2010 State Damage Prevention Program Grants Progress Report
Funding Opportunity Number: DTPH56-10-SN-0001
CFDA Number: 20.720

Award Number: DTPH56-10-G-PHPS01

Project Title: Utility Notification Center of Colorado State Damage Prevention

Date Submitted: August 31, 2010

Submitted by: J.D. Maniscalco
Executive Director
Utility Notification Center of Colorado (Colorado 811)

Specific Objective(s) of the Agreement

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

Section 2.03 Specific Objective(s) of the Agreement

Under this grant agreement, the UNCC will:

- Foster Support and Partnership with Stakeholders;
- Support Public Awareness and Education;
- Implement the Damage Prevention Compliance Program; and
- Review the Effectiveness of Damage Prevention Programs.

Workscope

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

Article III. 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 (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 (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 (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.

Note: Each element in the Specific Objectives aligns with a respective element in the Workscope. Further reference to accomplishments and future plans will reference only the Specific Objectives.

Accomplishments for this period (Item 1 under Article IX, Section 9.01 Progress Report: "A comparison of actual accomplishments to the objectives established for the period.")
[How are you progressing on each of the items/elements provided in the "Specific Objectives" and "Workscope"? Start with an overall description followed by item-by-item or element-by-element detail if possible.]

A) Progress Overview

Colorado811 is pleased with the progress we have made through August 2010 with our damage prevention efforts defined in the 2010 PHMSA State Damage Prevention Grant (Grant). The Damage Prevention Action Team (DPAT) was established in 2008 and continues to provide strong industry leadership and innovative public awareness programs. The DPAT is a group of about 50 representative industry stakeholders in Colorado that meets twice each year. This group discusses, designs and coordinates statewide public awareness efforts funded through the Grant and shares and reviews the progress made during the year on these programs. The Grant Forum Facilitator, Colorado811 Public Relations Administrator, and the DPAT Chairman serve as the group's leadership, provide the Grant program and finance administration and meet with all the Damage Prevention Councils (DPC) throughout the year.

Each DPC is also allocated a share of the Grant funds to support local (multi-county level) 811 public awareness, public school education, and stakeholder education programs. These programs have proven to be both innovative and successful at raising public awareness (as measured annually by the level of incoming tickets) and reducing the level of facility damages (as measured annually by damages per 1,000 incoming tickets). At the fall DPAT meeting, industry stakeholders and DPCs that have made significant progress or implemented innovative programs are recognized for their efforts. This recognition program has been quite popular with the stakeholders.

Finally, with the analysis from the Colorado Damage Data Report© (published annually since 2001) and the Colorado Damage Prevention County Report Cards© (published annually since 2007), we have been able to measure and identify the areas of the state where significant progress has been made as well as those areas that need improvement in awareness and damage prevention. Each of the 64 counties in Colorado is graded on three industry metrics that have been developed over the past three years and given an overall damage prevention grade. By looking at past data, we have been able to produce report cards dating back to 2004 (for a total of six years). Stakeholders as well as DPCs can review the report card to identify the progress they are making in 1) public awareness, 2) damage prevention, and 3) damage incident reporting (via the CGA Damage Information Reporting Tool (DIRT)). With this information, we have also developed several statistical tests that demonstrate progress has been made in public awareness and damage prevention and that those counties with a DPC are performing at higher awareness and prevention levels that the counties without a DPC. We have worked diligently over the past three years to develop these report card metrics and statistical tests and are pleased that they support our statement that we have made significant progress with the assistance of the PHMSA Grant since 2008. Additional statistical information is provided under "*Quantifiable Metrics*".

Each of the four objectives is reviewed next and includes a summary status of the budget and Facilitator hours for that objective.

Objective 1) Foster Support and Partnership with Stakeholders

The DPAT met in March 2010 to review Grant funding and approve spring and summer public awareness activities. Approximately 70 industry stakeholders from around the state attended the 2 day meeting and included One-Call administrators, facility owners, excavators, PUC officials, and first responders. Discussion included:

- Programs and funding for Damage Prevention Awareness Week in April 2010
- Promotional planning and funding for 811 Day in August 2010
- Programs and funding for DPC public awareness activities through August 2010
- Funding for development of the Dig Town model to support public education around the state in 2010
- Funding for creation and support of an 811 school education program in 2010
- Progress on the DP Portal under development since 2008
- Review of the new Damage Prevention Compliance module for the DP Portal
- Review of the new Damage Prevention Report Card module for the DP Portal
- Review of the new Damage Prevention Activity module for the DP Portal

Each DPC reviewed awareness and education activities from the winter months (2009-2010). A number of the DPCs discussed the innovative methods (non-Grant funding) used to raise funds for supporting expanded DPC activities. Some of these included:

Annual member DPC support fees
DP special program fees (primarily from pipeline operators I support of RP1162 activities)
Fees for stakeholders booths at excavators breakfasts
Stakeholder advertising fees on clipboards
Participant and sponsorship fees from industry golf tournaments

One of our specific goals was to initiate another two DPCs in the state. We met this goal with the formation of three new DPCs in SE Colorado, the Montrose Area, and the Summit Area. With the three new DPCs, Colorado now has fourteen DPCs, representing 36 of the 64 counties, 89.1% of the state population, 87.6% of the annual incoming ticket count and 90.3% of the annual facility damage count.

The Forum Facilitator has tracked and administered the Grant funding, coordinated the DPAT meetings, and met with many of the DPCs around the state. In addition, the Forum Facilitator has designed the DP effectiveness review process, designed the DP compliance program process, and is nearly complete with the process design of the DP Report Cards and DP Activities modules for integration into the DP Portal. 400 Facilitator hours were budgeted while a total of 217 hours have been expended through August 2010.

STATUS: This task is ongoing through the end of the year.

Budget Review

	Budget	Expense (Through 08/2010)	Funds Available
DPAT Support	$2,750.00	$0.00	$2,700.00
Grant Administration	$6,600.00	$5,550.00 74.0Hrs	$1,050.00
Forum Facilitator	11,380.00	$3,300.00 44.0Hrs	$8,080.00
Facilitator Travel	5,000.00	$534.42	$4,465.58

Objective 2) Support Public Awareness and Education

STATUS: Parts of this task are ongoing through the end of the year.

The following tasks have been completed:

Support for Damage Prevention Awareness Month in April 2010	
Statewide TV advertising campaign	$20,000.00
Support for 811 Education Day in August 2010	
Statewide radio advertising campaign	$1,200.00
Event signage and stakeholder promo items	$1,326.01
811 advertising and posters	$1,056.46
Support for Spring and Summer DPC Public Awareness Programs	
811 public promotional items	$686.70
811 TV advertising	$724.18
811 Newspaper advertising	$543.60
811 media video stations in hardware stores	$652.65
811 stakeholder promotional items for meetings	$1,092.64

The following tasks have been planned but not completed:

Support for Fall and Winter DPC Public Awareness Programs

Support for Fall DPC Stakeholder and School Safety Education Programs

Budget Review

	Budget	Expense (Through 08/2010)	Funds Available
811 Awareness Month	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	$0.00
DPC 811 Awareness	$9,900.00	$3,699.77	$6,200.23
DPC Education	8,350.00	$3,582.47	$4,767.53

Objective 3) Implement the Damage Prevention Compliance Program

The DP Compliance Program process will provide a process and web based mechanism to allow any stakeholder to input incident information on any other non-compliant stakeholder who will then be contacted, informed of legal implications defined under the law and offered educational services. The incident information will be stored in a statewide database and all follow-up activity will be logged. The DPAT Compliance Team and the DPC Compliance Administrator will be involved in follow-up and tracking activity for each incident. Compliance incident reports will be available by date and county as well as to identify repeat offenders across time and geography. Each DPC will initiate offender contact and provide damage prevention educational services.

Currently, Colorado Law defines two non-compliant activities:

1. A facility owner/operator has not registered and is not a member of the One-Call organization.
2. A stakeholder is excavating without having properly requested a facility locate.

STATUS:

The following tasks have been completed:

A statewide compliance process has been defined and documented
A data collection format has been designed

The following tasks have been started and are nearing completion:

Develop and test the County DP Compliance module for the portal

Budget Review

	Budget	Expense (Through 08/2010)	Funds Available
Forum Facilitator	$3,510.00	$1,237.00 16.50Hrs	$2,272.50
Portal Developers	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	$0.00

Objective 4) Review the Effectiveness of Damage Prevention Programs

4A) Define and improve the Colorado damage prevention review and analysis process

Our damage prevention review process has been defined over the past three years and allows us to review local and statewide progress on an annual basis at a county level. Analysis of valid data forms the cornerstone of the review process. This data is provided by both the excavators and facility owners and originates in the Norfield One-Call ticketing system and the CGA Damage Information Reporting Tool (DIRT). The DPCs are the focal point of the damage prevention programs and the annual improvement process. Without them, we would not have the manpower resources to implement both the public and stakeholder programs.

If the DPCs are in fact effective at increasing public awareness and improving damage prevention at the local level, then the critical question remains whether continued financial support of damage prevention programs for the DPCs is a worthwhile and desired outcome of the three year PHMSA Grant project.

The purpose of the review and evaluation then is to determine if awareness and damage prevention are improving and if the DPCs are contributing to that improvement.

The damage prevention review and evaluation process includes the following tasks:

Data Collection and Analysis Phase

1. Collect incoming ticket data at the county level from the Norfield Ticket System
2. Collect facility damage data at the county level from CGA DIRT
3. Collect demographic data at the county level from government sources
4. Produce and publish the Annual Colorado Damage Report
5. Share Colorado Damage Report with stakeholders
6. Produce and publish the Annual Colorado County DP Report Cards

Data Evaluation Phase

7. Evaluate the effectiveness of public awareness efforts, as measured by the Damage Prevention Awareness Metric, in counties with an active DPC versus those counties with no DPC. Through the use of statistical tests, quantify the effectiveness of organizing and supporting DPCs to raise public awareness levels. Creating and supporting DPCs is effective if a statistically significant number of counties with an active DPC are above the median awareness metric each year.

8. Evaluate the effectiveness of damage prevention efforts, as measured by the Damage Prevention Metric, in counties with an active DPC versus those counties with no DPC. Through the use of statistical tests, quantify the effectiveness of organizing and supporting DPCs to improve damage prevention. Creating and supporting DPCs is effective if a statistically significant number of counties with an active DPC are below a historical threshold Damage Prevention Metric each year.

9. Evaluate the effectiveness of damage prevention efforts, as measured by the Damage Prevention Metric, in all counties. Through the use of statistical tests, quantify the effectiveness of damage prevention efforts by determining if this metric has improved over multiple years. The metric should be decreasing over time if the efforts are effective.

Feedback and Improvement Phase

10. Review Colorado County DP Report Cards and effectiveness measures with each DPC for relevant counties.
11. Assist each DPC with creating public awareness, public education and stakeholder education programs.
12. Assist each DPC with funding public awareness, public education and stakeholder education programs.

The preliminary metrics determined from the review and analysis will be reviewed in the "Quantifiable Metrics" section to follow.

STATUS: This task is complete.

Budget Review

	Budget	Expense (Through 08/2010)	Funds Available
Grant Administration	$5,000.00	$4,968.75 66.25Hrs	$31.25

4B) Integrate the County Damage Prevention Report Card Module into the DP Portal.

The DP Report Card Module will provide web based access to the DP Report Cards for each county as well as the One-Call and demographic data used to compile them.

STATUS:

The following tasks have been completed:

Simplify the grading processes and algorithms
Determine Report Card grades for all counties from 2004 through 2009
Design and compile a county data file that can be fed to a DP Portal staging area

The following tasks have not been started:

Develop and test the County DP Report Card module for the portal

Budget Review

	Budget	Expense (Through 08/2010)	Funds Available
Forum Facilitator	$1,755.00	$600.00 8.00Hrs	$1,155.00
Portal Developers	$12,000.00	$6,000.00	$6,000.00

4C) Integrate the County Damage Prevention Activity Module into the DP Portal.

The DP Activity Module will allow each DPC to schedule and report information about each public awareness or stakeholder education activity . Information collected will include date, time, location, activity type, attendance and cost. The information will be utilized as a grading component for the DP Report Cards in future years.

STATUS:

The following tasks have been completed:

A preliminary data collection format has been designed
2009 DP Activity data has been manually collected

The following tasks have not been started:

Manually collect 2010 DP activity data
Develop and test the County DP Activity module for the portal

Budget Review

	Budget	Expense (Through 08/2010)	Funds Available
Forum Facilitator	$1,755.00	$600.00 8.00 Hrs	$1,155.00
Portal Developers	$6,000.00	$0.00	$6,000.00

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.")

[This is 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 is the data looking 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 pitched 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.]

A) Overview of Quantifiable Measures of Effectiveness

As defined under *Objective 4) Review the Effectiveness of Damage Prevention Programs, Data Evaluation Phase*, we defined three quantifiable measures of effectiveness:

Data Evaluation Phase

7) Evaluate the effectiveness of public awareness efforts, as measured by the Damage Prevention Awareness Metric, in counties with an active DPC versus those counties with no DPC. Through the use of statistical tests, quantify the effectiveness of organizing and supporting DPCs to raise public awareness levels. Creating and supporting DPCs is effective if a statistically significant number of counties with an active DPC are above the median awareness metric each year.

8) Evaluate the effectiveness of damage prevention efforts, as measured by the Damage Prevention Metric, in counties with an active DPC versus those counties with no DPC. Through the use of statistical tests, quantify the effectiveness of organizing and supporting DPCs to improve damage prevention. Creating and supporting DPCs is effective if a statistically significant number of counties with an active DPC are below a historical threshold Damage Prevention Metric each year.

9) Evaluate the effectiveness of damage prevention efforts, as measured by the Damage Prevention Metric, in all counties. Through the use of statistical tests, quantify the effectiveness of damage prevention efforts by determining if this metric has improved over multiple years. The metric should be decreasing over time if the efforts are effective.

B) Summary Review of Data From 2003 Through 2009

Each of these evaluations will be reviewed in more detail and a result provided in Section C). First, it may be helpful to provide a quick summary review of the data used to compile the County Damage Prevention Report Cards. The following table lists the statewide data from 2003-2009 and includes:

- Demographic data (population, pop density, net migration and building permits)
- One-Call data (incoming tickets, number of counties (of 64) with reported DIRT data, DIRT facility damages)
- DIRT facility damages for each facility type
- Damage metric (facility damages / 1,000 incoming tickets) for each facility type

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Land Area:	104,093	Square Miles						%Change	%Change
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2004-2009	2007-2009
Population:	4,585,803	4,649,267	4,713,246	4,807,199	4,895,355	4,987,285	5,074,114	9.1%	3.7%
Population Density:	44.1	44.7	45.3	46.2	47.0	47.9	48.7	9.1%	3.7%
Net Migration:	24,315	26,412	30,126	54,784	54,686	49,843	29,531	11.8%	-46.0%
Building Permits:	39,569	46,499	45,891	38,343	29,454	18,998	9,355	-79.9%	-68.2%
ONE-CALL DATA									
Incoming Tickets:	750,994	752,161	748,817	706,168	634,630	547,732	470,716	-37.4%	-25.8%
Counties w/ Reported Damages:	56	56	52	56	56	51	55		
DIRT Facility Damages:	13,540	10,573	9,371	8,947	6,358	4,900	3,192	-69.8%	-49.8%
Telecommunications Damages	6,425	5,216	4,639	4,144	3,195	2,602	1,911	-63.4%	-40.2%
Natural Gas Damages	4,489	2,627	2,435	2,939	2,185	1,521	768	-70.8%	-64.9%
Electric Damages	1,666	1,561	790	1,497	635	472	231	-85.2%	-63.6%
Cable TV Damages	847	1,079	1,434	258	235	226	200	-81.5%	-14.9%
Water Damages	90	84	53	89	77	62	40	-52.4%	-48.1%
Sewer Damages	19	5	17	16	21	6	17		
Other Damages	4	1	3	4	10	11	25		
DAMAGE METRIC									
Damages / 1,000 Tickets:	18.0	14.1	12.5	12.7	10.0	8.9	6.8	-51.8%	-32.3%
Telecom Damages / 1,000 Tickets	8.6	6.9	6.2	5.9	5.0	4.8	4.1	-41.5%	-19.4%
Nat Gas Damages / 1,000 Tickets	6.0	3.5	3.3	4.2	3.4	2.8	1.6	-53.3%	-52.6%
Electric Damages / 1,000 Tickets	2.2	2.1	1.1	2.1	1.0	0.9	0.5	-76.4%	-51.0%
Cable TV Damages / 1,000 Tickets	1.1	1.4	1.9	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	-70.4%	14.7%
Water Damages / 1,000 Tickets	0.12	0.11	0.07	0.13	0.12	0.11	0.08	-23.9%	-30.0%
Sewer Damages / 1,000 Tickets	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.04		
Other Damages / 1,000 Tickets	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.05		

The following six multi-year trends stand out in the data:

1) State population has been steadily increasing
2) Building permits have been decreasing since 2004, dropping 79.9%
3) Incoming tickets have been decreasing since 2004, dropping 37.4%
4) Facility damages have been decreasing since 2003, dropping 69.8% since 2004
5) The Damage Metric has been decreasing since 2003, dropping 51.8% since 2004
6) In most cases, the two year %change from 2007-2009 makes up the majority of the change since 2004

There are four general conclusions that can be drawn from these multi-year trends:

1) Incoming tickets have decreased at a much slower rate (about one-half the rate) than construction activity, as measured by building permit data. This is a positive trend and may indicate that the general awareness level has in fact increased over time. Of course, it may also indicate that building construction companies were not requesting an appropriate level of tickets for the amount of excavation involved.
2) Facility damages have decreased at a much faster rate (about twice the rate) than incoming tickets have decreased. It is always a good result when damages decrease, but if they are not decreasing at a faster rate than tickets are decreasing, progress has not been made. This result is a positive trend that points to a driving force that has improved damage prevention efforts by stakeholder.
3) The Damage Metric (facility damages / 1,000 incoming tickets) has decreased over time. Since this is a ratio of two industry measures, either of the measures could be impacting the decrease in the ratio. In this case, both measures have decreased, and since the denominator decreased at a faster rate than the numerator decreased, the ratio decreased. This is a positive trend that points to a driving force that has improved damage prevention efforts by stakeholders.
4) Since PHMSA provided grant funding in 2008 and 2009 for public awareness and stakeholder education, the rate of improvement for most of the measures has increased significantly. We view this as a positive trend, though it is limited to two years.

C) Quantifiable Measures of Effectiveness

The first two Quantifiable Measures of Effectiveness identified on pages 6 and 8 will be assessed based upon the group of 64 counties in Colorado and the existence of an active DPC in the county. Since the Grant funding supported public awareness and stakeholder education activities sponsored by the DPCs, it is useful to determine if supporting the DPCs produced results in counties where DPCs were active. Generally then, if the counties with an active DPC demonstrate, through an appropriate measure, a higher level of awareness and damage prevention than counties without an active DPC, then supporting DPCs to produce these results was both worthwhile and desirable and the programs were effective. The test for effectiveness will use *Contingency Tables* and the *Chi-square Independence of Variables Test*. The test of independence of variables is used to determine whether two variables are independent of or related to each other.

For example, if there are 64 counties and the level of public awareness can be measured by some method, then do those counties with a DPC have a higher level of public awareness than those counties without a DPC? Put another way, is a high level of public awareness in a county independent of having an active DPC in the county, or is it dependant upon having an active DPC in the county? This test will help to answer that question. Note that the test does not prove that the DPC is responsible for the higher level of public awareness, only that on average those counties with an active DPC have a higher level of public awareness than those counties without an active DPC. It is left to further verification to determine if appropriate activities have occurred that might have had an impact on the level of public awareness. But by definition of the question, we specified that the DPCs were in fact active in the county and tracking DP Activities will support the claim to our satisfaction.

The *Chi-square Independence of Variables Test* follows this procedure:

1) Make a claim that you wish to validate with some set of data
2) Identify the two variables that will be used in the test
3) State a proper *Null Test Hypothesis* relating to the independence of the variables and a proper *Alternate Test Hypothesis* relating to the dependence of the variables. Note that we are conducting the test to validate that the two variables are in fact dependent upon each other.
4) Construct a *Contingency Table* with the two variables
5) Determine the *Chi-square Value* from the expected data and observed data in the *Contingency Table*
6) Determine the *Degrees of Freedom* with the rows and columns of the table
7) Determine the *Confidence Level* and the *alpha value* for a right tailed test
8) Determine the *Critical Value* from a standard Chi-square Table
9) Evaluate the *Chi-square Value* against the Critical Value: if the *Chi-square Value* is greater than the *Critical Value*, reject the Null Hypothesis and accept the Alternate Hypothesis. There is sufficient evidence in the data for dependence of the two variables.

The third Quantifiable Measure of Effectiveness identified on pages 6 and 8 will be assessed based upon the group of 64 counties in Colorado and the change in the Damage Prevention Metric from 2004 to 2009. It is useful to determine if the damage level actually decreased over this period. Generally then, if the Damage Metric decreases it would be useful to know what helped to cause the decrease. The test for effectiveness will use the *t-Test of the Difference Between Two Means for Dependant Samples*, which will establish if the average Damage Prevention Metric changed significantly over the time period.

C1) Effectiveness of Public Awareness Efforts – Impact of DPCs

Effectiveness is measured by having a statistically significant number of counties with active DPCs above the median Public Awareness Metric (the value in the exact middle of the 64 counties). The test of the effectiveness will utilize four categories of sixteen counties each and determine the number of counties with an active DPC in each category. The lower two categories are below the median metric and the upper two categories are above the median metric. See County Table 1 on page 12 that lists the counties sorted by increasing Public Awareness Metric and identifies counties with an active DPC. The contingency table is constructed with this information.

Claim Statement:	Counties with an active DPC have higher levels of public awareness than counties without an active DPC.
Variable 1:	The public awareness level is measured by the Public Awareness Metric: LN(Density Adjusted Incoming Tickets) / LN(Population)
Variable 2:	Number counties with and without an active DPC
Hypothesis(null)	The level of Awareness within a county is independent of having an active DPC in the county
Hypothesis(alternate)	The level of Awareness within a county is dependent on having an active DPC in the county

Contingency Table: Constructed from County Table 1, 2009 Awareness Metric

	Lowest	<Median	>Median	Highest	ColSum
Counties w/ No DPC	16	13	7	4	40
Counties w/ DPC	0	3	9	12	24
RowSum	16	16	16	16	64
Expected Frequency	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	
Expected Frequency	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	
Chi Squared Value	3.60	0.90	0.90	3.60	**Chi-Square Sum**
Chi Squared Value	6.00	1.50	1.50	6.00	**24.00**

	Deg of Freedom (R-1)(C-1)	3
Right Tailed alpha	99.5% Confidence Level, @=0.005	0.005
Critical Value @	Right Tailed Test	12.838
IF 24 > 12.838	**True, so Reject H(null) in favor of H(alternate)**	

The conclusion, with a Confidence Level of 99.5%, is that there is enough evidence to support the claim statement that counties with an active DPC have higher levels of public awareness than counties without an active DPC. Creating and supporting DPCs and public awareness programs is an effective method to improve damage prevention awareness.

A review of County Table 1 provides an intuitive sense that this statement is true. The Chi-square Independence of Variables Test just confirms that the actual data supports the claim. A similar test of the eight counties with DPCs in 2004 reached the same conclusion.

COUNTY	Year	2004 Awareness Metric LN(Tickets(DenAdj)) per LN(Pop)
Kiowa	2004	0.660
Costilla	2004	0.678
San Juan	2004	0.680
Lincoln	2004	0.683
Crowley	2004	0.690
Bent	2004	0.704
Conejos	2004	0.714
Sedgwick	2004	0.719
Kit Carson	2004	0.720
Dolores	2004	0.729
Cheyenne	2004	0.732
Jackson	2004	0.732
Lake	2004	0.736
Phillips	2004	0.742
Saguache	2004	0.745
Alamosa	2004	0.747
Moffat	2004	0.748
Washington	2004	0.748
Hinsdale	2004	0.750
Otero	2004	0.757
Prowers	2004	0.761
Huerfano	2004	0.765
Baca	2004	0.772
Logan	2004	0.779
Mineral	2004	0.784
Montezuma	2004	0.788
Rio Grande	2004	0.795
Park	2004	0.797
Fremont	2004	0.807
Custer	2004	0.808
Las Animas	2004	0.810
Chaffee	2004	0.812
Gilpin	2004	0.813
Morgan	2004	0.814
Yuma	2004	0.827
Elbert	2004	0.831
Eagle	2004	0.835
Routt	2004	0.836
Rio Blanco	2004	0.843
Garfield	2004	0.844
Montrose	2004	0.844
Pueblo	2004	0.850
Gunnison	2004	0.851
San Miguel	2004	0.852
Archuleta	2004	0.858
Summit	2004	0.859
Pitkin	2004	0.862
Mesa	2004	0.868
La Plata	2004	0.872
Grand	2004	0.876
Denver	2004	0.885
Clear Creek	2004	0.888
Boulder	2004	0.891
Delta	2004	0.893
Jefferson	2004	0.899
Ouray	2004	0.903
Arapahoe	2004	0.912
Larimer	2004	0.920
Adams	2004	0.923
El Paso	2004	0.928
Weld	2004	0.939
Broomfield	2004	0.942
Douglas	2004	0.947
Teller	2004	0.973

COUNTY	Year	2009 Awareness Metric LN(Tickets(DenAdj)) per LN(Pop)
San Juan	2009	0.578
Crowley	2009	0.630
Kiowa	2009	0.660
Costilla	2009	0.665
Lake	2009	0.693
Conejos	2009	0.695
Saguache	2009	0.696
Lincoln	2009	0.710
Jackson	2009	0.715
Sedgwick	2009	0.723
Baca	2009	0.726
Kit Carson	2009	0.729
Dolores	2009	0.734
Bent	2009	0.739
Washington	2009	0.741
Prowers	2009	0.747
Rio Grande	2009	0.748
Alamosa	2009	0.749
Mineral	2009	0.750
Park	2009	0.752
Custer	2009	0.755
Otero	2009	0.756
Hinsdale	2009	0.756
Moffat	2009	0.761
Cheyenne	2009	0.761
Huerfano	2009	0.764
Phillips	2009	0.765
Elbert	2009	0.778
Fremont	2009	0.785
Delta	2009	0.788
Logan	2009	0.789
Archuleta	2009	0.792
Chaffee	2009	0.794
San Miguel	2009	0.796
Montezuma	2009	0.799
Ouray	2009	0.801
Eagle	2009	0.801
Routt	2009	0.803
Gunnison	2009	0.810
Montrose	2009	0.814
Las Animas	2009	0.817
Morgan	2009	0.824
Pueblo	2009	0.828
Yuma	2009	0.831
Grand	2009	0.835
Clear Creek	2009	0.837
Garfield	2009	0.842
Pitkin	2009	0.844
Adams	2009	0.844
Gilpin	2009	0.845
Mesa	2009	0.847
Jefferson	2009	0.854
Summit	2009	0.857
Denver	2009	0.857
Douglas	2009	0.861
Boulder	2009	0.862
Arapahoe	2009	0.863
Larimer	2009	0.866
Broomfield	2009	0.873
El Paso	2009	0.874
Weld	2009	0.878
La Plata	2009	0.897
Rio Blanco	2009	0.909
Teller	2009	0.919

County Table 1
2004 and 2009 Awareness Metric sorted by Increasing Awareness Metric

Dark Green Shading:
8 Counties with a DPC that existed in 2004

Blue Shading:
16 Counties with a DPC created in 2007 - 2009

Light Green Shading:
In 2009, 19 of 64 Counties (30%) maintained or increased their Awareness Metric from 2004. Larger population counties would find it much more difficult to raise their metric.

Descriptive Statistics

Measure	2004	2009
Lowest	0.660	0.578
Average	0.812	0.788
Median	0.812	0.793
Highest	0.973	0.919

Note: Since the Awareness Metric is a ratio of Incoming Tickets over Population, these descriptive measures will decrease from 2004-2009 since incoming tickets decreased while population increased. This is why we do not test the metric itself as it fluctuates with the economy. The described test validates the influence of DPCs to create higher awareness levels.

It is interesting to note that in 2009, two of the three counties (La Plata and Rio Blanco) with the highest Awareness Metric were counties with active DPCs and very active pipeline companies responding to RP1162 regulation. Both these counties also increased their public awareness metric from 2004 to 2009, a difficult feat in light of the way the metric is constructed and the slowdown in construction activity.

C2) Effectiveness of Damage Prevention Efforts – Impact of DPCs

Effectiveness is measured by having a statistically significant number of counties with active DPCs below the historical Damage Weighted Average Damage Prevention Metric (a value established in 2004). The 2004 metric is used as a reference to show improvement over time. The test of the effectiveness will utilize three categories of 13, 25, and 26 counties each and determine the number of counties with an active DPC in each category. The first category is above or worse than the reference average damage metric and the other two categories are below or better than the reference average damage metric. See County Table 2 on page 14 that lists the counties sorted by decreasing Damage Prevention Metric and identifies counties with an active DPC. The contingency table is constructed with this information.

Claim Statement:	Counties with an active DPC have better (lower than the reference metric) levels of damage prevention than counties without an active DPC.
Variable 1:	The damage prevention level is measured by the Damage Prevention Metric: Adjusted Damages per 1,000 Density Adjusted Incoming Tickets
Variable 2:	Number counties with and without an active DPC
Hypothesis(null)	The level of Damage Prevention within a county is independent of having an active DPC in the county
Hypothesis(alternate)	The level of Damage Prevention within a county is dependent on having an active DPC in the county

Contingency Table: Constructed from County Table 2, 2009 Damage Prevention Metric

	Above Median	Below Median	Below Median	ColSum
Counties w/ No DPC	13	23	20	56
Counties w/ DPC	0	2	6	8
RowSum	13	25	26	64
Expected Frequency	11.38	21.88	22.75	
Expected Frequency	1.63	3.13	3.25	
Chi Squared Value	0.23	0.06	0.33	**Chi Sum**
Chi Squared Value	1.63	0.41	2.33	4.98

	DoF (R-1)(C-1)	2
Right Tailed alpha	90.0% Confidence Level, @=0.10	0.100
Critical Value @		4.650
IF 4.98 > 4.65	True, So Reject H(null) in favor of H(alternate)	

The conclusion, with a Confidence Level of only 90.0%, is that there is enough evidence to support the claim statement that counties with an active DPC have better (lower than the historical reference metric) levels of damage prevention than counties without an active DPC. Creating and supporting DPCs and public awareness programs is an effective method to improve damage prevention.

A review of County Table 2 provides an intuitive sense that this statement is true. The Chi-square Independence of Variables Test just confirms that the actual data supports the claim. A similar test of the eight counties with DPCs in 2004 reached a similar conclusion.

COUNTY	Year	2004 Damage Metric Adj Damages per 1000 Tickets(DenAdj)
Montezuma	2004	62.062
Moffat	2004	55.820
Ouray	2004	45.659
Alamosa	2004	33.904
Grand	2004	29.943
Gunnison	2004	26.997
Costilla	2004	26.458
Lincoln	2004	23.632
Summit	2004	22.383
Logan	2004	22.171
Pitkin	2004	21.926
Garfield	2004	20.485
Hinsdale	2004	19.219
Conejos	2004	18.795
San Miguel	2004	18.581
Dolores	2004	16.698
La Plata	2004	16.684
Mesa	2004	16.643
Fremont	2004	15.197
Bent	2004	14.656
Huerfano	2004	14.559
Eagle	2004	14.485
Chaffee	2004	13.680
Lake	2004	13.505
San Juan	2004	13.236
Elbert	2004	12.854
Pueblo	2004	10.703
Sedgwick	2004	10.251
Las Animas	2004	10.150
El Paso	2004	9.207
Montrose	2004	9.084
Gilpin	2004	8.997
Rio Grande	2004	8.502
Larimer	2004	8.356
Morgan	2004	8.327
Teller	2004	8.074
Broomfield	2004	7.928
Delta	2004	7.738
Crowley	2004	7.540
Rio Blanco	2004	7.081
Boulder	2004	6.395
Weld	2004	6.356
Jefferson	2004	6.353
Arapahoe	2004	6.327
Otero	2004	6.156
Denver	2004	5.900
Phillips	2004	5.716
Mineral	2004	4.617
Jackson	2004	4.566
Douglas	2004	3.918
Washington	2004	3.431
Adams	2004	3.384
Routt	2004	3.313
Clear Creek	2004	2.939
Saguache	2004	2.889
Archuleta	2004	2.642
Custer	2004	2.490
Park	2004	2.184
Baca	2004	1.564
Kit Carson	2004	1.549
Prowers	2004	0.699
Yuma	2004	0.495
Cheyenne	2004	0.000
Kiowa	2004	0.000

COUNTY	Year	2009 Damage Metric Adj Damages per 1000 Tickets(DenAdj)
Dolores	2009	41.237
San Juan	2009	25.434
Pitkin	2009	25.007
Routt	2009	20.581
Cheyenne	2009	18.420
Hinsdale	2009	17.697
Grand	2009	15.478
Alamosa	2009	14.784
Phillips	2009	14.265
Costilla	2009	13.219
Lincoln	2009	13.014
Elbert	2009	12.030
Montezuma	2009	11.911
Montrose	2009	10.468
Park	2009	10.450
Gunnison	2009	10.237
Pueblo	2009	9.619
Chaffee	2009	9.480
Fremont	2009	9.296
Delta	2009	9.275
Eagle	2009	8.860
San Miguel	2009	8.625
Rio Grande	2009	8.573
Kiowa	2009	8.185
Summit	2009	7.810
Garfield	2009	7.748
Moffat	2009	7.488
Ouray	2009	6.718
Las Animas	2009	5.966
Mesa	2009	5.915
Otero	2009	5.825
Mineral	2009	5.628
El Paso	2009	5.476
Jackson	2009	5.468
Logan	2009	5.294
Huerfano	2009	5.113
La Plata	2009	3.944
Weld	2009	3.773
Lake	2009	3.716
Sedgwick	2009	3.434
Douglas	2009	3.351
Morgan	2009	3.179
Bent	2009	3.137
Larimer	2009	3.009
Kit Carson	2009	2.758
Jefferson	2009	2.588
Prowers	2009	2.477
Baca	2009	2.364
Adams	2009	2.237
Saguache	2009	2.072
Arapahoe	2009	2.064
Boulder	2009	1.984
Clear Creek	2009	1.889
Conejos	2009	1.873
Custer	2009	1.830
Teller	2009	1.777
Broomfield	2009	1.542
Denver	2009	1.325
Yuma	2009	0.952
Gilpin	2009	0.715
Archuleta	2009	0.555
Rio Blanco	2009	0.309
Crowley	2009	0.000
Washington	2009	0.000

County Table 2
2004 and 2009 Damage Prevention Metric sorted by decreasing Damage Prevention Metric

Dark Green Shading:
8 Counties with a DPC that existed in 2004

Blue Shading:
16 Counties with a DPC created in 2007 - 2009

Descriptive Statistics

Measure	2004	2009
Lowest	0.000	0.000 (BestLevel)
Average	12.751	7.491
Weight Ave	10.788	6.373
Highest	62.062	41.237 (Worst Level)

Note: Since the Damage Prevention Metric is a ratio of Adjusted Damages per 1,000 Density Adjusted Incoming Tickets, these descriptive measures should decrease over time if damages are decreasing at a faster rate that incoming tickets are decreasing. This is why we use the 2004 damage weighted Damage Prevention Metric as a reference point. The dark line on the 2004 table between Elbert and Pueblo counties sets this metric level. The described test validates the influence of DPCs to impact lower levels of the Damage Prevention Metric.

The test utilizes only the eight counties (Dark Green) that have had an active DPC since 2004. Although 16 other counties (Blue) created and supported DPCs from 2007-2009, there has not been sufficient time for the impact of public awareness and stakeholder education to fully impact the level of damages in the county. Without formal proof, I estimate that about four years are needed for the impact to show up in the data. Additional time is needed to validate my statement.

C3) Effectiveness of Damage Prevention Efforts – Improvement in Damage Metric

Effectiveness is measured by having a statistically significant decrease in the Damage Prevention Metric from 2004 to 2009 for each county. Whether a county had a DPC or not is not part of the test. The test of the effectiveness will determine the difference in the Damage Prevention Metric from 2004 to 2009 for each county and then determine if the average change is significantly different from no change based upon the group size and metric dispersion of the group of counties. See County Table 3 on page 16 that lists the counties sorted by name along with the Damage Prevention Metric for 2004, 2009 and the difference between them. A t-Test of the Difference in Means for Two Dependent Samples will be used to test the claim statement.

Claim Statement:	The Damage Prevention Metric is significantly lower in 2009 than it was in 2004.
Variable:	The damage prevention level is measured by the Damage Prevention Metric: Adjusted Damages per 1,000 Density Adjusted Incoming Tickets. The test variable is the difference between the metric from 2004 to 2009.
Hypothesis(null)	If Damage Prevention did not improve, the Damage Prevention Metric should be significantly higher or the same in 2009 as in 2004 u(diff) >= 0
Hypothesis(alternate)	If Damage Prevention did improve, the Damage Prevention Metric should be significantly lower in 2009 than in 2004; u(diff) < 0
Statistical Test:	t-Test of the Difference Between Two Means for Dependant Samples The Mean Difference t-Test is constructed from County Table 3 which lists the 2004 and 2009 Damage Prevention Metric and (2009 less 2004) difference in metric for each county.

t Test Value		Expected Mean U(diff) < 0	(3.573)
Degrees of Freedom	= 64 - 1		63
Left Tailed alpha	99.0% Confidence Level, @/2=0.005		0.005
t Test Critical Value @	From Standard t Distribution Table		(2.576)
IF -3.573 < -2.576	True, So Reject H(null) in favor of H(alternate)		

The conclusion, with a Confidence Level of 99.0%, is that there is enough evidence to support the claim statement that the Damage Prevention Metric is significantly lower in 2009 than it was in 2004. We can assume that something has changed with the attitudes and habits of stakeholders in enough counties in Colorado to cause the positive change in damage prevention and a statistically significant reduction in the Damage Prevention Metric overall. The natural question to ask is whether creating and supporting DPCs and public awareness programs was the primary cause of this change.

A review of County Table 3 provides an intuitive sense that this statement is true. The t-Test of the Difference Between two Means just confirms that the actual data supports the claim.

COUNTY	2004 Damage Metric Adj Damages per 1000 Tickets(DenAdj)	2009 Damage Metric Adj Damages per 1000 Tickets(DenAdj)	Difference 2009-2004	(Difference 2009-2004)^2
Adams	3.4	2.2	(1.147)	1.315
Alamosa	33.9	14.8	(19.120)	365.569
Arapahoe	6.3	2.1	(4.263)	18.175
Archuleta	2.6	0.6	(2.087)	4.355
Baca	1.6	2.4	0.801	0.641
Bent	14.7	3.1	(11.519)	132.690
Boulder	6.4	2.0	(4.411)	19.461
Broomfield	7.9	1.5	(6.387)	40.789
Chaffee	13.7	9.5	(4.200)	17.636
Cheyenne	0.0	9.2	9.210	84.827
Clear Creek	2.9	1.9	(1.050)	1.102
Conejos	18.8	1.9	(16.922)	286.348
Costilla	26.5	13.2	(13.239)	175.280
Crowley	7.5	0.0	(7.540)	56.858
Custer	2.5	1.8	(0.660)	0.436
Delta	7.7	9.3	1.538	2.364
Denver	5.9	1.3	(4.575)	20.927
Dolores	16.7	41.2	24.540	602.201
Douglas	3.9	3.4	(0.567)	0.321
Eagle	14.5	8.9	(5.625)	31.639
El Paso	9.2	5.5	(3.731)	13.922
Elbert	12.9	12.0	(0.824)	0.678
Fremont	15.2	9.3	(5.902)	34.831
Garfield	20.5	7.7	(12.737)	162.222
Gilpin	9.0	0.7	(8.281)	68.582
Grand	29.9	15.5	(14.465)	209.232
Gunnison	27.0	10.2	(16.760)	280.904
Hinsdale	19.2	17.7	(1.522)	2.316
Huerfano	14.6	5.1	(9.446)	89.228
Jackson	4.6	5.5	0.902	0.813
Jefferson	6.4	2.6	(3.765)	14.172
Kiowa	0.0	8.2	8.185	66.990
Kit Carson	1.5	2.8	1.209	1.462
La Plata	16.7	3.9	(12.740)	162.317
Lake	13.5	3.7	(9.789)	95.823
Larimer	8.4	3.0	(5.348)	28.599
Las Animas	10.1	6.0	(4.184)	17.506
Lincoln	23.6	13.0	(10.618)	112.743
Logan	22.2	5.3	(16.878)	284.857
Mesa	16.6	5.9	(10.728)	115.094
Mineral	4.6	5.6	1.011	1.022
Moffat	55.8	7.5	(48.332)	2,335.984
Montezuma	62.1	11.9	(50.151)	2,515.113
Montrose	9.1	10.5	1.384	1.915
Morgan	8.3	3.2	(5.148)	26.502
Otero	6.2	5.8	(0.331)	0.109
Ouray	45.7	6.7	(38.941)	1,516.377
Park	2.2	10.5	8.267	68.336
Phillips	5.7	14.3	8.549	73.084
Pitkin	21.9	25.0	3.081	9.492
Prowers	0.7	2.5	1.778	3.160
Pueblo	10.7	9.6	(1.084)	1.175
Rio Blanco	7.1	0.3	(6.771)	45.851
Rio Grande	8.5	8.6	0.072	0.005
Routt	3.3	20.6	17.268	298.181
Saguache	2.9	2.1	(0.817)	0.667
San Juan	13.2	25.4	12.198	148.788
San Miguel	18.6	8.6	(9.956)	99.117
Sedgwick	10.3	3.4	(6.817)	46.471
Summit	22.4	7.8	(14.573)	212.382
Teller	8.1	1.8	(6.298)	39.663
Washington	3.4	0.0	(3.431)	11.774
Weld	6.4	3.8	(2.582)	6.669
Yuma	0.5	1.0	0.457	0.208

County Table 3

2004 and 2009 Damage Prevention Metric sorted by county, not the Damage Prevention Metric.

Dark Green Shading:
8 Counties with a DPC that existed in 2004

Blue Shading:
16 counties with a DPC created from 2007 to 2009

Light Green Shading:
47 counties with a decrease in the Damage Prevention Metric from 2004 to 2009.

Descriptive Statistics

Measure	2004	2009	Difference
Lowest	0.000	0.000	-50.151
Average	12.751	7.491	-5.403
Highest	62.062	41.237	24.540
Standard Deviation of Diff			12.097
Standard Error of Diff			1.512
Sum of Difference			354.814
Sum of Difference^2			11,807.274
Degrees of Freedom			63.

This test is based upon the difference from 2004 to 2009 in the Damage Prevention Metric for each county and does not consider whether there is an active DPC in the county.

From 2004 to 2009, 47 of 64 (73.4%) counties decreased (improved) their Damage Prevention Metric an average of 9.5 damages per 1,000 incoming tickets.
The remaining 17 (26.6%) counties increased (worsened) their Damage Prevention Metric an average of 5.9 damages per 1,000 incoming tickets.

The table below summarizes the change in the DP Metric for the 2004 DPC Group, the 2007-2009 DPC Group, the Group with no DPC from 2004-2009.

	#Counties Improve	#Counties Worse	#Counties in Group	%Share of Group	Ave Group Change
With 04 DPC	8.	0.	8.	100.%	-3.4
With 09 DPC	12.	0.	16.	75.%	-16.4
With 09 DPC	0.	4.	16.	25.%	+5.8
TOTAL	20.	4.	24.		
No DPC	27.	0.	40.	67.5.%	-8.1
No DPC	0.	13.	40.	32.5.%	+5.9
TOTAL	27.	13.	40.		

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

[If the project is progressing 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 that may impact 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 begins right away after the agreement is in place, other delays can be caused by personnel changes or simply having a better understanding of the effort required once the work is underway.]

There are no issues, problems or challenge to report

Mid-term Financial Status Report

[Per the instructions in Article IX, Section 9.03 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 mid-term 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 9.03 of your agreement: "During the performance of the grant, the Grantee must submit a mid-term Financial Status Report, Standard Form 425 (SF-425), to report the status of 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."]

The mid-term financial report has been sent as a separate attachment to the AA

A summary of the 2010 Grant budget, expense, funds available, hours used, and hours remaining is presented below.

2010 PHMSA Grant Funding Summary	Program Item	Budget	Expense	Available	Hrs Used	Hrs Remain
Ob1) DPC Support and Partnership	DPAT Support	2,750.00	0.00	2,750.00		
	Grant Administration	6,600.00	5,550.00	1,050.00	74.00	14.00
	Forum Facilitator	11,380.00	3,300.00	8,080.00	44.00	107.73
	Facilitator Travel	5,000.00	534.42	4,465.58		
Ob2) Public Awarenss and Education	811 Awareness Month	20,000.00	20,000.00	0.00		
	DPC 811 Awareness	9,900.00	3,699.77	6,200.23		
	DPC Education	8,350.00	3,582.47	4,767.53		
Ob3) DP Compliance Process-Integration	Forum Facilitator	3,510.00	1,237.50	2,272.50	16.50	30.30
	Portal Developers	6,000.00	6,000.00	0.00		
Ob4) DP Effectiveness Process	Grant Administration	5,000.00	4,968.75	31.25	66.25	0.42
DP Report Cards Process-Integration	Forum Facilitator	1,755.00	600.00	1,155.00	8.00	15.40
	Portal Developers	12,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00		
DPActivity Process-Integration	Forum Facilitator	1,755.00	600.00	1,155.00	8.00	15.40
	Portal Developers	6,000.00	0.00	6,000.00		
TOTAL		100,000.00	56,072.91	43,927.09	216.75	183.25

Plans for Next Period (Remainder of Grant)

[In most cases, this section should just mention your plans for the remainder of the project. However, if you need to change the workscope at all for any reason, including whether you need to modify, remove, or add items, please explain.]

Objective 1 Next Period Plans) - Foster Support and Partnership with Stakeholders

DPAT Support

- Fall DPAT meeting – October 2010

Grant Administration

- Prepare final grant report
- Prepare final grant finance report
- Review report cards and program effectiveness results with all DPCs

Objective 2 Next Period Plans) Support Public Awareness and Education

DPC Support

- Support for fall and winter DPC Public Awareness Programs
- Support for fall DPC Stakeholder and School Safety Education Programs
- Complete the construction building of the Dig Town education exhibit

Objective 3 Next Period Plans) Implement the Damage Prevention Compliance Program

Implement DP Compliance Program

- Complete development of the County DP Compliance module for the portal
- Test County DP Compliance module
- Roll out County DP Compliance module to stakeholders

Objective 4 Next Period Plans) Review the Effectiveness of Damage Prevention Programs

Integrate the County Damage Prevention Report Card module into the DP Portal.

- Start and complete development of the County DP Report Card module for the portal
- Test County DP Report Card module
- Roll out County DP Report Card module to stakeholders

Integrate the County Damage Prevention Activity module into the DP Portal.

- Start and complete development of the County DP Activity module for the portal
- Test County DP Activity module
- Roll out County DP Activity module to stakeholders

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 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.]

No actions requested at this time