

ServiceFirst

Working Together



Service First Benefits and Costs Assessment

October 2004



Highlights

Highlights of the Service First Assessment Report, an executive guide

Why this Assessment?

In 2000, the General Accounting Office (GAO) completed a review of Service First—a Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service initiative to provide better customer service, improve natural resource stewardship, and conduct business more efficiently. GAO determined that although the methodology used to calculate the saving of the Service First initiative appeared reasonable, the dollar amount of the savings claimed by the agencies was not verifiable. The agencies agreed with the GAO recommendation to develop a joint system to provide reliable program data that could serve as a basis for tracking the status and progress of the initiative. A database and report/record system was developed and implemented in March 2001, however, it did not provide the verifiable information that GAO was seeking. In March 2004, the agencies began a review and assessment of nine of the Service First locations to determine the costs and benefits of the initiative. The Service First programs at the various Western locations range from a fully integrated single office managed by a single cross delegated manager, to offices that share only a physical location, with a range of situations in between.

Service First Benefits and Costs Assessment

Documented Information of What Service First Has Achieved

The Assessment Team reviewed Service First efforts at 9 locations.

| Tier One | Tier Two | Tier Three |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Durango, CO | Salmon, ID | Milwaukee, WI |
| Lakeview, OR | Idaho Falls, ID | Portland, OR |
| | Las Vegas, NV | Buffalo, WY |
| | | Pocatello, ID |

Tier One offices have cross delegation of line managers and the highest level of program cooperation. Tier Two offices have a moderate level of resource and program cooperation. Tier Three offices primarily share only a physical location.

What was found

The assessment, similar to the GAO review, was unable to confirm the savings claimed at the nine locations. While some of the claimed savings do create a dollar savings to the government, in general the claimed efficiencies lack sufficient documentation to verify the savings claimed.

Significant savings occur at Tier One offices with cross delegation of line managers for both the BLM and Forest Services. At locations where the line officers are not cross delegated, savings and efficiencies are no greater than non co-located offices.

Service First is most effective when employees are co-located, commingled, and integrated and support equipment and resources are shared—a shared administrative support staff, a single program staff officer, and shared equipment programs such as fleet, road crew, or surveying.

The database developed to track the various Service First projects is not uniformly used, nor does it track the information needed to determine – accurately – the efficiencies reported.

The energy and commitment needed to make this initiative work is significant, and process improvements are needed to ease this burden. Additionally there are no rewards to encourage employees to implement and achieve the long term benefits of this initiative.

Executive Summary

Service First is an initiative implemented by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Forest Service in March 1996 with the objectives to provide better customer service, improve natural resource stewardship, and conduct business more efficiently.

In November 2000, the General Accounting Office (GAO) report *LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES – Ongoing Initiative to Share Activities and Facilities Needs Management Attention* (GAO-01-50), described Service First activities, the estimated dollar savings of Service First projects, the opportunities for future co-locations¹, and the challenges that must be met before Service First is considered fully successful. The report also recognized the growth in the number of Service First projects currently implemented.

Although GAO determined that the methodology provided to calculate the savings of the Service First initiative was reasonable, they were unable to verify the dollar amount saved—approximately \$5.4 million from 1996 through 1999—claimed by the agencies.

GAO also concluded that the BLM and Forest Service:

- Do not have a system to collect basic information such as the number and location of participating units, the types of projects, and the savings and benefits achieved;
- Have not issued guidance on how to implement the Service First initiative; and
- Do not have a management review or evaluation component to assess results.

To closeout the GAO report, in fiscal year 2004, the BLM and Forest Service conducted an assessment of Service First and found that the above three items still exist. In fact, the team found it challenging to gather the documentation and information needed to complete the assessment because no systematic approach to collecting and maintaining information on Service First activities in either the BLM or Forest Service exists. As a result, cost and tangible benefits continue to be difficult to verify or quantify.

The assessment team evaluated the efforts of the nine Service First locations—Durango, CO; Lakeview and Portland, OR; Salmon, Idaho Falls, and Pocatello, ID; Buffalo, WY; Milwaukee, WI; and Las Vegas, NV (Appendix A).

The organizations in Lakeview and Durango have fully implemented cross-delegation of authority for line officer functions with one administrative officer effectively servicing both agencies. These locations have also fully integrated² their fleet management function, resulting in overall fleet reduction and

¹ Participating agencies have separate space within the same building. The agencies might share parking, rest rooms, conference rooms, exercise facilities (BLM/Forest Service Website <<http://fsweb.wo.fs.fed.us/servicefirst/index.html>>).

² Two or more agencies integrate operations when similar units work as one. For example, integration occurs when fleet, road maintenance, or telecommunications units work together in the same space and the public is unable to discern who works for which agency (BLM/Forest Service Website <<http://fsweb.wo.fs.fed.us/servicefirst/index.html>>).



Idaho Falls, ID

improved efficiencies. Additionally, the Durango organization has extensively implemented cross delegation of authority for all line officers. The Durango resource management staffs are co-mingled and the operations integrated. Other Service First locations share road crews, front desk responsibilities, supplies, copy machines, and telecommunications equipment, while in many locations, staffs are engaged in joint operations that include fire dispatch, property management, and shared limited skills such as biologists, archeologists, and public affairs officers. However, in certain locations, although the BLM and Forest Service offices are co-located, customers still must visit more than one office to meet all their needs.

The assessment team recommends that the Forest Service and the BLM implement the following actions.

Recommendation 1

Determine policymakers' interests regarding the Service First initiative and, based on the determination, establish a systematic approach to collecting and maintaining accurate and reliable information to support management needs.

Recommendation 2

Establish a simple method to evaluate local Service First actions that address the proposed outcomes, the current situation, and the final accomplishment.

Recommendation 3

Clarify existing guidelines and, if needed, issue new guidelines for co-locating offices, co-mingling³ staffs and integrating operations in the following areas:

- Processing collections;
- Shared personnel;
- Shared equipment and facilities;
- Customer service and program effectiveness;
- Joint administrative functions; and
- Joint management of intermingled lands, including fire operations (efforts would have occurred outside the Service First initiative).

Recommendation 4

Establish a management review or evaluation, possibly as part of the BLM's General Management Evaluation process and the Forest Service's Washington Office or Regional Review, to assess the results of the Service First initiative.

³ Two or more staff units are co-mingled when similar functions are adjacent. The primary benefits include increased communication, the opportunity gain knowledge, elimination of stereotypes, and the implementing joint operating functions (BLM/Forest Service Website <<http://fsweb.wo.fs.fed.us/servicefirst/index.html>>).

Background

Most Forest Service and BLM managed lands are located in the Western United States and are contiguous. Both agencies function under legislative mandates that guide their land management activities and each manage the lands for multiple uses, such as timber, minerals, grazing, and recreation, through multi level-headquarters and field offices. Although in many ways the Forest Service and BLM are similar, the magnitude of and emphasis on their respective natural resources differs. The agencies also conduct their responsibilities under different rules, use different administrative processes, charge different user fees, and have different approaches to customer service. The dissimilarities often cause public confusion and inefficient resource use.

In March 1996, the Forest Service and BLM announced the Service First initiative and designated pilot projects in Colorado and Oregon to provide the public with one-stop shopping. The agencies asked pilot units to consider the following questions when developing and implementing their programs:

- Is it legal?
- Is it good for our customers?
- Is it something we can be accountable for?
- Is it consistent with our agency's mission?

Other than the above considerations, the pilots were not given any other operational guidance, and they were not required to evaluate and measure program successes. Additionally, the pilots were not given any formal management structure or budget line item funding.

The Service First initiative has three objectives:

- Provide better customer service;
- Improve natural resource stewardship; and
- Conduct business more efficiently.

An Interagency Steering Committee—comprising Forest Service deputy regional foresters, BLM associate state directors, and other advisers—provided Service First oversight. Steering committee members had full-time positions

and duties and served on the steering committee part-time. The steering committee was tasked to develop and administer a framework to expand collaborative efforts between the Forest Service and BLM. The committee had the authority to remove internal barriers to achieving the mutual objectives of the initiative, and members were authorized to recommend removal of barriers that required legislative, regulatory, or policy changes to top agency management. Recently, the Forest Service and BLM announced the establishment



Pocatello, ID

of a Service First Implementation Team and the committee was relieved of its Service First responsibilities. The objectives of the implementation team are to:

- Integrate fuels reduction plans, targets, and implementation efforts in support of healthy forests;
- Align Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act inventories and coordinate all out-year competitive sourcing studies;
- Coordinate all Information Technology investments for compatibility of systems and applications; Implement the collocation plan; and
- Align priorities in the minerals and energy policies.



Lakeview Reception Area

The local Forest Service and BLM offices use several types of agreements to conduct Service First work. The agreements establish the framework under which the agencies implement the work and generally set the responsibilities and funding requirements. The most common documents used are memoranda of understanding, interagency agreements, and informal agreements.

The Service First initiative has primarily focused on co-locating the Forest Service and BLM offices while sharing resources and functions. Currently, the partnerships range from office co-locations to the full co-mingling of staff and operation integration. However, both agencies are interested in expanding their efforts to include partners with other federal or state agencies.

In November 2000, the General Accounting Office (GAO) recommended the following in their report *LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES – Ongoing Initiative to Share Activities and Facilities Needs Management Attention* (GAO-01-50).

To ensure that the Forest Service and BLM can readily provide the Congress and the agencies' decision-makers with reliable data on the Service First initiative and the results achieved that can be used to determine the extent to which the initiative has been successful and whether the cross-delegation of authority should be extended, we recommend that the Chief of the Forest Service and the Director of BLM jointly develop a system that will provide reliable program data that could serve as a basis for tracking the status and progress of the initiative-including the locations participating in Service First, the types of projects undertaken, and the savings or benefits achieved from the projects-and provide a basis for measuring and evaluating the results of the initiative.

In March 2001, the BLM and Forest Service responded to GAO's recommendation and began developing the Service First Project Database and the Service First – Co-location Record/Report. Both the database and the record/ report were

Objectives and Scope

available on the agencies' joint Service First site <<http://fsweb.wo.fs.fed.us/servicefirst/index.html>>. Designed to provide a ready source of information for use by offices involved in collaborative activities and offices planning new Service First actions, it was the responsibility of each Service First location to input and maintain the information in the database and the record/report. Because inclusion of cost and benefit information was optional, the value of the database has been limited. Additionally, offices did not regularly input and maintain the information in the database. As a result, the database does not provide a reliable basis for identifying and analyzing joint efforts. It is currently sporadically maintained and there are no plans for further development.

The Director of the BLM discussed a benefit/cost assessment plan with GAO to ensure that it met the intentions of GAO's recommendation and audit. On September 15, 2003, the Director of the BLM forwarded the plan to GAO (Appendix B), advised that all recommendations in the report had been implemented, and requested the closure of the audit (GAO-01-50). This assessment was conducted to meet the intentions of that plan.

The objectives for this assessment are as follows:

1. What are the costs and benefits related to customer service, natural resources stewardship and efficiency measures in five general categories: 1) Shared personnel; 2) Shared equipment and shared facilities; 3) Customer services and information; 4) Joint administrative projects; and, 5) Joint management of intermingled lands. Include fire operations even though efforts would have occurred without the Service First Initiative. Also, identify the percentage of Service First that is in the fire operation.
2. What do the external customers, employees and managers consider to be the benefits and challenges of Service First? Such challenges may include policies, regulations and legislation. How do we overcome those challenges?

Assessment scope included co-locations and projects in fiscal year 1996 through fiscal year 2003 at first, second, and third tier offices (Table 1) engaged in Service First.

Table 1. Service First tiers of integration and locations.

| Tiers of Integration | Assessment Locations |
|---|---|
| First tier - Highly integrated operations. Most work conducted has an interagency perspective. | Durango, CO Lakeview, OR |
| Second tier – Moderately integrated operations. Co-located offices are sharing personnel and equipment and working collaboratively on some projects. | Salmon, ID Idaho Falls, ID Las Vegas, NV |
| Third tier – Low integration of operations. Facility co-location with a minor amount of program collaboration. | Milwaukee, WI Portland, OR Buffalo, WY Pocatello, ID |

Methodology

The assessment team visited all sites except Buffalo, WY. The team did not visit Buffalo because three other third tier Service First organizations had been visited and the added expense of visiting another was unjustifiable. At the sites, the team interviewed managers, employees, and contractors who provide services to the agencies' external customers.

The assessment team gathered and reviewed the following information:

- Lease costs (old and new lease, including square footage and other information affecting costs);
- Floor plans;
- Utilities and janitorial expenses;
- Phone costs (old line count and new line count; changes in service);
- Personnel costs (positions shared, organizational structure and reporting requirements, changes in staffing levels);
- Travel (increase/reduction);
- Training (increase/reduction);
- Organization charts;
- Interagency payment documents;
- Memoranda of Understanding and other agreements; and
- Interoffice memoranda.

In addition, the team reviewed spreadsheets developed by the offices to identify projects and summarize their cost and benefits savings. The assessment team requested customer satisfaction data at all locations, however, this information was not available at any of the locations.

The team also requested a copy of the analysis used as a basis for making decisions regarding proposed co-location and joint projects. Staffs indicated that this information had either never been developed or was no longer available. At all sites, the team was informed that the real focus of the Service First efforts had not been cost savings, but rather the three primary objectives of Service First which are:

- Provide better customer service,
- Improve natural resources stewardship, and
- Conduct business more efficiently.

This assessment started in March 2004, the site visits occurred in May and June of 2004, and the final research and report drafted in August 2004.

In August, the assessment team provided a briefing for the Forest Service and BLM management. The briefing document contained suggestions on the various areas the agencies could expand Service First activities (Appendix C).

Findings and Recommendations

Objective 1

What are the costs and benefits related to customer service, natural resources stewardship and efficiency measures in 5 general categories: 1) Shared personnel; 2) Shared equipment and shared facilities; 3) Customer services and information; 4) Joint administrative projects; and, 5) Joint management of intermingled lands. Include fire operations even though efforts would have occurred without the Service First Initiative. Also, identify the percentage of Service First that is in the fire operation.

The assessment team attempted to determine the actual costs and benefits of the Service First initiative and to verify the cumulative approximate savings of \$4.8 million identified in the Service First database.

Shared Personnel

Some Service First offices improved overall efficiency by employing a single staff/line officer or specialist position for both agencies, while delivering a uniform message to the public and coordinating joint operations. In Lakeview, OR, and Durango, CO, the agencies use a single administrative officer and have integrated their administrative processes. In Durango, the Forest Service provides administrative support to the BLM that otherwise would be provided by the district or state office and would require additional travel costs or present other communication and coordination challenges. Other offices share scarce skills—weed scientist, soil scientist, archeologist, etc. Although these dual-role employees require additional training and must attend meetings related to their dual-agency roles, there were no indications that the added costs negated the efficiencies gained. By sharing personnel, the agencies are better able to accomplish their mission while eliminating the cost of each agency employing a specialist or paying travel costs and other expenses to use staff from distant offices.

Shared Equipment and Facilities

Offices are able to maximize efficiency by co-locating into one facility and sharing common areas such as conference rooms, restrooms, and hallways. Such arrangement promotes sharing professional knowledge and expertise, vehicle fleets, road crews, and office supplies and equipment, and potentially improves the overall quality of reception and public areas. As a result, the agencies are able to purchase equipment that might not have been affordable due to budget constraints.

The assessment team was unable to verify actual cost savings related to co-locations because the analyses used to support decisions were unavailable. A cost avoidance analysis would be required to show savings resulting from the two agencies co-locating. Such an analysis would compare the costs of separate facility acquisition and maintenance to that of the co-location facility.

It is reasonable to expect that not all co-locations will result in cost savings and that increased costs might be realized when moving from a government-owned facility to a leased facility. For example, before moving to the co-location office in Durango, the BLM and Forest Service occupied space in the same commercial office building. The space poorly served the public, inadequately met agency staffing needs, and the building was structurally compromised. Although moving to the co-location office eliminated all previous space deficiencies, the cost is greater. If a cost avoidance analysis for separate new space versus combined space had been conducted, it would be reasonable to list any positive difference as a cost avoidance or savings.

Generally, there is cost avoidance rather than a savings for rent payments following a co-location. The one exception was in Milwaukee, WI, where moving from a large federal building that housed many agencies the Forest Service and BLM were able to reduce their rent from approximately \$30 to \$20/square foot. In other locations, such as Salmon, ID, and Lakeview, OR, one agency moved from a government-owned facility into a commercial leased facility and started paying rent. In a typical co-location, the agencies gained needed space and other improvements at the new facility.

Other areas of cost avoidance or potential savings are:

- A single phone switch or a single voice-over IP results in reduced expenses for individual switches per agency and on future duplicative maintenance and upgrade costs;
- Integrated road crews and fleets;
- Shared telecommunication equipment and maintenance;
- Consolidated trunk lines, including voice and data lines; however, one of the challenges the organizations are facing is the Cobell litigation that places certain restrictions on BLM communication systems; and
- A joint radio system with consolidated agency radio frequencies, equipment that covers the spectrum of shared frequencies and an integrated radio system.

The assessment team recognizes that time and dollar limits affect implementation of cost efficiency measures. In addition, court actions, organizational realignments, and emergencies impose significant demands on the workforce.

Customer Service

There is a general perception that external customers reap non-tangible benefits because of one-stop shopping and a joint public information area provided at co-located offices. Customers can purchase maps, obtain wood cutting permits, etc. at a single site. In addition, absence of negative feedback via BLM customer comment cards is assumed to represent satisfaction. However, actual data regarding customer requirements and satisfaction was not available at any of the sites visited.

In 2001, Pacific Consulting Group conducted an external focus group survey for the Lakeview Public Land Center. The focus group included four participants that represented stakeholders, employees and managers of the BLM and Forest Service.



Las Vegas, NV

The objectives of the survey were to:

- Investigate whether the Service First program has been successful and if any changes are needed;
- Learn how the program influences customer service; and
- Learn how the program influences employees' personal work capabilities.

The surveys indicated a positive stakeholder response to the program. The external parties however were weighted to local parties of influence, such as a county commissioner, and not representative of a larger public constituency. The team did not review the cost/benefits of gathering this information. Staffs at all locations indicated that there are no ongoing efforts to gather customer service/satisfaction data.

In certain locations, even though the BLM and Forest Service offices are co-located, customers are still required to visit more than one office to meet their needs. This would occur, for example, if a Forest Service District Ranger's Office were not co-located with the BLM District/Field and the Forest Supervisor's offices. Since all three offices have specific land management responsibilities, a customer might have to visit more than one to satisfy specific permitting or information needs.

Joint Administrative Functions

There are examples of Service First offices implementing joint administrative functions as part of their daily operations; particularly in areas related to fleet and road maintenance. Lakeview, OR, consolidated its fleet management function and integrated the road crews. The results are reduced cost per vehicle

maintenance rates, reduced number of fleet vehicles, and increased road crew effectiveness. Lakeview plans to surplus seven vehicles at a saving of approximately \$30,000 per year. In Salmon, ID, Durango, CO, and Idaho Falls, ID, the BLM pays the Forest Service to provide road crew support in areas that it is unable to support with its existing equipment. Although this situation efficiently uses government-owned equipment, documentation was not available that provided cost benefit or saving information. The Forest Service and BLM recently competed against external sources to determine the most efficient road maintenance organization. The in-house agency offer prevailed and the assessment team therefore concluded that the Service First consolidation of fleet function in Lakeview is cost efficient.



Lakeview Radio Equipment

Missed opportunities and situations where offices could improve efficiencies also exist. For example, the Forest Service and BLM offices in Durango, Milwaukee, Pocatello, and Salmon, use separate copiers and mail meters, and most of the Service First sites maintain separate agency office supply stock.

Even if a tangible cost saving is not realized from joint administrative functions, employees experience an opportunity to become familiar with both agencies' policies and procedures. An intangible benefit of joint management is the increase in one staff's knowledge about the other agency's operation, work processes, and customers, and the challenge to become more efficient while providing better service to their customers.



Las Vegas Forest Service Annex

Table 2 shows specific joint administrative functions at the nine Service First locations.

Table 2. Areas of shared staff/joint projects.

| | Portland | Lakeview | Las Vegas | Pocatello | Idaho Falls | Salmon | Durango | Buffalo | Milwaukee |
|---|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|--------|---------|---------|-----------|
| Line Mgr w/cross delegated authority | | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | |
| Shared Administrative Officer | | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | |
| Joint Warehouse | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Share Computer Rooms | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | |
| Share Scarce Skills; i.e., Hydrologist, Realty Specialist, Biologist, Soil Scientist, Weed Specialist etc | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Shared Fleets | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | |
| Shared road crews | | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | |
| Joint Telecom | | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Joint Mail Room | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Front Desk/Public Room | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Office Equipment (copier/postage meters/etc) | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Fire Operations | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | |

The assessment team found examples of gained efficiencies through the sharing of range conservationists to support grazing allotment and range permit administration, and implementation of a consolidated fire dispatch function. Such efforts reduce the number of positions required to manage grazing allotments and range permit administration, while decreasing the number of employees needed to interact with a permittee.

Fire dispatch offices have been multi-agency and co-located for many years and, as such, they are a successful, long-term Service First model. However, there remain opportunities to increase the efficiency of fire operations. Agencies should consider consolidating fire staff/management officers and further integrate initial attack organizations. The assessment team review found

that although Idaho Falls has consolidated some of the fire functions, the units function under separate staff managers, while in Lakeview, one employee serves as the fire manager for both agencies. The Las Vegas, NV fire organization remains two distinct organizations despite having the benefit of co-location, while in Portland, the fire organization is managed jointly for the Northwest Regional Office and the Washington/Oregon State Office.

The Service First Project Database or the Service First – Co-location Record/ Report does not contain costs related to the fire operations. Therefore, because of time constraints, the complexities of the fire operations, and the long-recognized benefits of jointly managing fire operations, the team did not examine the costs and benefits of the fire operations.

Joint projects, such as management plans, ecosystem surveys, etc., offer an opportunity for improved cost effectiveness and customer service by sharing personnel to create a single product. In Lakeview, both agencies staff these projects with only the required specialists— one biologist or archeologist who is either a BLM or Forest Service employee. In Lakeview, it is common to have a Forest Service “ologist” assisting on a project that is predominantly on BLM lands and vice versa. On the other hand, in Idaho Falls, both agencies provide their own staff specialists to work on a single project, while in Buffalo, WY, the agencies have limited opportunities to sharing staffs/projects because the land management areas of each office are not adjacent.



Lakeview Shop

Generally, organizations can maximize efficiency by jointly assigning only the staff required to represent both agencies when conducting single biological studies, developing plans, etc. across agency boundaries, including other agencies as appropriate, and when developing a single report that meets the dual-agency requirements. However, no mechanism exists to evaluate the effectiveness of joint management to ensure that efficiency is maximized and that the process for joint management is continuously improved.

Objective 1 Conclusions

Although there were many examples of one agency providing staff support to the other and it would be reasonable to assume that savings are realized when this occurs, given the time allotted for this assessment, the team was unable to determine actual cost or savings because complete documentation of joint projects were not readily available. The Lakeview Interagency Office and the BLM’s Portland State Office provided copies of the spreadsheets they maintain to help track potential savings and benefits related to their Service First efforts. Lakeview also provided supporting documentation for entries on their spreadsheet. The project data for all 9 locations are listed in Appendix D.

None of the offices visited rely on the Service First Project Database or the Service First – Co-location Record/Report to identify and track the success of joint projects and other collaborative efforts in their organization. In addition, there are no requirements for the field organizations to systematically gather and maintain information related to the performance of their Service First efforts. Without the availability of rigorous cost data or mandated reporting for the Service First collaborative effort, there was no basis for measuring and evaluating the full results of the initiative. In addition, there was no customer satisfaction data available at any of the sites visited to determine if the offices are providing better customer service.

It appears that maximum collaboration and operational efficiency is achieved where there is one manager with the authority to manage the land, office, and employees. The locations with cross-delegated line officers, who can execute the other's line authority, have the next highest level of cooperation and efficiencies. Offices that are co-located and their employees are integrated (i.e., working as one) or co-mingled (i.e., similar functions located adjacent) also have a significant level of efficiency. Co-located offices without work project collaboration or other sharing had the lowest level of operational efficiency. Cross-delegation of authority and interagency agreements are effective tools and should be considered before contracting out services that the other agency might provide.

In August 2004, the assessment team provided a briefing for management that shared suggestions on areas that the BLM and Forest Service could expand Service First activities and gain efficiency (Appendix C—Conclusions from BLM and Forest Service Briefing Document, August 2004).

Objective 2

What do the external customers, employees and managers consider benefits and challenges of Service First? Such challenges may include policies, regulations and legislation. How do we overcome those challenges?

The assessment team interviewed staffs at the nine Service First locations regarding the benefits and challenges of the initiative, both from an internal and external perspective. The Service First locations range from combined regional/state offices, to forest supervisor/district offices to forest supervisor/field offices to ranger district/resource area offices. The mix of offices created opportunities and challenges for one-stop shopping. For example, due to the vast differences in roles and responsibilities, the co-located regional and field offices in Milwaukee have limited opportunities for collaborating on joint projects and sharing scarce skills. On the other hand, the single-line management of the forest supervisor's office and field office in Durango has created opportunities for maximizing benefits by fully integrating operations while commingling staffs.

Some of the benefits of the co-locations cited by managers and staff include employees that are better-qualified share information with the other agencies' employees as they interact professionally and personally in facility common areas throughout the workday. Such interactions encourage dismantling of professional barriers and provide opportunities for collaboration and open communication. Through the administration of joint projects, the staffs share knowledge and learn from the other agencies' staff.

Managers and employees frequently mentioned that administrative processes were some of the greatest challenges. They frequently identified processing agency-specific collections, efficiently using or the legality of using joint permits, and the correct cross delegation of law enforcement employees as difficult areas. In addition, because of a lack of clear guidance, many Service First offices are not pursuing use of a joint agency permitting process.

All locations must function under agency-specific guidelines regarding revenue accounting. For example, although customers can use credit cards to purchase

BLM products, those wanting to purchase Forest Service products are unable to use credit cards. However, the Durango office has overcome this challenge by using an interpretative association to process product purchases. In some offices, only the agencies' employees can sell the agencies' products. The team identified additional areas where the Forest Service and the BLM could expand Service First activities and gain more efficiency while overcoming the challenges staffs are facing. (Appendix C—Conclusions from BLM and Forest Service Briefing Document, August 2004).



Salmon Office

The San Juan Public Land Center in Durango, CO, is the only location visited with a single line manager with the authority to manage the activities of both agencies. The Lakeview Interagency Office and San Juan Public Land Center use one administrative officer who has the authority to manage both the BLM's and Forest Services's administrative functions, personnel, and fire operations. The Portland State Office and Northwest Regional Office have integrated their fire operations and have one manager who is responsible for overall management of the combined fire staffs. Staffs at some locations expressed uncertainty regarding the procedures for implementing cross delegation of authority in their organization. None of the other offices visited are using cross-delegated authority to manage their operations.

One of the three objectives of the Service First initiative is to provide better customer service. It was brought to the assessment team's attention that data was collected from an external focus group for the Lakeview Public Land Center in 2001. The focus group included four participants that represented stakeholders, employees and managers of the BLM and Forest Service.

The objectives of the survey were to:

- Investigate whether the Service First program has been successful and if any changes are needed;
- Learn how the program influences customer service; and
- Learn how the program influences employees' personal work capabilities.

The survey results indicated a positive stakeholder response to the program. The external parties however were weighted to local parties of influence, such as a county commissioner, and not representative of a larger public constituency.

At all of the sites, there is a general perception by the staffs that external customers reap non-tangible benefits due to one-stop shopping and the jointly managed public information area of the offices. Customers are able to purchase maps, obtain wood cutting permits, etc. at a single site. Staffs at all locations also indicated that there are no ongoing efforts to gather information from customers regarding their experience with the collocated offices. The assessment team decided against interviewing the commissioners whose names the staffs provided and recommended to the program leads that the agencies should implement routine information gathering from their external customers.

Objective 2 Conclusions

The staffs consistently expressed overwhelming support for the agencies' partnering and joint management efforts. They also recognized the challenges of managing the land and its resources in an environment where leadership direction and strategies might be incompatible, where managers might struggle to implement conflicting priorities, or where missions or interests of the co-located offices are not complementary.

As stated above, in August 2004, the assessment team provided a briefing for management that shared suggestions on areas that the BLM and Forest Service could expand Service First activities and gain efficiency (Appendix C—Conclusions from BLM and Forest Service Briefing Document, August 2004).

Summary

Overall, the Service First initiative is effective and additional efficiencies might be gained by expanding the use of joint business processes, cross delegation of authority, shared employees and other limited skills, shared equipment and supplies, and joint management of the land, agreements and permits.

In some locations, BLM and Forest Service have successfully created environments to provide improved customer services through cooperative efforts. Employees have expressed an interest in greater Service First involvement; however, it is important to establish policies and guidelines for Service First-related field activities to ensure continued effectiveness and legal accountability as units conduct cross delegations, resource sharing, and fund management.

We commend the dedication of the employees who are meeting inherent internal and external challenges while implementing the Service First initiative to achieve greater operating efficiencies.

The assessment team recommends that the Forest Service and the BLM implement the following actions.

Recommendation 1

Determine policymakers' interests regarding the Service First initiative and, based on the determination, establish a systematic approach to collecting and maintaining accurate and reliable information to support reporting requirements.

Recommendation 2

Establish a simple method to evaluate local Service First actions that address the proposed outcomes, the current situation, and the final accomplishment.

Recommendation 3

Clarify existing guidelines and, if needed, issue new guidelines for co-locating offices, co-mingling⁴ staffs and integrating operations in the following areas:

- Processing collections;
- Shared personnel;
- Shared equipment and facilities;
- Customer service and program effectiveness;
- Joint administrative functions; and
- Joint management of intermingled lands, including fire operations (efforts would have occurred outside the Service First initiative).

Recommendation 4

Establish a management review or evaluation, possibly as part of the BLM's General Management Evaluation process and the Forest Service's Washington Office or Regional Review, to assess the results of the Service First initiative.

Overall, the Service First initiative is effective and additional efficiencies might be gained by expanding the use of joint business processes, cross delegation of authority, shared employees and other limited skills, shared equipment and supplies, and joint manage of the land, agreements and permits.

The BLM and Forest Service have successfully created environments to provide improved customer services through cooperative efforts. Employees have expressed an interest in greater Service First involvement; however, it is important to establish policies and guidelines related to Service First-related field activities to ensure continued effectiveness and legal accountability as units conduct cross delegations, resource sharing, and fund management. We commend the dedication of the employees who are meeting inherent internal and external challenges while implementing the Service First initiative to achieve greater operating efficiencies.

⁴ *Two or more staff units are co-mingled when similar functions are adjacent. The primary benefits include increased communication, the opportunity gain knowledge, elimination of stereotypes, and the implementing joint operating functions (BLM/Forest Service Website <<http://fsweb.wo.fs.fed.us/servicefirst/index.html>>).*

Contacts

For more information about this report, please contact Larry Coffelt (480-610-3311), Kamilah Rasheed (202-452-5161), or Glen Parker (801-625-5209). Contacts and key contributors are listed in Appendix E.

Report Manager

Larry Coffelt, Service First Coordinator (U.S. Forest Service)

Assessment Team

Kamilah Rasheed, Senior Specialist for Management Controls and Program Evaluation (Bureau of Land Management)

Glen Parker, Intermountain External Accounting Team (U.S. Forest Service)



Salmon Reception Area



October 2004

Service First Benefits and Costs Assessment

Appendices

Appendix A

Service First Locations

Appendix B

Service First Benefit/Cost Assessment Plan

Appendix C

Conclusions from
Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service
Briefing Document, August 2004

Appendix D

Service First Project Data

Appendix E

Interviewees

Appendix A

Service First Locations

Buffalo, WY

Co-located Powder River Ranger District Office, Buffalo Field Office

Durango, CO

Co-located San Juan National Forest Supervisors Office, San Juan Public Lands Center¹

Idaho Falls, ID

Co-located Caribou/Targhee National Forest Supervisors Office, Upper Snake River District Office, Idaho Falls Field Office

Lakeview, OR (Lakeview Public Lands Center)

Co-located Fremont-Winema National Forest Supervisors Office, Lakeview District Office², Lakeview Resource Area

Las Vegas, NV

Co-located Spring Mountains National Recreation Area, Las Vegas Field Office³.

Milwaukee, WI

Co-located Eastern Regional Office, Milwaukee Field Office

Pocatello, ID

Co-located Westside Ranger District Office, Pocatello Field Office

Portland, OR

Co-located Pacific Northwest Regional Office⁴, Oregon/Washington State Office.

Salmon, ID

Co-located Salmon./Challis National Forest Supervisors Office, Salmon/Cobalt Ranger District Office, Salmon Field Office

¹ This BLM center is unique to Durango and is the equivalent to a BLM Field Office with the same functions and responsibilities.

² BLM district offices and Forest Service supervisor's offices are comparable organizations.

³ BLM field offices or resource areas and Forest Service ranger districts or National Recreation Areas are comparable organizations.

⁴ Forest Service regional offices and BLM state offices are comparable organizations. A regional office might be multi state. For example, the Northwest Region is comprised of two states and the Eastern Region is comprised of 20 states

Service First Benefit/Cost Assessment Plan

In Reply Refer To
1245 (830)

Mr. Barry T. Hill
Director, Natural Resources and Environment
U.S. General Accounting Office
411 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20548

SEP 15 2003

Dear Mr. Hill:

Enclosed is a plan developed jointly by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Forest Service to assess Service First costs and benefits. This plan is in response to the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) report "Land Management Agencies: Ongoing Initiative to Share Activities and Facilities Needs Management Attention" (GAO-01-50), which recommended that "...the Chief of the Forest Service and the Director of BLM jointly develop a system that will provide reliable program data that could serve as a basis for tracking the status and progress of the initiative, including the locations participating in Service First, the types of projects undertaken, and the savings or benefits achieved from the projects, and provide a basis for measuring and evaluating the results of the initiative."

The enclosed plan is intended to close this recommendation and audit GAO-01-50. This enclosed plan has been discussed with Linda Harmon of your office to ensure the assessment plan meets the intentions of the GAO's recommendation. All other recommendations in the report have been implemented. Therefore, we request closure of GAO-01-50.

If you have any questions, please contact Andrew Goldsmith, Service First Coordinator, BLM, at 202-452-5169, Larry Coffelt, Service First Coordinator, Forest Service, at 480-610-3311 or Andrea Nygren, Audit Liaison Officer, BLM, at 202-452-5153.

Sincerely,

/s/ Jim Hughes

for Kathleen Clarke
Director

Enclosure

Service First Assessment

Background

“Service First” is a collaborative partnership between the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Forest Service. The objectives of Service First are to: 1) Provide better customer service; 2) Improve natural resource stewardship; and 3) Conduct business more efficiently. While these objectives remain, Service First has expanded beyond individual examples of partnerships. Today, these partnerships range from office collocations to the full integration of workforces. As Service First expands to a “business as usual” approach, it will be helpful to project the expected benefits of Service First. In November of 2000, the General Accounting Office (GAO) issued a report entitled, “Land Management Agencies- Ongoing Initiative to Share Activities and Facilities Needs Management Attention” (GAO-01-50). This report recommended “...that the Chief of the Forest Service and the Director of BLM jointly develop a system that will provide reliable program data that could serve as a basis for tracking the status and progress of the initiative- including the locations participating in Service First, the types of projects undertaken, and the savings or benefits achieved from the projects- and provide a basis for measuring and evaluating the results of the initiative.”

In response to the GAO recommendation, the BLM and Forest Service developed a project database. The database contains information about the activity involved, the year initiated, the project title, office/general location and project details. The database is accessible from the Service First home page. It has provided a ready source of information for those offices involved in collaborative activities as well as those offices planning new actions. The design of the project detail section provides space to include cost and benefit information. In order to achieve the full scope of the recommendation, the BLM and Forest Service will assess the costs and benefits associated with Service First. This task will be accomplished by assessing the results of a cross-section of sites that have implemented varying levels of Service First collaboration.

Methodology

The BLM and Forest Service have jointly developed a strategy aimed at achieving the intent of GAO’s recommendation. While quantifying the costs and benefits of each Service First activity would be difficult, if not impossible, our strategy aims to capture the range of costs and benefits for a series of activity levels to help other units as they undertake a new Service First collaborative effort. Our strategy includes: (1) gathering quantitative and qualitative data about the costs and benefits identified by various units relating to customer service, natural resource stewardship, and efficiency measures; (2) speaking with customers, employees, and managers to gain their insights as to the strengths and weaknesses of Service First collaboration; and (3) communicating the results of our findings throughout both Agencies. The results will be shared with the Service First Steering Committee and line officers. Additionally, the findings will be available on the Service First web site.

The BLM and Forest Service will review the activities of several offices that are engaged in the Service First way of doing business. Offices covering three tiers of integration will be assessed. The first tier of Service First includes those offices that are highly integrated. They view much of the work in their offices from an interagency perspective. The second tier of Service First includes collocated offices that are

sharing personnel and equipment to a moderate extent and working collaboratively on various projects. The third tier of Service First is basic collocation with a minor amount of collaboration. Each office will respond to the same set of questions with the understanding that the answers will vary from office to office.

In addition to the questions, the BLM and Forest Service will meet with employees and managers to assess the benefits of Service First as it relates to the three objectives. When practical, the BLM and Forest Service will obtain the views of external customers for activities such as one-stop shopping, joint permits, integrated maps, etc.

Assessment Content

Each office will be asked to provide information on known costs and benefits for the following:

1. Customer Service
 - One-stop shopping (i.e. maps, information, permits, etc.)
 - Common processes
 - Consistent messages to the public (i.e. joint press releases, combined public meetings, etc.)
2. Natural Resource Stewardship
 - Common resource plans
 - Joint management/projects
 - Common databases
 - Consistent practices
3. Efficiency
 - Cost avoidance (i.e. rent, equipment, staffing, contracts, travel, training, etc.)

Proposed Site Sample

First Tier

- Durango, CO
- Lakeview, OR

Second Tier

- Salmon, ID
- Idaho Falls, ID

Third Tier

- Milwaukee, WI
- Santa Fe, NM
- Portland, OR
- Buffalo, WY

Implementation

- Develop questionnaire- October 15, 2003
- Complete data collection- December 15, 2003
- Complete data analysis- January 15, 2004
- Communicate results- February 15, 2004

Conclusion

The BLM and Forest Service recognize the importance of measuring Service First results in this day of performance management. Gathering and analyzing the necessary data and using the findings to communicate and improve the collaborative results will contribute to the success of Service First.

Appendix C

Conclusions from Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service Briefing Document, August 2004

Shared personnel

While co-locations do not necessarily result in cost savings, benefits do accrue from sharing 1) staff knowledge and expertise; 2) conference rooms, restrooms, and hallways; 3) vehicle fleets and road crews; and 4) office supplies and equipment. Cost benefits are generally generated from sharing conference room space, rest rooms and hallways; and in some cases supplies and copier machines.

Detailed below are areas where the Forest Service and the BLM could expand Service First activities and gain more efficiency, while overcoming the many challenges staffs are facing. Adequate policies and guidelines should be issued to support these efforts.

Staffing

Avoid staffing projects with both a BLM “ologist” and Forest Service “ologist” where one would suffice to represent both agencies. Also, employ a single administrative officer to serve both agencies at joint locations.

Personnel

Generally, in BLM offices below the District Office level, certain administrative positions are non-existent; i.e., Public Affairs Officer, Personnel Staff, etc. On the other hand, the Forest Service is well staffed in these functional areas at these locations. Using delegations of authority and interagency agreements, the Forest Service could provide these services to the BLM at many of the joint locations.

Road Crew

An integrated crew is most efficient. This would allow for better planning and utilization of crew staffs, and would support rotating locations during winter vs. summer months. This also increases the utilization of equipment with an overall reduced cost to the agencies by eliminating redundant equipment.

Shared Employee Activities

Use every opportunity to host shared picnics, holiday parties, retirement functions, etc. This helps to foster camaraderie and promotes the spirit of cooperation. No specific policies or guidelines are needed for this activity).

Shared equipment and shared facilities and supplies

Mail

Although offices are sharing the same mailroom, in many locations each of the agencies have their own postage meters, scales, and other equipment. Consideration should be given to sharing staffs, equipment and using joint accounts where feasible.

Copy Machines

Eliminate the use of separate copy machines. In some locations, there are either separate rooms that contain separate copying machines for each agency, or both agencies may have their own copiers housed in the same room but used only by the personnel of the agency that owns that particular copier. BLM/Forest Service should procure only enough copiers to support both agencies and share the costs of supporting those copiers.

Supply Room

Maintain one shared supply cabinet or area. In some offices, separate supply cabinets or area are maintained for use only by the employees of the agency that owns those supplies.

Office Equipment

Eliminate duplicate audiovisual equipment and other support equipment, wherever feasible. This will help to decrease maintenance costs and ownership/management issues.

Phones

Eliminate underutilized trunks. Avoid maintaining “ours” and “theirs” phone lines that existed prior to co-location. Several of these lines can be eliminated without affecting phone service.

Data Lines

imilar issue with T1, T3, and fiber lines. The BLM and Forest Service can share a single data line into a facility. Currently, it must be split into separate agency equipment until the Cobell lawsuit is resolved.

Voice over IP

This technology appears to be cost effective, and uses under-utilized data equipment and data lines. By using Voice over IP, the agencies avoid the \$.02/minute FTS 2000 long distance charge. This approach may not be feasible in all locations.

Telecommunication Equipment

Eliminate redundant telecommunications equipment. Some locations have gained efficiencies by sharing frequencies (mountain tops, repeaters, handhelds, etc. are programmed for the same frequencies). Equipment is jointly maintained and supported from the Regional Office and/or State Office telecom funding.

Customer services and program management

Space

Co-mingle staffs immediately upon co-locating or as soon as possible. It improves office communication and fosters coordination/cross pollination to have specialists located together and working side-by-side. This enhances the opportunity for peer discussions and interaction. This also eliminates the need for each specialist to have their own professional library, fosters sharing of equipment and assistance, and allows the professionals to improve the quality of their professional library with their limited resources.

Policy and Guidelines

The current Concept of Operations should be reviewed to determine if this provides adequate guidelines to the field. If not, the Forest Service and the BLM should ensure that adequate guidelines are issued. Such guidelines should also address what analysis is required when proposing joint projects, including co-location, and requirements regarding the maintenance of that analysis and supporting documentation should be addressed. Although the Forest Service has issued considerable guidelines through its directives system, it is the BLM's position that the field should have maximum flexibility in implementing Service First and as a result, have issued very little operating guidelines. According to the GAO report, a Concept of Operations was being developed and would be issued at the end of November 2000. The purpose of the Concept of Operations was to outline standard business procedures and to give practical advice and guidance on how to implement Service First effectively while complying with the laws and regulations governing the various financial and business operations. The Forest Service has issued the Concept of Operations as part of its directives system; however, the BLM has issued it under the cover of an Information Bulletin.

Customer Service

Establish a systematic approach to gather information from customers and stakeholders regarding their level of satisfaction with the products and services provided at co-located offices. This information would help the agencies address customer dissatisfaction while improving the overall service to the public. There is a strong perception among the employees that the public is generally happy when they can stop in one location for products and services. However, there is no systematic approach to gathering this information. There is no customer survey data available for any of the sites visited nor are the sites collecting customer comment cards in any amounts that could be deemed statistically valid.

Program Evaluation

In 2000, the GAO pointed out that the Service First initiative has no required program evaluation component, and there are still no evaluations or reviews being planned for this initiative. Now that the BLM has reinstated General

Joint administrative functions

Management Evaluations (GMEs), and the Forest Service has its Washington Office/Regional Reviews, the agencies should consider including some co-located offices in the annual review schedules. Such reviews should include the following objectives: 1) To what extent is the BLM meeting the objectives of the Service First initiative? 2) What are the benefits being derived from the agencies' Service First efforts? 3) What are the recommendations for improving/increasing Service First activities in the agencies? Consideration should also be given to including those office where no Service First projects are ongoing; e.g., co-location of facilities, co-mingling of staffs, or integration of operations, and determine the extent to which improvements would be gained by pursuing such efforts.

Co-location Record/Report Database

Either complete the database (tracking system) that is currently available on the Service First Webpage, or discontinue its use and remove it from the Website. The BLM/Forest Service initial response to the GAO report was to establish a database that would collect basic information on the scope and results of the Service First initiative. Although this system is currently available on the Service First website, the information is not complete nor is it accurate.

Cross Delegations

To become efficient and maximize the efficiencies of Service First, joint offices need to have a single Line Officer with cross delegation to manage the land, office and its personnel. In addition, cross delegations should be implemented throughout the office, wherever feasible.

Front Desk

Establish some consistency in how the Front Desk/Public Information Area is managed. Some consideration should be given to expanding the use of volunteers to staff this area in the various offices; utilize BLM's Collection and Billing System for credit card sales, allow access to the Forest Services' Special Use Data System (SIDS) and Timber Information management System (TIMS) for BLM employees. BLM can allow Forest Service employee access to CBS. Avoid traditional staffing from each agency of an FTE (or more). Share agency products in most cost effective manner, (i.e. transfer products or sell them to each other). The BLM front desk function is not the same as the Forest Service front desk, recognize this, and know that a joint front desk must support the BLM public room and coordinates public visits with BLM specialists whom the public is seeking out. Additionally, guidelines are needed to ensure financial documents, including collections, are processed efficiently between agencies.

Fleet Management

Maximize fleet management, including vehicle maintenance, by combining and managing the fleets for both agencies. In FY 2004, the Department and the bureaus began collaborative effort to improve the management of vehicle fleets and as a result developed action plans to improve fleet management and realize cost savings. Due to reduction in funding, the BLM committed to reductions and cost-savings by: 1) reducing the size of the fleet; 2) employing energy saving practices by fleet operators; 3) acquiring more efficient vehicles; 4) acquiring the minimum sized vehicle to accomplish the mission; 5) disposing of underutilized vehicles; 6) freezing the acquisition of vehicles from the General Services Administration Excess Vehicle program; and 7) exploring and developing the use of inter-bureau motor pools. In FY 2005, the BLM anticipates that it will reduce expenses by 1,016,000. The agencies should establish performance goals and issue guidelines to the field to ensure that every effort is made through the Service First initiative to achieve this budget reduction.

Directives and other correspondence

Maintain office records in a centralized location. To maximize effectiveness and efficiency, the BLM/Forest Service should maintain their records central to the employees in the office to promote sharing of information and cross-agency learning.

Property

Establish shared positions to support property accounting. Generally, because this function is often a part-time responsibility, this is assigned to someone as a collateral duty assignment. By utilizing a single individual to support both agencies, BLM/Forest Service could increase their expertise in this area, and therefore, provide support for both agencies. This would improve upon the use of traditional part time employees with other duties supporting property accounting.

Training

Coordinate and/or offer all training sessions to both agencies' employees and combine sessions when possible. This would encourage information sharing and support knowledge management.

Public affairs officer (PAO)

Established the PAO as a shared position, wherever feasible. Having a single PAO allows the co-located offices to deliver a single consistent message and potentially at a reduced cost. This also provides a single contact for media communications.

Joint management of intermingled lands, including fire operations (efforts would have occurred outside the Service First initiative).

Stewardship contracting

Use cross-delegations to implement stewardship contracting. In some offices, it makes more sense for the Forest Service to manage such contracts; however, delegations of authority are not in place to support this arrangement. As a result, we are not as efficient as we could be if such arrangement were in place.

Joint permits

Review our regulations to determine where we may issue joint permits, and establish policies and procedures to support joint permit activities, whenever feasible. Some of the office already issue joint permits for wood Christmas tree cutting; however, this is not done in all locations. In addition, there may be other opportunities for issuing joint permits that should be explored. By issuing joint permits, we could gain some efficiency and improve service to our customers.

Eco-system projects

The most efficient organization is where each agency jointly conducts a single biological study, plan, etc... across agency boundaries (including other agencies as needed). The joint work is staffed with the required specialist – not redundant specialists, with one from each agency – and provides a single report and data in the appropriate format to each agency.

Joint administration

Utilize shared positions wherever feasible. For instance, have a single range conservationist administer permits issued to the same permittee or all permittees in the same allotment. Similarly have a single administrator administer the joint permits or individual permits of the same special use permittee.

Appendix D Service First Project Data

| Proj. # | BLM office | FS office | Year Initiated | Project Title | Cust. Service | Op. efficiency | Re-source stewardship | Non financial benefits | Non measurable financial | Cost avoidance | 1 time savings | Annual Savings | Cumulative Savings |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--|---------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|
| 573 | Buffalo FO | Powder Range Dist | 97 | Co-location of offices | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Buffalo Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | San Juan FO | San Juan NF | 97 | Joint Reception Area | Yes | Yes | | | | | | \$10,000 | \$35,000 |
| 35 | San Juan FO | San Juan NF | 97 | Abandoned Mined Land Coord. | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | \$4,500 | \$18,000 |
| 36 | San Juan FO | San Juan NF | 97 | Shared FS surveyor | Yes | Yes | | Yes | | | \$9,000 | | \$9,000 |
| 37 | San Juan FO | San Juan NF | 97 | Shared Environ Specialist | Yes | Yes | | Yes | | | | | |
| 38 | San Juan FO | San Juan NF | 97 | Shared Geologist | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | |
| 39 | San Juan FO | San Juan NF | 97 | Co Management of San Juan FO and NF | Yes | Yes | | | | | | \$55,000 | \$248,000 |
| 33 | San Juan | Durango | 99 | Telephone System/Computer support | Yes | Yes | | | | \$25,000 | | | \$25,000 |
| Durango Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 202 | Idaho Falls | CT NF | 92 | Jointly operated visitor Center | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | \$35,000 | \$315,000 |
| 198 | Idaho Falls | C-T Nat Forest | 96 | Joint Fire Dispatch, Fire planning, fire suppression | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | \$87,000 | \$435,000 |
| 200 | Idaho Falls | CT/BT/SC NF's | 97 | Office co-location Personnel, B&F, LE, Fire, | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | \$27,000 | \$108,000 |
| 201 | Idaho Falls | CT NF | 98 | South Fork Snake River Mgmt and Fee Demo | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | \$100,000 | | |
| 199 | Idaho Falls | CT/BT NF's | 00 | Joint T-Comm and Computer Services | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| Idaho Falls Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 261 | Lakeview District | Fremont N.F. | 83 | Lakeview Inter-agency Fire Coordination Center | Yes | Yes | | | | \$150,000 | | \$75,000 | \$1,350,000 |
| 275 | Lakeview District | Fremont, Winema, Rogue N.F. | 89 | Resources and People (RAP) Camp | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 252 | Lakeview District | Fremont N.F. | 92 | Shared road maint. projects, equip. and facilities | Yes | Yes | | | | | | \$20,000 | \$60,000 |
| 271 | Lakeview District/KRA | Winema N.F. | 92 | Law Enforcement Agreements | Yes | Yes | | | | | | \$49,000 | \$147,000 |
| 253 | Lakeview Dist./LRA | Fremont N.F. | 94 | Joint Sec. 7 consultation biological opinions | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | |
| 260 | Lakeview Dist/LRA | Fremont N.F. | 94 | BLM firewood and map sales @ Silver Lake. | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | | | | |

| Proj. # | BLM office | FS office | Year Initiated | Project Title | Cust. Service | Op. efficiency | Re-source stewardship | Non financial benefits | Non measurable financial | Cost avoidance | 1 time savings | Annual Savings | Cumulative Savings |
|---------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---|---------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|
| 268 | Lakeview District/KRA | n/a | 94 | Management of Upper Klamath WSR | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 274 | Lakeview District/KRA | Fremont, Winema, Modoc N.F. | 94 | Outdoor Recreation Working Group | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 255 | Lakeview Dist./LRA | Fremont N.F. | 95 | BLM Range Mgt Spec. participates in Range work | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 269 | Lkvw District/KRA/ Medford Dist | Wineam N.F. | 95 | Outreach Prog. for Ed. Outdoor Exp. for youth | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 276 | Lakeview District/KRA | Winema, Fremont, Rogue N.F. | 95 | Horse Packing and Wilderness Skills Clinic | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 248 | Lakeview District | Fremont N.F. | 96 | Shared Public Information Off. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | \$57,460 | \$287,300 |
| 249 | Lakeview District | Fremont N.F. | 96 | Shared Graphic Artist Pos. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | \$25,000 | \$75,000 |
| 259 | Lakeview Dist./LRA | Fremont N.F. | 96 | Joint Watershed Council Support | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 263 | Lakeview District/KRA | Fremont N.F. | 96 | Shared Interagency Activities | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | \$30,000 | | \$45,000 | \$180,000 |
| 267 | Lakeview District/KRA | n/a | 96 | Management of CA. Section of Klamath River | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 273 | Lkvw District/KRA/ Medford Dist | Winema, Modoc, Rogue N.F. | 96 | Sharing of Rec. Info. with agencies & business. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 277 | Lakeview District/LRA | n/a | 96 | Beatty Butte Allotment Mgt Plans & EIS | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 278 | Lakeview District/KRA | Winema, Shasta/Trinity N.F. | 96 | Klamath Basin Provincial Advisory Committee | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 281 | Lakeview District/LRA | n/a | 96 | Co-operators in legisl. effecting transfer of lands | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 257 | Lkvw Dist/LRA, KRA | Fremont N.F. | 97 | Joint Watershed Analysis | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 258 | Lakeview Dist./LRA | Fremont N.F. | 97 | Joint Project Planning | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | \$24,000 | | | \$24,000 |
| 272 | Lakeview District/KRA | Winema, Deschutes N.F. | 97 | Landscape Architect Services | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | \$10,000 | \$30,000 |
| 245 | Lakeview District | Fremont N.F. | 98 | Shared Admin Officer 50/50 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | \$91,400 | | \$91,400 | \$137,000 |
| 254 | Lakeview Dist./LRA | Fremont N.F. | 98 | Joint Noxious Weed Treatment & ed. program | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | \$5,000 | \$15,000 |
| 256 | Lakeview Dist./LRA | Fremont N.F. | 98 | Joint Land Use Planning Charter | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 265 | Lakeview District | Fremont N.F. | 98 | Share training sessions | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | \$8,000 |

| Proj. # | BLM office | FS office | Year Initiated | Project Title | Cust. Service | Op. efficiency | Re-source stewardship | Non financial benefits | Non measurable financial | Cost avoidance | 1 time savings | Annual Savings | Cumulative Savings |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--|---------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| 266 | Lakeview District/KRA | Fremont N.F. | 98 | Shared Mgt exchanging expertise | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | \$65,000 | | \$65,000 | \$130,000 |
| 282 | Lakeview District/LRA | n/a | 98 | Develop Joint Warner Valley Overlook | Yes | Yes | | | | | \$2,000 | | \$2,000 |
| 283 | Lakeview District/LRA | n/a | 98 | Relocation of Sheldon NWR fence boundary | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | |
| 244 | Lakeview District | Fremont N.F. | 99 | Redelegation of authority. Forest Sup. & Dist Mgr. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | |
| 246 | Lakeview District | Fremont N.F. | 99 | Joint Mailrm, Public Receipt, shared Supervisor. | Yes | Yes | | | | \$10,000 | | \$10,000 | \$15,000 |
| 247 | Lakeview District | Fremont N.F. | 99 | Shared Tele-comm Serv. | Yes | | | | | | | \$33,000 | \$33,000 |
| 250 | Lakeview District | Fremont N.F. | 99 | Shared Property Mgt Position | Yes | Yes | | | | | | \$33,750 | \$16,875 |
| 262 | Lakeview District | Fremont N.F. | 99 | Interagency Fire Ecologist | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | \$30,000 | | \$15,000 | \$45,000 |
| 264 | Lakeview District | Winema N.F. | 99 | Shared Ecologist- NWFP | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | \$31,000 | | \$31,000 | \$31,000 |
| 284 | Lakeview District/LRA | n/a | 99 | Gather wild horses in Beatty Butte area | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 251 | Lakeview District | Fremont N.F. | 00 | Shared Automotive Repair Shops | Yes | Yes | | | | | | \$9,591 | \$9,591 |
| 270 | Lakeview District/KRA | Winema N.F. | 00 | Spencer Crk watershed Proj. & CRMP | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | |
| 279 | Lakeview District/KRA | Winema N.F. | 00 | Resolution on Ttl Max. Daily Load on 303 streams | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | |
| 280 | Lakeview District/LRA | Fremont N.F. | 00 | Collaboration on sub-basin reviews | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | \$25,000 | | \$25,000 |
| Lakeview Total | | | | | | | | | | \$407,400 | \$51,000 | \$575,201 | \$2,620,766 |
| 229 | Las Vegas FO | Las Vegas Rgr Dist | 95 | Joint fire dispatch services | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 230 | Las Vegas FO | Las Vegas Rgr Dist | 97 | Shared fire mgt officer & dispatch center mgr | Yes | Yes | | | Yes | | | | |
| 231 | Las Vegas FO | Las Vegas Rgr Dist | 98 | Shared Landscape Architech | Yes | Yes | | | Yes | | | | |
| 228 | Las Vegas FO | Las Vegas Rgr Dist | 99 | Coordinated mgt plan for wild horses/burro | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | |
| 232 | Las Vegas FO | Las Vegas Rgr Dist | 99 | Joint trail construction | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 233 | Las Vegas FO | Las Vegas Rgr Dist | 00 | Colocated office complex | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| Las Vegas Total | | | | | | | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 531 | Milwaukee | Milwaukee/R9 | 96 | Visitor Information and Customer Service | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |

| Proj. # | BLM office | FS office | Year Initiated | Project Title | Cust. Service | Op. efficiency | Re-source stewardship | Non financial benefits | Non measurable financial | Cost avoidance | 1 time savings | Annual Savings | Cumulative Savings |
|------------------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------|---|---------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|
| 532 | Milwaukee | Milwaukee/R9 | 96 | Conservation Advocacy | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | \$0 | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 533 | Milwaukee | Milwaukee/R9 | 96 | Conservation Education | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 652 | Milwaukee | FO Region 9 | 01 | Visitor Center | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | \$100,000 | | |
| Milwaukee Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 197 | IF/Pocatello | C-T NF | 97 | Joint sharing of minerals EIS & other mining activity | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$40,000 |
| Pocatello Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 462 | State Office | Region 6 | 80 | Forest-related services | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 459 | Fire Mgt. | Fire & Aviation Mgt. | 88 | Geographic Area Coordination Center | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 461 | State Office | Region 6 | 90 | Professional Services by contract | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 463 | State Office | Region 6 | 90 | Supplies, eg. Vault toilets and ignition spheres. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 464 | State Office | R-6 Head-quarters | 90 | Surveying Services | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 465 | State Office | R-6 Head-quarters | 90 | Shared Portland GPS Base Station | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 460 | Fire Mgt. | Fire & Aviation Mgt. | 92 | Coordination of Public Use Restrictions | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 466 | State Office | R-6 Head-quarters | 92 | Shared Burns GPS Base Station | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 467 | State Office | R-6 Head-quarters | 92 | Joint GPS Training | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 458 | Fire Mgt. | Fire & Aviation Mgt. | 95 | Integrated Fire Management Organization | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | \$350,000 | |
| 457 | Fire Mgt. | Fire & Aviation Mgt. | 96 | Cooperative Fire Protection Agreement | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | \$250,000 | |
| 468 | State Office | R-6 Head-quarters | 98 | GCDB Development | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | \$25,000 | \$25,000 |
| 469 | State Office | R-6 Head-quarters | 99 | Reprographic Services | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 470 | State Office | R-6 Head-quarters | 99 | Public Affairs issue coordination | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 471 | State Office | R-6 Head-quarters | 99 | Web posting NW Forest Plan docs | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| 472 | State Office | R-6 Head-quarters | 99 | Joint law enforcement activities | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| Portland Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$25,000 | \$625,000 |

| Proj. # | BLM office | FS office | Year Initiated | Project Title | Cust. Service | Op. efficiency | Re-source stewardship | Non financial benefits | Non measurable financial | Cost avoidance | 1 time savings | Annual Savings | Cumulative Savings | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------|--|---------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 188 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 96 | Heavy Equipment Use | | Yes | Yes | | | | | | \$1,577 | |
| 189 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 96 | Road Maintenance Sharing | | Yes | | | | | | | \$6,000 | |
| 182 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 97 | Custer County Disaster Agree/BLM/FS | | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | | |
| 183 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 97 | Butte County Disaster Agree/BLM/FS | | Yes | | Yes | | | | | | |
| 184 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 97 | Lemhi County Disaster Agree/BLM/FS | | Yes | | Yes | | | | | | |
| 185 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 97 | Special Use Permit Coordination | | | Yes | | Yes | | | | | |
| 186 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 97 | Range Allotment Management | | | Yes | | | | \$22,000 | | \$88,000 | |
| 187 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 97 | Telecommunication Personnel Sharing | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | \$38,425 | |
| 173 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 98 | CRAT Coordination/Training | | Yes | | Yes | | | | | | |
| 174 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 98 | Shared Fisheries | | Yes | | | | | \$20,000 | | \$40,000 | |
| 175 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 98 | Shared Land Exchange | | Yes | | | | | \$30,000 | | \$60,000 | |
| 176 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 98 | Shared Timber | | Yes | | | | | \$20,500 | | \$41,000 | |
| 177 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 98 | Shared Cadastral | | Yes | | | | | \$30,000 | | \$60,000 | |
| 178 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 98 | Selling each others permits | Yes | | | Yes | | | | | | |
| 179 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 98 | Fire Op Plan for Engines/Dispatch | | Yes | | | Yes | | | | | |
| 180 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 98 | Collocation to be operational 10/00 | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | \$32,250 | |
| 190 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 98 | Fire Procurement | Yes | Yes | | Yes | | | | | | |
| Las Vegas Total | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 172 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 99 | Fuels | | | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | |
| 191 | Salmon Field Office | Salmon-Challis SO | 99 | Shared Leadership Team Meetings | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | | |
| Salmon Total | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$122,500 | \$367,252 |
| 537 | Worland F.O. | Big Horn Forest | 99 | Assist each other on prescribed burns/wildfire | | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | | |
| Worland/ Buffalo Total | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Grand Total | | | | | | | | | | | \$432,400 | \$260,000 | \$951,201 | \$4,846,018 |

Appendix E

Interviewees

Buffalo, WY - Forest Service Powder River Ranger District and BLM Buffalo Field Office

John Warder, Acting District Ranger

Kathy Bulchis, Former District Ranger

Durango, CO - (San Juan Public Land Center) – Forest Service San Juan Supervisor's Office and BLM Durango Field Office

Susan Byson, Executive Director (San Juan Mountains Interpretive Association)

John Nolan, Telecommunications Specialist

Larry Sinclair, Forest Service Fleet Manager

Terry Woodall, Property and Fleet Management Assistant (BLM)

Ron Duvall, Administrative Officer

Dee Lewis, Accounting Manager

Art Sanchez, Visitor Information Specialist

Mark Stiles, Forest Supervisor/Center Manager

Idaho Falls, ID – Forest Service Caribou/Targhee Supervisor's Office, BLM Upper Snake River District Office and BLM Idaho Falls Field Office

Chuck Horshurgh, Geologist

Kendal Adams, Zone Surveyor

Skipp Staffell, Realty Specialist

Randy Tate, Forest Engineer

Randy Watson, BLM Engineer

Joanna Bennett, Public Affairs Officer

Carol Lyle, Fire, Planning & Ecosystems Branch Chief

Sid Keller, Telecommunications Specialist

Glen Riddle, Telecommunications Specialist

Kevin Conron, Fire Technician

Faye Christiensen, Range Technician

Carol Brown, Field Manager

Sheryl Bainbridge, Administrative Assistant

Michaela Moen, Administrative Assistant

Wanda Adams, Administrative Assistant

Rick Berger, Fire Technician

Gina Mortin, Fire Technician

Marsha Phillips, Support Services Supervisor

Monica Zimmerman, Outdoor Recreation Planner

Joe Kroayenbrink, District Manager

*Lakeview, OR - (Lakeview Public Land Center) – Forest Service Fremont/
Winema Supervisor's Office, BLM Lakeview District Office and BLM Lakeview
Resource Area Office*

Roland Glade, Construction and Maintenance Fireman

Dede Domingos, Administrative Officer

Shonni Hanks, Fleet Manager

Joe Tague, Associate District Manager

Mike Evans, Interagency Fire Staff Officer

Steve Ellis, District Manager

Karen Shimimoto, Forest Supervisor

*Las Vegas, NV – Forest Service Spring Mountains Natural Resource Area
Office and BLM Las Vegas Field Office*

Margie Onstad, Supervisory Administrative Specialist

Ann Haynes, Public Contact Representative

Jeff Marles, Computer Specialist

Terry Jarrell, South Zone Engineer

Jim Hurga, Project Manager/Soil Scientist

Albert Borkowski, Special Uses

Gerald Weaver, Public Room

*Milwaukee, WI – Forest Service Eastern Region Office and BLM Milwaukee
Filed Office*

Ken Fisher, Accountant

Linda Schmidt, Resources Lead

Roger Tremont, Leasing Specialist

*Pocatello, ID – Forest Service Salmon-Challis Supervisors Office, Salmon-
Cobalt Ranger District and BLM Salmon Field Office*

Gary Bishop, AFMO

Jan Hunt, SSS

David Sleight, Acting DFR

Ray Brainheard, Zone Forester

Matt Rendace, Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist

Diane Mecham, Administrative Assistant

Portland, OR – Forest Service Pacific Northwest Regional Office and BLM Oregon/Washington State Office

Sherrie Reed, Section Chief of Realty and Records

April Wilson, Assistant Regional Forrester for Civil Rights (Service 1st Coordinator)

Angel Dawson, Program Analyst

Paul Fredericks, State Engineer

John Keith, Assistant State Director for Management Service

Carl Gossard, Assistant Director for Wildland Fire Operations

Paul Frederick, Chief Branch of Engineering and Facilities

Salmon, ID – Forest Service Salmon-Challis Supervisors Office, Salmon-Cobalt Ranger District and BLM Salmon Field Office

Jim Werner, Forest Engineer

Pete Schuldt, Forest Engineer (Road Operations)

Jeff Knudson, Assistant Fire Management Officer

Gary Mills, Fire Management Officer

Julie Hopkins, Records Manager/FOIA

Emma Moore, Forest Resource Specialist

Sharon McComas, Purchasing Agent

Toni Sullivan, Grants and Agreements Specialist

Jan Taylor, Financial Technician

Gail Baer, Public Affairs Specialist

Steve Beverlin, Assistant Field Manager

Craig Nemeth, Assistant Field Manager

Jennifer Arnold, Administrative Officer

Pam Mihelich, Administrative Officers

Cathy Rhodes, Front Desk Supervisor