering	88.8%	11.2%
	Sedimentation & River Hydr	91.9%	8.1%
	Flood Hydrology/Emerg Mgmt	85.6%	14.4%
	Remote Sensing/GIS	97.8%	2.2%
	Fisheries Appilcations	90.1%	9.9%
	Geotechnical Engineering - 1	88.2%	11.8%
	Geotechnical Engineering - 2	87.8%	12.2%
	Geotechnical Engineering - 3	91.2%	8.8%
	Geology & Geotech Sppt	81.8%	18.2%
	Geotech Computer/Tech Sppt	94.6%	5.4%
	Seismotectonics/Geophysics	90.2%	9.8%
	Instrumentation & Inspections	91.2%	8.8%
	Mechanical Equipment	94.0%	6.0%
	Hydraulic Equipment	90.8%	9.2%
	Electrical Design	92.0%	8.0%
	Hydropower Tech Sppt	87.0%	13.0%
	Hydraulic Investig & Lab	88.8%	11.2%

	By positions/individuals within your SPO? (Insert positions and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Org Code	GS	By positions/individuals within your SPO? (Insert positions/names (optional) and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)	Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %	Objective measure of time working on overhead accounts (K88) in %
8668000	SES	DIRECTOR, TECHNICAL SVC CENTER	100%	*0%*
8668000	9	EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT	99%	*1%*
CLIENT SUPPORT AND TECHNICAL PRESENTATION OFFICE				
8668010	9	TECHNICAL EDITOR	96%	*4%*
8668010	12	HISTORIAN	44%	*56%*
8668010	11	TECHNICAL WRITER EDITOR	66%	*34%*
8668010	7	BUDGET ASSISTANT	98%	*2%*
8668010	7	TECHNICAL OPERATIONS ASSISTANT	70%	*30%*
8668010	12	TECHNICAL WRITER EDITOR	94%	*6%*
8668010	8	EDITORIAL ASSISTANT	98%	*2%*
8668010	15	PROGRAM MANAGER	73%	*27%*
8668010	9	TECHNICAL EDITOR	95%	*5%*
8668010	4	CLERK	9%	*91%*
8668010	7	BUDGET TECHNICIAN	67%	*33%*
8668010	11	PROGRAM ANALYST	94%	*6%*
8668010	8	EDITORIAL ASSISTANT	90%	*10%*
8668010	6	BUDGET TECHNICIAN	77%	*23%*
8668010	8	EDITORIAL ASSISTANT	93%	*7%*
8668010	11	PROGRAM ANALYST	61%	*39%*
8668010	14	CLIENT SERVICES MANAGER	10%	*90%*
CIVIL ENGINEERING SERVICES DIVISION				
8668100	15	SUPVY STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	24%	*76%*
8668100	7	SECRETARY (OA)	11%	*89%*
STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS GROUP				
8668110	13	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668110	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668110	9	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668110	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668110	8	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	97%	*3%*
8668110	13	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668110	12	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*

8668110	7	CIVIL ENGINEER (Student)	81%	*19%*
8668110	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	87%	*13%*
8668110	12	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668110	14	SUPVY CIVIL ENGINEER	56%	*45%*
8668110	14	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668110	13	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668110	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668110	13	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668110	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668110	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668110	7	CIVIL ENGINEER (Student)	97%	*3%*
8668110	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668110	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
PLANT STRUCTURES GROUP				
8668120	13	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668120	14	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	57%	*43%*
8668120	6	SECRETARY (OFFICE AUTOMATION)	16%	*84%*
8668120	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668120	11	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668120	13	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668120	12	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668120	13	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668120	12	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668120	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668120	11	ENVIRONMENTAL ENG	96%	*4%*
8668120	13	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER	87%	*13%*
8668120	11	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668120	12	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668120	12	ARCHITECT	97%	*3%*
8668120	12	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668120	14	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668120	13	LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT	99%	*1%*
8668120	11	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	100%	*0%*
8668120	13	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668120	11	CIVEL ENGINEER (STRUCTURAL)	99%	*1%*

8668120	12	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668120	12	ARCHITECT	89%	*11%*
8668120	11	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
WATERWAYS AND CONCRETE DAMS GROUP				
8668130	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668130	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668130	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668130	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	86%	*14%*
8668130	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668130	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668130	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668130	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668130	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668130	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668130	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668130	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668130	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668130	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	87%	*13%*
8668130	9	CIVIL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668130	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668130	11	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	91%	*9%*
8668130	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668130	6	SECRETARY (OA)	14%	*86%*
8668130	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668130	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668110	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668130	13	SUPV CIVIL ENGINEER	48%	*52%*
8668130	9	CIVIL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
WATER CONVEYANCE GROUP				
8668140	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668140	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668140	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668140	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668140	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668140	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*

8668140	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668140	14	SUPERVISORY CIVIL ENGINEER	70%	*30%*
8668140	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668140	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668140	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668140	10	MECHANICAL ENGRG TECHN	100%	*0%*
8668140	9	CIVIL ENGINEER	94%	*6%*
8668140	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	62%	*38%*
8668140	7	CIVIL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668140	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668140	6	SECRETARY (OA)	39%	*61%*
8668140	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668140	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668140	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668140	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668140	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668140	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668140	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668140	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
ESTIMATING, SPECIFICATIONS AND CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT GROUP				
8668170	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668170	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668170	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668170	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668170	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	93%	*7%*
8668170	14	SUPERVISORY CIVIL ENGINEER	27%	*73%*
8668170	7	Student Trainee (CIVIL ENGINEER)	95%	*5%*
8668170	6	SECRETARY (OFFICE AUTOMATION)	97%	*3%*
8668170	14	TECH SPECIALIST	98%	*2%*
8668170	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668170	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668170	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668170	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	91%	*9%*
8668170	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668170	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	94%	*6%*

8668170	10	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	99%	*1%*
8668170	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668170	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668170	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	94%	*6%*
8668170	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668170	10	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	86%	*14%*
8668170	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668170	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668170	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668170	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668170	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668170	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668170	14	CIVIL ENGINEER (Construction Liaison)	78%	*22%*
8668170	9	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668170	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668170	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668172	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
MATERIALS ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH LABORATORY				
8668180	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668180	4	CET	100%	*0%*
8668180	4	CLERK	99%	*1%*
8668180	12	ENG TECH	95%	*5%*
8668180	14	RESEARCH CIVIL ENGINEER	82%	*18%*
8668180	4	CLERK	100%	*0%*
8668180	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668210	12	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	100%	*0%*
8668180	12	GEOLOGIST	98%	*2%*
8668180	11	GEOTECH ENG	100%	*0%*
8668180	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668180	14	SUPERVISORY CIVIL ENGINEER	49%	*51%*
8668180	12	MATERIALS ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668180	6	SECRETARY (OFFICE AUTOMATION)	57%	*43%*
8668180	9	CIVIL ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668180	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	94%	*6%*
8668180	4	ENG TECH (CIVIL)	95%	*5%*

8668180	11	GEOTECH ENG	95%	*5%*
8668180	11	MATERIALS ENGINEERING TECH	100%	*0%*
8668180	6	ENG TECH (MATERIALS)	92%	*8%*
8668180	9	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668180	9	CIVIL ENGINEER	91%	*9%*
8668180	11	MATERIALS ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668180	12	CHEMIST	100%	*0%*
8668180	5	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	87%	*13%*
8668180	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668180	13	MATERIALS ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668180	11	MATERIALS ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668180	13	ELECTRONICS ENGINEER	94%	*6%*
8668180	13	MATERIALS ENGINEER	92%	*8%*
8668180	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	95%	*6%*
8668180	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
WATER AND ENVIRONMENATL RESOURCES DIVISION				
8668200	15	SUPVY GENERAL ENGINEER	53%	*47%*
8668200	7	SECRETARY (OFFICE AUTOMATION)	0%	*100%*
WATER RESOURCES PLANNING AND OPERATIONS SUPPORT GROUP				
8668210	14	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668210	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	94%	*6%*
8668210	7	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER (Student)	98%	*2%*
8668210	11	CIVIL ENGINEER (Hydrology)	95%	*5%*
8668210	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	94%	*6%*
8668210	12	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER	93%	*7%*
8668210	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668210	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668210	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668210	12	HYDROLOGIST	100%	*0%*
8668212	14	ECONOMIST	88%	*12%*
8668210	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668210	14	SUPVY HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	33%	*67%*
8668210	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668210	9	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	94%	*6%*
8668220	5	SECRETARY (OFFICE AUTOMATION)	6%	*94%*

ECONOMICS AND RESOURCE PLANNING TEAM				
8668212	12	SOCIAL SCIENCE ANALYST	99%	*1%*
8668212	13	ECONOMIST	97%	*3%*
8668212	12	ECONOMIST	97%	*3%*
8668212	12	ECONOMIST	100%	*0%*
8668212	13	ECONOMIST	95%	*5%*
8668212	12	ECONOMIST	65%	*35%*
8668212	12	ECONOMIST	99%	*1%*
8668212	14	ECONOMIST	92%	*8%*
8668212	13	ECONOMIST	98%	*2%*
8668212	11	SOCIOLOGIST	75%	*25%*
ENVIRONMENTAL APPLICATIONS AND RESEARCH GROUP				
8668220	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	93%	*7%*
8668220	12	FISH BIOLOGIST	99%	*1%*
8668220	6	SECRETARY (OFFICE AUTOMATION)	1%	*99%*
8668220	14	SUPVY BIOLOGICAL SCIENTIST	51%	*49%*
8668220	13	RESEARCH AQUATIC SCIENTIST	88%	*13%*
8668220	12	BOTANIST	100%	*0%*
8668220	13	RESEARCH CHEMIST	99%	*1%*
8668220	12	RESEARCH AQUATIC SCIENTIST	100%	*0%*
8668220	13	BIOLOGIST	84%	*16%*
8668220	13	RESEARCH AQUATIC BIOLOGIST	100%	*0%*
8668220	13	RESEARCH BOTANIST	100%	*0%*
8668220	11	BOTANIST	100%	*0%*
8668220	11	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	48%	*52%*
8668220	12	AQUATIC SCIENTIST	100%	*0%*
WATER TREATMENT ENGINEERING RESEARCH TEAM				
8668221	10	CHEMICAL ENGINEERING TECH	10%	*90%*
8668221	13	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	99%	*1%*
8668221	9	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668221	11	CHEMICAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668221	11	CHEMICAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668221	14	CHEMICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668221	14	RESEARCH CHEMIST	100%	*0%*
8668221	11	CHEMICAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*

8668221	11	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
SEDIMENTATION AND RIVER HYDRAULICS GROUP				
8668240	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668240	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668240	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668240	12	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	77%	*23%*
8668240	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	92%	*8%*
8668240	11	CIVIL ENGINEER (HYDRAULICS)	92%	*8%*
8668240	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668240	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668240	12	GEOLOGIST	100%	*0%*
8668240	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668240	14	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668240	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668240	11	CIVIL ENGINEER (HYDRAULICS)	100%	*0%*
8668240	13	GEOLOGIST	100%	*0%*
8668240	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668240	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668240	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668240	12	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	86%	*14%*
8668240	14	SUPERVISORY HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	40%	*60%*
8668240	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	90%	*10%*
8668240	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668240	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	94%	*6%*
8668240	12	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	99%	*1%*
FLOOD HYDROLOGY AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP				
8668250	9	STUDENT TRAINEE (ENG)	100%	*0%*
8668250	11	METEOROLOGIST	96%	*4%*
8668250	13	CE (Hydrologic)	87%	*13%*
8668250	11	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	61%	*39%*
8668250	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668250	14	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668250	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668250	14	SUPV HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	52%	*48%*
8668250	5	SECRETARY (OFFICE AUTOMATION)	12%	*88%*

8668250	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668250	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668250	11	CIVIL ENGINEER (HYDRAULICS)	99%	*1%*
8668250	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668250	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668250	13	LEAD TECHNICAL WRITER-EDITOR	57%	*43%*
8668250	11	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668250	11	METEOROLOGIST	99%	*1%*
8668250	12	EMERG MGMT	96%	*4%*
8668250	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668250	14	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	90%	*10%*
8668250	12	WILDLIFE BIOLOGIST	100%	*0%*
8668250	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
REMOTE SENSING AND GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION TEAM				
8668251	12	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	98%	*2%*
8668251	13	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	96%	*4%*
8668251	13	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	98%	*2%*
8668251	12	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	99%	*1%*
8668251	13	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	94%	*6%*
8668251	13	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	100%	*0%*
8668251	12	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	100%	*0%*
FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES GROUP				
8668290	13	WILDLIFE BIOLOGIST	94%	*6%*
8668290	2	CLERK	100%	*0%*
8668290	11	FISH BIOLOGIST	90%	*10%*
8668290	12	NATURAL RESOURCE SPECIALIST	96%	*4%*
8668290	12	FISH BIOLOGIST	89%	*11%*
8668290	13	FISH BIOLOGIST	100%	*0%*
8668290	5	FISH BIOLOGIST	100%	*0%*
8668290	12	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	85%	*15%*
8668290	14	SUPVY BIOLOGIST	43%	*57%*
8668290	7	FISH BIOLOGIST	81%	*19%*
8668290	7	FISH BIOLOGIST	81%	*19%*
8668290	12	RESEARCH FISHERY BIOLOGIST	99%	*1%*
8668290	12	WILDLIFE BIOLOGIST	95%	*5%*

8668290	9	FISH BIOLOGIST	94%	*6%*
8668290	12	FISH BIOLOGIST	74%	*26%*
8668290	13	NATURAL RESOURCE SPECIALIST	91%	*9%*
8668290	11	FISH BIOLOGIST	92%	*8%*
8668290	11	NATURAL RESOURCE SPECIALIST	85%	*15%*
8668290	11	FISH BIOLOGIST	85%	*15%*
8668290	14	SUPVY BIOLOGIST	18%	*82%*
8668290	11	FISH BIOLOGIST	67%	*33%*
8668291	2	Bio Aid (fall temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	4	Bio Aid (fall temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	4	Bio Aid (fall temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	4	Bio Aid (fall temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	2	Bio Aid (summer temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	4	Bio Aid (summer temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	3	Bio Aid (summer temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	2	Bio Aid (summer temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	2	Bio Aid (summer temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	4	Bio Aid (summer temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	4	Bio Aid (summer temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	4	Bio Aid (fall temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	2	Bio Aid (summer temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	3	Bio Aid (summer temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	4	Bio Aid (fall temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	2	Bio Aid (summer temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	4	Bio Aid (summer temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	2	Bio Aid (summer temp)	100%	*0%*
8668291	4	Bio Aid (summer temp)	100%	*0%*
GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES DIVISION				
8668312	15	LEAD ENGINEER	75%	*25%*
8668130	15	LEAD ENGINEER	68%	*32%*
8668300	07	SECRETARY (OFFICE AUTOMATION)	4%	*96%*
8668300	15	SUPERVISORY CIVIL ENGINEER	23%	*77%*
8668313	15	LEAD ENGINEER	72%	*28%*
EMBANKMENT DAMS AND GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING GROUP 1				
8668311	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	91%	*9%*

8668311	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668311	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668311	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	92%	*8%*
8668311	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*2%*
8668311	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668311	14	SUPVY CIVIL ENGINEER	62%	*38%*
8668311	9	CIVIL ENGINEER (GEOTECHNICAL)	83%	*17%*
8668311	7	(Student Trainee) CIVIL ENGINEER	92%	*8%*
8668311	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668311	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	86%	*14%*
8668311	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	77%	*23%*
8668311	6	SECRETARY (OFFICE AUTOMATION)	22%	*78%*
8668311	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668311	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	87%	*13%*
8668311	11	CIVIL ENGINEER (GEOTECHNICAL)	100%	*0%*
8668311	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	90%	*10%*
8668313	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	91%	*9%*
8668311	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	94%	*6%*
8668311	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668311	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
EMBANKMENT DAMS AND GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING GROUP 2				
8668312	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	87%	*13%*
8668312	9	CIVIL ENGINEER (GEOTECH)	74%	*26%*
8668312	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668312	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668312	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	92%	*8%*
8668312	11	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668312	12	PHYSICAL SCIENTIST	71%	*29%*
8668312	6	SECRETARY (OFFICE AUTOMATION)	5%	*95%*
8668312	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668312	4	ENG TECH	81%	*19%*
8668312	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668312	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	94%	*6%*
8668312	14	SUPVY CIVIL ENGINEER	55%	*45%*
8668312	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*

8668312	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668312	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668312	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668312	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668312	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668312	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668312	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668312	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	85%	*15%*
8668312	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	93%	*7%*
EMBANKMENT DAMS AND GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING GROUP 3				
8668313	9	STUDENT TRAINEE (CIVIL ENGR)	98%	*2%*
8668313	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	64%	*36%*
8668313	11	CIVIL ENGINEER (GEOTECH)	76%	*24%*
8668313	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668313	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668311	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	94%	*6%*
8668313	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668313	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668313	9	CIVIL ENGINEER (GEOTECH)	87%	*13%*
8668313	14	CIVIL ENGINEER (TECH SPEC)	94%	*6%*
8668313	14	SUPERVISORY CIVIL ENGINEER	60%	*40%*
8668313	11	STUDENT TRAINEE (CIVIL ENGR)	94%	*6%*
8668313	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668313	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	87%	*13%*
8668313	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668313	9	STUDENT TRAINEE (CIVIL ENGR)	93%	*7%*
8668313	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668313	14	SUPERVISORY CIVIL ENGINEER	56%	*44%*
8668313	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668313	9	STUDENT TRAINEE (CIVIL ENGR)	91%	*9%*
8668313	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	89%	*11%*
ENGINEERING GEOLOGY GROUP				
8668320	14	SUPERVISORY GEOLOGIST	19%	*81%*
8668320	12	GEOLOGIST	92%	*8%*
8668320	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*

8668320	4	ENG TECH		*100%*
8668320	13	GEOLOGIST	92%	*8%*
8668320	12	GEOLOGIST	96%	*4%*
8668320	9	PHYSICAL SCIENCE TECHNICIAN	0%	*100%*
8668320	4	ENG TECH	90%	*10%*
8668320	9	GEOLOGIST	93%	*7%*
8668320	12	GEOLOGIST	100%	*0%*
8668320	12	GEOLOGIST	96%	*4%*
8668320	14	GEOLOGIST	92%	*8%*
8668320	13	GEOLOGIST	94%	*6%*
8668320	11	GEOLOGIST	93%	*7%*
8668320	5	SECRETARY (OFFICE AUTOMATION)	2%	*98%*
8668320	12	GEOLOGIST	100%	*0%*
GEOTECHNICAL COMPUTER AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT GROUP				
8668322	11	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	95%	*5%*
8668322	9	PHYSICAL SCIENCE TECHNICIAN	99%	*1%*
8668322	10	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	85%	*15%*
8668322	9	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	98%	*3%*
8668322	9	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	97%	*3%*
GEOPHYSICS AND SEISMOTECTONICS GROUP				
8668330	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668330	13	GEOPHYSICIST	99%	*1%*
8668330	11	ELECTRONICS TECHNICIAN	85%	*15%*
8668330	11	GEOLOGIST	84%	*16%*
8668330	12	GEOLOGIST	100%	*0%*
8668330	9	STUDENT TRAINEE (GEOLOGY)	90%	*10%*
8668330	11	PHYSICAL SCIENCE TECHNICIAN	54%	*46%*
8668330	13	IT SPECIALIST	100%	*0%*
8668330	13	GEOLOGIST	99%	*1%*
8668330	14	GEOLOGIST	64%	*36%*
8668330	9	GEOPHYSICIST	93%	*7%*
8668330	13	GEOPHYSICIST	100%	*0%*
8668330	4	STUDENT TRAINEE (PHYS SCI)	100%	*0%*
8668330	13	GEOPHYSICIST	91%	*9%*
8668330	9	GEOPHYSICIST	96%	*4%*

8668330	12	GEOLOGIST	93%	*7%*
8668330	11	GEOLOGIST	88%	*12%*
8668330	9	STUDENT TRAINEE (GEOPHYSICS)	78%	*22%*
8668330	7	GEOPHYSICIST	72%	*28%*
8668330	12	GEOPHYSICIST	100%	*0%*
8668330	13	GEOPHYSICIST	97%	*3%*
INSTRUMENTATION AND INSPECTIONS GROUP				
8668360	14	GENERAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668360	14	SUPERVISORY CIVIL ENGINEER	11%	*89%*
8668360	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668360	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	94%	*6%*
8668360	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668360	2	CLERK	0%	*100%*
8668360	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668360	12	CE Tech	100%	*0%*
8668360	13	IT SPECIALIST (APPSW)	100%	*0%*
8668360	8	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	96%	*4%*
8668360	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	5%	*95%*
8668360	6	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	100%	*0%*
8668360	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668360	9	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	100%	*0%*
8668360	6	SECRETARY	0%	*100%*
8668360	14	GEOLOGIST	94%	*6%*
8668360	10	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	99%	*1%*
8668360	7	DATA TECHNICIAN	99%	*1%*
8668360	3	CLERK	69%	*31%*
8668360	12	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668360	12	IT SPECIALIST (OS)	100%	*0%*
8668360	9	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	100%	*0%*
8668360	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668360	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	5%	*95%*
8668360	9	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	97%	*3%*
8668360	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	88%	*12%*
8668360	14	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668360	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*

8668360	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668360	10	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	100%	*0%*
8668360	12	CIVIL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668360	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668360	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	90%	*10%*
8668360	13	CIVIL ENGINEER	78%	*22%*
INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES DIVISION				
8668400	15	SUPVY GENERAL ENGINEER	78%	*22%*
8668400	6	SECRETARY (866410/20)	0%	*100%*
8668400	7	SECRETARY (Division)	0%	*100%*
8668400	6	SECRETARY (8668430)	0%	*100%*
8668400	6	SECRETARY (8668440)	4%	*96%*
8668400	6	SECRETARY (8668460)	0%	*100%*
MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT BRANCH				
8668410	12	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668410	14	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668410	11	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	88%	*12%*
8668410	11	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668410	11	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668410	9	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668410	13	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668410	9	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668410	14	SUPVY MECHANICAL ENGINEER	23%	*77%*
8668410	13	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668410	11	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	88%	*12%*
8668410	13	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668410	11	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668410	13	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668410	12	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668410	12	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668410	12	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668410	13	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668410	11	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
HYDRAULIC EQUIPMENT GROUP				
8668420	7	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	82%	*18%*

8668420	14	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668420	9	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668420	14	SUPVY MECHANICAL ENGINEER	23%	*77%*
8668420	12	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668420	13	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668420	9	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668420	12	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668420	12	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668420	7	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	87%	*13%*
8668420	13	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668420	12	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668420	12	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668420	12	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668420	13	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
ELECTRICAL DESIGN GROUP				
8668430	14	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668430	11	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668430	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668430	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668430	11	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668430	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668430	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668430	13	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668430	14	SUPVY ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	49%	*51%*
8668430	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668430	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668430	9	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	86%	*14%*
8668430	11	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	89%	*11%*
8668430	11	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668430	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668430	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668430	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668430	9	STUDENT ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	88%	*12%*
8668430	14	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668430	14	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*

8668430	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668430	7	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	75%	*25%*
HYDROPOWER TECHNICAL SERVICES GROUP				
8668440	13	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	80%	*20%*
8668440	12	COMPUTER ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668440	13	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668440	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	93%	*7%*
8668440	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668440	14	SUPVY ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668440	13	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	94%	*6%*
8668440	11	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668440	9	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	87%	*13%*
8668440	10	ELECTRONICS TECHNICIAN	65%	*35%*
8668440	4	STUDENT TRAINEE	84%	*16%*
8668440	9	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	90%	*10%*
8668440	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668440	13	ELECTRONICS ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668440	13	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	88%	*12%*
8668440	14	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	79%	*21%*
8668440	9	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668440	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668440	11	IT SPECIALIST (OS)	98%	*2%*
8668440	13	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	51%	*49%*
8668440	9	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	66%	*35%*
8668440	12	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	91%	*9%*
8668440	9	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668440	11	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	90%	*10%*
8668440	13	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668440	13	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	98%	*2%*
8668440	13	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	99%	*1%*
8668440	9	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	87%	*13%*
8668440	11	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668440	14	SUPVY ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	2%	*98%*
HYDRAULIC INVESTIGATIONS AND LABORATORY SERVICES GROUP				
8668460	10	CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	81%	*19%*

8668460	0	RESEARCH LAB MODEL MAKER	93%	*7%*
8668460	0	RESEARCH LABORATORY MACHINIST	98%	*2%*
8668460	14	SUPVY HYDRAULIC ENG	29%	*71%*
8668460	13	RESEARCH HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	96%	*4%*
8668460	13	RESEARCH HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	89%	*11%*
8668460	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668460	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	90%	*10%*
8668460	0	RESEARCH LAB MODEL MAKER	94%	*6%*
8668460	9	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668460	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	76%	*24%*
8668460	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668460	11	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	85%	*15%*
8668460	14	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	100%	*0%*
8668460	9	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	95%	*5%*
8668460	0	RESEARCH LAB MODEL MAKER	91%	*9%*
8668460	12	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	97%	*3%*
8668460	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	92%	*8%*
8668460	13	HYDRAULIC ENGINEER	91%	*9%*

Summary of TSC FY 2011 Completion Report Surveys

Customer Group	No. of Surveys Sent	No. of Responses	Cost effectiveness of the service	Coordination with client and other service providers	Timeliness of assistance	Knowledge of technical areas	Responsiveness of staff	Quality of Product	Overall Performance	Summary Value
Great Plains Region	74	23	4.22	4.39	4.39	4.78	4.52	4.74	4.65	4.53
Lower Colorado Region	35	26	4.42	4.69	4.58	4.73	4.69	4.62	4.58	4.62
Mid Pacific Region	94	42	4.46	4.59	4.54	4.80	4.73	4.66	4.63	4.63
Pacific Northwest Region	61	29	4.00	4.31	4.11	4.48	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.28
Upper Colorado Region	45	24	4.54	4.91	4.67	4.96	4.75	4.81	4.88	4.79
SSLE (Dam Safety & Security)	136	68	3.91	4.10	4.13	4.26	4.21	4.25	4.15	4.15
Research Office	55	14	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Program Analysis Office	25	22	4.73	4.82	4.95	4.77	4.86	4.86	4.77	4.82
Reclamation - Other	13	10	3.80	4.20	4.60	4.50	4.40	4.50	4.30	4.33
Other Govt Agencies	41	33	4.44	4.52	4.41	4.81	4.63	4.66	4.66	4.59
Totals/Averages	579	291	4.29	4.33	4.29	4.49	4.40	4.42	4.38	4.35

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (LC ESO)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported	
II.A	Total Number of Active Service Agreements in FY 2011	***53***		***Service Agreements Initiated in FY 2011***
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***41***		***All Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011***
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***$5,282,021***		
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date **Calculation**	***37***	90.2%	
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget **Calculation**	***38***	92.7%	
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date **Calculation**	***$4,922,106***	93.2%	
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget **Calculation**	***$5,052,563***	95.7%	
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports **Calculation**	***37***	90.2%	
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$9,997,733***		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization - NOTE: The sum of these 3 columns will equal 100%.

SOPs II.C.1 II.C.2 II.C.3 Name	Category	Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %	Objective measure of time working on program accounts (WRR and P&A) in %	Objective measure of time worked on overhead (K-accounts) in %
ESO	By your Service Provider Organization (SPO)	***83%***	***2%***	***15%***
	By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Business/Administration		*45%*	*0%*	*55%*
Safety		*95%*	*0%*	*5%*
Design-Civil		*87%*	*2%*	*11%*
Design-Mechanical and Electrical		*93%*	*0%*	*7%*
Contract Admnistration		*89%*	*0%*	*11%*
Construction Management		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
Examination of Existing Structures/Safety of Dams		*89%*	*0%*	*11%*
	By positions/individuals within your SPO? (Insert positions/names (optional) and respective percentages.)			
3006000	Safety and Occupational Health Manager	*95%*	*0%*	*5%*
3006000	Regional Engineer	*55%*	*35%*	*10%*
3006000	Deputy Regional Engineer	*55%*	*20%*	*25%*
3006050	Admin Assistant	*25%*	*0%*	*75%*
3006050	Portfolio Manager	*100%*	*0%*	*0%*
3006050	Portfolio Manager	*50%*	*0%*	*50%*
3006050	Program Support Assistant	*25%*	*0%*	*75%*
3006050	Business Manager	*25%*	*0%*	*75%*
3006200	Civil Engineer	*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006200	Civil Engineer	*85%*	*0%*	*15%*
3006200	Civil Engineer	*70%*	*20%*	*10%*
3006200	Civil Engineer	*100%*	*0%*	*0%*
3006200	Group Manager	*75%*	*0%*	*25%*
3006200	Civil Engineer	*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006200	Civil Engineer	*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006200	Engineering Technican	*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006200	Civil Engineer	*90%*	*0%*	*10%*

3006300	Mechanical Engineer		*100%*	*0%*	*0%*
3006300	Mechanical Engineer		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006300	Engineering Technican		*100%*	*0%*	*0%*
3006300	Group Manager		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006300	Engineering Technican		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006300	Joseph Stubitz		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006400	Civil Engineering Technican		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006400	Civil Engineer		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006400	Group Manager		*85%*	*0%*	*15%*
3006400	Civil Engineer		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006400	Civil Engineering Technican		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006500	Civil Engineer		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006500	Engineering Technican		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006500	Group Manager		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006500	Civil Engineer		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006550	Construction Control Inspector		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006550	Construction Control Inspector		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006550	Supervisory Construction Control Rep.		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006550	Construction Control Inspector		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006550	Construction Control Inspector		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006575	Supervisory Construction Control Rep.		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006575	Construction Control Inspector		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006575	Construction Control Inspector		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006575	Construction Control Inspector		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006575	Construction Control Inspector		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006600	Civil Engineer		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006600	Civil Engineering Technician		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006600	Group Manager		*85%*	*0%*	*15%*
3006300	Civil Engineer		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*
3006600	Mechanical Engineer		*90%*	*0%*	*10%*

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Customer Satisfaction with the overall project

SOP II.B

Service Provider Organization (SPO) Code List (used for sorting/reporting by SPO)

Technical Service Center =	TSC	LC Southern California Area Office =	SCAO
PN Regional Office =	PN	LC Yuma Area Office =	YAO
GP Regional Office =	GP	LC Pheonix Area Office =	PXAO
MP Regional Office =	MP	LC Dams Office	
LC Regional Office =	LC	Hoover Dam =	Hoover
UC Regional Office =	UC	Parker Dam =	Parker
Provo Area Office =	PAO	Davis Dam =	Davis
Four Corners Construction Office =	FCCO	LC Boulder City Area Office	
Mid-Pacific Construction Office =	MPCO	Equal Employment Opportunity =	EEO
Drill Crew =	DC	Resources Management Office =	RMO
Outsourced Contractor =	OC	Multi-Species Conservation Program =	MSCP
		Engineering Services Office =	ESO

Office	# of Surveys Sent	# of Responses
PN	1	1
LC	5	5
SCAO	5	5
YAO	2	1
PXAO	3	3
Hoover	4	3
Parker	2	0
Davis	2	2
EEO	2	2
RMO	1	1
MSCP	1	1
ESO	7	7
TSC	1	1
TOTAL	**36**	**32**

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

Office	Cost Effectiveness	Activity Understanding	Timeliness	Technical Knowledg	Problem Solving	Responsiveness	**Total**
PN	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	**4.7**
LC	4.0	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.4	**4.6**
SCAO	4.8	4.9	4.2	4.4	4.6	4.6	**4.6**
YAO	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
PXAO	5.0	4.8	4.5	5.0	4.7	5.0	**4.8**
Hoove	3.3	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.3	4.2	**3.7**
Parker							
Davis	4.5	3.5	2.0	3.5	3.0	3.0	**3.3**
EEO	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
RMO	5.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	1.0	**2.8**
MSCP	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
ESO	4.4	5.0	3.9	5.0	4.3	4.1	**4.5**
TSC	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
TOTAL	**4.5**	**4.7**	**4.1**	**4.6**	**4.4**	**4.4**	

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
ESO	***Average Ratings by All Customers***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness	***4.5***			
	Activity Understanding	***4.7***			
	Timeliness	***4.1***			
	Technical Knowledge	***4.6***			
	Problem Solving	***4.4***			
	Responsiveness	***4.4***			
	Calculation	26.6	4.4		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
Parker Dam	***Machine Shop Electrical Upgrade (John Steffen) - Contacted on 10/17/11 & 10/19/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness				
	Activity Understanding				
	Timeliness				
	Technical Knowledge				
	Problem Solving				
	Responsiveness				
	Calculation	0	0.0		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
Hoover Dam	***Arizona and Nevada Parking Lot Improvements (Roy Given 494-2226) - Contacted on 10/17, 10/19, 10/20/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Open communication, open to strategizing solutions to problems, regular team meetings were held to go over issues and options.***	***ADA and SHPO requirements, age of facilities, changing use patterns, and limited site space to work with***
	Cost Effectiveness	***3***			
	Activity Understanding	***4***			
	Timeliness	***3***			
	Technical Knowledge	***4***			
	Problem Solving	***4***			
	Responsiveness	***4***			
	Calculation	22	3.7		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
Hoover Dam	***Arizona Turnaround (Roy Given) - Contacted on 10/17, 10/19, & 10/20/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***ESO was willing to help define the project, provided persistence and worked effectively, held regular team meetings, and given all the external delays the project was still completed on time.***	***Approved drawings did not meet original specifications which resulted in various changes to the Project and a product that did not fully meet the client's expectations.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***2***			
	Activity Understanding	***4***			
	Timeliness	***3.5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***4***			
	Problem Solving	***2***			
	Responsiveness	***3.5***			
	Calculation	19	3.2		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
Davis Dam	***Arc Flash Study (Lammers) - Contacted on 10/17/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Was very, very cost effective.***	***Took a very long time; during project work was reassigned to someone who did not have as much techincal knowledge.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***3***			
	Timeliness	***1***			
	Technical Knowledge	***3***			
	Problem Solving	***3***			
	Responsiveness	***3***			
	Calculation	18	3.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
Parker Dam	***Station Service Battery (John Steffen) - Contacted on 10/17/11 & 10/19/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness				
	Activity Understanding				
	Timeliness				
	Technical Knowledge				
	Problem Solving				
	Responsiveness				
	Calculation	0	0.0		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
PN	***Periodic Facility Reviews (Micheal Marriott 208-378-5336) - 10/17/11; (Jan Schrader 509-633-9584) - Contacted on 10/19/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		***The large, complex nature of Grand Coulee Dam made inspections and reviews difficult.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***4***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***4***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	28	4.7		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
YAO	***YDP Fire Water Modification (Charles McCaughey 928-343-8365) - Contacted on 10/17/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Project was successful in that it was a unique problem and ESO had a good understanding of the issue and developed quick solutions.***	
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	30	5.0		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
PXAO	***Tribal Well Scoping and Cost Estimates (Debbie Garey 623-773-6463) - Contacted on 10/17/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Project went really well.***	***Original timeline was rather ambitious, so it was hard to meet the timeline.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***4.5***			
	Timeliness	***4***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***4***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	27.5	4.6		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
MSCP	***McAllister Lake Design Project (Nathen Lenon x8015) - Contacted on 10/17, 10/19, & 10/21/2011***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	30	5.0		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
Davis Dam	***Main Unit Transformer Replacement and Cost Analysis (Rob Skordas 702-494-2301) - contacted on 10/17/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		*Report took longer than expected although we understand Enrique is really busy.*
	Cost Effectiveness	***4***			
	Activity Understanding	***4***			
	Timeliness	***3***			
	Technical Knowledge	***4***			
	Problem Solving	***3***			
	Responsiveness	***3***			
	Calculation	21	3.5		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
RMO	***Small Loans RO&M Examination (Amy Porter x8573) - Contacted on 10/17/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***ESO management had a good technical understanding of the work and were able to get involved when necessary.***	***POC could use some coaching: Mod was never done to SA; Communication did not occur; draft was not provided to customer for review; several errors were in report; customer was not provided an electronic copy and was asked customer to burn CD's and distribute or pay more; interrupted phone calls and conversations; technical understanding lacking***
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***2***			
	Timeliness	***3***			
	Technical Knowledge	***2***			
	Problem Solving	***4***			
	Responsiveness	***1***			
	Calculation	17	2.8		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
ESO	***Safety (Scott Tincher) - Contacted on 10/21/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***The Safety manager for LC has played an active role in making ensuring that safety related issues remain at the forefront of LC discussions.***	***Safety verification can often appear to be threateneing to an organization. Working on overcoming that perception.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***4***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***4***			
	Responsiveness	***4***			
	Calculation	27	4.5		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
ESO	***EES - Emergency Management (Scott Tincher) - Contacted on 10/21/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***LC EM contact is proactive in assisting the office in obtaining compliance. Working with area offices to improve exercise awareness.***	***With all going on, it can be a challenge to keep up with exercise requirements.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***4***			
	Responsiveness	***4***			
	Calculation	28	4.7		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
ESO	***EES - Review - High & Significant Hazardous Dams (Scott Tincher) - Contacted on 10/21/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Overall, inspections and reports are complete and an accurate reflection of facilities. Info is also coordinated with the effected office.***	***Need to work on meeting schedules and deadlines.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***4***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***2***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***4***			
	Responsiveness	***4***			
	Calculation	24	4.0		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
ESO	***EES - Review - Associated Facilities (Scott Tincher) - Contacted on 10/21/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Again, reports and complete and accurate. Good coordination withy effected office.***	***Better meeting deadlines that High and Significant Hazard program, but room for improvement.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***4***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***3***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***4***			
	Calculation	26	4.3		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
ESO	***EES - Inspection - Reclamation Bridges (Scott Tincher) - Contacted on 10/21/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Given funding available, performing a very good job getting program in place.***	***Need to complete effort. Program competes with others for funding and often is not as high a priority as would like.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***4***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	29	4.8		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
ESO	***EES - Inaccessible Feature Review - Inspections (Scott Tincher) - Contacted on 10/21/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Reasonable attention is provided to this program and the EES group does an excellent job maintaining the rope access team.***	***Need to ensure efficiency of the program.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***4***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***4***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***4***			
	Responsiveness	***4***			
	Calculation	26	4.3		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
ESO	***EES - Administration (Scott Tincher)***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Work under this project is in support of the overall EES program. The related support has been very good.***	***Need to ensure that effort going into admin does not become too burdensome to program.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***4***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***4***			
	Responsiveness	***4***			
	Calculation	27	4.5		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
LC	***K35 General (Dave Palumbo) - Contacted on 10/26/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness	***4***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***4***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***4***			
	Calculation	27	4.5		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
LC	***K35 Outreach (Dave Palumbo) - Contacted on 10/26/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***4***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	29	4.8		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
LC	***K35 Training (Dave Palumbo) - Contacted on 10/26/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness	***3***			
	Activity Understanding	***4***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***4***			
	Calculation	26	4.3		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
LC	***K35 On the Job Training (Dave Palumbo) - Contacted on 10/26/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness	***4***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***4***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***4***			
	Calculation	27	4.5		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
Hoover Dam	***Water Level Measurments using Geomatics Technology (Joe Donnelly) - Contacted on 10/18/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		***Learning how to use TPS Unit and dealing with sunlight glare made it difficult to use the screens. ESO was quite helpful in resolving the problem.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***4***			
	Timeliness	***4***			
	Technical Knowledge	***4***			
	Problem Solving	***4***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	26	4.3		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
PXAO	***2011 RO&M (Jeff Keller 623-773-6440) - Contacted on 10/18/11, 10/19/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Phil has provided very good quality and excellent work.***	***None.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***4.5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	29.5	4.9		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
Hoover	***Hoover Rockfall Mitigation (Becky Bigham 494-2589) - Contacted on 10/18/11 & 10/19/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness				
	Activity Understanding				
	Timeliness				
	Technical Knowledge				
	Problem Solving				
	Responsiveness				
	Calculation	0	0.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
PXAO	***Black River Pump Station O&M (Stephen Johnson and other team member 623-773-6246) - Contacted on 10/18/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Enrique's services were requested specifically because he has the best expertise in the field, has well rounded knowledge, provides great service and products, and is very cost effective, he did an excellent job, provided excellent coordination with tribes and contractor, instrumental in protecting the government's interest, works great with the team, would have paid him much more if he had the time available.*	*None.*
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	30	5.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
LC Front Offic	***Date Street 100 and 200 As Builds (Dave Palumbo) - Contacted on 10/19/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Willingness to do the necessary research and field varification to ensure the accuracy of the project.***	***Historically as-build's weren't maintained well.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***4***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***4***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	28	4.7		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
YAO	***YAO Quantification of Stockpiles (Mike Igeo 928-343-8272) - Contacted on 10/25/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness				
	Activity Understanding				
	Timeliness				
	Technical Knowledge				
	Problem Solving				
	Responsiveness				
	Calculation	0	0.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
TSC	***Survey's at Horse Tooth, Dixie Canyon, Spring Canyon, and Soldier Canyon Dams (DeWayne Campbell 303-445-3052) - Contacted on 10/20/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Alejandro was always very client focused.***	***None.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	30	5.0		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
EEO	***Youth Initiative (Linda Rivera x8405) - Contacted on 10/26/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Great job.***	
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	30	5.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
SCAO	***Soboba Water Management Plan Review (Bill Steele)- Contacted on 10/25/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Over the last couple years, ESO has become an excellent engineering organization that is technically confident, knowledgeable, performance orienationed, and delivers excellent products. ESO did $900,000 of work for us this year.***	***Overall, reorganizing ESO getting employees to buy into the new structure was a challenge.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***4.5***			
	Timeliness	***4.75***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	29.25	4.9		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
SCAO	***Hoover Drum Gate Seal Value Engineering Study (Mark Cook) - Contacted on 10/25/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Appreciate the help; the product was a successful VE Study.***	***It has taken a long time to receive the final report.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***4***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***1***			
	Technical Knowledge	***3***			
	Problem Solving	***4***			
	Responsiveness	***3***			
	Calculation	20	3.3		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
EEO	***Black River Diversion Tunnel Drilling Support (Mike Miller) - Contacted on 10/26/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Great Customer Service.***	
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	30	5.0		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
SCAO	***Hoover Vacancy Selection Panel (Mark Cook) - Contacted on 10/25/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Really appreciate the help and input was very valuable.***	
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***4***			
	Problem Solving	***4***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	28	4.7		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
SCAO	***Drawing Scanning and Database Work (Scott Tincher) - Contacted on 10/21/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	30	5.0		

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
SCAO	***Reclamation Wide Sustainability Team Participation (Scott Tincher) - Contacted on 10/25/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	30	5.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
EEO	***Diversity Steering Team Committee (Linda Rivera x8405) - Contacted on 10/25/11***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Great job.***	
	Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
	Activity Understanding	***5***			
	Timeliness	***5***			
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	30	5.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (UC Region)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported
II.A	Total Number of Active Service Agreements in FY 2011	***1***	
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***1***	
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***$75,000***	
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***1***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***1***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	***$75,000***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	***$75,000***	
	Calculation		100.0%
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports	***1***	
	Calculation		100.0%
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$75,000***	

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization - NOTE: The sum of these 3 columns will equal 100%.

SOPs II.C.1 II.C.2 II.C.3	**Name**	**Category**	**Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %**	**Objective measure of time working on program accounts (WRR and P&A) in %**	**Objective measure of time worked on overhead (K-accounts) in %**
	UC	By your Service Provider Organization (SPO)	***4***	***85***	***11***
		By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
	Design		***6***	***83***	***11***
	AutoCAD Support		***0***	***90***	***10***
	Bridge Inspection & EDMS		***0***	***95***	***5***
		By positions/individuals within your SPO? (Insert positions/names (optional) and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
	Civil Engineer, GS-12		***0***	***90***	***10***
	Technician, GS -9		***3***	***87***	***10***
	Civil Engineer, GS-11		***0***	***95***	***5***
	Civil Engineer, GS-11		***20***	***75***	***5***
	Mechanical Engineer, GS-12		***2***	***93***	***5***
	Sup. Civil Engineer, GS-13		***0***	***75***	***25***

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Customer Satisfaction with the overall project

SOP II.B

Service Provider Organization (SPO) Code List (used for sorting/reporting by SPO)

Technical Service Center =	TSC
PN Regional Office =	PN
GP Regional Office =	GP
MP Regional Office =	MP
LC Regional Office =	LC
UC Regional Office =	UC
Provo Area Office =	PAO
Four Corners Construction Office =	FCCO
Mid-Pacific Construction Office =	MPCO
Drill Crew =	DC
Outsourced Contractor =	OC

Note: Key success factors and challenges should accompany all ratings.

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	*Rating*		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
UC	***Flaming Gorge Dam - Sewage Treatment Plant Upgrade***	***1 (poor) to 5***	Average Rating	***1. The time allotted to drafting up the specification was appropriate.***	***The customer had no response to this question.***
	Cost Effectiveness	***3***		***2. Staff came to Flaming Gorge and saw for themselves what the project entailed***	
	Activity Understanding	***5***		***3. Questions were asked all along the way.***	
	Timeliness	***5***		***4. An open line of communication was used.***	
	Technical Knowledge	***5***			
	Problem Solving	***5***			
	Responsiveness	***5***			
	Calculation	28	4.7		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (FCCO)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported
II.A	Total Number of Active Service Agreements in FY 2011	**88**	
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	**0**	
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	**$0**	
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	**0**	
	Calculation		#DIV/0!
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	**0**	
	Calculation		#DIV/0!
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	**$0**	
	Calculation		#DIV/0!
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	**$0**	
	Calculation		#DIV/0!
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports	**0**	
	Calculation		#DIV/0!
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$7,608,761***	

Note: All service agreements are long term agreements and none were completed in FY 2011.

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization - NOTE: The sum of these 3 columns will equal 100%.

SOPs II.C.1 II.C.2 II.C.3 Name	Category	Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %	Objective measure of time working on program accounts (WRR and P&A) in %	Objective measure of time worked on overhead (K-accounts) in %
FCCO	By your Service Provider Organization (SPO)	***86***	***1***	***13***
	By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Office Engineering		***100***	***0***	***0***
Field Engineering		***100***	***0***	***0***
Technical Services		***100***	***0***	***0***
Administrative		***27***	***0***	***73***
Management		***76***	***9***	***15***
	By positions/individuals within your SPO? (Insert positions/names (optional) and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Civil Engineer, GS-15		***95***	***5***	***0***
Civil Engineer, GS-13		***100***	***0***	***0***
Civil Engineer, GS-13		***100***	***0***	***0***
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-13		***50***	***50***	***0***
Civil Engineer, GS-12		***100***	***0***	***0***
Secretary, GS-6		***10***	***0***	***90***
Division Manager, GS-13		***100***	***0***	***0***
Civil Engineer, GS-5		***100***	***0***	***0***
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-12		***100***	***0***	***0***
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-11		***100***	***0***	***0***
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-11		***100***	***0***	***0***
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-10		***100***	***0***	***0***
Civil Engineer, GS-12		***100***	***0***	***0***
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-10		***100***	***0***	***0***
Electrical Engineer, GS-12		***100***	***0***	***0***
Civil Engineer, GS-12		***100***	***0***	***0***
Civil Engineer, GS-11		***100***	***0***	***0***
Division Manager, GS-13		***100***	***0***	***0***

Civil Engineer, GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineer, GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineer, GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Electrical Engineering Technician, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Materials Engineering Technician, GS-7	*100*	*0*	*0*
First Fill Monitor, GS-4	*100*	*0*	*0*
First Fill Monitor, GS-4	*100*	*0*	*0*
First Fill Monitor, GS-4	*100*	*0*	*0*
First Fill Monitor, GS-4	*100*	*0*	*0*
First Fill Monitor, GS-4	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Mechanical Engineering Technician, GS-10	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-10	*100*	*0*	*0*
Electrical Engineering Technician, GS-10	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-10	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Inspector, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Inspector, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-5	*100*	*0*	*0*
Mechanic, WG-10	*100*	*0*	*0*
Electrician, WG-10	*100*	*0*	*0*
Electrical Engineer. GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Mechanical Engineer, GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Mechanical Engineering Technician, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Division Manager, GS-13	*100*	*0*	*0*
Photographer, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Geologist, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Geologist, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Geologist, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*

Construction Control Representative, GS-10	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Survey Technician, GS-8	*100*	*0*	*0*
Materials Engineering Technician, GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Materials Engineering Technician, GS-7	*100*	*0*	*0*
Materials Engineering Technician, GS-10	*100*	*0*	*0*
Materials Engineering Technician, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Materials Engineering Technician, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Materials Engineering Technician, GS-7	*100*	*0*	*0*
Administrative Officer, GS-12	*0*	*0*	*100*
Budget Analyst, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
IT Specialist, GS-11	*0*	*0*	*100*
Budget Analyst, GS-11	*0*	*0*	*100*
Budget Analyst, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
General Supply Specialist, GS-9	*0*	*0*	*100*
Administrative Coordinator, GS-6	*100*	*0*	*0*
Supply Technician, GS-5	*0*	*0*	*100*
Mail and File Clerk, GS-4	*0*	*0*	*100*
Office Automation Clerk, GS-3	*0*	*0*	*100*
Mail and File Clerk, GS-2	*0*	*0*	*100*

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (PAO)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported
II.A	Total Number of Active Service Agreements in FY 2011	***27***	
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***7***	
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	***$764,037***	
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date **Calculation**	***7***	100.0%
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget **Calculation**	***7***	100.0%
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date **Calculation**	***$764,037***	100.0%
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget **Calculation**	***$764,037***	100.0%
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports **Calculation**	***7***	100.0%
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	***$7,272,000***	

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization - NOTE: The sum of these 3 columns will equal 100%.

SOPs II.C.1 II.C.2 II.C.3 Name	Category	Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %	Objective measure of time working on program accounts (WRR and P&A) in %	Objective measure of time worked on overhead (K-accounts) in %
PAO	By your Service Provider Organization (SPO)	***83***	***16***	***1***
	By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Field Engineering Division I		***98***	***1***	***1***
Inspection Group I		***100***	***0***	***0***
Engineering Equipment Group		***98***	***1***	***1***
Field Egineering Division II		***95***	***3***	***2***
Inspection Group II		***100***	***0***	***0***
Surveys Group		***85***	***10***	***5***
Materials Engineering Group		***95***	***0***	***5***
Office Engineering Division		***97***	***0***	***3***
Geology Group		***99***	***0***	***1***
Contract Administration Group		***100***	***0***	***0***
Drilling Operations Group		***94***	***0***	***6***
Design Group		***99***	***0***	***1***
Water and Environmental Resources Division		***11***	***89***	***0***
Water Resources Group		***6***	***94***	***0***
Environmental Group		***20***	***80***	***0***

Field Engineering Division I	***98***	***1***	***1***
Supervisory Civil Engineer, GS-13	***97***	***2***	***1***
Civil Engineer, GS-12	***100***	***0***	***0***
Civil Engineer, GS-12	***91***	***1***	***8***
Inspection Group I	***100***	***0***	***0***
Supervisory Construction Representative, GS-11	***100***	***0***	***0***

Construction Inspector, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Inspector, GS-8	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Inspector, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Engineering Equipment Group	*98*	*1*	*1*
Operator Supervisor, WS-10	*89*	*3*	*8*
Lead Equipment Operator, WL-11	*97*	*0*	*3*
Lead Equipment Operator, WL-11	*97*	*0*	*3*
Equipment Operator, WG-10	*100*	*0*	*0*
Equipment Operator, WG-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Equipment Operator, WG-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Equipment Operator, WG-11	*98*	*0*	*2*
Equipment Operator, WG-8	*100*	*0*	*0*
Equipment Operator, WG-10	*100*	*0*	*0*
Equipment Operator, WG-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Equipment Operator, WG-19	*100*	*0*	*0*
Lead Civil Engineering Tech, GS-10	*98*	*2*	*0*
Civil Engineering Tech, GS-9	*98*	*2*	*0*
Civil Engineering Tech, GS-9	*96*	*2*	*2*
Civil Engineering Tech, GS-9	*98*	*2*	*0*
Field Engineering Division II	*95*	*3*	*2*
Supervisory Civil Engineer, GS-13	*100*	*0*	*0*
Inspection Group II	*100*	*0*	*0*
Supervisory Construction Representative, GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Supervisory Construction Representative, GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Inspector, GS-8	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Inspector, GS-9	*98*	*2*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Inspector, GS-8	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Inspector, GS-8	*100*	*0*	*0*

Surveys Group	*85*	*10*	*5*
Supervisory Survey Technician, GS-12	*85*	*10*	*5*
Survey Technician, GS-8	*85*	*10*	*5*
Survey Technician, GS-8	*85*	*10*	*5*
Survey Technician, GS-5	*85*	*10*	*5*
Materials Engineering Group	*95*	*0*	*5*
Supervisory Materials Engineering Tech, GS-12	*95*	*0*	*5*
Materials Engineering Tech, GS-8	*95*	*0*	*5*
Materials Engineering Tech, GS-8	*95*	*0*	*5*
Materials Engineering Tech, GS-5	*95*	*0*	*5*
Office Engineering Division	*97*	*0*	*3*
Supervisory Civil Engineer, GS-13	*95*	*5*	*0*
Geology Group	*99*	*0*	*1*
Supervisory Geologist, GS-12	*94*	*1*	*5*
Geologist, GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Geologist, GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Geologist, GS-8	*100*	*0*	*0*
Contract Administration Group	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineer, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Design Group	*99*	*0*	*1*
Supervisory Civil Engineer, GS-12	*98*	*0*	*2*
Civil Engineering Technician, GS-8	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineer, GS-11/12	*99*	*0*	*1*
Civil Engineer, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*

Drilling Operation Group	*94*	*0*	*6*
Lead Driller, WL-10	*80*	*0*	*20*
Driller, WG-10	*95*	*0*	*5*
Driller, WG-10	*95*	*0*	*5*
Driller, WG-10	*95*	*0*	*5*
Driller Helper, WG-8	*95*	*0*	*5*
Driller Helper, WG-5	*95*	*0*	*5*
Driller Helper, WG-8	*95*	*0*	*5*
Driller Helper, WG-8	*95*	*0*	*5*
Driller Helper, WG-5	*95*	*0*	*5*
Driller Helper, WG-8	*95*	*0*	*5*
Water and Environmental Resources Division	*11*	*89*	*0*
Resource Program Manager, GS-13	*5*	*95*	*0*
Water Resources Group	*6*	*94*	*0*
Supervisory Resource Management Specialist, GS-12	*5*	*95*	*0*
Civil Engineer, GS-12	*5*	*95*	*0*
Landscape Architect, GS-12	*5*	*95*	*0*
Economist, GS-11	*10*	*90*	*0*
Economist, GS-11	*10*	*90*	*0*
Outdoor Recreation Planner, GS-9	*0*	*100*	*0*
Environmental Group	*20*	*80*	*0*
Environmental Group Chief, GS-12	*10*	*90*	*0*
Environmental Protection Specialist, GS-12	*50*	*50*	*0*
Fish and Wildlife Biologist, GS-12	*10*	*90*	*0*
Archeologist, GS-11	*10*	*90*	*0*

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Customer Satisfaction with the overall project

SOP II.B

Service Provider Organization (SPO) Code List (used for sorting/reporting by SPO)

Technical Service Center =	TSC
PN Regional Office =	PN
GP Regional Office =	GP
MP Regional Office =	MP
LC Regional Office =	LC
UC Regional Office =	UC
Provo Area Office =	PAO
Four Corners Construction Office =	FCCO
Mid-Pacific Construction Office =	MPCO
Drill Crew =	DC
Outsourced Contractor =	OC

Note: Key success factors and challenges should accompany all ratings.

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
1	***PAO***	***Ute Tribe Rock Creek Survey (BIA)***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Completed in FY11***	***Weather***
		Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
		Activity Understanding	***5***			
		Timeliness	***3***			
		Technical Knowledge	***5***			
		Problem Solving	***5***			
		Responsiveness	***5***			
	$5,000	**Calculation**	28	4.7		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
2	***PAO***	***Crooked Creek Dam Rehabilitation (Forest Service)***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Working with the Forest Service to locate outlet to fit their preferred outlet channel. Completed FY11***	***Several changes by Forest Service late in the process on design and field locations. Limited funding required creativity in order to meet client needs. Project 98% complete.***
		Cost Effectiveness	***4***			
		Activity Understanding	***5***			
		Timeliness	***5***			
		Technical Knowledge	***5***			
		Problem Solving	***4***			
		Responsiveness	***3***			
	$525,000	**Calculation**	26	4.3		
	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
3	***PAO***	***Scofield Dam Spillway Gatehouse Construction Management (CUWCD)***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Completed FY11 and final walkthrough completed.***	***None.***
		Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
		Activity Understanding	***5***			
		Timeliness	***5***			
		Technical Knowledge	***5***			
		Problem Solving	***5***			
		Responsiveness	***5***			
	$20,000	**Calculation**	30	5.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	*Rating*		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
4	***PAO***	***Willard Bay State Park South Marina Campground Inspection (Utah State Parks and Rec.)***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Completed 2011***	
		Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
		Activity Understanding	***4***			
		Timeliness	***4***			
		Technical Knowledge	***3***			
		Problem Solving	***5***			
		Responsiveness	***5***			
	$26,000	**Calculation**	26	4.3		
	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	*Rating*		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
5	***PAO***	***Scofield Dam Spillway Modification Project (SOD)***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Completed FY11 with final walkthrough.***	***Weather.***
		Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
		Activity Understanding	***5***			
		Timeliness	***5***			
		Technical Knowledge	***5***			
		Problem Solving	***5***			
		Responsiveness	***5***			
	$1,374,000	**Calculation**	30	5.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
6	***PAO***	***Deer Creek Dam Modification Project - Ph. 3 (SOD)***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Completed FY11.***	
		Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
		Activity Understanding	***5***			
		Timeliness	***5***			
		Technical Knowledge	***5***			
		Problem Solving	***5***			
		Responsiveness	***5***			
	$1,077,000	**Calculation**	30	5.0		
	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
7	***PAO***	***Black River (LC Region)***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	***Completed FY11.***	***Depth of holes and rock formation were challenging.***
		Cost Effectiveness	***5***			
		Activity Understanding	***5***			
		Timeliness	***5***			
		Technical Knowledge	***5***			
		Problem Solving	***5***			
		Responsiveness	***5***			
	$804,000	**Calculation**	30	5.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	Cost Effectiveness	Activity Understanding	Timeliness	Technical Knowledge	Problem Solving	Responsiveness	**Total**
1	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**4.7**
2	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	**4.3**
3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
4	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	**4.3**
5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
7	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
TOTAL	**4.9**	**4.9**	**4.6**	**4.7**	**4.9**	**4.7**	**4.8**

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
PAO	***Average Ratings by All Customers***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness	***4.9***			
	Activity Understanding	***4.9***			
	Timeliness	***4.6***			
	Technical Knowledge	***4.7***			
	Problem Solving	***4.9***			
	Responsiveness	***4.7***			
	Calculation	28.6	**4.8**		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Product Delivery (MPCO)

SOP	Data Requested for FY 2011	***Data Reported***	Results Reported
II.A	Total Number of Active Service Agreements in FY 2011	76	
II.A	Total Number of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	31	
II.A	Total $ Value of Service Agreements Completed in FY 2011	*$2,135,263*	
II.A.1	Total number of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	*27*	
	Calculation		87.1%
II.A.2	Total number of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	*30*	
	Calculation		96.8%
II.A.3	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed by the agreed upon final completion date	*$1,702,680*	
	Calculation		79.7%
II.A.4	Dollar value of Service Agreements completed within the agreed upon budget	*$1,915,831*	
	Calculation		89.7%
II.A.5	Number of Service Agreements with Completion Reports	*31*	
	Calculation		100.0%
	Total Dollar Value of Work Performed on Service Agreements	*$13,070,879*	

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Percent Utilization - NOTE: The sum of these 3 columns will equal 100%.

SOPs II.C.1 II.C.2 II.C.3 Name	Category	Objective measure of time spent working under service agreements in %	Objective measure of time working on program accounts (WRR and P&A) in %	Objective measure of time worked on overhead (K-accounts) in %
MPCO	By your Service Provider Organization (SPO)	*97*	*1*	*3*
	By each working group within your SPO? (Insert working groups and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Office of Construction Engineer		*79.5*	*7.5*	*13*
Preaward and Project Management		*76*	*7*	*17*
Office Engineering		*96.5*	*0.5*	*3*
Field Engineering		*98.75*	*0.25*	*1*
Materials Branch		*96*	*2*	*2*
	By positions/individuals within your SPO? (Insert positions/names (optional) and respective percentages. Add rows as needed.)			
Construction Engineer, GS-15		*67*	*15*	*18*
Safety & Occupational Health Manager, GS-12		*92*	*0*	*8*
Engineering Technician (Civil)		*77*	*5*	*18*
Civil Engineer, GS-12		*36*	*19*	*45*
Civil Engineer, GS-9		*94*	*1*	*5*
Civil Engineer, GS-12		*97*	*3*	*0*
Office Engineer, GS-13		*85*	*0*	*15*
Engineering Technician (Civil), GS-7		*94*	*0*	*6*
Civil Engineer, GS-12		*97*	*0*	*3*
Engineering Technician (Civil), GS-7		*100*	*0*	*0*
Engineering Technician (Civil), GS-12		*97*	*0*	*3*
Civil Engineer, GS-9		*98*	*0*	*2*
Civil Engineer, GS-7		*89*	*0*	*11*
Mechanical Engineer, GS-7		*94*	*4*	*2*
Engineering Technician (Civil), GS-12		*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineer, GS-9		*97*	*0*	*3*
Civil Engineer, GS-5		*100*	*0*	*0*
Engineering Technician (Civil), GS-12		*100*	*0*	*0*

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

Civil Engineer, GS-9	*97*	*0*	*3*
Student Trainee (Engineering), GS-5	*100*	*0*	*0*
Engineering Technician (Civil), GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineer, GS-11	*95*	*2*	*3*
Field Eng (Suprvsry Construction Representative), GS-13	*91*	*5*	*4*
Field Eng (Suprvsry Construction Representative), GS-13	*100*	*0*	*0*
Field Eng (Suprvsry Construction Representative), GS-13	*77*	*0*	*23*
Student Trainee (Engineering), GS-5	*100*	*0*	*0*
Engineering Technician (Civil), GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Inspector, GS-7	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Engineering Technician, GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineer, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-11	*98*	*2*	*0*
Civil Engineer, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineer, GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Inspector, GS-7	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineer, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Office Clerk, GS-3	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-9	*98*	*2*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Inspector, GS-5	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Inspector, GS-7	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-8	*98*	*0*	*2*
Office clerk, GS-3	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Inspector, GS-7	*100*	*0*	*0*
Engineering Technician (Civil), GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Management Specialist, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineer, GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

Civil Engineer, GS-12	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Office Automation Clerk, GS-4	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Inspector, GS-6	*100*	*0*	*0*
Civil Engineer, GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Representative, GS-11	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Inspector, GS-8	*100*	*0*	*0*
Construction Control Inspector, GS-7	*100*	*0*	*0*
Engineering Technician (Materials), GS-4	*100*	*0*	*0*
Engineering Technician (Materials), GS-7	*88*	*4*	*8*
Engineering Technician (Materials), GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Engineering Technician (Materials), GS-7	*98*	*2*	*0*
Engineering Technician (Materials), GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Engineering Technician (Materials), GS-7	*98*	*2*	*0*
Engineering Technician (Materials), GS-9	*100*	*0*	*0*
Student Trainee (Engineering), GS-4	*100*	*0*	*0*
Engineering Technician (Materials), GS-6	*87*	*6*	*7*
Supervisory Engineering Technician (Materials), GS-12	*91*	*7*	*2*
Engineering Technician (Materials), GS-7	*100*	*0*	*0*
Engineering Technician (Materials), GS-5	*97*	*1*	*2*
Engineering Technician (Materials), GS-9	*94*	*3*	*3*

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

This section is intended to measure Customer Satisfaction with the overall project

SOP II.B

Service Provider Organization (SPO) Code List (used for sorting/reporting by SPO)

Technical Service Center =	TSC
PN Regional Office =	PN
GP Regional Office =	GP
MP Regional Office =	MP
LC Regional Office =	LC
UC Regional Office =	UC
Provo Area Office =	PAO
Four Corners Construction Office =	FCCO
Mid-Pacific Construction Office =	MPCO
Drill Crew =	DC
Outsourced Contractor =	OC

Note: Key success factors and challenges should accompany all ratings.

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
1	MPCO	*TCID Ditch Rider Building Demolition, Phase 2*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Inspector was punctual and thorough; He had responsive involvement with the contractor's personnel that kept communications open and on track; During a planned absence, had a competent replacement; Both Inspectors kept LBAO informed of contract progress on a regular schedule.*	*One neighbor of the Rice Road work site was inserting her concerns for her interests and both Inspectors had the grace and poise to represent Reclamation's interest and make adjustments to address the neighbor's concerns.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*5*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*5*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	30	5.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
2	MPCO	*Stampede Dam Spillway Debris Removal*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Inspector was patient with the contractor; Government O&M personnel, in region and the Area Office, stepped up to facilitate power plant closures, remove fish from basin, and inspect basin on a moment's notice.*	*Reluctance to terminate Contractor up front. This is easy to say, but hard to implement since we are to prove the contractor out before termination; The contractor was not able to listen to inspector advice, and he was not expert enough at dewatering; The contractor did not deliver dewatered spillway on time.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*5*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*4*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	29	4.8		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
3	MPCO	*Stony Gorge Dam Inspection Access*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Experienced contract staff; Funding/resource availability; Monthly Project team meetings.*	*Contractor delays.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*5*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*5*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	30	5.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
4	MPCO	*Bear Creek Pumping Plant*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Professionalism of MPCO inspectors, OGRs and other staff; Technical expertise of MPCO inspector, OGRs and other staff; MPCO staff willingness to provide information and explanation of various technical issues to non-project and non-technical staff and partners, and coordination with U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS) staff at the San Luis NWR Complex during construction.*	*Numerous delays due to a variety of contributing factors.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*5*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*4*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*5*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	29	4.8		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
5	MPCO	*Friant Dam Generator Replacement*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*The contractor was very receptive to discuss issues; The contractor offered constructive ideas; The project superintendent was very knowledgeable and capable.*	*Poor preliminary drawings provided to contractor.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*4*			
		Activity Understanding	*4*			
		Timeliness	*4*			
		Technical Knowledge	*4*			

	Problem Solving	*5*			
	Responsiveness	*5*			
	Calculation	26	4.3		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
6	MPCO	*Agency Lake Ranch Sevenmile Canal Bridge Inspection*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Site inspection and amendment of budget condition.*	*Weather caused delays in inspection schedule.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*5*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*5*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	30	5.0		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
7	MPCO	*FKC Turnout Project - Avenue 24 and Cecil Avenue*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Construction Schedule; Inspector expertise; Communication between Inspector and Program Office. Daily reports.*	*Construction delay due to rain; Construction changes to specific parts.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*3*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*4*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*4*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			

		Calculation	26	4.3		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
8	MPCO	*NKWSD 8-1 Lateral Turnout Project - Bakersfield*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Daily progress reports were a great asset in determining the progress of the Contractor; Inspector's past experience with a variety of canal projects.*	*Weather delays and flooding of construction site.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*4*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*4*			
		Problem Solving	*4*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	27	4.5		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
9	MPCO	*Coleman Revegetation RAX #453*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
		Cost Effectiveness	*5*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*5*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	30	5.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
10	MPCO	*Putah Diversion Compound, Renovation Project and Canal Lane Public Improvement Plans, Solano County Water Agency*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Communication; Professionalism.*	*None*
		Cost Effectiveness	*5*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*5*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	30	5.0		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
11	MPCO	*Northfork Pipeline Modifications RAX #232*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Weekly coordination meetings; Understanding of operations.*	*The complexity of the outages. Nothing on MPCO side.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*3*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*5*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	28	4.7		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
12	MPCO	*Nimbus Unit Work Platforms*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Understanding our operational requirements; Coordination with contractors.*	*Coordination with outages and other work.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*2*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*5*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	27	4.5		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
13	MPCO	*New Melones Boat House RAX #500*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*MPCO inspectors did a great job.*	*Having original SOW re-written (mostly formatting) at high cost to customer, which resulted in not having enough money to build a 2-slip boathouse.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*3*			
		Activity Understanding	*4*			
		Timeliness	*3*			
		Technical Knowledge	*3*			
		Problem Solving	*4*			
		Responsiveness	*4*			
		Calculation	21	3.5		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
14	MPCO	*New Melones Road Repair Phase 2*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Communication between MPCO Inspector and project office.*	
		Cost Effectiveness	*3*			
		Activity Understanding	*4*			
		Timeliness	*4*			
		Technical Knowledge	*4*			
		Problem Solving	*3*			
		Responsiveness	*4*			
		Calculation	22	3.7		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
15	MPCO	*New Melones Buildings Reroof RAX #482*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		*Minor communication issues between Contractor and COTR regarding invoices.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*4*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*4*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	28	4.7		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
16	MPCO	*Spawning Gravel at Sailor Dam – Lower American River*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Understanding tasks to be completed; Taking directions from the Project Geologist; Keeping on schedule.*	*Equipment deliveries and equipment breakdowns; Rain and other challenging weather conditions (i.e. +100 degree heat); Media attention; Permit time constraints.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*5*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*5*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	30	5.0		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
17	MPCO	*Nimbus Radiating Cable Antenna RAX #512*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Mentoring given to the inspector when he requested it by the main office. It was refreshing to see this kind of collaboration.*	*Crafts persons attitudes about the technology. Minor challenge but irritating nonetheless. Unstable relationship between the sub and the prime and the delays caused by their litigation issues. The prime losing data and their inability to replace it because of challenge No. 2. This was the biggest delay.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*4*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*5*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	29	4.8		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
18	MPCO	*Folsom Powerplant Radiating Cable Antenna RAX #510*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Mentoring given to the inspector when he requested it by the main office. It was refreshing to see this kind of collaboration.*	*Crafts persons attitudes about the technology. Minor challenge but irritating nonetheless. Unstable relationship between the sub and the prime and the delays caused by their litigation issues. The prime losing data and their inability to replace it because of challenge No. 2. This was the biggest delay.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*4*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*5*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	29	4.8		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
19	MPCO	*Folsom Dam Radiating Cable Antenna RAX #508*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Mentoring given to the inspector when he requested it by the main office. It was refreshing to see this kind of collaboration.*	*Crafts persons attitudes about the technology. Minor challenge but irritating nonetheless. Unstable relationship between the sub and the prime and the delays caused by their litigation issues. The prime losing*
		Cost Effectiveness	*4*			
		Activity Understanding	*5*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*5*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			

					data and their inability to replace it because of challenge No. 2. This was the biggest delay.
	Calculation	29	4.8		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
20	MPCO	*Nimbus Refrigeration*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Overall project performance was just average in my opinion. No other comments.*	*There was an issue regarding what the SOW clearly indicated, and what was installed on the project. The SOW clearly indicated to use rigid Metal conduit throughout. This was not done, and there was difficulty convincing MPCO and getting the contractor back out to the site to install.*
		Cost Effectiveness	*3*			
		Activity Understanding	*3*			
		Timeliness	*3*			
		Technical Knowledge	*3*			
		Problem Solving	*3*			
		Responsiveness	*3*			
		Calculation	18	3.0		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
21	MPCO	*Folsom South Canal Fencing*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*MPCO and MP210 were involved in this project from the beginning; RAX official*	*Wet weather - access roads not fully accessible; Neighboring homes -*
		Cost Effectiveness	*5*			

		Activity Understanding	5		*asked for periodic reports and status reports; CCAO Project Manager stayed involved and did site visits weekly; MPCO Inspector did an excellent job on the contract.*	*protection of the public; Vehicles along roadways and traffic safety; Dry grass and cobblestone in soils.*
		Timeliness	5			
		Technical Knowledge	5			
		Problem Solving	5			
		Responsiveness	5			
		Calculation	30	5.0		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
22	MPCO	*Materials Lab Support - Moses Lake - Weber Siphon*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Staff person was responsive in mobilizing to Moses Lake, WA; Staff person supervisor provided excellent technical support to person on site; Staff person was technically competent for tasks required.*	*The extent of detail and distance from home seemed to put stress on staff person; Staff person was very regimented in work habits which at times created challenges adjusting to the changes in priorities of the quality assurance testing; He struggled at times handling problems in a calm manner*
		Cost Effectiveness	4			
		Activity Understanding	4			
		Timeliness	4			
		Technical Knowledge	3			
		Problem Solving	2			
		Responsiveness	3			
		Calculation	20	3.3		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
23	MPCO	*Shasta TCD Middle Gate Repairs & Seal Beam*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Inspector's attention to detail.*	*Contract Administrator's attention to detail.*
		Cost Effectiveness	1			

	Activity Understanding	*2*			
	Timeliness	*2*			
	Technical Knowledge	*3*			
	Problem Solving	*3*			
	Responsiveness	*2*			
	Calculation	13	2.2		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
24	MPCO	*Shasta Spillway Bridge Repair*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Inspector's attention to the project.*	*Underwater examination of the installation.*
		Cost Effectiveness	***1***			
		Activity Understanding	***2***			
		Timeliness	***2***			
		Technical Knowledge	***3***			
		Problem Solving	***3***			
		Responsiveness	***2***			
		Calculation	13	2.2		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
25	MPCO	*Tracy HVAC*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*The Project Manager for this project retired and person who took over project in close out phase didn't have the knowledge of the project to*	
		Cost Effectiveness				
		Activity Understanding	***See comment under Key***			

	Timeliness Technical Knowledge Problem Solving Responsiveness	***Factors***		*knowledge of the project to rate the Service Provider, but returned the completion report.*	
	Calculation	0	0.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
26	MPCO	*Tracy FF Trashrack Cleaners*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*The Project Manager for this project retired and person who took over project in close out phase didn't have the knowledge of the project to rate the Service Provider, but returned the completion report.*	
		Cost Effectiveness Activity Understanding Timeliness Technical Knowledge Problem Solving Responsiveness	***See comment under Key Factors***			
		Calculation	0	0.0		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
27	MPCO	*Tracy PP Trashracks*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*The Project Manager for this project retired and person who took over project in close out phase didn't have the knowledge of the project to rate the Service Provider, but returned the completion report.*	
		Cost Effectiveness Activity Understanding Timeliness Technical Knowledge Problem Solving Responsiveness	***See comment under Key Factors***			
		Calculation	0	0.0		

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
28	MPCO	*O'Neil Unit 4160 Switchgear Breaker Replacement*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*The Project Manager for this project retired and person who took over project in close out phase didn't have the knowledge of the project to rate the Service Provider, but returned the completion report.*	
		Cost Effectiveness Activity Understanding Timeliness Technical Knowledge Problem Solving Responsiveness	***See comment under Key Factors***			
		Calculation	0	0.0		
	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
29	MPCO	*Shasta Double Breakers/Double Bus*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Previously established good working relationships with on site MPCO staff; Flexibility of NCAO workforce to adjust to changing work conditions and schedule; Flexibility of contractor to adjust to changing work conditions*	*Lengthy delays and lack of flexibility when dealing with acquisition processes and contract modifications; Interfacing with another federal agency (Western Area Power Administration)*
		Cost Effectiveness Activity Understanding Timeliness Technical Knowledge Problem Solving	*5* *4* *4* *3* *4*			

	Responsiveness	*5*		*and schedule; Team approach to solving problems.*	*and their contractor working on the same project; Changing work conditions and outage scheduling issues; Other project workload and resource limitations.*
	Calculation	25	4.2		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
30	MPCO	*Delta Cross Channel Radial Gate Security Improvements - RAX #474*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
		Cost Effectiveness	*4*			
		Activity Understanding	*4*			
		Timeliness	*5*			
		Technical Knowledge	*5*			
		Problem Solving	*5*			
		Responsiveness	*5*			
		Calculation	28	4.7		

	SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
31	MPCO	*Nimbus Dam Radial Gates - RAX #389*	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating	*Understanding of our process; MPCO did job as*	*Flood activities.*

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

	Cost Effectiveness	*3*		*required.*	
	Activity Understanding	*3*			
	Timeliness	*4*			
	Technical Knowledge	*4*			
	Problem Solving	*4*			
	Responsiveness	*4*			
	Calculation	22	3.7		

#	Cost Effectiveness	Activity Understanding	Timeliness	Technical Knowledge	Problem Solving	Responsiveness	**Total**
1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	**4.8**
3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
4	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**4.8**
5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	**4.3**
6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
7	3.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	**4.3**
8	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	**4.5**
9	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
10	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
11	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**4.7**
12	2.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**4.5**
13	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	**3.5**
14	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	**3.7**
15	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	**4.7**
16	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**
17	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**4.8**
18	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**4.8**
19	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**4.8**
20	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	**3.0**
21	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**5.0**

FY 2011 Coordination and Oversight Group (COG) Annual Report Data Call

22	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	**3.3**
23	1.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	**2.2**
24	1.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	**2.2**
25*							
26*							
27*							
28*							
29	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	**4.2**
30	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**4.7**
31	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	**3.7**
TOTAL	**3.9**	**4.4**	**4.4**	**4.4**	**4.3**	**4.5**	**4.3**

NOTE: The Project Manager for this project retired and person who took over project in close out phase didn't have the knowledge of the project to rate the Service Provider, the returned the completion report.

SPO Code	Project/Activity Name	***Rating***		Key factors that led to success in managing the activity or project and overcoming challenges.	Challenges encountered during the project or activity.
MPCO	***Average Ratings by All Customers***	***1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)***	Average Rating		
	Cost Effectiveness	***3.9***			
	Activity Understanding	***4.4***			
	Timeliness	***4.4***			
	Technical Knowledge	***4.4***			
	Problem Solving	***4.3***			
	Responsiveness	***4.5***			
	Calculation	25.9	**4.3**		