

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

Award Number: DTPH56-08-G-PHPS04

Project Title:

A program to help Colorado establish collaborative stakeholder efforts, implement more effective stakeholder communications, and target appropriate 811 awareness, education and training programs.

Date Submitted: March 31, 2009

Submitted by: JD Maniscalco

Specific Objective(s) of the Agreement

[Cut and paste from Section 2.03 of your agreement.]

Under this grant award UNCC will assist Colorado in accomplishing the following:

- (a) establish collaborative stakeholder efforts;
- (b) implement more effective stakeholder communications about the specific root causes; and
- (c) target appropriate 811 awareness programs as well as education and training to specific stakeholder groups at local levels in the following seven ways:
 1. by creating a statewide Damage Prevention Action Team (DPAT) to communicate and foster the EDPI 9-Element initiatives, to disseminate damage prevention findings, to help support the efforts of local Damage Prevention Councils (DPCs), and to coordinate state damage prevention advocacy;
 2. by establishing or working with local DPCs supported by representative industry stakeholders; including owners and operators, locators, excavators, the One-Call center, associations, safety and regulatory agencies, and public officials, etc.;
 3. by collecting, analyzing and reporting timely and comprehensive damage prevention findings; including One-Call activity, facility damage data, and useful demographic information; to each local DPC through a central communication process and web portal;
 4. by empowering local DPCs to respond to this information and take appropriate action to investigate and remediate primary root causes of damage through stakeholder awareness, education and training;
 5. by delivering CGA's 811 public awareness outreach information to state and local public officials and encouraging active participation in damage prevention efforts;
 6. by developing and delivering comprehensive stakeholder education and training programs in subsequent years that address the primary root causes of facility damage; and
 7. by providing an ongoing and timely county "Damage Prevention Report Card" that provides regular feedback to the local DPCs and all stakeholders on the success of actions and remedial efforts.

Workscope

[Cut and paste from Article III. Workscope portion of agreement.]

Under the terms of this agreement, the Grantee will address, the following elements listed in 49 USC §60134 through the actions it has specified in its Application.

- *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 (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.

Accomplishments for the grant period (Item 1 under Agreement Section 9.02 Final Report: “A comparison of actual accomplishments to the objectives established for the period.”)

[How did you progress on each of the elements provided in the “Specific Objectives” and “Workscope”? How did your progress compare with established objectives? Start with an overall description, followed by item-by-item or element-by-element detail if possible.]

Objective 1, Elements 1, 2 and 5

Update: The role of Damage Prevention Action Team (DPAT) was presented and accepted by the Denver Metro Damage Prevention Council (DMDPC - a CGA Regional Partner). Efforts and presentations have been made to expand the stakeholder participation to include additional facility owners, locate companies, excavators, industry associations, and regulatory authority.

For example, the Colorado Contractors Association has participated in a number of meetings of the DMDPC this summer. We have coordinated with them to utilize their weekly member newsletter to include damage prevention news, announcements, DPC and event schedules, stories, etc, in the future.

Also, the Colorado PUC recently attended a presentation on the grant programs and Damage Prevention Report Card. We continue to work closely with them around the state and all other stakeholders to keep them informed of our progress.

Final: The role of the DPAT expanded significantly in the second half of the year. Stakeholders from all active DPCs accepted the call to action and met in November to discuss the grant, to review how they were spending the grant funding in 2008, to discuss the future of damage prevention in Colorado, and lay the groundwork for future meetings and activities in 2009. Thirty- five stakeholders, all DPC leaders from around the state, attended the half-day meeting. Steve Pott from Colorado PUC attended in addition to several UNCC Board of Directors members and representatives from the contract locating companies.

The group reviewed how grant funds were used by each DPC in 811 awareness and educational activities. This discussion brought new ideas to the table including the use of postcards to target awareness to homeowners and business owners in areas where damage had occurred. Participants were invited to assist UNCC with specifying the amount and use of grant funding for 811 awareness and education activities in future years.

One interesting development was the effort by the Mesa County DPC to meet with city engineers and officials to successfully change local land use code to require the use of tracer wire for new water and sewage construction.

Objective 1 was met in 2008. We will continue to move forward strengthening the DPAT. In future years the DPAT will serve as a forum for discussion of damage prevention issues in Colorado, will help to coordinate damage prevention activities amongst stakeholders, and will be responsible for defining the request for grant funding.

Objective 2, Elements 1, 2 and 5

Update: A review and selection process was developed and implemented to identify four geographic areas for grant assistance in 2008. All four areas already had a Damage Prevention Council (DPC) established, although they may not have been actively pursuing damage prevention activities. The four areas were also representative of the geography and demographics of the state. Several trips were made to each area over the summer and the DPCs were introduced to the EDPI Initiatives and Forum concept. All four areas embraced the project and are thankful to have additional funds to address damage prevention issues in their area.

Final: Colorado had seven active DPCs in the state in 2008. These included: 1) Denver Metro, 2) El Paso County, 3) Mesa County, 4) Las Animas County, 5) Weld County, 6) Four Corners, and 7) Western Slope. These DPCs included representatives from facility owners, excavators, locators, the one-call center, and occasional attendance from PUC representatives and local industry organizations. The Four Corners and Western Slope DPCs also included representatives from public safety (first responder) organizations.

The first four DPCs meet regularly to discuss damage prevention issues, coordinate with the one-call center and locators, review notification and damage statistics, and resolve relevant issues. These DPCs were not actively involved in awareness or damage prevention activities prior to 2008, primarily due to a lack of funding. The remaining three DPCs have well attended stakeholder education meetings (excavator/first responder breakfast or dinner) that are funded by local stakeholders. Attendance at these events has grown to 400 in Weld County and around 50-100 in Four Corners and Western Slope. The Four Corners and Western Slope events are sponsored primarily by the pipeline industry in response to RP1162.

The Forum Facilitator and the UNCC Public Relations Administrator met with the first four of the DPCs from two to six times in 2008 to review the EDPI 9 Initiatives, establish the objectives of the grant, to review locate request and facility damage statistics, and to introduce the new Damage Prevention Report Card. These four DPCs were provided grant funds in 2008 to assist with 811 awareness and stakeholder education activities. Each of these DPCs determined the most appropriate use of the funds under guidelines from UNCC.

Objective 2 was met in 2008. In future years we intend to establish additional DPCs in the state (3 new DPCs in 2009), to increase participation in DPC meetings (invite local community and public-works officials to participate), and to encourage DPCs to sponsor additional damage prevention activities (we will request additional grant funding and hope to establish DPC self-funding).

Objectives 3, Elements 1, 5 and 8

Update: *The Damage Prevention Communications Portal is in the initial design stages, with the (beta 1) release scheduled for December 2008. A stakeholder design team has been assembled and meets monthly to provide design elements and project direction. When initially released, the portal will provide the data collection/storage and delivery mechanism for the Report Card.*

Final: The Damage Prevention Portal (beta 1) was delivered in December 2008. The portal provides the user with the ability to select a county on a map of the state and retrieves a table of monthly damages that occurred in the county from 2004 through 2007. There is still significant work to be completed to provide the data elements needed for reporting and tracking damage information, delivering the report card, and for the site to serve as a communications portal for industry stakeholders. The additional county level information that will be available on the portal includes: locates requests, 2nd notices, population, housing permits, net migration, and damage prevention activities scheduled and completed. The portal will also allow users to register into "local communities" as well as to post important documents such as DPC meeting minutes. Each "community" will have the ability to customize the look and feel of its section of the portal to project a local identity.

Objective 3 was not met in 2008. Although we are progressing with the development of the portal, we are unfortunately behind schedule with the data presentation. During mid-2008, a significant effort was needed to upgrade the hardware and software infrastructure to support a comprehensive portal environment. Now that this work is nearly complete, we are working to include the remainder of the damage prevention data presentation and add additional functionality. We are confident that we can complete the development in 2009.

The DP Portal is located at:

<http://www.dpportal.org>

Objectives 4, 5, and 6, Elements 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7

Update: A Grant Assistance Request Form was designed to identify local damage prevention issues, define possible solutions and provide estimated costs to implement the solutions. Representative stakeholders in each of the four areas discussed and identified two or more local damage prevention issues, developed local solutions and they are all currently in the process of selecting vendors for the solutions.

One solution shared by all four areas is to aggressively promote 811 awareness through the purchase and distribution of decals and bumper stickers to local stakeholders.

Another important solution in a rural area that is progressing nicely is to work with local city engineers to revise the municipal land-use code to 1) require One-Call membership and locate notifications prior to permitting, and 2) require developers to bury tracer wire with underground facilities. Two cities within the county are moving forward with implementation.

A solution initiated by the DMDPC is to investigate and possibly initiate a type of industry self-enforcement of One Call laws by aggressively pursuing civil fines for One Call infractions. Aggrieved stakeholders would be asked to assign their rights to the DMDPC, who would communicate with stakeholders involved in the infraction. Incident review, arbitration and industry education would be offered to stakeholders. All fines collected would be used to further the damage prevention awareness and education process. This investigation is still in the early stages and additional progress will take many months since this would be both a voluntary and collaborative process. There are also many obstacles to overcome and many processes to define.

Another proactive solution being pursued by several of the areas is to develop a basic industry educational packet that will be mailed out to targeted stakeholders within the county. The 2007 damage prevention data from CGA DIRT will be used to identify an industry group needing further industry education.

Final-Objective 4: The Damage Prevention Report Card and annual damage report is published electronically on the UNCC web site (not yet on the portal). The DPCs and other interested stakeholders are encouraged to first review the report card and identify local damage prevention needs. The local needs typically fall into one of two categories. Either there is an awareness issue or a damage prevention issue (location or excavation). Once the primary issue is determined using the report card, the annual report contains additional information that helps the DPCs target specific stakeholder groups with an appropriate message or education.

The award of the grant funds has certainly empowered the four DPCs that received the money to take action. Each of the four DPCs allocated expenditures into programs to increase public and professional awareness. Use of funds included: 1) promotional items for public awareness and stakeholder educational events, 2) 811 awareness decals for use on vehicles, 3) excavator awareness booths at trades shows, 4) excavator meeting events, and 5) 811 awareness postcards targeted to areas where damaged had occurred. Colorado has a high level of public and professional awareness and a low level of damages. But when a facility damage does occur, about 50% occur without the excavator requesting a locate. The DPCs continue to focus on both homeowner and professional awareness.

Objective 4 was met in 2008. In future years we intend make grant funds available to all active DPCs (up to 10 in 2009) to fund and sponsor public awareness and stakeholder education programs.

Final-Objective 5: Objective 5 was not met for 2008. We did not develop an outreach program to deliver the damage prevention report card and 811 awareness information to state and local public officials. This project is currently being developed to coincide with Damage Prevention Awareness Month in April, 2009. An outreach letter, report card and CGA 811 media kit will be delivered to County Commissioner's offices and Public Works departments in each county.

Final-Objective 6: Objective 6 was not scheduled for 2008 implementation. The Denver Metro DPC and UNCC are both undertaking projects to develop stakeholder education programs in 2009. As a follow-up to the enforcement investigation undertaken by DMDPC in 2008, they will develop and implement an administrative and educational framework to contact and educate all stakeholders involved in a damage or digging without a locate. Facility owners, excavators and locators will be asked to report all stakeholders in violation of one-call laws. The violators will be contacted, informed of legal one-call requirements and requirements for civil fines, and offered appropriate education. A database will also be created to track repeat offenders. Civil fines will not be pursued in 2009. Once a working framework is established and effective, additional steps can be explored and taken for further enforcement and funding.

Objectives 7 and 3, Elements 1, 2 and 8

Update: *The County Damage Prevention Report Card has been designed using 2007 damage prevention data from CGA DIRT and local economic and demographic information. Select stakeholders within the state are reviewing the work for acceptance. Once accepted, the county report cards will be made available to all stakeholders (UNCC web site and direct mailings) for assessment of their efforts and progress in their geographic area. All stakeholders are encouraged to submit their damage event data in a timely manner and in compliance with the damage reporting requirements in the Colorado One Call Law. In future years, the Report Card will be available on the DP Communications Portal. UNCC will provide a description of how the report card is developed for the industry in the near future.*

Final: The Damage Prevention Report Card (DPRC) has been reviewed with the DPCs, industry stakeholders, the Colorado PUC, and DOT/PHMSA representatives. Stakeholders see our unique report card as an important step in measuring and tracking damage prevention activities and improving damage prevention efforts going forward. The DPCs review the report card annually to determine if the major problem in their local area is public awareness or safe excavation. They also have access to additional damage data to better target their awareness message or education and training to specific industry groups.

A difficulty is not knowing what level of ticketing and damages is appropriate or acceptable. This has led us to: 1) develop a rating system that measures the average damage metrics for Colorado's 64 counties, 2) recognize and learn from those counties (and DPCs) that are above average and doing a good job, and 3) attempt to improve those counties that are below average. The goal is to increase active participation in damage prevention efforts and to raise the average metric level. 2008 was the first year to use the report card (with 2007 damage data) so it will become the baseline for future years. Since facility owners must report the 2008 damage data by March 31 (CGA DIRT), we do not have a second year of data to compare at this time. We should have the 2009 Damage Report Card available after June 2009.

We continue to improve and simplify the dissemination of the damage prevention information. In 2009 we plan to include a measure of local damage prevention activities and to make the report card available to county commissioners and county public works officials. These officials will be invited and encouraged to actively participate in the damage prevention process. The report card currently available in a both a printed and digital version on the UNCC web site. It will be available through the Damage Prevention Portal when it is complete in late 2009.

Objective 7 has been met for 2008. In future years we hope to make a monthly version of the report card available.

NOTE: Element 3 of the EDPI 9 Initiatives:

No progress has been made on Element 3 at this time. Discussions are taking place in 2009 to address a study of locating issues by UNCC and the Colorado PUC.

Quantifiable metrics/measures of effectiveness (Item 2 under Agreement Section 9.02 Final Report: “Where the output of the project can be quantified, a computation of the cost per unit of output.”)

[This may be difficult to explain across the board, but we’re trying to get a gauge for how effective this grant work is in improving your program. If your grant is more data oriented, you likely had some sort of metrics in mind to improve upon. If so, what were those metrics and how does the data look now compared to when the program started? If you’re doing something along the lines of enforcement that involves incident review, how many cases have you been able to review/close and/or fines collected compared to before the grant work? If you are working on something more along the lines of public awareness, to how many stakeholders have you been able to reach? Even if you don’t have the metrics fully defined, put whatever you can here.]

Final: The quantifiable measures of effectiveness that we will ultimately achieve include increased stakeholder participation, more effective stakeholder education, increased public awareness, increased excavation notifications and reduced facility damages. It is too early in the implementation process to measure any hard results from this project with regards to increased public awareness, increase excavation notifications, and reduced facility damages. Notification and damage data from 2007 will establish a quantifiable baseline in each of these areas to measure future results against – and this is a very important step. When the 2008 DIRT damage data is analyzed after mid-April 2009, hard comparisons can begin to be made.

We can say that the flow of information between the stakeholders as well as stakeholder participation and collaboration has increased significantly just through the process of introducing and communicating with stakeholders about the project. This result, in and of itself, is a major accomplishment that was stressed in the EDPI Initiatives and the PHMSA program definition. The creation and participation in the DPAT by damage prevention leaders around the state is a major success for Colorado. The collaborative effort will contribute significantly to damage prevention efforts around the state and lend credibility to this effort. The identifiable result we see at the DPC meetings is stakeholders discussing and identifying solutions to problems instead of just complaining about the issues. The difference now is that someone is guiding them in a results driven process and money has been offered to them to address the issues – a critical contribution. Stakeholders clearly know what the local issues are and have been creative in identifying solutions. The next step is getting them to actively participate in implementing their solutions and to find a continued source of funding in future years.

We can also say that we have increased professional and public awareness in some communities as well as stakeholder education through the expenditure of grant funds and the implementation of the local awareness solutions. Future measurements of notification level will help confirm this statement. The DPCs and stakeholders are certainly thankful for the assistance that UNCC and PHMSA has provided.

As we articulated in our proposal, we will begin to actually see the additional effectiveness of the project through the measurement and reporting of increase of excavation notifications and the reduction of facility damages in 2009 in the areas where the program was implemented. The awareness and educational efforts do take time to propagate through the community. We had no expectations of improvements in these numbers in 2008.

We are anxious to see the offender letter writing campaign get started in 2009. This initiative may initially be modeled in the larger metro areas and then spread to the smaller rural areas. The attitudes and sense of “community” and “well being” are quite different between the metropolitan and rural areas. We feel it is important to respect and work with these differences to give these areas an opportunity to attempt to solve their local needs and issues.

There is no question that the work so far has been fully embraced by the stakeholders in Colorado and is successful by any measure. Additional hard evidence of changes in notifications and damages for the four funded areas can be forwarded in approximately June, 2009 after the 2008 DIRT damage data is analyzed.

Issues, problems or challenges (Item 3 under Agreement Section 9.02 Final Report: “The reasons for slippage if established objectives were not met. “)

[If the project has successfully concluded on schedule, simply state there are no issues, problems or challenges to report. If there have been delays for any reason, explain what they are and how that has impacted the grant work. For instance, with some States, even after an agreement is in place, it has to be sent back to the Governor’s office or Information Technology agency for approval, and this takes more time than originally anticipated. Even if work began immediately after the agreement was in place, other delays could have been caused by personnel changes or issues that arose as the project progressed.]

Objective 3 was not met in 2008. Although the DP Portal was functional by year-end, it was not as functional as we had envisioned. The software developers underestimated the amount of work required to implement the underlying framework to build a comprehensive portal environment. They are continuing to work on this framework into early 2009. Additional damage prevention tracking information and functionality will be added later in 2009.

Objective 5 was not met for 2008. We delayed the implementation of the community awareness outreach program for state and local officials until 2009. Additional time was needed for stakeholders to review and accept the concept of the report card, which is an integral part of the outreach. Also, we felt that the program should coincide with the National Damage Prevention Awareness Month in April 2009.

Objective 6 was not scheduled for 2008. Objective 6 is in the process of implementation in 2009.

There are no issues with objectives 1, 2, 4, and 7.

Other pertinent information including, when appropriate, actions taken to address the recommendations PHMSA provided in correspondence dated [Different for each agreement] (Item 4 under Agreement Section 9.02).

[This section alludes to your initial notification, typically listed as "Recommendations" under 3b where we asked "Please acknowledge these recommendations, above, and carefully consider them as areas for program improvement. Although a detailed response addressing these areas is not necessary at this time, PHMSA would like to see these recommendations, and any actions taken addressing them, discussed in the Grant Progress Report."

Please list each recommendation and describe whether or not you have been able to address it. Note the amount and types of recommendation differ slightly for each grantee, but at a minimum all should have received the recommendation "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." As most did not clearly describe this in their application, it may not have been clear enough in the solicitation. What we're looking for here is some description on how you perform with regard to timing, personnel, and costs associated with deliverables (basically delivering on what you say you will). We are most interested in timeliness as it's related to this grant, but you can also describe your general performance on completing other grants of this nature.]

3b. Recommendations:

Item 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.

Timing:

After the project was awarded we defined a project schedule and timeline for important tasks and for each of the four geographic areas.

The UNCC Executive Director and the grant/forum facilitator meet weekly to discuss the schedule, review progress and resolve any issues that come up.

The grant/forum facilitator and the UNCC Public Relations Administrator meet with the four DPCs monthly and encourage them to stay on schedule. Additional sub-committees have been established and meet regularly to carry out specific tasks.

The portal development team meets monthly to keep that part of the project on schedule.

Final: The UNCC Executive Director will tighten the oversight of the portal contractor.

A clearer definition of the functionality and features of the portal will be developed

Realistic project milestones and deliverables will be developed to complete the project in 2009.

Personnel:

We have not had any personnel issues since the same group that developed the proposal continue to work on the project.

Final: No new comments

Costs:

All grant costs were itemized in the proposal and no changes have been made.

Grant funds are not co-mingled with the Call Center operating accounts. The UNCC Accountant maintains a special grant checking account and all accounting records.

The Grant Request Form is used to document and track the request for funding for local DPC awareness and education initiatives. The requests must be approved by the UNCC Executive Director. Approved DPC program invoices will be paid directly by UNCC and grant funds are not transferred to the DPC's treasury accounts.

Final: No new comments

Item 2. The State Department of Transportation and Railroad communities are exempt from being a member of the state One-call Center and not required to call before digging. We think that these groups should not be exempt.

CDOT:

Although CDOT is exempt from being a member under the Colorado One Call Law, they are in fact a registered member of UNCC. CDOT works closely with UNCC and has provided facility location records for major corridors in the larger metropolitan areas and is making progress toward including their other non-registered corridors. CDOT is not exempt under state law from requesting locates as an excavator and they do utilize the One Call system.

Final: No new comments

Railroads:

The railroads are exempt from being a member under Colorado One Call Law. Union Pacific has worked closely with UNCC over the past five years on a pilot project to provide facility location records. This pilot project is an attempt for them to understand the One Call functionality, evaluate the membership requirements and assess the benefits of membership and electronic notification. The railroads are not exempt under state law from requesting locates as an excavator and they do utilize the One Call system.

Final: No new comments

Final Financial Status Report

[Per the instructions in Section 9.04 of your agreement (included below), this should go to the AA as a separate form and all you put here is something to the effect of "The final financial report has been sent as a separate attachment sent to the AA.". However, if there are any issues with the Financial Status Report, or additional explanation is needed, please put that here. If there are any delays for whatever reasons, these should be communicated to the AA and AOTR in advance.

"At the end of the grant period, the Grantee will submit a Final Financial Status Report, Standard Form 269 (SF-269), to report the status of funds. In addition to SF-269, the Grantee should provide the break down of costs for each object class category as stated in SF-424A. This report must be submitted to the AA in electronic form via e-mail no later than [refer to your agreement for date, but should be same as this progress report]."

There are no issues with the grant financial status.

The final financial report (SF-269) will be sent as a separate attachment to the AA on March 31, 2009.

\$1023.25 of Federal Grant Funding was not used in 2008.

Should this be returned or can we use the funds in 2009?

Several minor changes were made in use of the Federal Funds.

	Budget	Actual	Transfer Out	Transfer In
Travel Expenses	8,560.00	4,811.60	-3,748.40	0.00
Supplies – Office	550.00	1,094.49	0.00	544.49
Supplies – Postage	1,500.00	0.00	-1,500.00	0.00
811 DPC Awareness	20,000.00	23,680.66	0.00	3,680.66
Contractual	69,390.00	69,390.00	0.00	0.00
Total	100,000.00	98,976.75	-5,248.40	4,225.15
Unobligated Funds	0.00	1,023.25		
Total	100,000.00	100,000.00		

Travel expense was not as high as expected. \$4,811.60 was used and \$3,748.40 transferred out, with \$3,680.66 of this used for the 811 DPC awareness program and \$67.74 left as unobligated funds.

Office-Postage expense was not as high as expected. \$0.00 was used and \$1,500.00 transferred out, with \$544.49 of this used for Supplies-Office and \$955.51 left as unobligated funds.

Unobligated Federal Funds totaled \$1023.25.

Requests of the AOTR and/or PHMSA

[In most cases, any questions or actions requested of the AOTR and PHMSA (such as grant modifications in anyway) should have been discussed in advance and have been address or are in the process of being addressed; in which case, you just put “No actions requested at this time” and/or explain the action being taken if in process. However, if something has come up recently, or you haven’t been able to discuss with the AOTR yet, please describe here.]

No actions requested at this time

This report must be submitted to the AOTR and the AA in electronic form via e-mail no later than March 31, 2009.

Agreement Officer’s Technical Representative (AOTR)

Mr. Max Kieba
U.S. Department of Transportation
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
Office of Pipeline Safety
1200 New Jersey Ave, SE, Room E22-319
Washington, DC 20590
Telephone: (202) 493-0595
Fax: (202) 493-2311 E-mail: Max.Kieba@dot.gov

Agreement Administrator (AA)

Ms. Karina Munoz
U.S. Department of Transportation
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
Office of Contracts and Procurement, PHA-30
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, E22-301
Washington, D.C. 20590
Telephone: (202) 366-4059
Fax: (202) 366-7974 E-mail: Karina.Munoz@dot.gov