Department of Energy

Bonneville Power Administration
P.O. Box 3621
Portland, Oregon 97208-3621

Official File

CORPORATE

January 5, 2006

In reply refer to: DK-7

Mr. L. Daniel Glass

RE: FOIA Request #06-010

Dear Mr. Glass:

Thank you for your email of January 4, 2006, requesting information under the Freedom of Information Act. In your letter, you requested a copy of the Dean Landers report submitted to Vickie VanZandt on June 15, 2005

Your request was received by our office on January 5, 2006, and has been logged in as FOIA #06-010. In your letter, you expressed a willingness to pay processing fees for your request.

Ms. Vickie VanZandt, senior vice president of the transmission business line, has been designated as Authorizing Official for your request. Ms. VanZandt has 20 working days, until February 3, 2006, to provide a response. Should you have any questions, Ms. VanZandt may be reached at Mail Stop T-DITT2 or by calling 360-418-8005.

Sincerely,

/s/ Christina J. Brannon

Christina J. Brannon
Freedom of Information Officer

Department of Energy

Bonneville Power Administration
P.O. Box 3621
Portland, Oregon 97208-3621

Official File

CORPORATE

January 30, 2006

In reply refer to: DK-7

Mr. L. Daniel Glass

RE: FOIA Request #06-010

Dear Mr. Glass:

This letter responds to your Freedom of Information Act that was received by our office on January 4, 2006. In your request, you asked for a copy of a report prepared by Dean Landers on behalf of Vickie VanZandt. You state in your request that the report was submitted to Ms. VanZandt by Mr. Landers on June 15, 2005.

Enclosed are all segregable portions of the report. However, BPA has determined that certain information contained in the report should be withheld from public disclosure under 5 USC § 552(b)(5) (Exemption 5) and 5 USC § 552(b)(6) (Exemption 6) of the FOIA, as described in the following paragraphs.

Exemption 5

Exemption 5 protects inter-agency or intra-agency documents from disclosure that would normally qualify for a recognized civil discovery privilege. BPA asserts the deliberative process privilege for information contained in the report that is both pre-decisional and deliberative in nature.

Mr. Landers was hired by BPA to assist management in responding to workplace controversies that were brought forward by concerned employees. Mr. Landers was also requested to provide management with his opinions regarding the causes of the controversies and to provide his recommendations on how management might respond. Therefore, the report meets the requirements of an inter-agency document. The entire report prepared by Mr. Landers is pre-decisional because it was part of an agency decision-making process. The reasonably segregable, non-exempt portions of this report are being released to you. However, the non-factual and deliberative portions of the report are being withheld under exemption 5. The withheld information contains recommendations and conclusions made to management by Mr. Landers, which reflect Mr. Landers' personal views and opinions and do not necessarily reflect the opinions and/or conclusions of BPA. BPA is also withholding Mr. Landers' summaries of

his witness interviews, with the exception of the summary he prepared of your statement. The summaries are not signed by the interviewees and are not verbatim statements. Furthermore, the summaries contain the opinions and thoughts of the individuals being interviewed and are not purely factual in nature. Any factual information contained in the summaries is inextricably intertwined with non-factual material and cannot be reasonably segregated.

Release of the material described above could interfere with the candid exchange of advice and recommendations to management in the future, thereby depriving management of the benefit of being able to thoroughly and impartially evaluate and respond to workplace issues.

Exemption 6

With the exception of information you would be entitled to receive under the Privacy Act, BPA asserts the personal privacy privilege under Exemption 6 for information contained in the report that identifies the individuals that participated in the factual inquiry. This information includes the identity of individuals who were requested and/or were interviewed by Mr. Landers', the identities of the employees who brought their concerns forward to management, and information that impacts the privacy of individual(s) against whom allegations were made. In addition, BPA is withholding identifying information of individuals who gave or received monetary awards. Finally, BPA is withholding Dan Landers' personal phone number and email address.

BPA has determined that a significant privacy interest exists in the information described above. Individuals who participate in administrative investigations are expected to reveal information about relationships between co-workers and supervisors. To be effective, the factual inquiry required the individuals who participated to give candid information and opinions. Release of identifying details would inhibit the cooperation of individuals in future inquiries or investigations, for fear that their involvement would be made public. Release of this information could also lead to reprisals by or against other employees and/or supervisors. This could deter concerned individuals from bringing workplace issues and concerns forward to management in the future. Additionally, there is a privacy interest in revealing the names of individuals who gave or received awards. Release of information pertaining to the identities of employees who received or gave awards may incite jealousies amongst co-workers. Also, there is a privacy interest against public disclosure of Mr. Landers' individual phone number and email address. The public disclosure of this information could result in Mr. Landers' receiving unwanted email and phone communications.

BPA has also determined that there is little to no public interest in the information being withheld because it does not shed significant light on the operations and activities of the BPA. The report concerns internal workplace issues between a relatively small group of employees. The public disclosure of identifying information of those who participated in the factual inquiry does not reveal anything about BPA's operations or activities. There is little public interest in the names of individuals that gave or received awards. In addition, disclosing Mr. Landers'

private phone number and private e-mail address would not reveal anything about BPA and, therefore, would not enhance the public's understanding of BPA's operations and activities. If you are dissatisfied with this determination, you may appeal within 30 days from the date you receive this letter to the Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20585. The appeal must be in writing and both the envelope and letter must be clearly marked "Freedom of Information Act Appeal."

Sincerely,

/s/ Christina J. Brannon

Christina J. Brannon
Freedom of Information Act Officer

Enclosures

BPA F 1325.05e
(08-1999)
(Previously BPA 303)

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Electronic Form Approved
by CIL 08/03/1999

Office of General Counsel

InterOffice Memo

Date: January 24, 2006

To: Vickie VanZandt

From: Joe Bennett

Subject: Draft FOIA Response

Attached is a draft letter in response to Dan Glass' FOIA request. Also attached is a copy of the non-exempt material that Mr. Glass will receive pursuant to the request.

When you have finished reviewing the attached material, please return it to either me or Carol Jacobson in a blue envelope (Routing LC-7). We will then coordinate with Michael Coffey in BPA's FOIA office to get the response letter signed and mailed.

If you have any comments or concerns about the draft response and/or materials planned to be sent to Mr. Glass please let either me or Carol know. I may be reached at extension 5265 and Carol may be reached at extension 4179. Thank you.

This is fine, Joe.
Thanks for your work
on this issue.

Department of Energy

Bonneville Power Administration
P.O. Box 3621
Portland, Oregon 97208-3621

DRAFT

In reply refer to: DK-7

Dan Glass

Dear Mr. Glass:

This letter responds to your Freedom of Information Act that was received by our office on January 4, 2006. In your request, you asked for a copy of a report prepared by Dean Landers on behalf of Vickie VanZandt. You state in your request that the report was submitted to Ms. VanZandt by Mr. Landers on June 15, 2005.

Enclosed are all segregable portions of the report. However, BPA has determined that certain information contained in the report should be withheld from public disclosure under 5 USC § 552(b)(5) (Exemption 5) and 5 USC § 552(b)(6) (Exemption 6) of the FOIA, as described in the following paragraphs.

Exemption 5

Exemption 5 protects inter-agency or intra-agency documents from disclosure that would normally qualify for a recognized civil discovery privilege. BPA asserts the deliberative process privilege for information contained in the report that is both pre-decisional and deliberative in nature.

Mr. Landers was hired by BPA to assist management in responding to workplace controversies that were brought forward by concerned employees. Mr. Landers was also requested to provide management with his opinions regarding the causes of the controversies and to provide his recommendations on how management might respond. Therefore, the report meets the requirements of an inter-agency document. The entire report prepared by Mr. Landers is pre-decisional, because it was part of an agency decision making process. The reasonably segregable, non-exempt portions of this report are being released to you. However, the non-factual and deliberative portions of the report are being withheld under exemption 5. The withheld information contains recommendations and conclusions made to management by Mr. Landers, which reflect Mr. Landers' personal views and opinions and do not necessarily reflect the opinions and/or conclusions of BPA. BPA is also withholding Mr. Landers' summaries of his witness interviews, with the exception of the summary he prepared of your statement. The summaries are not signed by the interviewees and are not verbatim statements. Furthermore, the summaries contain the opinions and thoughts of the individuals being interviewed and are not

purely factual in nature. Any factual information contained in the summaries is inextricably intertwined with non-factual material and cannot be reasonably segregated.

Release of the material described above could interfere with the candid exchange of advice and recommendations to management in the future, thereby depriving management of the benefit of being able to thoroughly and impartially evaluate and respond to workplace issues.

Exemption 6

With the exception of information you would be entitled to receive under the Privacy Act, BPA asserts the personal privacy privilege under Exemption 6 for information contained in the report that identifies the individuals that participated in the factual inquiry. This information includes the identity of individuals who were requested and/or were interviewed by Mr. Landers', the identities of the employees who brought their concerns forward to management, and information that impacts the privacy of individual(s) against whom allegations were made. In addition, BPA is withholding identifying information of individuals who gave or received monetary awards. Finally, BPA is withholding Dan Landers' personal phone number and email address.

BPA has determined that a significant privacy interest exists in the information described above. Individuals who participate in administrative investigations are expected to reveal information about relationships between co-workers and supervisors. To be effective, the factual inquiry required the individuals who participated to give candid information and opinions. Release of identifying details would inhibit the cooperation of individuals in future inquiries or investigations, for fear that their involvement would be made public. Release of this information could also lead to reprisals by or against other employees and/or supervisors. This could deter concerned individuals from bringing workplace issues and concerns forward to management in the future. Additionally, there is a privacy interest in revealing the names of individuals who gave or received awards. Release of information pertaining to the identities of employees who received or gave awards may incite jealousies amongst co-workers. Also, there is a privacy interest against public disclosure of Mr. Landers' individual phone number and email address. The public disclosure of this information could result in Mr. Landers' receiving unwanted email and phone communications.

BPA has also determined that there is little to no public interest in the information being withheld because it does not shed significant light on the operations and activities of the BPA. The report concerns internal workplace issues between a relatively small group of employees. The public disclosure of identifying information of those who participated in the factual inquiry does not reveal anything about BPA's operations or activities. There is little public interest in the names of individuals that gave or received awards. In addition, disclosing Mr. Landers' private phone number and private e-mail address would not reveal anything about BPA and therefore would not enhance the public's understanding of BPA's operations and activities.

If you are dissatisfied with this determination, you may appeal within 30 days from the date you receive this letter to the Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy, 1000

Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20585. The appeal must be in writing and both the envelope and letter must be clearly marked "Freedom of Information Act Appeal."

Sincerely,

Christina J. Brannon
Freedom of Information Act Officer

Enclosures

Factual Inquiry

CONFIDENTIAL

Prepared
for

Vickie VanZandt, P.E.

Senior Vice President, Transmission Business Line

Bonneville Power Administration

June 15, 2005

Prepared
by

Dean M. Landers

Redacted

Table of Contents

I. Letter initiating project from Vickie VanZandt

II. Plan of Action

A. Find out what happened—background; dates; sequence; important events
B. Determine the causes of the controversy between McGhee & Glass
C. Form an opinion as to whether McGhee's actions were well founded in regard to:

1. Glass' Performance Appraisal
2. Moving Glass to non-managerial position
3. Not placing Glass on a PIP and denying Glass' WGI

D. Develop recommendations for McGhee to deal with the work place issues
E. Develop recommendations for Vickie to respond to:

1. McGhee
2. Glass
3. Employees

III. How we Move Forward

IV. Documentation

A. List of Interviews and Meetings
B. Performance Appraisal
C. PAR for Dan Glass 10/21/04
D. Within Grade Denial
E. TFHE Budget Report 04
F. Premier Choice Awards
G. Dan's Reassignment
H. Dan's Letter to Foremen
I. Letter from Employees
J. Letter from Administrator
K. Dan's letter to Vickie
L. Key Points of Interviews
M. Unsolicited Letter from Stan Kuchler

H

Marie:

Please find enclosed the documents pertinent to the review I am asking Dean to conduct. It needs to be clear that my draft response was NOT sent. I would like Dean to interview the following people to discover the facts surrounding this issue:

Redacted

I do not want to be prescriptive in the questions he asks – just let him find out what happened, what he perceives to be the cause of the controversy, whether he believes the actions taken by John with respect to Dan's performance rating and reassignment were well founded, his recommendations for John to deal with the work place issues, and for me on how to respond. I intend to talk with these people as well. I want to use Dean for objectivity (John and I have been friends for 10 years). I want to talk with them myself because I don't want a perception that I am disconnected from their concerns. I would like to talk with Dean before he begins his work. Not all of these interviews need to be face-to-face (i.e., I don't think he needs to travel to the work sites to talk with the FIII).

Thank you

Vickie

II

II. Plan of Action

A. Find out what happened—background; dates; sequence; important events
B. Determine the causes of the controversy between McGhee & Glass
C. Form an opinion as to whether McGhee's actions were well founded in regard to:

    1. Glass' Performance Appraisal
    2. Moving Glass to non-managerial position
    3. Not placing Glass on a PIP and denying Glass' WGI

D. Develop recommendations for McGhee to deal with the work place issues
E. Develop recommendations for Vickie to respond to:

    1. McGhee
    2. Glass
    3. Employees

A

II. Plan of Action

A. Background: Dates, Sequence, Important events

Background: John McGhee became manager of Construction & Maintenance Services on January 27, 2002. At that time Dan Glass was Manager, Central Electrical Services; thus, McGhee became Glass' supervisor.

Glass was rated FULLY SUCCESSFUL by McGhee for fiscal years 2002 and 2003. A Performance Plan was put in place for fiscal year 2004 (appraisal period 10/1/03 to 9/30/04) signed by Glass on 12/24/03 and McGhee on 12/29/03. The Reviewing Official, Frederick M. Johnson, signed that document on 12/29/03 (See Section IV, Tab B).

One progress review was conducted and documented as having occurred on 3/23/04. Although McGhee's initials are not in the space provided for "Rating Officials Initials," (See Section IV, Tab B) both McGhee and Glass acknowledge the progress review took place.

McGhee administered his appraisal of Glass' performance for fiscal year 2004 on 10/21/04. The Summary Rating was NEEDS IMPROVEMENT. Glass claims that "I left there (McGhee's office) thinking I needed some improvement. After I signed I told John, 'we'll do better next year' and he said 'well good'".

The performance contract had been spelled out; Glass was a party to its development and both employees signed it. Glass did not fulfill his contractual obligations in regard to the expense budget. Consequently, McGhee rated Glass "0" on the two expense elements of his contract (and three other elements discussed elsewhere in this Inquiry). When McGhee gave Glass his performance appraisal on 10/21/04 both men agreed that the Rating Level was NEEDS IMPROVEMENT. Later it was discovered by a member of Transmission's administrative staff, Cheryl Russell, that the rating should have been UNACCEPTABLE based on the points assigned. The staff member notified McGhee who, after reviewing the appraisal in Cheryl's office, modified the Summary Rating to UNACCEPTABLE, which properly reflected the points McGhee had awarded Glass. McGhee had the opportunity to revise the points in order to make the overall rating remain at NEEDS IMPROVEMENT, but declined to do so. McGhee said that "I

intended to assign Dan a NEEDS IMPROVEMENT but I have to hold people accountable for the points and how they come out."

After changing the Summary Rating on Glass' performance appraisal from NEEDS IMPROVEMENT to UNACCEPTABLE McGhee did not notify Glass of this revision nor provide him a copy. Glass discovered the Summary Rating had been changed from Frederick Johnson during their meeting on 12/20/04. Mr. Johnson provided a copy of the appraisal to Glass at that time.

Glass claims McGhee asked him to come see him following the staff meeting on 11/29/04. McGhee then advised Glass that he was "unable to recommend a WGI" (See Section IV, Tab D) and that "I am going to do a PIP (for you)".

On 12/3/04 McGhee told Glass he would be reassigned. McGhee said, "I couldn't figure out how I was going to make a PIP work when things I had put in place hadn't worked." I was told that Dan said, "It's hard to teach an old dog new tricks" when someone asked him about going on a PIP. I decided I needed to move Dan into a staff position and hire a new manager.

I came to the conclusion that was my only choice. I told Dan I was reassigning him and we would put together a communications plan on Monday. Dan sent his email out on Monday (12/6/04) to the foremen" (See Section IV, Tab H).

After being told he was being reassigned on Friday, 12/3/04 Glass says he went home and thought about it overnight. He says he reached the conclusion to retire and drafted an email to his foremen on 12/4/04. On 12/5/04 he sent the email to himself at BPA then on 12/6/04 he sent it to the foremen from his office.

On 12/20/04 Glass went to see Frederick Johnson where he says he learned for the first time that his Performance Rating had been changed from NEEDS IMPROVEMENT to UNACCEPTABLE. Glass was officially reassigned to a new position, Construction Maintenance Specialist (See Section IV, Tab G) on 12/26/04 and retired 1/30/05.

Dates and Key Events

09/00/79	**Glass begins work at BPA in Construction as Electrician**
03/00/88	**Glass promoted to field Foreman**
11/00/92	**Glass detailed into the office as Assistant Superintendent**
12/00/92	**Glass permanently assigned to office as Superintendent**
01/27/02	**McGhee becomes Glass' supervisor**
Spring 03	**Glass and Four staff members relocate office to PSB**
12/24/03	**Glass signs performance plan (*appraisal for 10/1/03 to 9/30/04*)**
12/29/03	**McGhee signs performance plan**
12/29/03	**Fred Johnson signs performance plan**
03/23/04	**McGhee administers mid-point rating with Glass**
10/21/04	**McGhee administers annual rating with Glass (Needs Improvement)**
10/00/04	**Needs Improvement changed to Unsatisfactory by McGhee after finding numerical scores equal Unsatisfactory**
11/17/04	**McGhee signs WGI denial**
11/18/04	**Fred Johnson signs annual rating**
11/29/04	**McGhee informs Glass of PIP and that WGI denied**
12/03/04	**McGhee informs Glass he is reassigning him**
12/06/04	**Glass sends e-mail "A Door Closing-Another About to Open"**
12/20/04	**Glass met with Fred Johnson at Robin's suggestion Fred informs Glass of Unacceptable rating**
12/26/04	**Effective date of Glass' Reassignment to Construction & Maintenance Operations Specialist**
01/11/05	**McGhee allegedly stated he had agonized over decision to dismiss Glass for eight months---McGhee denies, says he was misquoted**
01/23/05	**Letter to Administrator from Construction employees**
01/24/05	**Glass' 55th birthday**
01/30/05	**Glass retires**
03/10/05	**Email from Administrator to Construction employees**
03/28/05	**Letter to Vickie from Glass**

B

B. Causes of the controversy between McGhee & Glass

Redacted

c

C. McGhee's actions in regard to:

→ examined books w/ Betty Brooks

1. Glass' Performance Appraisal

The following five sub-elements in Glass' Performance Contract were scored "0": 1) TFHE Total Expenses; 2) TFHE Expense Overtime; 3) Training; 4) Recognition; and 5) Safety. Each of these items is discussed below.

1) TFHE Total Expenses

Expenditures $1,346,743 (Less Reimbursable $225,294)	$1,121,449
Budget	936,164
Over Budget	**$185,285**

2) TFHE Expense Overtime

Expenditures	$104,335
Budget	45,844
Over Budget	**$58,491**

Conclusion:

↑

Redacted

↓

3) Training

Standard: Opportunities for personal development, training and to maintain technical and professional competence is provided by at least three training courses identified by field supervisors, courses to be completed by 05/15/04.

Discussion: Two classes were completed in 2004 and a third in January 2005 by TFHE employees. The reason McGhee gave for assigning Glass a "0" on this item was:

"What I put into his contract was a requirement to get his organization the three classes so fulfilling his contract meant getting three classes for his organization. He didn't actively participate in this."

According to Glass, "John and the foremen in the field set them (the classes) up at one of the foreman meetings."

Conclusion:

Redacted

redacted-

sc

4) Recognition

Standard: 90% of all TFHE employees receive some form of personal recognition by EOY.

Discussion: The reason McGhee gave for assigning Glass a "0" on this item was: "There were crews that no one got any recognition though we bought $25 gift certificates. Only the foremen got an award."

Glass claims, "We took part of the budget and bought these Premier Choice Awards. They gave a stack to every foreman. They took care of it."

Of the six Electrician Foremen III I interviewed, five claimed they had received one or more Premier Choice Award in 2004 from Glass. The six foremen told me that every person on their crews had received one or more Premier Choice Award in 2004 with only one exception and that involved an employee having performance and/or conduct problems. I also obtained an

8-page list of TFHE employees who received awards (See Section IV, Tab F).

redacted

5) Safety

Standard: Provide direction and leadership for a TFHE Safety Program to assure TFHE has a safety record of no more than XX lost time injuries and no fatalities at 9/30/04.

Discussion: Both McGhee and Glass agree that the standards for this element were not met.

Conclusion: Redacted

2. Moving Glass to non-managerial position

Redacted

McGhee took a number of actions involving TFHE between the time he became Glass' supervisor in January 2002, and the date he reassigned Glass,

December 2004, that may suggest that "disagreements" existed between the two. During this period of time:

Redacted -

3. Not placing Glass on a PIP and Denying Glass a WGI

PIP:

Redacted

D

D. Recommendations for McGhee to deal with the work place issues

Redacted

E

E. Recommendations for how Vickie should respond to:

1. McGhee

Redacted

Recommendations for how Vickie should respond to:

2. Glass

Redacted

Recommendations for how Vickie should respond to:

3. Employees

Redacted

III

III. How we move forward

Redacted

π

IV. Documentation

A. List of Interviews and Meetings
B. Performance Appraisal
C. PAR for Dan Glass 10/21/04
D. Within Grade Denial
E. TFHE Budget Report 04
F. Premier Choice Awards
G. Dan's Reassignment
H. Dan's Letter to Foremen
I. Letter from Employees
J. Letter from Administrator
K. Dan's letter to Vickie
L. Key Points of Interviews
M. Unsolicited Letter from <redacted name, exemption 6>

A

Interviews/Meetings

Redacted

B

BPA F 3430.02e (Page 2)
(09-03)

Electronic Form Approved
by CIEP 09/17/2003

.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
ONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION
MANAGERIAL/SUPERVISORY
PERFORMANCE PLAN AND APPRAISAL

rence should be made to Bonneville Power Administration Personnel Letter 430-2 for policy guidance and further information.

Period Covered
From 10/1/03 To: 9/30/04

1. Name of Employee
L. Daniel Glass

2. Employee ID (EmplID)

3. Position Title, Series, and Grade
Manager, Central Electrical Services

5. Organization Title and Routing
TFHE

Certification of Discussion and Issuance of Performance Plan

A copy of the elements, sub-elements and performance standards has been provided to the employee and an opportunity to discuss them with the Rating Official has been afforded to the employee.

6. Employee's Name *(Print or Type)* and Signature
L. Daniel Glass — Date 12/24/03

7. Rating Official's Name *(Print or Type)* and Signature
John B. McGhee — Date 12/29/03

8. Reviewing Official's Name *(Print or Type)* and Signature
Fredrick Johnson — Date 12/29/03

9. Progress Reviews

Frequent progress reviews are recommended and should include both interim assessment of performance and a review of the continuing appropriateness of the performance plan's standards, including the weighting (points assigned) to each standard. At a minimum, one formal progress review is required, usually at about the midpoint of the appraisal period. The dates of progress reviews are to be recorded, and both the employee and the Rating Official are to initial using the boxes to the right.

Employee's Initials	Rating Official's Initials	Date
LDG	3/23/04	3/23/04

10. Reasons For Appraisal *(to receive a rating, the employee must have served at least 90 days under an established performance plan, r the same Rating Official):*

- [x] Annual Rating of Record
- [ ] Rating of Record for reasons other than Annual rating *(specify reason).*
  (You must contact the Employee Relations staff in Personnel Services when you use this reason for appraisal.)
- [ ] Advisory Rating for detail or time-limited promotions of 120 days or more.
- [ ] Advisory Rating due to employee's position change.
- [ ] Advisory Rating assigned due to Rating Official leaving *(employee was supervised at least 90 days under an established performance plan.)*

11. Critical Elements Rating

Critical Elements	Points Earned	Rating Level S	M	N	U
1. Stakeholder/Customer/Client	30	X			
2. Financial	5				X
3. Internal Systems & Processes	10		X		
4. Leadership/Management/Supervision	21				X
Total Points	66	Elements Rating Level-mark (X) in appropriate boxes			

12. Summary Rating

- [ ] **S - SIGNIFICANTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS:** 90 or more points earned, at least two elements rated as **S**, and no element rated as **N** or **U**.
- [ ] **M - MEETS EXPECTATIONS:** Does not meet **S** rating requirements and EITHER (1) 70 or more points earned, no more than 1 element is rated as **N** and none at **U**; OR (2) all 4 elements rated as M.
- [ ] **N - NEEDS IMPROVEMENT:** Less than 70 points earned, at least one element rated as **N** and none rated as **U**; OR 2 or more elements rated as **N** and none rated as **U** (regardless of points earned).
- [x] **U - UNACCEPTABLE:** One or more elements rated as **U**.

13. Certification of Summary Rating

The performance rating documented on this form has been discussed with the employee and the employee has been given a copy.

Employee's Signature — Date 10/21/04

g Official's Signature — Date 10/21/04

Reviewing Official's Signature — Date 11/18/04

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

CRITICAL PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS

Performance Standard: One or more discrete standards must be established and listed separately under Elements 1-3, and under each of the four sub-elements for Element 4. **Base-Level Points and Extra Points must be separately assigned for each discrete performance standard at the time the performance plan is established.**

Employee Name: L. Daniel Glass

	Base-Level Points Assigned (per standard)	Extra Points Assigned (per standard)	Points Earned
ELEMENT 1: Stakeholder/Customer/Client: Address key outcomes for the unit's or program's stakeholder, which could include external customers and constituencies and internal clients. At a minimum, includes levels of satisfaction with the unit's or program's products and services.			
Infrastructure milestones completed: 1. Kangley – Echo Lake 500 kV substation completed by 12/31/03 2. Grand Coulee – Bell 500 kV substation additions completed by 9/30/04 3. Celilo HVDC valve replacement work for FA completed by 5/30/04 4. Dworshak series capacitor banks energized by 10/31/03 5. Pearl 500 kV transformer bank energized by 12/31/03 6. Bell series capacitor bank construction started by 6/30/04 7. Captain Jack 500 kV reactor energized by 2/29/04 o (2 points per target met)	14		14
Complete at least 90% of the scheduled replacements of WECC equipment prioritized as *category one equipment* by 9/30/04. Bounus points if 95% is completed by 9/30/04.	9	4	13
RAS projects required to maintain transmission reliability or capacity meet schedules agreed on with TO and TN.	3		3
TOTAL POINTS FOR CRITICAL ELEMENT 1	26	4	30
ELEMENT 2: Financial: Addresses key financial outcomes for the organizational unit or program(s) for which the manager is responsible. At minimum, this includes use of budgetary resources.			
(1) Expense expenditures for TFHE do not exceed 100% of budget at FY04 closing (does not include reimbursables) 8 pts for 99 – 100%, 9 pts for 97 – 98%, 10 pts for 95 –96% 936,184 – 1,346 144%	10		0
Capitol expenditures for TFHE do not exceed 100% of budget at FY04 closing (does not include reimbursables) 16,928 - 14,707 87% 3 pts for 99 – 100%, 4 pts 97 – 98%, 5 pts for 95 – 96%. Extra pts for FY-04 capital expenditures below 95% of approved SOY TFHE level	5		2
(2) Assure that TFHE expense overtime falls in the range of 95 – 100% of approved SOY level. 45,844 – 104,335 228% 2 pts for 99 – 100%, 3 pts for 97 – 98%, 4 pts for 95 – 96%	5		
Bonus if overtime is below the 95% level.		3	0
TOTAL POINTS FOR CRITICAL ELEMENT 2	20	3	5
ELEMENT 3: Internal Systems & Processes: Addresses key outcomes for how the unit's or program's work is accomplished in an effective and/or improved manner (i.e., through operational systems, processes, policies, procedures, etc.)			
Participate in at least 1 crew monthly safety meting on each TFHE crew by 9/30/04, which increases safety awareness	5		5
Partner with Construction Safety Manager for safety topics to supply crews with material for monthly safety meetings, to reduce lost time injuries to the level of FY 01-02	5		5
TOTAL POINTS FOR CRITICAL ELEMENT 3	10		10

BPA F 343
(09-03)

Electronic Form ... oved by
CIEP – 09/17/2003

CRITICAL PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS

Performance Standard: One or more discrete standards must be established and listed separately under Elements 1-3, and under each of the four sub-elements for Element 4. **Base-Level Points and Extra Points must be separately assigned for each discrete performance standard at the time the performance plan is established.**

Employee Name: L. Daniel Glass

	Base-Level Points Assigned (per standard)	Extra Points Assigned (per standard)	Points Earned
ELEMENT 4: Leadership/Management/Supervision: Addresses key outcomes that address managerial duties and behavioral attributes that: (1) are focused solely on the management of people and the work environment within the manager's organization or program and (2) successfully support BPA's HPO Objectives.			
Leadership: Addresses setting direction and managing work.			
✓ Complete informal face-to-face check-ins with each direct report asking what is working? What changes could be made to improve process? At least 3 times measured by feedback from the direct reports.	4		4
✓ Working with the Ross Facilities Manager, complete a workplan for the complex electrician crew for FY04 by January 30, 2004. Engage employees in the workplan by meeting with stakeholders on a monthly basis to evaluate progress and assign new projects.	4		2
Talent: Addresses building and fostering a talented workforce.			
Provide every employee the opportunity to have an IDP by 2/28/04, and consolidate information for TFHE to identify training desires, identify opportunities for details and job shadowing and for training. Track IDP's by holding quarterly meetings with the foremen to discuss progress on individual IDP's. At least 90% of employees must have completed one identified development goal by 9/30/04. Extra credit if all employees with an IDP have completed at least one development goal by 9/30/04. 3 points	4	3	4
(3) Opportunities for personal development, training and to maintain technical and professional competence is provided by at least three training courses identified by field supervisors, courses to be completed by 05/15/04.	3		0
Develop a rotation plan for employees in the switchboard shop so they rotate out onto field crews to maintain expertise. Plan will identify start and end dates for each person's tour of duty and will be posted in the switchboard shop by 01/30/04	3		3
Motivation/Alignment: Addresses motivating and aligning staff around organizational purpose, goals, strategies, and results.			
(4) 50% of all TFHE employees receive some form of personal recognition by mid-year and 90% receive such recognition by EOY.	3		0
Provide updates on the TBL, TF and TFH targets and strategies at employee meetings by 5/30/04 and 8/30/04. (Meetings are held for all field crews).	3		3
Positive Work Environment: Addresses workforce and workplace diversity, supportive work environment, communication, and conflict resolution.			
(5) Provide direction and leadership for a TFHE Safety Program to assure TFHE has a safety record of no more than XX lost time injuries and no fatalities at 9/30/04.	3		0
Provide direction and leadership for a TFHE vehicle accident record of no more than XX preventable vehicle accidents on 9/30/04	3		3
Manager will form one or more employee forums by 3/1/04 to understand and address employee survey results. Develop an action plan to address improvements identified by the employee forums by 4/15/04. Extra credit if TFH's employee survey score on the question "overall this is a good place to work" improves by 10% or more. 2 points	2	2	2
TOTAL POINTS FOR CRITICAL ELEMENT 4	32	5	21
TOTAL POINTS RATING FOR ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS (Base Level Points must equal 88; Extra Points Assigned must equal 12)	88	12	66

CRITICAL PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS

Performance Standard: One or more discrete standards must be established and listed separately under Elements 1-3, and under each of the four sub-elements for Element 4. **Base-Level Points and Extra Points must be separately assigned for each discrete performance standard at the time the performance plan is established.**

Base-Level Points Assigned (per element)	Extra Points Assigned (per element)	Point Earne
(88)	(12)	

c

PAR for Dan Glass
October 21st, 2004

Dan you do a good job working with the field foremen on the technical aspects of the job. When they have problems with design, materials etc. you are there for them and I know they appreciate it. Your calm quiet demeanor suits them very well and they are comfortable with you. I appreciate the fact that you focus on keeping the work going and the crews busy. I regret putting you and others in a position of having to get some of the category one replacements done by the end of Sept. I would have willingly taken the loss of points on my contract for that had I realized in advance what it was going to cost us. But you guys got it done and that's great. It appears that you aren't simultaneously managing the budget with the workload. You will need to keep an eye on both the budget and the workload in 2005.

Goals for 2005

- Training…work with your foremen to develop a training plan for each crew (or individual) that ensures that they get 40 hours of technical training. This can be formal, OJT or other forms of training that you choose but it must be documented. I expect a written plan from each foreman then they will be held accountable for accomplishing their plan. I will help with any budget constraints or whatever else you need from me.
- Rewards and Recognition…work with your foremen to understand the need to recognize employees, the impacts of recognition and how to give recognition when there isn't a lot of money available. For 2005 you will have a budget of $190 per employee for rewards and recognition. I will be looking for you to use at least 95% of that by the end of the year. Also I would recommend that you do at least one employee celebration and encourage each foreman to do something just with his/her employees. You will also have budget for two-8 hour time off awards for employees. Use that at your discretion. I'd like to see some use of non-monetary awards such as the pictures of projects or plaques, your choice but please do something.
- IDP's. Work with your foremen so they understand that they have a responsibility for these as well as the employees. The foremen are to be having quarterly discussions with employees on their IDP's and documenting what has been accomplished. We will be putting something in your 2005 contract similar to the 2004 contract on IDP's. It will become more challenging to get things accomplished as the years go by but it's important to continue development both from an organizational and individual standpoint.
- Safety…continue to work on improving safety meetings. Attend at least two safety meetings with each crew in 2005. Take an active lead in making policy on safe work practices…for example, using four slings instead of two or three to lift disconnect switches. That should have been your call to standardize the practice for all crews.
- Manage your overtime budgets. We will be putting something in your contract on both capital and expense overtime. You will need to work with Garrett and Pete to ensure that we schedule outages long enough to do the job without the overtime.
- By January 2005, turn over all scheduling to Garrett so you can focus on working with the foremen and crews on the survey and safety issues. Use the workplan as a tool to help manage the budget too.

- I'd suggest an article in the Between the Lines on each of the field crews. Corrine Mauck is out liaison with the publication. I think the employees would benefit a lot from some good press. Quotes from project managers and others would be great.

John McGhee

D

U.S. Department of Energy
Bonneville Power Administration
Within-Grade Increase Notice
(FOR PERSONNEL SERVICES ONLY)

1. EMPLOYEE'S NAME	2. EMPLOYEE'S ORG. CODE
Glass,L Daniel	TFHE
3. EMPLOYEE'S TITLE	4. ADMIN CONTACT
Central Electrical Services Manager	
5. WITHIN GRADE INCREASE DUE DATE	6. CURRENT SERIES/GRADE/STEP
11/28/2004	1601-14-7

WITHIN-GRADE INCREASE NOTICE

The employee listed above is eligible for a within-grade increase (WGI) on the date noted above. In order for the employee to receive the WGI on time, the employee's current performance rating of record must be successful.

To be considered current, the rating must cover performance during the employee's most recently completed appraisal period as of the date noted above.

If the qualifying rating is not on file in the servicing personnel office, the employee will not receive the WGI on the date noted above, as regulations require that the increase be postponed until the qualifying rating is received. Once the qualifying rating is received, the WGI will be processed retroactively, effective on the date noted above.

In order to receive a rating, the employee must have been under an officially established performance plan in the same position under the same rating official for the minimum appraisal period. The minimum appraisal period is 90 calendar days (starting with the date that the reviewing official approved the performance plan). If these requirements cannot be met, the employee's appraisal period must be extended to meet the applicable minimum appraisal period. If you have moved into your position recently and, therefore, have not supervised the employee for at least the minimum appraisal period, the employee's second-level supervisor may serve as the rating official in order to avoid extending the appraisal period. However, the second-level supervisor must have sufficient knowledge of the employee's performance during the appraisal period and the minimum appraisal period requirements still must be met.

If the employees' current performance is at an acceptable level, do not return this notice. If the employee's current performance is not at an acceptable level of competence, you must contact your servicing personnel representative immediately for guidance on withholding the WGI. Return this signed notice no later than two weeks prior to the WGI due date noted in block #5 above.

Questions about this notice or other performance appraisal procedures should be directed to your administrative staff.

Not Satisfactory
I am unable to recommend a within-grade increase of this employee. I have discussed my decision with the Reviewing Official and coordinated with the Employee Relations Staff to develop the appropriate negative determination notice to the employee (PL 531-1,paraXI).

Signature of Supervisor	Title	Date
	MGR C&MS	11/17/04

Report ID: BPPER034 Print Date: 11/17/2004

E

Report ID: 3842TFHE
Transmission Services

Data Source: Ledger - Actual, Budget
Fiscal Year: 2004

Bonneville Power Administration
TFHE
CENTRAL ELECTRICAL SERVICES
Through the Month Ended September 30, 2004

Run Date: October 04, 2004
Run Time: 16:02

% of Year Lapsed = 100%

Account Number	Account Description	Prior FY Expenditures	Operating Year Budget	YTD Expenditures	Percent of Budget	Projected End of Year	Projected Over/ (Under)
107110	CAP ANNUAL STRAIGHTIME	257,663	269,496	289,878	108%	289,878	20,382
107115	CAP HOURLY STRAIGHTIME	5,328,009	5,839,317	5,038,554	86%	5,038,554	(800,763)
107120	CAP BENEFITS OFFSET FOR HOUF	223,249	256,277	214,083	84%	214,083	(42,194)
107130	CAP ANNUAL OVERTIME	62	-	-			-
107135	CAP HOURLY OVERTIME	1,424,782	1,646,603	2,498,992	152%	2,498,992	852,389
107140	CAP PREMIUM PAY	7,817	10,834	27,336	252%	27,336	16,502
107155	CAP RETENTION ALLOWANCE	580	-	(356)		(356)	(356)
107170	CAP BENEFITS LOADING	1,554,731	1,771,726	1,555,378	88%	1,555,378	(216,348)
107175	CAP LEAVE LOADING	1,146,002	1,343,808	1,236,145	92%	1,236,145	(107,663)
107210	CAP MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT	304,940	375,870	288,819	77%	288,819	(87,051)
107220	CAP GSA RENTAL	383,185	388,149	386,127	99%	386,127	(2,022)
107225	CAP VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT US	251,427	268,793	290,157	108%	290,157	21,364
107230	CAP TRANSPORTATION OF THING:	641	5,000	-	0%		(5,000)
107320	CAP SERVICE CONTRACTS	23,847	62,000	20,995	34%	20,995	(41,005)
107330	CAP SUPPLMNTL LABOR CONTRAC	1,026,314	2,806,665	1,235,865	44%	1,235,865	(1,570,800)
107410	CAP TRAINING	8,834	-	-			-
107415	CAP TRAVEL	1,511,250	1,710,016	1,551,705	91%	1,551,705	(158,311)
107420	CAP OTHER EMPLOYEE COSTS	8,316	100,000	-	0%		(100,000)
107430	CAP COMMUNICATION & UTILITIES	42,617	34,784	31,811	91%	31,811	(2,973)
107440	CAP RENTS &LEASES	23,038	37,886	40,786	108%	40,786	2,900
107451	CAP_DISCOUNT_LOST	-	-	12		12	12
107515	CAP SHARED SERVICES	1,030	-	195	-	195	195
107560	CAP INDIRECT	1,230	1,681	1,506	90%	1,506	(175)
	CWIP	13,529,563	16,928,905	14,707,988	87%	14,707,988	(2,220,917)
108110	RET ANNUAL STRAIGHTIME	-	-	736		736	736
108115	RET HOURLY STRAIGHTIME	345,310	-	352,059		352,059	352,059
108120	RET BENEFITS OFFSET FOR HOUF	14,616	-	14,348		14,348	14,348
108135	RET HOURLY OVERTIME	77,565	-	128,316		128,316	128,316
108140	RET PREMIUM PAY	993	-	148		148	148
108170	RET BENEFITS LOADING	95,701	-	102,566		102,566	102,566
108175	RET LEAVE LOADING	70,295	-	80,900		80,900	80,900
108220	RET GSA RENTAL	15,030	25,000	13,158	53%	13,158	(11,842)
108225	RET VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT US	6,887	9,500	16,135	170%	16,135	6,635
108320	RET SERVICE CONTRACTS	-	28,000	-	0%		(28,000)
108330	RET SUPPLMNTL LABOR CONTRAC	85,458	86,805	41,247	48%	41,247	(45,558)
108415	RET TRAVEL	80,988	102,004	109,453	107%	109,453	7,449
108430	RET COMMUNICATION & UTILITIES	418	-	166		166	166
108440	RET RENTS & LEASES	-	-	1,235		1,235	1,235
	RWIP	793,262	251,309	860,467	342%	860,467	609,158
	Capital	14,322,825	17,180,214	15,568,455	91%	15,568,455	(1,611,759)
600110	EXP ANNUAL STRAIGHTIME	1,039	7,656	3,351	44%	3,351	(4,305)
600115	EXP HOURLY STRAIGHTIME	403,178	437,086	652,613	149%	652,613	215,527
600120	EXP BENEFITS OFFSET FOR HOUF	17,666	19,028	30,972	163%	30,972	11,944
600135	EXP HOURLY OVERTIME	40,916	45,844	104,335	228%	104,335	58,491
600140	EXP PREMIUM PAY	1,700	1,441	2,664	185%	2,664	1,223
600145	EXP AWARDS	28,096	39,149	15,932	41%	15,932	(23,217)
600146	EXP - BPA SUCCESS SHARE AWAF	92,275	-	-			-
600147	EXP - BL TEAM SHARE AWARDS	205,322	-	-			-
600170	EXP BENEFITS LOADING	115,319	127,604	191,728	150%	191,728	64,124
600175	EXP LEAVE LOADING	85,146	96,696	153,351	159%	153,351	56,655
600210	EXP MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT	3,434	2,000	8,222	411%	8,222	6,222
600220	EXP GSA RENTAL	28,734	46,700	26,061	56%	26,061	(20,639)
600225	EXP VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT US	25,955	36,291	27,137	75%	27,137	(9,154)
600320	EXP SERVICE CONTRACTS	1,124	5,000	1,114	22%	1,114	(3,886)
600330	EXP SUPPLMNTL LABOR CONTRAC	4,831	-	46,471		46,471	46,471
600410	EXP TRAINING EXP	230	53,000	1,875	4%	1,875	(51,125)
600415	EXP TRAVEL	14,588	15,369	66,844	435%	66,844	51,475
600420	EXP OTHER EMPLOYEE EXPS	1,232	-	1,241		1,241	1,241
600430	EXP COMMUNICATION & UTILITIES	-	1,000	16	2%	16	(984)
600440	EXP RENTS & LEASES	-	-	110		110	110
600450	EXP OTHER	(3,955)	1,300	750	58%	750	(550)
600515	EXP SHARED SERVICES	150	-	11,933		11,933	11,933
600560	EXP INDIRECT	434	1,000	-	0%		(1,000)
700003	ACCOUNTING ADJUSTMENTS	97	-	21		21	21
	TOTAL EXPENSES	1,067,510	936,164	1,346,743	144%	1,346,743	410,579
	Grand Total Capital + Expenses	15,390,335	18,116,378	16,915,198	93%	16,915,198	(1,201,180)

Juanita Jimenez 619-6778

110,579
225,294
852,285

expense reimbursables 225,294.45

185,285

Report ID: 3842TFHE
Transmission Services

Bonneville Power Administration
TFHE
CENTRAL ELECTRICAL SERVICES
Through the Month Ended September 30, 2004

Run Date: October 04, 2004
Run Time: 16:02

Data Source: Ledger - Actual, Budget
Fiscal Year: 2004

% of Year Lapsed = 100%

Account Number	Account Description	Prior FY Expenditures	Operating Year Budget	YTD Expenditures	Percent of Budget	Projected End of Year	Projected Over/ (Under)
	CWIP PERSONNEL COMP	8,517,471	9,491,458	8,361,375	88%	8,361,375	(1,130,083)
	Capital Personnel Costs (RWIP)	-	-	-			-
	PERSONNEL COMP	624,048	689,511	1,034,679	150%	1,034,679	345,168
	Total Personnel Costs	9,141,518	10,180,969	9,396,053	92%	9,396,053	-784,916
	Capital Contract Costs (CWIP)	-	-	-			-
	Capital Contract Costs (RWIP)	-	-	-			-
	Expense Contract Costs	-	-	-			-
	Total Contract Costs	0	0	0			0

77

Date	Given to	amount	vendor	reason for recognition	given by
3/5	redacted names - exemption 6	$ 25.00	PC	work quantity achieved	redacted names - exemption 6
3/5		$ 25.00	PC	work quantity achieved	
3/5		$ 25.00	PC	work quantity achieved	
3/5		$ 25.00	PC	work quantity achieved	
3/8		$ 25.00	PC	volunteering for crew safety proctor	
3/10		$ 25.00	PC	McNary's Powerhouse 230kV disconnects - with the short time frame, it took extra effort from all to complete this job in do time.	
3/10		$ 25.00	PC	McNary's Powerhouse 230kV disconnects - with the short time frame, it took extra effort from all to complete this job in do time.	
3/10		$ 25.00	PC	McNary's Powerhouse 230kV disconnects - with the short time frame, it took extra effort from all to complete this job in do time.	
3/10		$ 25.00	PC	McNary's Powerhouse 230kV disconnects - with the short time frame, it took extra effort from all to complete this job in do time.	
3/10		$ 25.00	PC	McNary's Powerhouse 230kV disconnects - with the short time frame, it took extra effort from all to complete this job in do time.	
3/10		$ 25.00	PC	McNary's Powerhouse 230kV disconnects - with the short time frame, it took extra effort from all to complete this job in do time.	

3/10	redacted names - exemption 6	$ 25.00	PC	McNary's Powerhouse 230kV disconnects - with the short time frame, it took extra effort from all to complete this job in do time.	redacted names - exemption 6
3/10		$ 25.00	PC	McNary's Powerhouse 230kV disconnects - with the short time frame, it took extra effort from all to complete this job in do time.	
3/11		$ 25.00	PC	effort beyond expectations	
3/15		$ 50.00	PC	Doing work at John Day under difficult conditions	
3/15		$ 50.00	PC	Doing work at John Day under difficult conditions	
3/31		$ 25.00	PC	Bringing Celilo to a successful conclusion	
3/31		$ 25.00	PC	Bringing Celilo to a successful conclusion	
3/31		$ 25.00	PC	Bringing Celilo to a successful conclusion	
3/31		$ 25.00	PC	Bringing Celilo to a successful conclusion	
3/31		$ 25.00	PC	Bringing Celilo to a successful conclusion	
3/31		$ 25.00	PC	Bringing Celilo to a successful conclusion	
3/31		$ 25.00	PC	Bringing Celilo to a successful conclusion	
4/12		$ 25.00	PC	Team Player	
4/12		$ 25.00	PC	Team Player	
4/12		$ 25.00	PC	Team Player	
4/13		$ 25.00	PC	Team Player	
4/13		$ 25.00	PC	Team Player	

4/13		$ 25.00	PC	Team Player	
4/13		$ 25.00	PC	Team Player	
4/13		$ 25.00	PC	Team Player	
4/14		$ 25.00	PC	Team Player	
4/14		$ 25.00	PC	Team Player	
4/19		$ 50.00	PC	Assisting outage at Covington and Raver	Dan Glass
4/19		$ 50.00	PC	Schedule at Pearl	Dan Glass
4/19		$ 50.00	PC	For taking on any and all assignments tossed her way	Dan Glass
4/19		$ 50.00	PC	for well organized project management	Dan Glass
4/27		$ 50.00	PC	willing to go above and beyond the normal when needed	Dan Glass
4/27		$ 50.00	PC	for the smooth transaction for the crew with the change of foremen	Dan Glass
4/27		$ 50.00	PC	Willing to teach those not as profient w/ rigging the ropes when needed	Dan Glass
4/29		$ 50.00	PC	excellent skills in scheduling work @ Bell	Dan Glass
4/29		$ 50.00	PC	excellent skills in scheduling work @ Coulee	Dan Glass
4/29		$ 50.00	PC	Technical Skills for splicing into existing 15 kV cable	Dan Glass
4/29		$ 50.00	PC	for being/having an efficient crew	Dan Glass
5/17		$ 50.00	PC	Team Player	
5/17		$ 50.00	PC	Team Player	
5/17		$ 50.00	PC	Team Player	
5/17		$ 50.00	PC	Team Player	

redacted names

exemption 6

Redacted names ex-6

Redacted names ex-6

redacted names exemption 6

6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16			$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment
6/16		s	$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment

redacted names exemption 6

6/16	Redacted names exemption 6	$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment	redacted names- exemption 6
6/23		$ 25.00	PC	Safe/good job at Bell 500	
6/23		$ 25.00	PC	Safe/good job at Bell 500	
6/23		$ 25.00	PC	Safe/good job at Bell 500	
6/23		$ 25.00	PC	Safe/good job at Bell 500	
6/23		$ 25.00	PC	Safe/good job at Bell 500	
6/23		$ 25.00	PC	Safe/good job at Bell 500	
6/23		$ 25.00	PC	Safe/good job at Bell 500	
6/23		$ 25.00	PC	Safe/good job at Bell 500	
6/23		$ 25.00	PC	Safe/good job at Bell 500	
6/23		$ 25.00	PC	Safe/good job at Bell 500	
6/23		$ 25.00	PC	Safe/good job at Bell 500	
6/23		$ 25.00	PC	Safe/good job at Bell 500	
6/23		$ 25.00	PC	Safe/good job at Bell 500	
6/24		$ 25.00	PC	For the extra coverage during co-workers absence	Dan Glass
6/24		$ 25.00	PC	For the extra coverage during co-workers absence	Dan Glass
7/14		$ 25.00	pc	Maple Valley Project long hrs, on time and safely	redacted names exemption 6
7/14		$ 25.00	pc	Maple Valley Project long hrs, on time and safely	
7/14		$ 25.00	pc	Maple Valley Project long hrs, on time and safely	
7/14		$ 25.00	pc	Maple Valley Project long hrs, on time and safely	
7/14		$ 25.00	pc	Maple Valley Project long hrs, on time and safely	
7/14		$ 25.00	pc	Maple Valley Project long hrs, on time and safely	

7/14	Redacted names – exemption 6	$ 25.00	pc	Maple Valley Project long hrs, on time and safely	redacted names – exemption 6
7/14		$ 25.00	pc	Maple Valley Project long hrs, on time and safely	
7/14		$ 25.00	pc	Maple Valley Project long hrs, on time and safely	
7/14		$ 25.00	pc	For being a productive FMN 1 and team player	
7/20		$ 25.00	pc	Going the extra mile	
7/20		$ 25.00	pc	Going the extra mile	
7/29		$ 25.00	pc	Procurement from many vendors	
7/29		$ 50.00	pc	Procurement from many vendors	
7/29		$ 25.00	pc	Rewire crew trailer to specific need	
8/9		$ 25.00	PC	Perfect Rack assembly	
8/9		$ 25.00	PC	Volunteering for Redo	
8/9		$ 25.00	PC	Over and above	
8/9		$ 25.00	PC	Over and above	
8/11		$ 25.00	PC	Knowing that I'm buried workload-wise right now, she input the mileage for the G Vehicles and handled a large load of prints at CSB for me (which she volunteered to do).	
8/11		$ 50.00	PC	For work for Arizona Power System	Dan Glass
8/11		$ 50.00	PC	For work for Arizona Power System	Dan Glass
8/17		$ 50.00	PC	Extraordinary support & sacrifices	(redacted) name – exemption 6

8/17	redacted names- exemption 6		$ 50.00	PC	Extraordinary support & sacrifices	redacted names- exemption 6
8/17			$ 50.00	PC	Extraordinary support & sacrifices	
8/17			$ 50.00	PC	Extraordinary support & sacrifices	
8/17			$ 50.00	PC	Extraordinary support & sacrifices	
8/17			$ 50.00	PC	Perserverance and support of Big Eddy 500kV SCADA project	
8/17			$ 50.00	PC	Contnuing support on Ostrander 500kV Capacitor Project	
8/17			$ 25.00	PC	Continuing dedicated service and expertise	
8/17			$ 25.00	PC	Expertise and dedication in quality work practices and ethics	
8/18			$ 25.00	PC	Always cost cutting	
8/18			$ 25.00	PC	Good Job on the Grand Coulee Rack	
8/19			$ 25.00	PC	Over and above	
8/24			$ 25.00	PC	Extra Effort Teton Rack	
7/1			$ 25.00	PC	Outside wiring	
9/1			$ 25.00	PC	Outside wiring	
9/1			$ 25.00	PC	Outside wiring	
9/1			$ 25.00	PC	Outside cable	
9/1			$ 50.00	PC	Columbia Disconnects	

5/19		$ 50.00	PC	for his coordination & preparation work to make the Harney reactor outage a success	Dan Glass
5/21		$ 25.00	FM	TBL Employee Celebration	[redacted]
5/24		$ 25.00	PC	Team Recognition	[redacted]
5/24		$ 25.00	PC	Team Recognition	[redacted]
5/24		$ 25.00	PC	Team Recognition	[redacted]
5/24		$ 25.00	PC	Team Recognition	[redacted]
5/24		$ 25.00	PC	Team Recognition	[redacted]
5/24		$ 25.00	PC	Team Recognition	[redacted]
5/24		$ 25.00	PC	Team Recognition	[redacted]
5/24		$ 25.00	PC	Team Recognition	[redacted]
5/24		$ 25.00	PC	Team Recognition	[redacted]
5/24		$ 25.00	PC	Team Recognition	[redacted]
5/26		$ 50.00	PC	for jumping in and helping out after 90 days of detail	[redacted]
6/2	[redacted]	$ 50.00	PC	for being so willing to go anywhere in the system to pull & splice cable	Dan Glass
6/8		$ 25.00	PC	for their help with shifting, swapping, and moving around GSA vehicles for the 2004 new vehicle exchange.	Dan Glass
6/8		$ 25.00	PC	for their help with shifting, swapping, and moving around GSA vehicles for the 2004 new vehicle exchange.	Dan Glass
6/8	[redacted]	$ 50.00	PC	coordinating the replacement of vehicles	Dan Glass
6/16		$ 25.00	PC	For continued efforts for a better work environment	redacted name- exemption 6

redacted names- exemption 6

redacted names- exemption 6

G

Standard Form 50
Rev 7/91
U.S. Office of Personnel Management
Guide to Processing Personnel Actions, Chapter 4

NOTIFICATION OF PERSONNEL ACTION

1. Name (Last, First, Middle)	2. Social Security Number	3. Date of Birth	4. Effective Date
Class,L Daniel		[illegible]	12-26-2004

FIRST ACTION		SECOND ACTION	
5-A. Code: 721	5-B. Nature of Action: Reassignment	6-A. Code	6-B. Nature of Action
5-C. Code: N2M	5-D. Legal Authority: Reg 335.102. Promotion/reassignmnt/CLG	6-C. Code	6-D. Legal Authority
5-E. Code	5-F. Legal Authority	6-E. Code	6-F. Legal Authority

7. FROM: Position Title and Number	15. TO: Position Title and Number
Central Electrical Services Manager PD: J00217 Position: 00000217	Construction&Maintenance Operations Specialist PD: J03470 Position: 00004158

8.Pay Plan	9.Occ. CD	10.Grd/Lvl	11.Step/Rate	12.Tot. Salary	13.Pay Basis	16.Pay Plan	17.Occ. CD	18.Grd/Lvl	19.Step/Rate	20.Tot. Salary/Award	21.Pay Basis
GS	1601	14	07	$102,307.00	PA	GS	1601	14	07	$102,307.00	PA

12A. Basic Pay	12B. Locality Adj.	12C. Adj. Basic Pay	12D. Other Pay	20A. Basic Pay	20B. Locality Adj.	20C. Adj. Basic Pay	20D. Other Pay
$89,203.00	$13,104.00	$102,307.00	$0	$89,203.00	$13,104.00	$102,307.00	$0

14. Name and Location of Position's Organization	22. Name and Location of Position's Organization
TFHE Bonneville Power Administration Construction & Maintenance Services Central Electrical Services Vancouver WA USA	TFH Bonneville Power Administration Construction & Maintenance Services Vancouver WA USA

EMPLOYEE DATA

23. Veterans Preference	24. Tenure	25. Agency Use	26. Veterans Preference for RIF
1 (1-None, 2-5 Point, 3-10 Point/Disability, 4-10 Point/Compensable, 5-10 Point/Other, 6-10 Point/Compensable/30%)	1 (0-None, 1-Permanent, 2-Conditional, 3-Indefinite)		YES: [ ] NO: X

27. FEGLI	28. Annuitant Indicator	29. Pay Rate Determinant
Basic + Option B (1x)	9 Not Applicable	0

30. Retirement Plan	31. Service Comp. Date (Leave)	32. Work Schedule	33. Part-Time Hours Per Biweekly Pay Period
1 CSRS	07-15-1968	F Full Time	

POSITION DATA

34. Position Occupied	35. FLSA Category	36. Appropriation Code	37. Bargaining Unit Status
1 (1-Competitive Service, 2-Excepted Service, 3-SES General, 4-SES Career Reserved)	E (E-Exempt, N-Nonexempt)	RR-CF02	8888

38. Duty Station Code	39. Duty Station (City-County-State or Overseas Location)
532370011	Vancouver Clark WA USA

40. Agency Data	41. EMPLID	42.	43.	44.
	0000217			PAR Number: 05-TFH-014

45. Remarks
- Position is at the full performance level.

46. Employing Department or Agency	47. Agency Code	48. Personnel Office ID	49. Approval Date	50. Signature/Authentication and Title of Approving Official
Department of Energy Bonneville Power Administration	DN82	4237	01-03-2005	Smithey,Roy Patrick Manager, Personnel Services

Editions Prior to 7/91 Are Not Usable After 6/30/93

1 - Employee Copy

Position Dan was moved to.

DOE F 3511.1e (6-94)
(Formerly DOE F 3200.5)
All Other Editions Are Obsolete
EFG (07-90)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
POSITION DESCRIPTION

Electronic Form Approved by CGIR - 06/24/94

To be Completed by Personnel

1. POSITION NUMBER

2. ORGANIZATION CODE

3. ACTION (Circle Letter): A - ADD, C - CHG, D - DEL: A

PART I - TO BE COMPLETED BY INITIATING OFFICE

4. ORGANIZATIONAL LOCATION OF POSITION
a. First Subdivision (Below DOE): Bonneville Power Administration
b. Second Subdivision: Transmission Business Line
c. Third Subdivision: Transmission Field Services
d. Fourth Subdivision: Construction & Maintenance Services
e. Fifth Subdivision:
f. Sixth Subdivision:

5. SENSITIVITY: 1 - Nonsensitive, 2 - Noncritical Sensitive, 3 - Critical Sensitive, 4 - Special Sensitive: 1

6. FINANCIAL STATEMENT REQUIRED: ☒ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No

7. COMPUTER POSITION:

8. LEVEL OF ACCESS: Ø

9. DUTY STATION: Vancouver, Washington

10. EMPLOYING OFFICE LOCATION: PORTLAND, OREGON

11. ORGANIZATIONAL TITLE OF POSITION (40 Characters) (Complete only if different from recommended Classification Title): Construction & Maintenance Process Manager, GS-1601-14

12. RECOMMENDED CLASSIFICATION (Optional):

13. Supervisory Certification: I certify that this is an accurate statement of the major duties and responsibilities of this position and its organizational relationships, and that the position is necessary to carry out Government functions for which I am responsible. This certification is made with the knowledge that this information is to be used for statutory purposes relating to appointment and payment of public funds, and that false or misleading statements may constitute violations of such statutes or their implementing regulations.

a. Typed or Printed Name and Title of Immediate Supervisor: Johnny B. McGee, Construction & Maintenance Services Manager
Signature: [signature] Date (MM/DD/YY): 04/18/03

b. Typed or Printed Name/Title of Higher-Level Supervisor or Manager (Optional):
Signature: Date (MM/DD/YY):

PART II - TO BE COMPLETED BY PERSONNEL OFFICE

14. Classification Certification: I certify that this position has been classified consistently with the most applicable standards published by the Office of Personnel Management.
Title: HRS
Signature: [signature] Date (MM/DD/YY): 5-28-03

15. RECERTIFICATION
a. Date (MM/DD/YY) INITIALS
b. Date (MM/DD/YY)
c. Date (MM/DD/YY) INITIALS
d. Date (MM/DD/YY)
e. Date (MM/DD/YY)
f. Date (MM/DD/YY)

16. CLASSIFICATION TITLE OF POSITION (60 Characters): GEOINFORMATION MAINTENANCE OPERATOR

17. CLASSIFICATION TITLE OF POSITION (Continued): TRANSPORTATION SPECIALIST

18. Pay Plan: GS

19. Occ. Series Code: 1601

20. Grade: 12

21. Occ. Series Modifier: 10

22. Functional Class Code (for Scientists and Engineers):

23. Full Part Level: 14

24. FLSA: E

25. Bargaining Unit Status Code: S

26. Comp. Area:

27. Comp. Level:

28. Position Tenure: P

29. Agency Code: DN12

30. Agency Use:

PART III - REMARKS

JØ3470

BUS-8888

PART 1 - POSIT
PART 2 - OFFIC
PART 3 - EMPLI

OPM Job Family Position Classification Standard for Equipment Facilities, and Services Group, GS-1600 Implementated effective May 2003
Position Description reviewed and recertified: KW

PE-11-13
RETENTION: Z-A + 1 YR

Construction & Maintenance Operations Specialist
GS-1601-14
J03470
Related Job Codes: N/A

Position Description
May 28, 2003
TFH

Introduction

This is a senior level staff position, responsible for developing BPA policy and implementation strategies in all areas of construction and maintenance management. The position is located in Construction and Maintenance Services, Transmission Field Services in the Transmission Business Line, Bonneville Power Administration. The incumbent of this position serves as Construction and Maintenance Services process manager representing the construction and maintenance aspects of projects, including annual plans, schedules, and budgets.

Duties

Serves as staff expert responsible for providing policy development and analysis in the fields of construction management, construction budgeting and estimating, logistics and strategic planning.

Analyzes capital program effectiveness including private and public sector benchmarking, studies of organizational effectiveness, delegations of authority, work processes, document flow, and system needs required to effectively and efficiently accomplish program goals and objectives. Determines innovative alternative methods or procedures to correct deficiencies and increase productivity, client service, and reduce resource requirements.

Establishes performance measures, analyzes Construction & Maintenance Services' performance for compliance with existing laws, regulations, Bonneville policy and practices, and sound business practice.

In collaboration with Construction & Maintenance Services Performance Managers, develops budget and annual operating plans for the Logistics Services purchasing and supply chain management function. Responsible for managing budget and achieving operating plan objectives.

Develops sources of information; identifies and performs analyses of issues; develops options and alternatives providing indepth technical analyses; prepares written reports and/or provides oral briefings to agency decisionmakers.

Responsible for coordinating the development of the annual workplan and the subsequent ongoing analysis of project schedules and resource needs required to meet project completion requirements

Develops and facilitates the implementation of processes, procedures and practices to improve the management of BPA's capital program for infrastructure, capital replacements and improvements.

Maintains effective, collaborative relationships with executives, managers and technical staff within BPA, the Department and other Federal officials on all matters related to the organization's role in support of BPA's capital programs.

Defines the scope, facilitates, and leads matrix cross functional/cross organizational process teams to review process performance and determine process improvements. Negotiates service level agreements with clients, establishes client service measurements, monitors client satisfaction, effectively balances business considerations, process improvements, and improved client satisfaction goals.

Identifies skill level requirement for process team members, provides ongoing feedback to performance managers of employee participation, recommended recognition, and any development needs identified.

Working with the performance managers, coordinates/conducts informal and formal training for Logistics Services staff to increase their skill level and enhance their ability to work with clients.

Participates in or conducts reviews of purchasing transactions and activities as necessary.

Factor 1 - Knowledge Required by the Position - Level 1-8

This level represents mastery of the application of a wide range of qualitative and/or qualitative methods for the assessment and improvement of program effectiveness. Additionally, a comprehensive knowledge of the range of laws, policies, regulations, and precedents applicable to the accomplishment of one or more Bonneville programs in order to assess the value and effectiveness of program accomplishments is typical of this level.

For other work assignments, knowledge may be applied in developing program proposals requiring Legislation or having significant impact on the agency programs and resources.

Factor 2 - Supervisory Controls - Level 2-5

Is responsible for the planning, coordination and accomplishment of projects with are provided in terms of broadly defined functions of the employing organization. The incumbent independently negotiates the scope and objectives of the study as well as identification of resources required for completion.

The review of work is confined to compliance with broad agency policy and responsiveness to the needs of the senior level management.

Factor 3 - Guidelines - Level 3-5

Guidelines consist of basic policy statements concerning the issue or problem being studied and may include reference to pertinent legislative history, related court decisions, state and local laws, or policy initiatives of agency management.

The incumbent must exercise considerable judgment in interpreting and adapting existing precedents and in developing new or improved approaches to analyze, develop, and present authoritative information or analyses on controversial and regionally import subjects to persons with conflicting views. The methods and procedures developed often serve as precedents for other individuals.

Factor 4 - Complexity - Level 4-5

The incumbent is often required to deviate from traditional methods and to develop new valuative criteria and methodology. The incumbent's increasing visibility and ongoing working relationships with policymaking bodies require judgment and ingenuity in maintaining objective, technical standards.

The complexity of analyses may require that the individual coordinate the effort of several participants in the assignments. The work requires the incumbent to review, summarize, and present findings to aid policymakers in examining complex policy proposals.

Factor 5 - Scope and Effect - Level 5-5

The purpose of the work is to analyze and evaluate major substantive, mission-oriented programs including providing authoritative information and analysis, either written or oral, which identifies, interprets, and develops alternatives and options. This may include the development of long-range programs plans, goals, objectives, and milestones, or to evaluate the effectiveness of programs conducted throughout an organization.

The work involves identifying and developing ways to resolve problems or cope with issues which directly affect the accomplishment of principal program goals and objectives.

Factor 6 - Personal Contacts - Level 6-3

Personal contacts are with a variety of individuals both internal and external to Bonneville. Internal contacts include Bonneville top management officials as well as individuals throughout the organization. External contacts include management officials of other agencies, public/private utilities, congressional staff members, members of the media, etc. These contacts are unstructured and characterized by the need to establish parameters, etc.

Factor 7 - Purpose of Contacts - Level 7-4

Contacts are primarily to provide and present information regarding complex policy issues, participate in conferences, meetings, or presentations involving problems or public policy issues with great sensitivity or importance; to identify emerging issues, etc.

Factor 8 - Physical Demands - Level 8-1

The work is sedentary, although some slight physical effort may be required in stooping, kneeling, bending, etc.

Factor 9 - Work Environment - Level 9-1

The work is performed in an office setting with adequate heating, lighting, and air ventilation.

H

A DOOR CLOSING - - ANOTHER ABOUT TO OPEN

As I look back over my career, I am at peace knowing I have given my best. As an apprentice, I graduated six months early. Approximately two years later, I became Lead Electrician. A couple years later, I became Shop Foreman, with approximately 50 people in my charge; always trying to make the best decisions and working for the greater good. When the Canal was turned over to Panama, I became one of the first to be affected by a RIF. Rather than bump someone in another job, I chose to move my family to the United States, again seeking to put other's welfare over my own. In September of 1979, I came to work for BPA. In March of 1988, I became a field Foreman. In November of 1992, I took a detail into the office. Then a month later, it became a permanent assignment. In spite of re-organizational title changes, my work ethics and goals have always remained the same: to support and help the field employees in any way possible.

Oversight bout capital

Each year at performance appraisal time, I would look back and know that I had done the best I could. I have always received a "fully successful" or "highly successful" performance rating. My philosophy of supervision is that I don't believe you can lead unless you are willing to serve. I have always tried to serve you by intentionally giving you all the support I could, and by trying to make myself as available as much as I possibly could.

This last year, I went under a new performance contract, which required financial management by line item, rather than managing my overall budget. I made a conscious choice to work the overtime rather than bring on contractors. I was under the impression that John understood this, as he approved all the overtime. If we needed to have contractors working to complete the work, we were also working overtime. I tried to move money from my contracting budget to my overtime budget but was denied. My conscience choice to overspend in my overtime budget was the main reason for not getting enough points to make a "fully successful" rating.

(1) Last month, for the *first time* in my 36 plus years of federal employment, I received a "needs improvement" on my performance appraisal. I struggle with this judgment of my performance because if I had to do it over again, I know I would still make the same decisions. I also realize, I would make the same choices next year, if necessary.

(2) Struggling with my own disappointment at receiving a "less than satisfactory" rating, I empathize even more with Mike's reaction to being rated "unqualified" for the General Shops Manager. Mike, when Cindy was giving her report at the foreman's meeting from the investigation, I wanted to explain what had happened but I didn't want to bore everyone with the details. There was some confusion during the rating process. When I left the room where the rating was done, I left believing you were on the qualified list. I found out later that things had changed and you were dropped from the list; which I was unaware of. I believed at the time, there had to have been some conspiracy because I was certain you were on the list to have an interview. I was shocked when you didn't make the list. I am truly sorry for any embarrassment you may have received from this.

(3) Well, the "needs improvement" rating apparently was not enough. On Monday, the 29th of November, John informed me I was going to be placed on a performance improvement plan and he had denied my step increase, due this month. I was incredibly stunned. WOW! The step increase was my incentive to stay until the end of 2005. Now what?

(4) On Friday, the 3rd of December, I met with John to put my new contract in place. He informed me we didn't need to bother with the contract because he was removing me as a manager, as of the first of the year. What a shock! So that means I will be your supervisor for 2 more weeks, then I go on leave for 2 weeks. This brings us to the first of the year, when John will move me back to Van Mall, place me in a cube to work on "special assignments." So, it looks like my position will be vacant sooner than I thought.

This has all come at a time when I was struggling with how long to stay at BPA before retiring. What I will miss the most is the friendships I have made over the years, especially with you. For the past week, I have

(5) examined my motives and my options. I know in my heart, I would still make the same choices and decisions I made last year. I can not betray my own standards. For me to maintain my self-respect, and above all, my integrity,

(6) ***I will be retiring on my birthday.***

I

January 23, 2005

cc Roth

Stephen J Wright
Administrator and Chief Executive Officer
Bonneville Power Administration
Executive Office

Dear Sir:

As employees of Central Electrical Services, we would like to thank you for your assiduous efforts to see BPA become the power provider of choice for the Great Northwest. We are appreciative for the job security you have afforded us through your persistent efforts. Your prowess as a political leader, speaker and manager has served you well through two administrations and we anticipate well into the future with BPA. It is because of these attributes that we would like to petition your consideration to the following issue.

Over the past several years, we all have experienced changes here at BPA. Some of the changes have been mandated due to politics or economics. We are not against credible change that improves BPA's image as a reliable and responsible organization. We all react to change differently with various levels of concern and discernment.

Redacted

Van Zandt
Hart

Will schedule a meeting to discuss

Redacted

J

VanZandt,Vickie - T

From: VanZandt,Vickie - T
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2005 5:16 PM
To: Roach,Randy A - L
Subject: FW: Response to Letter

-----Original Message-----
From: Wright,Stephen J - A
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2005 1:11 PM
To: ADL_TFHE_ALL; ADL_TFHG_ALL; ADL_TFHP_ALL
Cc: VanZandt,Vickie - T
Subject: Response to Letter

Thank you for the recent letter I received signed by members of the Construction Team. I don't normally respond to comments I receive regarding personnel issues, but since this is the first time in my tenure I have received a letter signed by so many, I want to share my thoughts with you.

First, I appreciate that the letter was drafted in a thoughtful, temperate manner. You noted that there are things you may not know about the situation. This seems right since the available information appears to come from only one of othe parties in this dispute. In fact, from a quick review of this situation, it seems likely there are portions of this story which are and, as in any personnel situation, should remain private.

In reviewing your letter, I am struck by the following. Management had an objective to reduce the use of overtime given our financial circumstances. Whether and how this directive was carried out is a legitimate part of the performance appraisal process. Your question is whether the appraisal and subsequent actions were carried out in a meritorious and fair fashion.

These are matters that are best handled through factual inquiry. I have asked Vickie VanZandt to review this situation, and she has agreed. Since she will have the information about this, she will also provide communication with you from here forward.

Because personnel matters frequently require confidentiality, Vickie and I cannot promise that you will ever know all the information surrounding this situation. But we do commit to a good faith effort to assure that senior management understands it.

Steve

K

Dan Glass

Monday, March 28, 2005

Hi Vickie,

Recently, I was given a copy of Steve Wright's response to a petition that was sent to him. I understand, it was in reference to something on my behalf from some of the Construction employees. Steve states that you will be conducting an investigation "handled through factual inquiry." I have not seen or read the petition referred to by Steve.

I want to meet with you and answer any questions you may have, although I may have more questions than answers. Such as:

- What portions of "this personnel situation should remain private?"
- I do not think the "appraisal and subsequent actions were carried out in a meritorious and fair fashion."
- What part of John's actions were meritorious and fair, especially in the light of my removal?

Several BPA employees have contacted me with concerns about what is being said and implied about me. There are insinuations about irremediable decisions and actions I must have made. Employees who got Steve's email think Steve implied as much in his letter with the phrase: ". . . available information seems to come from only one of the parties in this dispute. . . . it seems likely there are portions of the story which are, and as in any personnel situation, should remain private."

If you are doing an investigation (which I sincerely encourage you to do), I would like to know what I am being accused of. What could I have possibly done, to merit the actions taken against me? What "factual inquiry" have you made regarding this matter? Did you receive and read the copy of the letter I sent Steve? I never heard a word from either of you.

As I stated in my letter to Steve, all of my job evaluations were exemplary and I had a respected reputation throughout my 36+ years of Federal employment, until John McGhee's Nov. 2004 evaluation and his immediate action of removing me from my position as Manager; all without an opportunity for discussion and explanation. My previous supervisors have supported and appreciated my work as manager. My job evaluations support this.

I am still in shock over the lack of respect I received from John and Fred. It seems there was a hidden agenda to remove me, and they were both in on it. Why didn't them come to me and discuss their agenda? I would have considered moving to another position within BPA. I would have liked to continue to work for BPA, several more years before retiring, but not when I am falsely accused and treated so disrespectfully.

I believe myself to have been a loyal employee trying to do the best for BPA. My integrity and character are very important to me. (1) I believe my integrity and character were attacked; (2) and continue to be attacked and damaged.

Please call me. My home phone # is

Thank you for your attention to this matter,

Dan

Dan

L

Interview Summaries

	Page
	1
	4
	9
	11
	14
Redacted	15
	16
	19
	20
	21
	24
	26
	27
	29
	31
	33

Interview Summary: Dan Glass

- John dictated policy; the final straw was when he selected Doug Hunter
- The guys who work for Doug don't seem to like him
- My performance ratings prior to FY04 have all been successful
- Contact between John and I occurred at staff meetings once a week unless he wanted something
- John required shirt with sleeves and no shorts before it came out in the apm's; everyone was in an uproar
- Only construction had to follow those rules
- John would have me stay after staff meetings if he wanted to discuss something
- There was no social connection between us
- There was no socializing even at work stations; John just went to his room. (Echo Lake was an example: John came in but we never saw him again. People thought he didn't care about what we were doing. He was viewed as a disciplinarian never sitting down with the crew to see what was happening.)
- John got a call that the guys were working without hard hats. He jumped in his car instead of calling me to go down there. That was east of Salem about an hour and a half for him. The crew thought it was kind of crazy.
- We put the performance contract in place in 03; we talked about expectations
- In March we talked and he said I think we're on track here or it may have been that we needed to watch the expense here
- We talked about the 3 training classes he wanted; we did 2 and chose to move one into the annual meeting time which automatically made you lose these
- It was probably back in September when John started saying something about being over budget
- John wanted me to get with Betty to figure out where things were
- Since Betty was getting that information for John, I didn't ask her to do it for me
- We may have gone over budgets in the staff meetings
- Even in the middle of the year John was concerned about the capital overtime
- I told John if we're going to be forced to complete these category I projects you're going to have to move money from my contracting budget to my overtime budget
- He said he would go ask and at the next meeting when he came back he said no
- I told him we were going over our budget on overtime but there's enough in my budget to stay in the overall budget
- John was aware that we went over it
- Once a month the budget was given and I was aware that parts of the budget were going over
- I became aware that John determined I was not going to meet my contract on the 21st of October
- John handed me that document (See Section IV, Tab C) and I read through it. I got down to this point here where it said I would have willingly taken the

loss of points on my contract for that had I realized in advance what it was going to cost us. In other words not met the replacements for category 1. I stopped and said wait a minute we talked about this on several occasions. He stopped and looked at me and said let's see how the points come out. Right there I knew I'd been had because there was not any discussion beyond anything else. It stopped. He tallied the points up and I signed the paper and left. I didn't mention to John during that process that I didn't think I'd made the 70 points.

- Expenditures for TFHE went over 144%. That doesn't include reimbursable. I called Juanita after the fact and I asked her how much of this expense was reimbursable. She said $225,294. So I subtract that from the $410,579 it was over and came up still $185,285 over. The total budget was $936,184. It's difficult for Construction to budget for expense because we're mostly capital. You take what few people you have and count their salaries but you don't take into account work done for Maintenance and charged to expense. We made them give us a work order. That got it off the capital program and onto expense. That came off of my budget so it's free labor to them. It's difficult to know what you plan on doing for the year for Construction because of Maintenance and what they want and need.

- I would disagree with the "0" without seeing the breakdown. If it were maintenance that came out of my budget and it was critical that shouldn't be counted against this. I couldn't tell you if it was critical work without seeing the breakdown. They give you a work order. Is it critical? What does it do to relationships between Construction and Maintenance if you don't do it? It's the same overtime. If it was 10 hours in a pay period I could authorize. If it was more than 10 per person John would. Why was he authorizing the overtime if we were discussing the budgets at staff meetings? A lot of it had to be done on the weekend. Station service, replace 2 transformers. I sent 2 people to Arizona to help Arizona power out. That would have been reimbursable. It was 24 hour shifts with a lot of overtime. Those are the kind of thing I needed the breakdown for. John came up with a form to fill out for overtime. A copy was emailed to me and Stacy would forward with overtime on expense. There was a lot of reimbursable on overtime. $45,844 was the total budget on overtime. $104,335 was actually spent. One of the edicts John came up with was that he was the only one who could authorize. It would come to me or Garrett. It was capital and expense. Stacy would check with Joanne and let me know if it was authorized. John would sign it and put in a file. It took away any authority for me to give overtime. Sometimes but rarely did I authorize the 10 hours of overtime. I would send it to him anyway. If it was the first of the pay period I didn't want to be looked at and questioned why you worked ten hours the next week. I didn't feel good about him taking over the overtime. It was his way of taking control and minimizing my responsibilities. He started doing this about his second year. He felt like I wasn't controlling the overtime. He was going to make sure that we took care of it. He told us at a staff meeting for all managers. All 3 who work in the field had to do it. My foremen thought it was dumb to have to fill it out

instead of just talk to you. They had to write it down. A few refused to write it down so I did it for them. John approved 99% of it. He never questioned me but asked Garrett to look at it. John never asked me about overtime that some foreman had asked for.

- One of the things John questioned me on was at the switchboard shop. If they were behind they were working 5 tens maybe every other weekend depending on what the work load was. One thing I didn't realize at the time was that anything the switchboard shop made for the warehouse was expense. The assumption on both my part and the foreman's part was that it was going to capital project. Everything we built went to the warehouse it was essentially free labor yet when it went out from the warehouse to a capital project I don't know how that correlates to anything that we did in the shop. I'm not sure that we could have done anything differently. The way the warehouse functions is they're just in time delivery. If stuff is on back order in the field it means they need it. They call for it and they want it. At what point are you going to say no we're not going to do this because it comes out of expense? At what point does it become capital? The warehouse should pay the switchboard shop but there's not a money transfer. That's where some of this overtime and straight time would have been on expense because we build a lot of pt ct cabinets, a variety of things that went to stock that then went to a capital program. The warehouse had a need date. There were times we would circumvent the warehouse and get them out then do the paperwork afterwards. I was very involved in the switchboard shop in the priorities. They worked overtime if there was a need but not to go into stock. It's my fault for not having the stuff available to argue with him on.

- We went way over on safety; we missed on that and I don't question the "0"

- Initially John gave me a Needs Improvement. It was whited out and I never knew it had changed until I went to see Fred. Fred said I did it wrong. He said don't you have a copy and I said I never received a copy. Cheryl Russell probably dated it. The box changed. Fred signed it after it went to Cheryl. I left there thinking I need some improvement. I need to know how to fix all of this. After I signed this I told John "we'll do better next year" and he said "well, good." I'm not sure I'd have signed it if the "U" was initially there. I would have requested more time to go back and do research.

- October 21st performance appraisal John didn't mention anything about a PIP or WGI at that point. I heard about those two things the Monday before the foreman's meeting (Nov 29th). He wanted me to come see him after the staff meeting. He just told me what he was doing and I said OK.

- Tuesday 30th Nov. foreman's meeting in Celilo; the electrical foremen were there, field foreman, carpenters, Bobby Goodpasture was there. That lasted 1½ days. It used to be foremen were required to run it. John came and took over the meetings. He came up with the agenda. A lot of it had to do with the survey. Mostly it was administrative stuff. Joanne, Betty, Stacey attended. Nov 29th to Dec 3rd no part in meeting, just listening. I didn't tell anyone abut the rating. They learned from memo on Dec. 6. Memo upset a lot of people. People said they were pushing out a good man; they thought I had been done wrong. If I had it to do over again I would make the same decision and same choices next year. I had very little control over budget choices. I had more of an agency view of Bonneville than a TFHE view. My decisions were always based on what does the system need verses what's in my contract. That I would do over again. If the system needed us to work overtime I would have worked overtime. If the system needed us to do maintenance projects because they had to be done (and maintenance couldn't get to it or didn't have the manpower for it) I would have done that again.
- I didn't see Richland verses Sunnyside as a big issue. The places had been picked because of closeness; all that's there is a motel, no facilities. When you upset the troops you get less work out of them. Wautoma is a big job starting in Oct and still going on. Sunnyside would not be a place to spend 9 months to a year in. John was real upset that I had changed things. We were only talking about 15 minutes (30 from Sunnyside and 45 from Richland). Bobby Molt lives in Tri Cities and didn't want to be off PD so he found a trailer park in Sunnyside and turned in his PD. Betty got it and he made Sunnyside the shop. Moving or taking 15 minutes on your own time. It wasn't an issue for me but it was for John.

- I don't think John will ever recover. They had a hard time with him the first 3 years. I'm not talking to anybody about this. It's gotten me bitter towards Bonneville in the way it was handled. I should have been asked to go and find out about the info from Betty. "Can you explain any of this?" He could have done that. The fact that I got something less than satisfactory. I worked hard for these people. Not sure what happened. John snuck up and smacked me over the head. I didn't see it coming. Maybe I was too proud thinking I was too important. Life goes on. I wasn't given that chance to improve. Today everybody gets a chance to improve and I didn't. At the time of the appraisal I said I'll do better next year. My own feeling was that it's all about the employee survey and that John couldn't take ownership that he had any part in the poor survey. I had to be the scapegoat. Now he'll make sure that the employee survey gets better next year. My opinion is it's going to be worse than last years.

- They don't believe that John is there for BPA or Bonneville's benefit but there for John's benefit. He's on his own with no restraint. John told me himself he likes to do things nobody has ever done. He's getting rid of a manager. It's not a good reason to move me because I changed the shop location. That was back in October.

- I still care about these people and concerned people are not thinking about what they're doing. As long as John is there it'll always be that way. I hope people don't get in serious accidents. That's the part that bothers me. There's nothing that I can do. They need to get all this behind them.

- Robin called me to see how I was doing. I said I don't like what is going on. She asked me if I had talked to Fred. I went to talk to him on Monday, December 20. I was explaining the differences between John and me. He stopped me and said, "Your expertise is in technical but frankly you're a very poor supervisor and I'm going to back up John on this one." That surprised me. I was cordial. He said there were things I was asked to do and I didn't do them. I think he was referring to the budget. He wasn't real specific. Where you're going to be assigned there's a real need there. I could get you clear out of Construction if you want to. I said I would think about it. He gave me a tape measure and it was the last one there. He thanked me for the contributions and said I was going to be missed. That flabbergasted me. All these years and nobody told me.

m

Rec'd May 23, 2005
DL

In my career as a construction electrician, foreman I, and foreman III for BPA I worked with and for Dan Glass. I know him to be a knowledgeable journeyman electrician, a good electrical foreman, and good manager, as well as a dedicated employee and "a super nice guy".

In my dealings with him as my supervisor for the time I was a foreman for BPA construction I found him to be very supportive and helpful and easy to work with.

As I had always had excellent help and support from him it came as a great surprise when I heard he was being removed from the position of TFHE manager. He had ,as far as I knew always done a great job in that position.

Looking back at BPA's electrical construction organization the job of supervising the eight electrical field construction crews was always done by two people. Through various "re-organizations, re-engineerings," etc. the job was cut one person and the crews to six. When the crews were expanded again to eight it still was just one manager. This was a lot for Dan to handle but he seemed to do it even though overloaded.

If in the future the crew numbers are expanded it should be looked at and possibly have the Supervision split again.

← Redacted → (names & identifying details)
Exemption 6

← redacted → name
Exemption 6

redacted name
exemption 6