

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

**Award Number:** *DTPH56-11-SN*

**Project Title:** *Kentucky underground Protection State Damage Prevention*

**Date Submitted:** *October 31, 2011*

**Submitted by:** *Tim Vaughn*

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

*Under this grant agreement, KUP will:*

- *Development and implementation of methods for effective communication*
- *Foster support and partnership with stakeholders*
- *Reviewing the adequacy of internal performance measures*
- *Support a Damage Prevention Education Program for industry stakeholders*
- *Laws and regulations of the damage prevention process*
- *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 on-call center, the enforcing agency, and the excavators have partnered to design and implement training for the employees of operators, excavators, and locators.*
- *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 review.*

**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.”)**

**“Law Enforcement Training Kit”**

*The project involved researching existing programs that have been developed by other states, creating the Kentucky Advisory Team, and working with law enforcement to determine what protocol needed to be followed, what content is needed, how to create it in a manner that has ease of access by the end-users and how to train the end-users. A cross-functional team was assembled which contains members from several stakeholder groups. The team researched what the “kit” should be i.e.: paper documents that are provided and/or reproducible, electronic forms that could be downloaded or a web based product. A visit was made to Florida to see the Sunshine State 811 web based product and meet with the developing programmers to discuss the lessons learned from their efforts. Visits were also made with training professionals representing the Kentucky State Police and the Kentucky Sheriffs Association. It became vividly clear that a web based product is the best option. This solution is far-reaching and provides for greater quality control of the data. Research determined that virtually all agencies have internet access in their primary vehicles, if not all vehicles, that have the ability to access the internet. Additionally, a web based product allows us to expand into other emergency responder groups with greater ease by simply expanding the data on the site. Discussions have been conducted with potential programmers and work will begin in January and will be completed in April.*

**“Development of Damage Prevention Councils”**

*Damage prevention councils are in the progress of being established in two areas of Kentucky that currently do not have organized utility coordination efforts; Paducah (western part of state) and Lexington (central part of the state). In addition to these councils focusing on the typical DPC discussions and material (enhanced communication between stakeholders, pre-construction coordination and damage review), these councils will be used as a platform to train law enforcement in their respective regions of Kentucky.*

*Kentucky currently has Damage Prevention Councils in Northern Kentucky and Louisville. The success of these councils can be directly contributed to each having a strong “Community Champion”, (Duke Energy in Northern KY and The Louisville/Jefferson County Damage Prevention Consortium). This model will be emulated in the western part of Kentucky by Atmos Energy and The Western Kentucky Construction Association (Division of the AGC) and in the central region by Columbia Gas of KY. Kentucky 811 has been working with these companies to lead the effort of establishing these two new councils.*

**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.”)**

*Since these projects are still in the development stages, it is difficult to gauge effectiveness at this point.*

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

*These projects are progressing on schedule. No delays are expected.*

*A huge amount of planning has gone into the end product of this effort. This upfront work should translate into substantial savings that will be realized on the programming and web designing costs. This project should easily be completed below the original estimates. The exact amount cannot be determined at this point.*

### **Mid-term Financial Status Report**

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

*At this stage of the project implementation spending has been very minimal. The bulk of the expense will be in development of the web based product. These expenses will be reflected in the final report.*

### **Plans for Next Period (Remainder of Grant)**

*The remainder of the program will be spent working with the web site programmer developing the program, testing and de-bugging.*

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

*No action requested at this time.*