

**2011 State Damage Prevention Program Grants Final Report**  
**Funding Opportunity Number: DTPH56-11-SN-0001**  
**CFDA Number: 20.720**

**Award Number:** DTPH56-11-G-PHPS21

**Project Title:** Missouri Public Service Commission State Damage Prevention

**Date Submitted:** April 30, 2012

**Submitted by:** Robert Leonberger

### **Specific Objective(s) of the Agreement**

Under this grant agreement, the MPSC will:

- Development and implementation of methods for effective communication
- Foster support and partnership with stakeholders
- Reviewing the adequacy of internal performance measure
- Support a Damage Prevention Education Program for industry stakeholders
- Resolving disputes to define State authority's role
- Laws and regulations of the damage prevention process
- Foster and promote the use of Improving Technologies
- Review the Effectiveness of Damage Prevention Programs

### **Workscope**

Under the terms of this grant 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, 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 once call 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 review.

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

**Summary of Project**

The Missouri Common Ground Damage Prevention and Excavation Safety Summit (Summit) held in Columbia, MO on November 9 and 10, 2011, was the first event of its kind in Missouri, it greatly exceeded everyone’s expectations. We believe it may have been one of the largest events of its kind in the nation. During the SDP Grant application process and Summit planning activities, the number of stakeholder attendees was estimating at 250-300 participants for planning purposes. The final statistics...853 registered attendees and 36 unregistered attendees.

The Summit offered an interesting and stakeholder relevant program with 14 different courses directly related to damage prevention and safety over 2 days. The training courses offered included: OSHA 10, Competent Person, Locator Training, Overhead Power Line Safety, Educating the Public, Investigating Damages, Pipeline Safety, Trench Safety, Blasting Safety, Internet Ticketing Training, MO One Call System Training, Hydro Excavating Demonstration, and Changing Behaviors. In addition to the training there was a Locating Rodeo and an Excavator Rodeo, as well as 60 vendors.

**Specific Objectives**

Development and implementation of methods for effective communication/Element 1  
Stakeholders in Missouri are keenly aware that communication is the foundation of successfully preventing damage to underground utility infrastructure. The Summit focused considerable resources on a variety of issues designed to enhance communication from concept to the completion of an excavation. In addition to the Summit itself giving the opportunity for excavators, utilities, locators and other stakeholder to participate in an event and open/re-enforce communication, the training provided training for better communication of excavators with MO One Call (Internet Ticketing Training and MO One Call System Training).

Foster support and Partnership with Stakeholders/Element 2 and Element 5  
The Summit itself gave the opportunity for excavators, utilities, locators and other stakeholder to participate in an event and support/partnerships among stakeholders. The Summit provided an environment for all stakeholders to come together to address a shared interests. To promote participation and assure adequate representation, a steering committee was assembled consisting of representatives from the excavating, One Call, locating, utility, and government industries in addition to vendor representatives with products/services relevant to damage prevention. Also, engagement of the excavating and locating community was accomplished through their participation in equipment rodeos. These two events, conducted independently, provided excavators and locators the opportunity to demonstrate their professional proficiencies while applying industry best practices to further damage prevention concepts. Excavators operated machinery (provided by vendors) and competed with other contestants in accuracy and time. Locators (separated into individual utility-type groups) attempted to locate buried utilities under time constraints and were measured on the degree of their accuracy relative to their competitors. While designed to be educational, these fun and competitive events built camaraderie and encouraged support and participation in future educational activities.

### Reviewing the Adequacy of Internal Performance Measure/Element 3

The Summit's inclusion of a locate rodeo had a direct application to the adequacy of locating performance measures. Quality assurance programs and performance measures are difficult to assess if pertinent industry standards and practices are not considered. As such, locate rodeos not only suggest the use of accepted practices, but strongly encourage them in competition. Furthermore, specific attention on these guidelines generated an interest by utilities in reviewing their application for use in relation to their current standards and procedures. In addition to the locate rodeo, an expansive examination of locating practices was performed as a "Locating 101" class taught locating theory and provide specific instruction about how locators work, why they may not, and how to respond to virtually every scenario encountered in the field. This tract consisted of several hours of classroom instruction followed by field training and exhaustive review best practices for use in daily operations.

### Support a Damage Prevention Education Program for Industry Stakeholders/Element 4

The Summit's focus was centered on training, awareness, and education. As demonstrated in the Summit Agenda, over 50 hours of educational training was conducted over a two day event, in addition to equipment demonstration, vendor displays, and the excavator and locate rodeo competitions. The steering committee was tasked with designing the curriculum so as to ensure that the educational needs of their industry participants are met. Each member of the steering committee provided valuable insight into the challenges their personnel encounter relative to damage prevention. That insight facilitated targeted education and training and served to enhance knowledge and awareness of all stakeholders.

### Resolving Disputes to Define State Authority's Role/Element 6

In response to the lack of demonstrated dispute resolution, the MO PSC put forward legislative proposals to address the matter through the changing the agency given authority in the state for civil penalties. Because this is a substantial deviation from current practices, a broad discussion was held at the Summit. In this forum, all stakeholders were encouraged to participate and offer solutions to resolving disputes. To address dispute resolution as an integral part of a damage prevention program, the Summit sought to assess and report. From data already collected to data collected from summit participants, a general assessment of the status will be made.

### Laws and regulations of the damage prevention process/Element 7

Closely related and somewhat interdependent on the dispute resolution noted above, the matter of enforcement for the damage prevention laws was discussed concurrent with any discussion of dispute resolution by reviewing current and suggested enforcement mechanisms. Through an analysis of data collected by CGA's DIRT program as well as information obtained from MO PSC requests, the case for equitable and uniform enforcement will be made. To advance the discussion surrounding effective enforcement in Missouri, stakeholders needed to be keenly aware of current damage trends and the extent to which they impact all participants in the damage prevention process. In addition to a review of damages, attendees engaged in discussion of legislative initiatives. There will also be an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on enforcement mechanisms and how they believe the process can be streamlined and improved.

#### Foster and promote the use of Improving Technologies/Element 8

Concurrent with communication, technology is a critical component of preventing damages to underground utilities. As innovative products and services become more accessible, operational demand dictates continued investment and enhancements to sustain flexibility and efficiency. The Summit addressed available technology from two angles. First and foremost, current and prospective technologies was displayed and discussed through vendor demonstrations as well as call center modules. This provided participants with a first hand perspective on how it may be implemented at their own organizations. Secondly, educational sessions trained attendees on the use of available technologies and provide opportunities to address questions and familiarize themselves with the innovations. Additionally, the discussion of technologies sought input from stakeholders on what they would deem useful in their operations so that resources may be committed to those projects in future development. Through the Summit, newly developed and emerging technologies were displayed for participants to trial. Additionally, training conducted on currently available products enhanced the proficiency of end users and reduce the possibility of repeated and unnecessary errors that may be problematic. Specifically, training on the use of Internet Ticketing and Internet Mapping provided attendees with first-hand experience supervised by those charged with administering the various programs. Most importantly, the Summit generated innovative ideas.

#### Review the Effectiveness of Damage Prevention Programs/Element 9

Like all attempts and experiments at bringing a new idea to fruition, success is measurable only by an honest and consistent analysis of each component upon completion. The Summit is no different, and several criteria will be used to assess its effectiveness. The first measure was a review of damage data and trends in the utility and excavation industries. This provided perspective on historical causes of damages and identified corrective measures that were successfully implemented. Secondly, a comprehensive review of the state's initiatives with respect to PHMSA's Nine Elements of Damage Prevention targeted areas of deficiency. A third measure was the attempt to develop an informal council tasked with discussing and reviewing current MO PSC legislative proposals. A final gauge for effectiveness was to encourage the use of CGA's DIRT program so that benchmarks can be established for future comparisons to ascertain the influence of individual or collective elements of the damage prevention program as a whole. To assess the success not only of the Summit, but damage prevention efforts in general, a solicitation to voluntarily participate in a damage prevention council was directed to summit participants. In addition to summarizing and assessing the Summit, the council will also provide direction for training and analyze potential legislation that has direct or indirect impacts to the damage prevention process.

#### **Quantifiable Metrics/Measures of Effectiveness (Item 2 under Article IX, Section 9.01**

**Project Report: “Where the output of the project can be quantified, a computation of the cost per unit of output.”)**

As noted previously, this inaugural Missouri Common Ground Damage Prevention Summit provided relevant training and education and was attended by almost 900 stakeholders. The attendance far surpassed the initial projections of 250-300 participants. In addition to MO One Call personnel and MO PSC personnel, about 73% of the attendees were excavator personnel and about 27% were utility personnel from different types of utilities. The 60 vendors partnered with us to showcase new products, services, and equipment, as well as providing numerous pieces of equipment for the rodeo and for display. The positive feedback from participants and the number

of stakeholders impacted by the damage prevention message (training/education/presentations) was the best measure of effectiveness.

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

There were no “problems”. However, since this Summit was the first of its kind in Missouri, we did not know what to expect. The “challenge” was the overwhelming success...anticipating 250-300 participants and eventually having almost 900 stakeholder attendees.

**Final Financial Status Report**

The final financial report has been sent as a separate attachment to the AA. There is one expenditure for \$451.34 that has not been paid by the Missouri Public Service Commission. The invoice submitted by the vendor for payment did not contain sufficient information detailing the service provided and until that information is provided, the PSC cannot pay the invoice. The vendor was contacted, but has not yet supplied the detailed information required.

**Requests of the AOTR and/or PHMSA**

No actions requested at this time.