

Results of BLM Survey on Resource Management Planning and Lessons Learned

Please describe your role in the RMP or RMP Amendment process.		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Project manager	24.6%	16
Other	23.1%	15
Reviewer (e.g., State Office [SO] or WO)	24.6%	16
Resource specialist / interdisciplinary team member	18.5%	12
Contractor	6.2%	4
Writer/editor	1.5%	1
District or Field Manager	1.5%	1
Solicitor (e.g., Regional Office [RO] or Washington Office [WO])	0.0%	0

About what percentage of your time is/was allocated to the RMP (compared to other projects)?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
95 – 100%	50.0%	8
80 – 94%	31.3%	5
50 – 79%	12.5%	2
<50%	6.3%	1

As a project manager, are/were you in a full-time permanent position managing the RMP?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Yes	93.8%	15
No	6.3%	1

As the project manager, are you managing, or did you manage the RMP since its inception, or did you assume the role from a previous project manager?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Managed the RMP since its inception	62.5%	10
Assumed RMP project manager role from a previous project manager	37.5%	6

Was your RMP or RMP Amendment completed on schedule or, if in progress, is it on schedule?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
No – delayed over 1 year	47.8%	22
Yes	19.6%	9
No – delayed 6 months to 1 year	17.4%	8
No – delayed by 2 to 6 months	8.7%	4
No – delayed by up to 2 months	6.5%	3

What were the biggest challenges or factors delaying progress on your RMP revision? Indicate what level of negative impact the item below had on your schedule. If you did not encounter a particular item please indicate (N/A).

Answer Options	Not a factor (1)	(2)	Somewhat (3)	(4)	Major Factor (5)	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Multiple review cycles (e.g., State Office, Washington Office, Solicitor's Office)	4	5	6	10	21	2	3.85	48
Other	4	0	1	0	6	6	3.36	17
Other non-RMP job commitments of the interdisciplinary team	4	11	13	7	12	0	3.26	47
Need to complete or update GIS data	6	7	15	6	11	2	3.20	47
Issues with quality of analysis or deliverables	9	8	6	12	10	2	3.13	47
Changes in policy or guidance	7	10	10	10	8	1	3.04	46
Contracting problems	9	9	7	6	9	7	2.93	47
Changes in the alternatives	8	13	5	7	8	6	2.85	47
Ineffective communication with interdisciplinary team and/or contractor	10	9	13	5	8	2	2.82	47
Involvement of Cooperating Agencies	14	8	8	6	8	3	2.68	47
Need for specific studies or modeling (such as air modeling)	14	10	6	8	7	3	2.64	48
Lack of management support	18	6	7	6	7	4	2.50	48
Coordination with federal, state and local regulatory agencies throughout the process (other than cooperating agencies)	10	17	8	6	2	4	2.37	47
Additional public involvement (e.g., RAC Subgroup, working groups)	12	13	12	5	1	4	2.30	47
Inconsistency with laws, regulations or policy that requires additional analysis	17	9	10	4	4	3	2.30	47
Other non-RMP job commitments of the RMP project manager	22	10	5	7	1	2	2.00	47

Were there any points in the RMP process where you were able to make up time and accelerate the schedule?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
No	71.1%	32
Yes	28.9%	13

Was/is your RMP or RMP Amendment on or under the original budget?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Not sure	44.7%	21
No – over by \$300,000 or more	19.1%	9
No – over by between \$50,000 to \$100,000	14.9%	7
Yes	10.6%	5
No – over by up to \$50,000	6.4%	3
No – over by between \$100,000 to \$300,000	4.3%	2

What were/are the biggest factors leading to the cost overruns? Rank the applicable options from not a factor (1) to major factor (5). If an item is not applicable or was not encountered, please indicate (N/A).

Answer Options	Not a factor (1)	(2)	Somewhat (3)	(4)	Major factor (5)	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Contracting problems	5	4	4	5	9	10	3.33	37
Other	3	0	0	1	3	14	3.14	21
Issues with quality of analysis or deliverables	6	3	7	8	4	9	3.04	37
Changes in policy or guidance	9	4	3	5	9	8	3.03	38
Multiple review cycles (e.g., State Office, Washington Office, Solicitor's Office)	9	3	8	1	7	10	2.79	38
Need to complete or update GIS data	10	3	9	3	5	8	2.67	38
Changes in the alternatives	11	5	2	1	8	11	2.63	38
Ineffective communication with interdisciplinary team and/or contractor	10	7	3	4	4	10	2.46	38
Other non-RMP job commitments of the interdisciplinary team	7	10	5	4	2	9	2.43	37
Involvement of cooperating agencies	13	6	3	1	6	9	2.34	38
Need for specific studies or modeling (such as air modeling)	14	2	5	4	3	10	2.29	38
Lack of management support	17	3	4	4	0	10	1.82	38
Inconsistency with laws, regulations or policy that requires additional analysis	16	4	3	2	1	12	1.77	38
Additional public involvement (e.g., RAC subgroup or working groups)	18	5	4	2	0	9	1.66	38
Other non-RMP job commitments of the RMP project manager	16	7	2	2	0	10	1.63	37

Were there any points in the RMP process where you were able to save money or reduce costs?

Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
No	78.6%	33
Yes	21.4%	9

How would you rank the overall quality of the document and analysis associated with your RMP or RMP Amendment?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Average Quality	60.0%	27
High Quality	24.4%	11
Low Quality	11.1%	5
Unknown	4.4%	2
Inadequate	0.0%	0

What were/are the biggest factors impacting the quality of the RMP or RMP Amendment?							
Answer Options	No Negative Impact (1)	Minimal Negative Impact (2)	Moderate Negative Impact (3)	Significant Negative Impact (4)	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Time constraints	6	8	19	10	2	2.77	45
Budget constraints	11	16	13	3	1	2.19	44
Expertise of BLM staff	7	15	16	6	1	2.48	45
Expertise of contractor staff	8	7	10	12	8	2.70	45
Inadequate flow of information from SO or WO	4	13	14	6	6	2.59	43
Changing direction	5	8	18	10	4	2.80	45
Low priority at the Field Office (FO) or SO	18	12	8	3	4	1.90	45
Lack of SO or WO involvement	16	12	9	3	5	1.98	45
Inaccurate information	14	16	8	3	3	2.00	44
Other	4	0	1	6	2	2.82	13

How long did alternatives development take for your RMP or RMP Amendment?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
6 months to 1 year	32.5%	13
3 months to 6 months	30.0%	12
1 to 3 months	12.5%	5
1 year to 18 months	12.5%	5
18 months to 2 years	10.0%	4
More than 2 years	2.5%	1

How long did alternatives development take compared to your initial schedule estimate?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
On schedule or ahead of schedule	36.8%	14
1 to 2 months longer	21.1%	8
More than 6 months longer	21.1%	8
4 to 6 months longer	13.2%	5
2 to 4 months longer	7.9%	3

Were any groups outside the BLM interdisciplinary team (and contractor, if applicable) heavily involved in alternatives development?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	26
No	33.3%	13

Please indicate which groups outside of the BLM interdisciplinary team (and contractor, if applicable) were heavily involved in alternatives development.		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Cooperating agencies	88.5%	23
Other groups	38.5%	10
Sanctioned RAC subgroup	26.9%	7

Did this additional public involvement result in the RMP or RMP amendment being delayed?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Yes	53.8%	14
No	46.2%	12

How could the alternatives development process have been improved or accelerated?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Dedicating a block of time to focus only on alternative development	42.9%	15
More management support	34.3%	12
Increased interdisciplinary team dedication	34.3%	12
Other	34.3%	12

How involved was your Field Manager in the RMP or RMP Amendment process?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Engaged and allocated the appropriate staff resources	48.8%	21
Not engaged due to other constraints	20.9%	9
Other	16.3%	7
Engaged but did not provide enough staff resources	14.0%	6

Do you feel that the level of the Field Manager's involvement directly or indirectly affected the timeline, quality, and progress of the RMP?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Yes	83.7%	36
No	16.3%	7

Describe your working relationship on the RMP or RMP Amendment with the State Office and Regional Office solicitors?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
They were engaged early and throughout the process, provided guidance, and served as part of the project team	30.2%	13
They provided constructive comments that generally improved the quality of the document	27.9%	12
They reviewed submittals but their comments were generally not constructive or helpful	18.6%	8
Not applicable	18.6%	8
Adversarial	4.7%	2

Describe your working relationship on the RMP or RMP Amendment with the BLM Washington Office and Washington Office Solicitors?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
They provided constructive comments that generally improved the quality of the document	30.2%	13
They reviewed submittals but their comments were generally not constructive or helpful	30.2%	13
Not applicable	30.2%	13
Adversarial	7.0%	3
They were engaged early and throughout the process, provided guidance, and served as part of the project team	2.3%	1

Did you use a contractor to help with the RMP or RMP Amendment?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Yes	74.4%	32
No	25.6%	11

**Please indicate which of the following aspects of the RMP process were contractor deliverables?
Select all that apply.**

Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Affected environment	78.1%	25
Impact analysis	78.1%	25
Preparing/compiling Draft RMP/EIS	75.0%	24
Socioeconomic baseline assessment report	75.0%	24
Purpose of and need for proposed action	71.9%	23
Alternatives development (not including travel management)	71.9%	23
Scoping meetings and scoping report	68.8%	22
Analysis of and responses to public comments on Draft RMP/EIS	68.8%	22
Preparing/compiling Proposed RMP/Final EIS	68.8%	22
Newsletters & related publicity at milestones (e.g., DRMP, PRMP, RMP/ROD)	53.1%	17
Maintaining administrative record	56.3%	18
Authored the Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS)	46.9%	15
Biological Assessment	43.8%	14
Travel management alternatives development	43.8%	14
Preparing/compiling Approved RMP/Record of Decision	40.6%	13
Wild and scenic rivers eligibility study and report	34.4%	11
Wild and scenic rivers suitability study and report	31.3%	10
Facilitating cooperating agency meetings	31.3%	10
Other	28.1%	9
Protest Response	18.8%	6
Facilitating sanctioned RAC subgroup meetings	9.4%	3



Based on your BLM experience, what are the most important qualities of a contractor?							
Answer Options	Not Important (1)	(2)	Somewhat Important (3)	(4)	Very Important (5)	Rating Average	Response Count
Quality of work product	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	29
Project manager's communication skills	0	1	1	4	22	4.68	28
A solid project manager with experience completing RMPs for the BLM	1	0	3	1	24	4.62	29
Schedule consciousness	0	0	3	10	16	4.45	29
Expertise in BLM planning and policy	0	1	2	10	16	4.41	29
A solid project manager with experience completing NEPA documents for the BLM	1	2	3	6	17	4.24	29
Project manager's personality 'fit' with BLM project manager and team	0	1	4	12	12	4.21	29
Other	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	6
A solid small core team of the Project Manager and a few key resource specialists	1	2	2	11	12	4.11	28
Budget consciousness	1	3	7	7	11	3.83	29
References and reputation	3	6	8	6	5	3.14	28
Proximity of contractor's office to the FO	3	6	11	6	2	2.93	28
A large team of resource specialists	3	7	11	5	2	2.86	28

What do you consider to be key elements to a successful RMP or RMP Amendment?								
Answer Options	Least Important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Most Important (5)	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Effective communication	0	1	2	9	31	1	4.63	44
Planner needs to be dedicated full time to the project	0	0	3	11	28	2	4.60	44
Management support	0	0	3	12	28	1	4.58	44
Fully engaged and dedicated small core team	0	0	5	16	21	2	4.38	44
Updated and supported Geographic Information System	0	2	3	14	23	2	4.38	44
Other	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.33	11
Management buy-off on Chapters 1 and 2 (Purpose and Need, and Alternatives) prior to conducting impact analysis to avoid false starts	0	3	6	16	16	3	4.10	44
A good facilitator for interdisciplinary team meetings	1	5	5	16	15	2	3.93	44
Anticipate the unexpected (it always takes longer than you think)	1	0	11	19	11	1	3.93	43
Ongoing coordination with federal, state and local regulatory agencies throughout the process	2	4	12	14	10	1	3.62	43
A WO lead dedicated to the project and actively involved throughout the process	6	6	17	9	5	1	3.02	44

