

2008 State Damage Prevention Program Grants Progress Report
Funding Opportunity Number: DTPH56-08-SN-0001
CFDA Number: 20.720

Award Number: DTPH56-08-G-PHPS01
Project Title: State Damage Prevention Program
Date Submitted: November 26, 2008
Submitted by: Annmarie Robertson, IURC

Specific Objective(s) of the Agreement

Under this grant award IURC will: (1) pursue the establishment of an active, engaged Regional Common Ground Alliance (CGA) and (2) provide statewide, random quality control audits of the dig process, from receipt of notification to actual excavation.

Workscope

Element (1): Participation by operators, excavators, and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of methods for establishing and maintaining effective communications between stakeholders from receipt of an excavation notification until successful completion of the excavation, as appropriate.

Element (2): A process for fostering and ensuring the support and partnership of stakeholders, including excavators, operators, locators, designers, and local government in all phases of the program.

Element (3): A process for reviewing the adequacy of a pipeline operator's internal performance measures regarding persons performing locating services and quality assurance programs.

Element (4): Participation by operators, excavators, and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of effective employee training programs to ensure that operators, the onecall center, the enforcing agency, and the excavators have partnered to design and implement training for the employees of operators, excavators and locators.

Element (5): A process for fostering and ensuring active participation by all stakeholders in public education for damage prevention activities.

Element (6): A process for resolving disputes that defines the State authority's role as a partner and facilitator to resolve issues.

Element (7): Enforcement of State damage prevention laws and regulations for all aspects of the damage prevention process, including public education, and the use of civil penalties for violations assessable by the appropriate State authority.

Element (8): A process for fostering and promoting the use, by all appropriate stakeholders, of improving technologies that may enhance communications, underground pipeline locating capability, and gathering and analyzing information about the accuracy and effectiveness of locating programs.

Element (9): A process for review and analysis of the effectiveness of each program element, including a means for implementing improvements identified by such program reviews.

Accomplishments for this period (Item 1 under Agreement Section 9.01 Progress Report: “A comparison of actual accomplishments to the objectives established for the period.”)

The excavation pilot program began on June 1, 2008, at which time IUPPS employed an individual to conduct random field reviews of the excavation process. This program involves site inspection of job sites to (1) determine if the locates have been performed in a timely manner, (2) if the call center has correctly entered the ticket and (3) speak with contractors to get feedback on the one call process. Through 11/20/08 447 inspections have taken place in an eight-county area.

Since the grant was awarded, funding has been used to sponsor one stakeholder meeting to provide technical information about Indiana’s damage prevention program, activities and tools that are being used or may be used to improve the program, and findings from field audits. Although the program funded by this grant cannot comprehensively address each of the nine elements, progress has been made as described below. These activities, when coupled with other activities undertaken by the One Call Center separate from this grant project, have served to improve Indiana’s position with respect to the nine elements of an effective damage prevention program.

Element (1): Participation by operators, excavators, and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of methods for establishing and maintaining effective communications between stakeholders from receipt of an excavation notification until successful completion of the excavation, as appropriate.

Through the quality control check program, Indiana has been able to reach out to excavators at a grass roots, one-on-one level, which has translated into increased participation from this stakeholder group during meetings. In addition, excavators, locators and facility owners are able to provide feedback directly on a one-on-one basis to a One Call Center representative, who in turn, provides that information to One Call leadership. Some of the strengths and weaknesses of the state’s damage prevention program are already beginning to become evident from these site visits. Indiana also incorporates many features that facilitate effective ticket transmission, such as polygon mapping. Indiana continues to make efforts to improve communication and participation by all stakeholders outside of the program funded by this grant.

Element (2): A process for fostering and ensuring the support and partnership of stakeholders, including excavators, operators, locators, designers, and local government in all phases of the program.

The partnership contemplated by this element is under development. Participation by certain stakeholder groups including locators and excavators is increasing at meetings. This may be a result of the One Call Center’s on-site field presences coupled with an increased overall focus on outreach by the One Call Center.

Element (3): A process for reviewing the adequacy of a pipeline operator’s internal performance measures regarding persons performing locating services and quality assurance programs.

The information gained through the field visits is provided to all facility owners in a summary format. A sample of the data being collected is shown below. Information such as the extent to which operators mark their facilities within the required timeframe (two full working days) should be very helpful to operators in examining their locating programs. Additional detail

concerning the information learned during the site visits is available to operators upon request, including photographic documentation. As the program evolves and more information is learned, it is anticipated that the standard report may change in order to provide stakeholders with needed information.

Element (4): Participation by operators, excavators, and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of effective employee training programs to ensure that operators, the one call center, the enforcing agency, and the excavators have partnered to design and implement training for the employees of operators, excavators, and locators.

This element has not yet been incorporated into the program. It is anticipated that education will be a major component of future enforcement activities.

Element (5): A process for fostering and ensuring active participation by all stakeholders in public education for damage prevention activities.

This element is currently addressed by the One Call Center's Damage Prevention Committee and the Indiana Pipeline Awareness Association. In addition, Regional CGA meetings have provided for involvement of added stakeholders.

Element (6): A process for resolving disputes that defines the State authority's role as a partner and facilitator to resolve issues.

Indiana has no formalized process for dispute resolution, and the program funded by this grant only indirectly provides information useful in dispute resolution via Regional stakeholder input. This element is being addressed outside of the program funded by this grant.

Element (7): Enforcement of State damage prevention laws and regulations for all aspects of the damage prevention process, including public education, and the use of civil penalties for violations assessable by the appropriate State authority.

Indiana's existing program does not include provisions for enforcement. Activities are underway to incorporate those changes into Indiana's law. Stakeholder groups are actively pursuing this issue and it is feasible that enforcement will be incorporated into the program within the next year or two.

Element (8): A process for fostering and promoting the use, by all appropriate stakeholders, of improving technologies that may enhance communications, underground pipeline locating capability, and gathering and analyzing information about the accuracy and effectiveness of locating programs.

It was anticipated that the site visit portion of the program funded by this grant might address locating capability. This has not been addressed at this time because of concerns about liability. However, this is a topic that is appropriate for discussion at Regional CGA meetings and will be considered at future stakeholder meetings.

Element (9): A process for review and analysis of the effectiveness of each program element, including a means for implementing improvements identified by such program reviews.

Indiana has not yet developed a process for a review of its program relative to the nine elements. With respect to the program funded by this grant, the implementation team meets on a monthly basis to review the program and data gathered and make revisions to the program if necessary. Some of the other elements are reviewed through other activities, such as One Call Committee meetings and legislative stakeholder meetings

Quantifiable Metrics/Measures of Effectiveness (Item 2 under Agreement Section 9.01 Project Report: “Where the output of the project can be quantified, a computation of the cost per unit of output.”)

The goals of this program have been to gather information on the performance of the call center and the locators. We have compiled this information and have sent a summary report for the period of June 1st, 2008 through August 31st to the stakeholders in the pilot program area. In addition, monthly in-house meetings have been held to review the progress of this pilot program. Some sample reports are shown in the attachments. Through the end of November, nearly 500 site visits were completed.

On November 13th, 2008 a stakeholder meeting was held and over 40 utilities, excavators, and locators from the pilot project area attended this event. The goal of the meeting was to review with the stakeholders the goals and objectives of the SDPP pilot project, and to obtain feedback and suggestions for the project. Concurrent with the implementation of this program the One Call Center has been developing a tool that will Attached is a list of the attendees, as well as a list of individuals who showed interest in actively participating in a chapter of the Indiana Regional CGA.

Issues, Problems or Challenges (Item 3 under Agreement Section 9.01 Project Report: “The reasons for slippage if established objectives were not met.”)

No issues.

Other pertinent information including, when appropriate, actions taken to address the recommendations PHMSA provided in correspondence dated [Different for each] (Item 4 under Agreement Section 9.01).

The recommendations included in the April 4 correspondence included two specific recommendations:

- 1. “Solicitation, Section 6.01, Criteria (6) states, “A commitment to quality controls in timing, personnel, and costs for deliverables offered in exchange for the grant.” We would like to see more detail on your commitment to this criterion.” The IURC met with One Call Center representatives immediately upon notification of the award. An individual was identified to be responsible for carrying out the program elements. The IURC and the One Call Center entered into an agreement and the IURC General Counsel drafted a contract that was signed by the two parties. Equipment was purchased and reporting parameters established, and the field program began on June 1, 2008. Since that time, the IURC has met monthly with the implementation team to review data collected and how funding was spent. In addition, plans for next steps, including facilitating Regional CGA meetings were formulated and implemented. All activity and expenditures are track in spreadsheets, and actual vs. estimated expenditures discussed.*
- 2. “There is a lack of enforcement currently in place. This is a comment that we recommend you forward to your State lawmakers for appropriate consideration.” Although this specific comment has not been forwarded to all state lawmakers as suggested, some have been made aware of this. Additionally, as indicated above, activity is underway to incorporate enforcement into Indiana’s One Call law.*

The overall response to the pilot program has been positive from all stakeholders, and the one-on-one, on-site field presence provides for a unique opportunity to both educate and learn from stakeholders (particularly excavators) at a grass-roots level.

Mid-term Financial Status Report

The mid-term financial report has been sent as a separate attachment sent to the AA. The actual costs for the equipment category exceed the amount estimated. These were one-time expenditures that were needed to support the field inspection activities, and no additional equipment expenses are anticipated for this grant. Additionally, the expenses listed under the travel category exceed the estimated amount. This is primarily due to the cost of gasoline. It is anticipated that these increased costs will be offset by costs for personnel, fringe benefits and supplies, which should be lower than anticipated.

Plans for next period (remainder of grant)

Continuation of the program.



October 1, 2008

Indiana 811 Member:

Since the first of June 2008, Indiana 811 has been conducting a Quality Control pilot program funded by a federal grant. The objective of this program is to study locate requests from their inception at the call center, to the job site at Proper Notice time, to a follow up visit at the ticket expiration date.

This pilot program will allow an in-depth study of processes and procedures now in place and highlight any possible areas in need of improvement. Our hope is to foster communication between all stakeholders to improve efficiency and promote underground safety best practices.

The counties initially being studied in this pilot project are Boone, Hamilton, Hancock, Hendricks, Johnson, Marion, Morgan and Shelby. Attached are the results we have gathered from June through August in those Counties, as well as an explanation of the data. This data is only being distributed to Indiana 811 Members in the pilot program Counties listed above.

In addition, we would like to invite each of you to attend a stakeholder meeting that will be sponsored by Indiana 811 on November 13th, 2008 at the Valle Vista Conference Center in Greenwood, IN. This stakeholder meeting is being conducted not only for all Members covered by this program, but other Members and organizations who are interested in learning more about this program. An agenda and RSVP are attached. This stakeholder meeting will focus on discussing the goals of this pilot project, answering your questions, and giving everyone an opportunity to offer suggestions. We look forward to your input, as we try to continually make digging safer.

Thanks & Dig Safely,

Aaron Holeman
Quality Control/Training/Special Projects Indiana 811



STAKEHOLDER MEETING

NOVEMBER 13th, 2008

9:00 am – 11:00 pm

**Valle Vista Conference Center
Greenwood, IN**

RSVP

Please provide the following information:

Company Name: _____

Names of Individuals Who Will Be Attending from Your Company

Name: _____

Name: _____

Name: _____

Name: _____

Note: A continental breakfast will be served.

Please fax or email your RSVP to Michelle Shoemaker. If you have any questions, she can be reached at 317-893-1410.

Fax: 877-230-0496
Email: mshoemaker@iupps.org



AGENDA

- Introduction
- Review of the 9 Elements of an effective Damage Prevention Program as outlined by the US Congress.
- Review Goals of Indiana 811 Quality Control Pilot Project
- Review the Preliminary Results of the Project
- Question and Answer Session to Discuss the Project
- Future Initiatives

Daily Field Routine for SDPP

- I select which County will be sampled that day.
- After arriving in the selected county I further break down the tickets into Townships.
- I attempt to work in 1 or 2 Townships a day to minimize the number of miles driven.
- I randomly select a ticket for my visit at proper notice time or no later than 1 hour after.
- Upon arrival at job site I determine which utilities have been marked and take pictures of the site.
- I enter the information in the data base. A sample is below with an explanation of the data gathered.

Spreadsheet for SDPP

Ticket Number	County	Date	First Visit Notes	Second Visit Notes	Gas	Pipeline	Electric	Telecom	CATV	Fiber	Sewer	Water
808151452	BOONE	8/19/2008			NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA
808150571	BOONE	8/19/2008			NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NA	NO	NO
806190647	BOONE	6/23/2008			NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NA	YES	NO
806192056	BOONE	6/23/2008			NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NA	NO	NO
807141010	BOONE	7/17/2008			NO	NA	NO	YES	YES	NA	NO	NO
807151311	BOONE	7/17/2008	NO RESPONSE BY ANY.	Site was marked work is complete 8-4-08.	NO	NA	NO	NO	NO	NA	NO	NO
808150480	BOONE	8/19/2008			YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NA	NO	NO
808150512	BOONE	8/19/2008			YES	NA	YES	YES	YES	NA	NO	YES
808150548	BOONE	8/19/2008			YES	NA	YES	YES	YES	NA	NO	YES
808150965	BOONE	8/19/2008			YES	NA	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
808151208	BOONE	8/19/2008	MISSING 2 FIBER AND 4 PIPELINES.		YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO

- The first column is the ticket number assigned by Indiana 811.
- The second column is the County of the job site.
- The third column is the date of the initial visit.
- The fourth column is comments by the agent on the first visit.
- The fifth column is comments by the agent on the second visit if performed.
- The sixth through thirteenth columns are for Utility types and note if they have located.
- NA – Did not appear on the ticket.
- NO – Lines were no marked at the time of the site visit.
- YES – Lines were marked on time.

Summary Chart for SDPP

	Gas	Pipeline	Electric	Telecom	CATV	Fiber	Sewer	Water
Yes	27	0	27	29	29	0	5	12
No	5	19	6	4	4	9	27	20
NA	1	14	0	0	0	24	1	1
Total	33							

Yes	82%	0%	82%	88%	88%	0%	15%	36%
No	15%	58%	18%	12%	12%	27%	82%	61%
NA	3%	42%	0%	0%	0%	73%	3%	3%
Total	100%							

- The first line denotes the utility type.
- The second line denotes if the area was marked.
- The third line denotes if the area was not marked.
- The fourth line denotes if the utility was not on the ticket.
- The fifth line is the total number of tickets for the quarter
- The second chart is the same information in percentage form.

November 26, 2008

Indiana Cost Categories (through October, 2008)

SDP Grant

Equipment : \$29003.5

Travel: \$2626.00

Supplies: \$175.50

Personnel: \$11,287.50

Contractual: \$740.00

Total: \$43,832.50

NOTE: The actual cost for the equipment category exceeds the amount estimated. These were one-time expenditures that were needed to support the field inspection activities, and no additional equipment expenses are anticipated for this grant. Additionally, the expenses listed under the travel category exceed the estimated amount. This is primarily due to the cost of gasoline. It is anticipated that these increased costs will be offset by costs for personnel, fringe benefits and supplies, which should be lower than anticipated.