
South Dakota Damage Prevention Improvement Program

Status as of March 15, 2011

Topics

- Historical timeline
- Elements 4, 5 and 9
 - Status
 - Best practices
- Audience Input

Historical Outline

- June 1, 2010 - PHMSA damage prevention characterization tool results
 - Ranked in top third of states
 - Not fully implemented in elements 4, 5 and 9
 - 4 - Partnership in employee training
 - 5 - Partnership in public education
 - 9 - Data analysis to continually improve program effectiveness
- June 3, 2010 - Opened Docket PS10-002
 - Investigate best practices for deficient elements via contractor
 - Survey Stakeholders
 - Recommend legislative changes if appropriate

Historical Outline Continued

- 8-16-10 - Hired Kendrick Consulting
 - Straw Man of best practices
- October 29, 2010 – Straw Man report issued
- October, 2010 – 2011 State Damage Prevention Grant Application submitted
 - Survey stakeholders
 - Straw Man best practices
 - South Dakota applicability

2011 Timeline

- With Damage Prevention Grant
 - April – December – Contractor stakeholder survey
 - December – Staff recommendation to commission on legislative changes, if any
- Without Damage Prevention Grant
 - October 2011 – Feb 2012 – Staff stakeholder survey
 - April 2012 – Staff recommendation to commission on legislative changes, if any

QUESTIONS

- Why did the PUC open a docket?
- Is a docket really necessary?
- Does the PUC intend to make changes to the current damage prevention statutes and rules?
- What is the PUC's goal?
- Isn't this SD One Call's job?
- How can I participate?

Element 4 (Employee Training)

- 4a – Multi-stakeholder training committee
 - Not Implemented
 - Current individual stakeholder responsibility
 - Best Practices to Consider
 - Coordinating Council or Damage Prevention Consortium
 - Third party training company
 - PUC Training Coordinator for all stakeholders

Element 4b

- Training curricula prepared, available
 - Partially Implemented
 - Pipeline programs reviewed
 - One Call – excavator training
 - Best Practices to Consider
 - Coordinating Council or Damage Prevention Consortium
 - Third party training company
 - PUC Training Coordinator for all stakeholders

Element 4c

- Training periodically evaluated
 - Partially Implemented
 - Pipeline programs reviewed
 - One Call – excavator training
 - Best Practices to Consider
 - Coordinating Council or Damage Prevention Consortium – trainee surveys
 - Third party training company– trainee surveys
 - PUC Training Coordinator for all stakeholders– trainee surveys

Element 4d

- Training tailored to data trends
 - No information on implementation
 - Best Practices to Consider
 - Coordinating Council or Damage Prevention Consortium – trainee surveys
 - Third party training company– trainee surveys
 - PUC Training Coordinator for all stakeholders– trainee surveys

Element 4e

- Training calendar for all stakeholders
 - No information on implementation
 - Best Practices to Consider
 - Coordinating Council or Damage Prevention Consortium
 - Third party training company
 - PUC Training Coordinator – webinars, on-site

Element 4f

- Training records are maintained
 - No information on implementation
 - OQ records for pipelines, no info on other stakeholders
 - Best Practices to Consider
 - Coordinating Council or Damage Prevention Consortium - develop system for all stakeholders
 - Third party training company - develop system for all stakeholders
 - PUC Training Coordinator – develop system for all stakeholders

Element 5b (Public Education)

- Establish strategic relationships
 - Partially implemented, needs improvement
 - Ongoing relations – nothing formal
 - Best Practices to Consider
 - Partner with organizations: AgExpo, SDPA, LEPC's
 - Partner with local vendors and suppliers: equipment rental firms, equipment dealers, fencing companies, ag supply stores
 - Partner with neighboring states: DigSafe New England example

Element 5c

- Strategic Marketing Plan
 - No information on implementation
 - Best Practices to Consider
 - Third party marketing campaign development
 - In-house marketing campaign – fairs, mascot, materials for schools, public service announcements
 - Partner with SD One Call and SDPA

Element 5d

- Stakeholders use field reps to provide education where/when needed
 - No information on implementation
 - Being done but no data
 - Best Practices to Consider:
 - Survey stakeholders
 - Mandate thru legislation
 - Provide incentives (reduced consortium fees) for stakeholders with field rep

Element 5 e

- Target audiences and their needs identified
 - Not implemented
 - Homeowner target audience poorly addressed
 - One Call training focuses on excavators
 - Best Practices to Consider:
 - Third party identification of target audiences
 - In-house committee to identify
 - Use training program insights to identify

Element 5f

- One call has documented public awareness, education and damage prevention program
 - Partially implemented, needs improvement
 - One Call Board but not documented
 - Best Practices to Consider:
 - Assist One Call in documentation
 - Hire third party to document
 - Task the One Call Board with documentation

Element 9 (Damage Prevention Program Review)

- 9a - Data analysis and program review used to improve program
 - Partially implemented, Actions planned for improvement
 - Call Center data used
 - Damage data missing
 - Best Practices to Consider:
 - Mandate use of DIRT
 - Collect performance measure data – repeat violaters, education program attendance, marking timeliness
 - Use Subject Matter experts
 - Develop SD specific damage reporting form
 - Collect and analyze spatial data using GIS

Element 9c

- Stakeholders report to DIRT
 - Partially implemented, actions planned
 - Voluntary reporting encouraged
 - Best Practices to Consider:
 - Mandate DIRT reporting
 - Punitive measures for failure to report
 - Require alternate reporting tool

Element 9e

- Analyze reported data to improve program
 - Not implemented
 - Best Practices to Consider:
 - Fully implement DIRT reporting
 - Adopt performance review approach
 - Method to feed data review back to training and education programs

Element 9f

- Damage report results quantified against risk factor
 - Not implemented
 - Best Practices to Consider
 - Develop lagging indicator metrics such as incident per mile, incidents per 1000 locates
 - Develop leading indicators such as # tickets, marking response time
 - Use subjective data to establish risk factors

Element 9 g

- Performance assessed against other organizations
 - Not implemented
 - Best Practices to Consider:
 - Use SD DIRT data to national data
 - Partner with similar states to assess baseline performance
 - Use Pipeline Performance Tracking System, INGA, NAPSR data for comparison
 - Partner with interstate operators to assess SD to other states

Element 9h

- Make reported damage data available to the public
 - Not implemented
 - Best Practices to Consider:
 - Put on SD One Call website
 - Develop lessons learned campaign
 - Develop SD specific DIRT report and make available

Audience Discussion Best Practices

- Do anything below work for Training in SD?
 - Coordinating Council or Damage Prevention Consortium
 - Third party training company
 - PUC Training Coordinator for all stakeholders

Audience Discussion

- Do any below work for Partnerships in SD?
 - Partner with organizations: AgExpo, SDPA, LEPC's
 - Partner with local vendors and suppliers: equipment rental firms, equipment dealers, fencing companies, ag supply stores
 - Partner with neighboring states: DigSafe New England example

Audience Discussion – Best Practices

- Do any below work for Reporting in SD?
 - Mandate DIRT reporting
 - Punitive measures for failure to report
 - Require alternate reporting tool

For Further Information

- Visit www.puc.sd.gov
- Click on Commission Information
- Click on Commission Dockets
- Click on Pipeline Safety Dockets
- Click on 2010
- Click on PS10-002