**2010 State Damage Prevention Program Grants Final Report**

**Funding Opportunity Number: DTPH56-10-SN-0001**

**CFDA Number: 20.720**

**Award Number:** *DTPH56-10-G-PHPS14*

**Project Title:** *North Carolina Utilities Commission State Damage Prevention*

**Date Submitted:** *3/31/2011*

**Submitted by: Chris Isley NCUC & Ron Fairbanks NC811**

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

*Under this agreement, the North Carolina Utilities Commission will conduct locator training, publish a Safety and Damage Prevention Magazine, and hold public awareness and damage prevention meetings. These programs are designed by the North Carolina One Call Center to promote usage of the 811 Call before you dig number, to promote the current State statute, and to promote future amendment of the state statute.*

**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 (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.*

**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.**”)

(1) The North Carolina 811 Magazine has been published and is now in the third edition. The magazine has been well received and as a result we have received many inquires as on how a stakeholder can get a article placed in the magazine. The first issue was distributed to over 6,000 recipients including all North Carolina Legislators both Senate and House. All State Government Cabinet members, the Governor, and Staff. The magazine was also sent to Mayors, Town Clerks, Public Works Directors, and City and County Commissioners. All Superior Court Judges, Sheriffs, State Trooper District Captains, Fire Chiefs, Fire Marshalls, 911 Directors, and Emergency Management Personnel received a Magazine. Also over 3,000 Excavators, Contractors and Sub Contractors were included in the magazine mailing.

The recipients for the second issue increased to over 8,000 which included newly elected officials, requests from individuals who received the first issue at a meeting, trade shows and expositions, Pipeline awareness events, and other venues where the magazine was made available.

The response to the magazine has been all positive. Requests have come for rights to reprint articles in other magazines. These have come from Mayors, Excavators, and other Magazines. The magazine has brought such increased awareness of safe digging practices that one mayor issued a safe digging proclamation for his city after seeing the Governor’s State proclamation in the latest issue.

This project has been a complete success in reaching all the Stakeholder groups, raising the level of awareness for safe digging practices, and preparing the way for future information and awareness for the critical need for Damage Prevention in North Carolina.

The magazine is being contracted with ACTS Inc. for the first year @ $20,000.

(2) The Public Awareness program for 2010 was a complete success. Our expectation was to have 1,000 attendees during the year. We had over 1,500 attendees and were asked to conduct more sessions.

Stakeholder groups that attended were from all areas for the emergency responder sessions. They included full and part time fire fighters, Battalion Chiefs, Sheriffs, State Troopers, and Police Officers, 911 personnel, EMS, HAZMAT, Mayors, and various elected officials.

The Excavator sessions were attended by utility workers representing all types of utilities, Contractors from various industries, Insurance employees, Forestry workers, Locators, Municipal employees, and state employees including Utility Commission staff and DOT personnel.

During these presentations, we were able to carry the Damage Prevention Message not just for natural gas pipeline transmission and distribution systems but for all underground infrastructures in North Carolina.

We received overwhelming positive feedback and have been asked to expand the events in 2011.

Costs:

Personnel Total Hours Expended 873.50 = $15,198.90

Travel $6,173.07

Equipment $5,287.46

Supplies $43,939.46

Total 70,598.89

Grant $35,000

(4) This project involved conducting three training sessions throughout the state for locator training. The training was open to all stakeholder groups and was attended by various groups including municipality employees and utility employees who locate their own underground facilities. The training was very successful and feedback from the attendees was all positive. Each attendee received both classroom theory work and hands on field work.

It is hard to qualify the results and the effect on reduced damages, because there is presently no mandatory reporting of damages in North Carolina. Training and reinforcement training is one positive step in reducing damages overall. Each attendee was presented a certificate of completion at the end of the training course.

Costs:

Contractual $6,392.09

Supplies $3,152.32

Total $9,544.41

**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.”)**

**(See above)**

*[This may be difficult to explain for every grant project, but we’re trying to get a sense of how effective this grant work has been in improving your damage prevention 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, how many stakeholders have you been able to reach? Even if you don’t have the metrics fully defined, put whatever you can here.]*

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

**(NO Issues)**

*[If the project has successfully concluded on schedule, simply state that there are no issues, problems or challenge to report. If there have been delays for any reason, explain what they are and how they have 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 for approval, which 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. ]*

**Final Financial Status Report**

*“The financial report has been sent as a separate attachment to the AA”*

*[Per the instructions in Article IX, Section 9.04 of your agreement (included below), the financial status report should go to the Agreement Administrator (AA). For this section of the progress report, simply state “The final financial report has been sent as a separate attachment to the AA.”. However, if there are any issues with the Financial Status Report or additional explanation is needed, please provide that information here. If there are any delays for whatever reasons, these should be communicated to the AA and AOTR in advance.*

*From Article IX, Section 9.04 of your agreement: “At the end of the grant period, the Grantee must submit a Final Financial Status Report, Standard Form 425 (SF-425), to report the status of all funds. In addition to SF-425, the Grantee should provide the break down of costs for each object class category (Personnel, Fringe Benefits, Travel, Equipment, Supplies, Contractual, Other, and Indirect Charges). This report must be submitted to the AA in electronic form via e-mail no later than [refer to your agreement for date.”]*

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

**:No actions requested at this time”**

*[In most cases, any questions or actions requested of the AOTR and PHMSA (such as grant modifications) should have been addressed in advance of filing the report. If this is the case, simply state “No actions requested at this time” or explain any actions that are currently in process. However, if something has come up recently, or if you haven’t been able to discuss with the AOTR yet, please describe here.]*