

RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

WORKS

Contractor Assessment 2007



U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation
Mid-Pacific Region

Mission Statements

The mission of the Department of the Interior is to protect and provide access to our Nation's natural and cultural heritage and honor our trust responsibilities to Indian Tribes and our commitments to island communities.

The mission of the Bureau of Reclamation is to manage, develop, and protect water and related resources in an environmentally and economically sound manner in the interest of the American public.

Table of Contents

- Management Summary 3
- Introduction 4
 - Methodology 4
- Respondents 5
 - Respondent Profile 6
 - Respondent Characteristics 7
- Results 8
 - Service 8
 - Credibility and Value 9
 - Accountability 10
- Priorities 11
 - Improved Reports 11
 - Consistency of Information 11
 - Improved Follow-Up 12
 - Other Priorities 12
- Future Considerations 13
- Conclusions and Next Steps 14
- Appendix 15

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Within the last year, the Bureau of Reclamation's Mid-Pacific Region has initiated efforts to more fully evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the Central Valley Project (CVP) water accounting process. During interviews performed for *Managing for Excellence*¹, CVP water customers expressed dissatisfaction with the CVP water delivery and accounting system, known as BOR-WORKS, and its underlying business process (collectively referred to as WORKS).

In September 2006, the Region hired a project manager to oversee system modifications and business process improvements. It was determined that periodic assessments of the water customers would be critical to establishing a performance baseline and gauging improvements to BOR-WORKS and the water accounting process with regards to four of WORKS' essential goals: service, system credibility, value, and accountability.

In March 2007, the Region administered the first assessment to measure CVP water contractors' perceptions about how effectively the Region manages their water service accounts. More than 150 CVP contractors received invitations to participate in the assessment. Approximately 30 percent of CVP contractors who received the assessment responded.

Key Findings

The WORKS Assessment results show that CVP water contractors have a neutral opinion of WORKS:

- On a 1-5 scale (1 = Highly Negative, 5 = Highly Positive), the overall assessment revealed an average performance index of 3.15.
- Service questions received the highest performance index of 3.64.
- System credibility and value received the lowest performance index of 2.74.

The WORKS Assessment results also show:

Contractors delivering larger amounts (25,000 acre-feet or more) were more likely to have a negative perception of Reclamation's water accounting process.

- Most responses had little (significant) variance based on Central Valley Project Water Association (CVPWA) membership, but those responses with variance tended to reveal a more favorable perception from members.
- The most commonly noted priorities identified by respondents were (in order of priority): improved reports, consistency of information, and improvement follow-up.
- A large majority (between 78 percent and 82 percent) of all respondents were willing to standardize reporting forms that are not currently standardized.

With the feedback received from the assessment, efforts are underway to address CVP contractor concerns and move toward critical improvements to WORKS.

¹ <http://www.usbr.gov/excellence/>

INTRODUCTION

The WORKS Assessment measures CVP water contractors' perceptions about how effectively the Bureau of Reclamation Mid-Pacific Region manages their water service accounts. This is the first assessment conducted by the Region. Subsequent assessments will be administered annually to determine trends of improvement or decline in services provided. Assessment questions address perceptions and priorities of the water accounting system (BOR-WORKS) and the surrounding business processes.

The WORKS Assessment provides the Region with one source of information for evaluating success in reaching four of WORKS' essential goals:

- Service – *Streamline process. Improve operational effectiveness, efficiency, and access to information for end users.*
- System Credibility – *Improve integrity of the system and the extent to which it is perceived to produce intended results.*
- Value – *Provide more useful services and accurate information. Increase customer satisfaction.*
- Accountability – *Improve financial/accounting controls, business practice guidelines, stewardship.*

The Region conducted the assessment March 2-23, 2007. The Regional Office, Area Offices, and CVPWA sent out notifications about the survey. An online survey portal, Question Pro, administered the assessment. Out of approximately 156 CVP contractors who received the assessment, approximately 30 percent responded to the assessment. Respondents represented a broad range of demographics, including small vs. large contractors, various regions of the Central Valley, and association membership.

METHODOLOGY

In order to keep the assessment analysis simplified and report it in raw form, the data of the assessment was unweighted².

Assessment responses were then analyzed individually and cumulatively to observe patterns of response and outliers. The results of such analysis are noted in each section's "Key Findings."

All level of agreement responses were quantified on a Likert response scale. The responses were given the following values:

Strongly Agree: 5
Somewhat Agree: 4
Neutral: 3
Somewhat Disagree: 2
Strongly Disagree: 1
N/A: 0

²Unweighted data is not adjusted to give weight to individual responses based on the population from which the responses were drawn. For example, a population (total = 100) has two subgroups A (20 percent of the population) and B (80 percent of the population). Twenty people from the population respond to a survey, 10 from group A and 10 from group B. Weighted data would adjust the responses so that the relative importance of each group would be adjusted to the original population so group A's responses still signified only 20 percent in the findings and group B was 80 percent Unweighted

data gives each response equal value.

These values were grouped with related responses and averaged out to create a Performance Index. For example:

If Question 1 was asked with a total of 10 respondents and the distribution of responses was: Strongly Agree – 2 (10 pts), Somewhat Agree – 5 (20 pts), Neutral 1 (3 pts), Somewhat Disagree – 1 (2 pts), Strongly Disagree – 1 (1 pt) - $36/10 = 3.6$

The Performance Index for this question would be 3.6.

Open text comments were grouped by the topic and quantified based on the frequency of comments regarding each topic. Open text comments were not “scored.” Rather, the comments were given a priority based on frequency which provides Reclamation a means to determine the most common concerns. This will be used strategically in focusing process changes and improving future assessment ratings.

RESPONDENTS

Respondent Profile

Participation Summary	
Invitations*	
Total Invitations	156
Participant Statistics	
Respondents	38
Bounced	24
Withdrawal	2
Response Rate	29.23%
Average Time to Complete Survey	22 minutes
Key	
Bounced – Invitations returned due to invalid e-mails. Withdrawal – Invitees that opted out of participating. Response Rate – Completed surveys/Potential Respondents.	

Respondent Characteristics

Survey Summary	
Area Office	
Willows	34%
Folsom	23%
Fresno	43%
Communication Frequency	
Often (More than once a month)	47.06%
Sometimes (Several times a year)	47.06%
Rarely (No more than once a year)	5.88%
Never	0%
Other	0%
Annual Acre-Feet Water Deliveries	
0-500	5.88%
500-5,000	17.65%
5,000-25,000	26.47%
25,000-75,000	26.47%
more than 75,000	23.53%
CVP Water Association Membership	
Yes	61.76%
No	29.41%
Would rather not say	8.82%

Observations

According to other online survey portals, the average response rate for online surveys is 32.52 percent. This particular assessment falls slightly below average; however, juxtaposing the respondent profile with that of respondent characteristics, one can see a reasonable distribution of responses across various segments of the target population. This distribution increases the legitimacy of the assessment and allows for segmentation analysis.

RESULTS

Service

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Performance Index (PI)
Reclamation finance staff is knowledgeable and professional.	21.21%	45.45%	24.24%	6.06%	3.03%	0.00%	3.82
Reclamation finance staff is courteous.	51.52%	33.33%	6.06%	6.06%	0%	3.03%	4.41
It is easy to access the right point of contact for the answers I need.	21.21%	27.27%	6.06%	30.30%	15.15%	0.00%	3.39
Staff quickly follows-up on resolving issues.*	27.27%	27.27%	6.06%	15.15%	24.24%	0.00%	3.33
Staff appears to have a positive perception of BOR-WORKS and the surrounding process.	12.12%	15.15%	27.27%	27.27%	9.09%	9.09%	3.23
						Average PI	3.64

Observations

Service responses received an average performance index of 3.6 by water users, indicating a high-neutral opinion of service. Responses were relatively consistent between subgroups. However, seven out of eight (or 87.5 percent) of the smaller water (0-5,000 acre-feet) customers indicated either “Strongly Agree” or “Somewhat Agree” regarding ease in accessing the right point of contact for answers. When questioned about staff quickly following up on resolving issues, larger water users (more than 25,000) expressed the majority of discontent, with over half of the responses being either “Somewhat Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”.

Respondents were asked to provide text comments if they answered any of the questions with “Somewhat Disagree” or “Strongly Agree” so that Reclamation could identify those areas to address in improving ratings.

Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water users generally perceived Reclamation staff as knowledgeable, professional, and courteous. • The top service-related complaints were (in order of frequency): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Follow-up on issues or timeliness of corrections and information ○ Desire for central point of contact ○ Discontent with Regional Office communications • "Our area office is very helpful and makes the time to assist. Some Region staff is courteous. Some seem as if you are a nuisance to them when calling to ask questions or 'its not there job/department'. Typically I don't know who my point of contact is for a specific question....Emails/phone calls go unanswered for days, if answered at all..." - Survey Respondent

Credibility and Value

Table 2: Credibility and Value Results							
	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Performance Index (PI)
The reports provided to me by Reclamation are useful	9.09%	18.18%	6.06%	36.36%	30.30%	0%	2.76
The reports provided to me by Reclamation are accurate.	6.05%	15.15%	24.24%	27.27%	27.27%	0%	2.72
Average PI							2.74
How confident are you in Reclamation's accounting of your water delivery information?							
Very Confident	6.25%						
Somewhat confident	56.25%						
No confidence	37.50%						

Observations

Credibility and value responses received an average performance index of 2.74 which indicates moderate dissatisfaction from water users regarding the credibility and value of WORKS and its surrounding business process. To a lesser extent, responses based on water deliveries followed the same pattern as Service responses, with larger water users responding less favorably than smaller water users. Based on this fact, one can surmise that credibility and value decrease with increasingly complex contracts.

Respondents were asked to provide text comments if they answered any of the questions with “Somewhat Disagree” or “Strongly Agree” so that Reclamation could identify those areas to address in improving ratings.

Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The top credibility and value-related complaints were (in order of frequency): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Complexity and lack of clarity of reports ○ Timeliness of corrections or receiving reports ○ Inaccuracy of report information • "I am new to reading these documents...I would like to know where to go to learn how to understand what they mean." – Survey Respondent • "The monthly reports are useful, if you are looking at only that month's activity. However, since there are prior month and even prior year adjustments, without year to date totals, it becomes useless...The annual water delivery reports (WDR's) have been mostly useless....the report does not show a true picture of the water deliveries." - Survey Respondent

Accountability

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Performance Index (PI)
The water accounting process is cohesive.	2.94%	11.76%	32.35%	29.41%	23.53%	0%	2.70
I have a clear understanding of the water accounting process	11.76%	29.41%	23.53%	14.71%	20.59%	0%	3.12
I have a clear understanding of all the rates that relate to my various water transactions	32.35%	35.29%	11.76%	8.82%	8.82%	2.94%	3.73
Reclamation staff provides consistent information regarding my account standing between workgroups (i.e. accounting, ratesetting, area offices).	11.76%	17.65%	17.65%	23.53%	23.53%	5.86%	2.76
						Average PI	3.08

Observations

Accountability responses received an average performance index of 3.08 which indicates a low-neutral perception from water users regarding accountability. A noticeable deviation was regarding “I have a clear understanding of the water accounting process.” Forty-five percent of water users near the Willows Area Office responded with “Strongly Disagree.” Contractors between 25,000 and 75,000 acre-feet of water deliveries also responded to the same question with 44 percent strongly disagreeing. Again, larger water users tended to respond less favorably than smaller water users.

Respondents were asked to provide text comments if they answered any of the questions with “Somewhat Disagree” or “Strongly Agree” so that Reclamation could identify those areas to address in improving ratings.

Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The top accountability-related complaints were (in order of frequency): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Disjointed workgroups and lack of internal communications ○ Untimely correction of errors • "I do not clearly understand the water accounting process and have asked for training/seminars/info/etc....There seems to be a disconnect between accounting ratesetting etc. You don't always get the same answer from one department to the next." – Survey Respondent • "We probably need some workshop from Reclamation on the accounting process to better understand it." - Survey Respondent

Priorities

Respondents were asked to list three major priorities they would like to have Reclamation address regarding BOR-WORKS and its surrounding business process. The responses collected provided a range of perspectives on the areas that various contractors find important. When grouped thematically, three areas were consistently presented as the most prominent priorities. Based on these areas, a list of action items was formulated.

Improved Reports

The most common priority noted by respondents was the improvement of reports received from Reclamation. More specifically, respondents voiced a desire to have:

- More customer-friendly and useful reports. As one water user noted,

“The Monthly Water Statement that the Bureau sends out contains information that is not relevant to the District, the report consists of too many pages that contain no information, and the pages are confusing...”

Other reports, such as the Water Deliveries and Revenue (WDR), were also mentioned as being ineffectual for the purposes they are intended.

- Accurate information on reports.
- Reports sent in a timely manner and on a regular basis. Respondents revealed that in some instances, their district had not received water statements for several months.

ACTION ITEM(s):

- Consult with water users on revisions to statements and reports received from Reclamation.
- Improve internal controls to ensure accurate input.
- Examine process to improve timeliness of report distribution.

Consistency of Information

Respondents also voiced concerns regarding the consistency of information received from Reclamation. A perception of these inconsistencies seemed to be primarily focused on disconnects between area office staff and Regional office staff. As evidenced in the Service responses, the general perception is more favorably slanted towards Area Office staff. One respondent noted that,

“Contractors should be able to completely reconcile their charges and payments [...] with their respective Area Office...and then see the IDENTICAL data come from the Regional Office.”

The inconsistency of information is one of the underlying themes that permeated throughout most survey responses; however, this issue of poor internal communications also referred to contradictions between various workgroups (i.e. water accounting, accounting, ratesetting).

ACTION ITEM(s):

- Minimize points of contact for communications with water users.
- Reconcile area office spreadsheet information to BOR-WORKS information.

Improved Follow-Up

The last major priority presented was improving follow-up on communications with contractors and establishing a process for reporting errors. Respondents reported that Reclamation staff does not consistently answer inquiries in a timely manner. Some comments focused on contractors feeling as if they were getting “the runaround.” This area is also connected to the perception of disjointedness and inconsistency of information within the Region. Respondents appeared confused on who to contact if they discovered suspected errors on statements and were unsure how these errors were resolved once identified. One respondent recommended,

“Establish an error correction process where Contractors report suspected errors [...] and following correction Reclamation will advise districts by email or letter that there was no error or the error is corrected.”

ACTION ITEM(s):

- Standardize error correction process.
- Provide contact (e-mail or phone number) to escalate complaints or concerns.

Other Priorities

Although to a lesser extent, other priorities were mentioned by respondents for consideration. A few other notable priorities discussed were:

- Moving our water accounting process over to a billing system rather than our current advance payment system.
- Giving water users online access (read-only) to view contract information.
- Improving external communication (i.e. personnel changes and water rates)
- Providing training for contractors.

Future Considerations

The final section of the assessment included questions to gauge water users’ general feelings towards possible changes. This included communications from Reclamation and standardizing of reporting forms.

I prefer to receive reports and information related to BOR-WORKS via:		I would like to be updated _____ on WORKS* progress.	
Email	59.38%	Monthly	71.88%
Standard Mail	28.13%	Quarterly	15.63%
Other	12.50%	Annually	6.25%
Other Responses: Both email and standard mail		As Requested	6.25%

Responses regarding all future considerations were strongly concentrated which indicates a heavy interest in many areas that are not currently being utilized by Reclamation. For example, Table 4 shows nearly 60 percent of respondents indicated that they would prefer to receive BORWORKS reports and information via e-mail. Another 12.5 percent of respondents stated that they would like to receive information by e-mail and standard mail both. Considering the medium used to administer the assessment (an online survey portal), this is not unexpected; however, those who opted to send surveys via fax also voiced the same preference. Table 4 also shows a high interest in regular updates on WORKS progress. Seventy-one percent of respondents indicated that they would like to receive these updates monthly.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
I would like to have web-access to BOR-WORKS to view contract information.	75.00%	18.75%	6.25%	0%	0%	0%
I am willing to use a standard input form for reporting water delivery information.	43.75%	34.38%	6.25%	3.13%	6.25%	6.25%
I am willing to use a standard input form for remitting payments.	50.00%	31.25%	6.25%	3.13%	6.25%	3.13%

Responses shown in Table 5 also indicated strong support of the areas presented. Although the standardization of forms received less strong agreement, both had approximately an 80 percent positive response rate. The open text fields provided some clarification to hesitation underlying these responses. As one respondent noted, “Standard input forms must allow for ALL conditions required by ALL contractors.” Respondents seemed concerned that standard forms would be created without contractor feedback and create more confusion to a process they already perceive as unclear; however, it is clear that standardization itself has significant support from water users.

Conclusions and Next Steps

With Performance Indices between 2.74 and 3.64 (1-5 scale), the assessment indicates definite room for improvement but a strong existing framework in which to make improvement. Reclamation's ongoing shift to a more customer-oriented environment will greatly enhance its relationship with the water community at-large.

Generally, water users expressed a positive attitude toward staff and seemed frustrated with the water accounting process and organizational impediments. A major undertone of the assessment was the water users' desire to have an accurate picture of the standing of their water services contracts.

Current efforts are underway to significantly improve the water accounting system and its underlying process. These efforts include:

- Improving the readability and functionality of monthly water statements
- Streamlining the process for posting payments
- Quality-related improvements. Water users have provided input on the format of the revised monthly water statements and been kept privy to other ongoing improvement efforts. These efforts are expected to not only improve customer satisfaction but assist the Region with providing contractors with a more accurate standing of their water service accounts.

In addition to system changes, the Region is also implementing measures to increase customer satisfaction and organizational efficiency. This will range from:

- New business processes
- Resource evaluations
- More stringent training (contractors and staff) requirements
- Increased consensus among staff regarding water service contracts
- A formal issue resolution process
- Improved policy and business system analysis.

These practices will not only increase the timeliness of operations, but also serve to continually align the water accounting process with Regional goals.

Through this assessment the Region will have a valuable tool in gauging its progress. The Region will administer this assessment annually over the next few years and then every 2 years thereafter to monitor change regularly. As the Region assesses these indices every year, it will have a clear compass by which to focus continuous improvement.

In the road ahead, staff and management alike must make a commitment to excellence. This excellence cannot be found in a vacuum. Rather, our excellence must be established through deliberate and collaborative decision-making processes. As evidenced by the responses, there is a high interest by our stakeholders in our efforts to help this Region succeed.

APPENDIX

Which Area Office is your point of contact?

Willows (MP Construction Office)	32.35%
Folsom (Central California Area Office)	23.53%
Fresno (South Central California Area Office)	44.12%

How often do you communicate with Reclamation regarding the accounting details of your water contract(s)?

Often (More than once a month)	47.06%
Sometimes (Several times a year)	47.06%
Rarely (No more than once a year)	5.88%
Never	0.00%
Other	0.00%

On average, how many acre feet of water are delivered under your contract(s) annually?

0-500	5.88%
500-5,000	17.65%
5,000-25,000	26.47%
25,000-75,000	26.47%
over 75,000	23.53%

Are you a member of the Central Valley Project Water Association?

Yes	61.76%
No	29.41%
Would rather not say	8.82%

	Total	Willows	Folsom	Fresno	0-500	500-5,000	5,000-25,000	25,000-75,000	75,000+	CVPWA Members	CVPWA NonMembers	Membership Not Stated
Reclamation finance staff is knowledgeable and professional.												
Strongly Agree	21.21%	36.36%	0.00%	21.43%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	25.00%	12.50%	25.00%	10.00%	33.33%
Somewhat Agree	45.45%	27.27%	62.50%	50.00%	0.00%	33.33%	55.56%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%
Neutral	24.24%	18.18%	37.50%	21.43%	50.00%	0.00%	44.44%	12.50%	25.00%	15.00%	40.00%	33.33%
Somewhat Disagree	6.06%	9.09%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	5.00%	0.00%	33.33%
Strongly Disagree	3.03%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%
N/A	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Reclamation finance staff is courteous.												
Strongly Agree	51.52%	45.45%	37.50%	64.29%	50.00%	66.67%	44.44%	50.00%	50.00%	45.00%	70.00%	33.33%
Somewhat Agree	33.33%	27.27%	50.00%	28.57%	0.00%	33.33%	44.44%	25.00%	37.50%	35.00%	20.00%	66.67%
Neutral	6.06%	9.09%	12.50%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	10.00%	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	6.06%	9.09%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
N/A	3.03%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%
It is easy to access the right point of contact for the answers I need.												
Strongly Agree	21.21%	36.36%	0.00%	21.43%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	25.00%	12.50%	25.00%	10.00%	33.33%
Somewhat Agree	27.27%	0.00%	37.50%	42.86%	50.00%	33.33%	33.33%	12.50%	25.00%	25.00%	40.00%	0.00%
Neutral	6.06%	9.09%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	30.30%	36.36%	50.00%	14.29%	0.00%	16.67%	44.44%	37.50%	25.00%	20.00%	40.00%	66.67%
Strongly Disagree	15.15%	18.18%	0.00%	21.43%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	37.50%	20.00%	10.00%	0.00%
N/A	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Staff quickly follows-up on resolving issues.												
Strongly Agree	27.27%	36.36%	12.50%	28.57%	100.00%	66.67%	0.00%	25.00%	12.50%	25.00%	30.00%	33.33%
Somewhat Agree	27.27%	9.09%	37.50%	35.71%	0.00%	16.67%	44.44%	25.00%	25.00%	30.00%	20.00%	33.33%
Neutral	6.06%	9.09%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	15.15%	9.09%	25.00%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	12.50%	25.00%	10.00%	30.00%	0.00%
Strongly Disagree	24.24%	36.36%	12.50%	21.43%	0.00%	16.67%	11.11%	37.50%	37.50%	25.00%	20.00%	33.33%
N/A	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

	Total	Willows	Folsom	Fresno	0-500	500-5,000	5,000-25,000	25,000-75,000	75,000+	CVPWA Members	CVPWA NonMembers	Membership Not Stated
Staff appears to have a positive perception of BOR-WORKS and the surrounding process.												
Strongly Agree	12.12%	27.27%	0.00%	7.14%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.00%	0.00%	33.33%
Somewhat Agree	15.15%	0.00%	37.50%	14.29%	50.00%	33.33%	11.11%	12.50%	0.00%	15.00%	20.00%	0.00%
Neutral	27.27%	9.09%	37.50%	35.71%	0.00%	0.00%	44.44%	25.00%	37.50%	25.00%	30.00%	33.33%
Somewhat Disagree	27.27%	45.45%	12.50%	21.43%	0.00%	16.67%	33.33%	37.50%	25.00%	25.00%	30.00%	33.33%
Strongly Disagree	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	25.00%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%
N/A	9.09%	9.09%	12.50%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	12.50%	12.50%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%
The reports provided to me by Reclamation are useful.												
Strongly Agree	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	50.00%	16.67%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	9.52%	11.11%	0.00%
Somewhat Agree	18.18%	9.09%	25.00%	21.43%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	12.50%	23.81%	0.00%	33.33%
Neutral	6.06%	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	9.52%	0.00%	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	36.36%	27.27%	50.00%	35.71%	50.00%	16.67%	33.33%	62.50%	25.00%	38.10%	33.33%	33.33%
Strongly Disagree	30.30%	45.45%	25.00%	21.43%	0.00%	16.67%	33.33%	25.00%	50.00%	19.05%	55.56%	33.33%
N/A	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
The reports provided to me by Reclamation are accurate.												
Strongly Agree	6.06%	0.00%	0.00%	13.33%	50.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	10.00%	0.00%
Somewhat Agree	15.15%	0.00%	25.00%	20.00%	0.00%	16.67%	33.33%	12.50%	0.00%	20.00%	10.00%	0.00%
Neutral	24.24%	20.00%	25.00%	26.67%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	37.50%	37.50%	20.00%	30.00%	33.33%
Somewhat Disagree	27.27%	40.00%	50.00%	6.67%	50.00%	33.33%	33.33%	37.50%	0.00%	35.00%	10.00%	33.33%
Strongly Disagree	27.27%	40.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	33.33%	11.11%	12.50%	62.50%	20.00%	40.00%	33.33%
N/A	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
How confident are you in Reclamations accounting of your water delivery information?												
Very Confident	6.25%	0.00%	12.50%	6.67%	50.00%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%
Somewhat Confident	56.25%	66.67%	75.00%	40.00%	50.00%	100.00%	66.67%	44.44%	28.57%	52.63%	50.00%	100.00%
No Confidence	37.50%	33.33%	12.50%	53.33%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	55.56%	71.43%	36.84%	50.00%	0.00%

	Total	Willows	Folsom	Fresno	0-500	500-5,000	5,000-25,000	25,000-75,000	75,000+	CVPWA Members	CVPWA NonMembers	Membership Not Stated
The water accounting process is cohesive.												
Strongly Agree	2.94%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.76%	0.00%	0.00%
Somewhat Agree	11.76%	18.18%	12.50%	6.67%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	9.52%	10.00%	33.33%
Neutral	32.35%	36.36%	37.50%	26.67%	50.00%	33.33%	55.56%	22.22%	12.50%	33.33%	30.00%	33.33%
Somewhat Disagree	29.41%	27.27%	37.50%	26.67%	0.00%	16.67%	22.22%	55.56%	25.00%	33.33%	20.00%	33.33%
Strongly Disagree	23.53%	18.18%	12.50%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	22.22%	50.00%	19.05%	40.00%	0.00%
N/A	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

I have a clear understanding of the water accounting process.												
Strongly Agree	11.76%	9.09%	12.50%	13.33%	50.00%	16.67%	11.11%	0.00%	12.50%	14.29%	10.00%	0.00%
Somewhat Agree	29.41%	18.18%	37.50%	33.33%	0.00%	50.00%	33.33%	22.22%	25.00%	33.33%	20.00%	33.33%
Neutral	23.53%	18.18%	12.50%	33.33%	50.00%	0.00%	11.11%	22.22%	50.00%	23.81%	30.00%	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	14.71%	9.09%	37.50%	6.67%	0.00%	16.67%	22.22%	11.11%	12.50%	9.52%	20.00%	33.33%
Strongly Disagree	20.59%	45.45%	0.00%	13.33%	0.00%	16.67%	22.22%	44.44%	0.00%	19.05%	20.00%	33.33%
N/A	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

I have a clear understanding of all the rates that relate to my various water transactions.												
Strongly Agree	32.35%	27.27%	25.00%	40.00%	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	44.44%	25.00%	38.10%	30.00%	0.00%
Somewhat Agree	35.29%	18.18%	50.00%	40.00%	100.00%	50.00%	0.00%	33.33%	50.00%	33.33%	40.00%	33.33%
Neutral	11.76%	9.09%	12.50%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	11.11%	12.50%	14.29%	10.00%	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	8.82%	18.18%	0.00%	6.67%	0.00%	16.67%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	4.76%	0.00%	66.67%
Strongly Disagree	8.82%	18.18%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	22.22%	11.11%	0.00%	4.76%	20.00%	0.00%
N/A	2.94%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	4.76%	0.00%	0.00%

Reclamation staff provides consistent information regarding my account standing between workgroups (i.e. accounting, ratesetting, area offices).												
Strongly Agree	11.76%	9.09%	12.50%	13.33%	50.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	12.50%	9.52%	20.00%	0.00%
Somewhat Agree	17.65%	9.09%	25.00%	20.00%	50.00%	33.33%	11.11%	11.11%	12.50%	19.05%	10.00%	33.33%
Neutral	17.65%	27.27%	25.00%	6.67%	0.00%	16.67%	33.33%	22.22%	0.00%	19.05%	10.00%	33.33%
Somewhat Disagree	23.53%	18.18%	25.00%	26.67%	0.00%	16.67%	44.44%	22.22%	12.50%	14.29%	40.00%	33.33%
Strongly Disagree	23.53%	27.27%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	44.44%	50.00%	28.57%	20.00%	0.00%
N/A	5.88%	9.09%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	12.50%	9.52%	0.00%	0.00%

I prefer to receive reports and information related to BOR-WORKS via:

E-mail	59.38%
Standard Mail	28.13%
Other	12.50%

Other Responses

Both, No Preference

I would like to be updated _____ on WORKS progress.

Monthly	71.88%
Quarterly	15.63%
Annually	6.25%
As Requested	6.25%

I would like to have web-access to BOR-WORKS to view contract information.

Strongly Agree	75.00%
Somewhat Agree	18.75%
Neutral	6.25%
Somewhat Disagree	0.00%
Strongly Disagree	0.00%
N/A	0.00%

I am willing to use a standard input form for reporting water delivery information.

Strongly Agree	43.75%
Somewhat Agree	34.38%
Neutral	6.25%
Somewhat Disagree	3.13%
Strongly Disagree	6.25%
N/A	6.25%

I am willing to use a standard input form for remitting payments.

Strongly Agree	50.00%
Somewhat Agree	31.25%
Neutral	6.25%
Somewhat Disagree	3.13%
Strongly Disagree	6.25%
N/A	3.13%

