

CHAPTER 9

Reporting and Evaluation Task Team Best Practices

9.1 CHAPTER SUMMARY

With representation from utilities, contractors, locators, one-call centers, and regulatory agencies, the Reporting and Evaluation Task Team was faced with a challenge to formulate best practices that are practical and useful for all stakeholders involved with damage prevention.

The main obstacle for the Team was to develop best practices for a process that is not universally used. The Team found numerous examples of reporting and evaluation practices, but a limited number reached a state-wide basis that fully included **all** stakeholders.

As a foundation, the Team used examples of practices that are currently utilized to develop best practices for reporting and evaluating damage prevention data. The Team also developed a sample form for reporting damage prevention information. The form represents a composite of the best reporting information currently being gathered by utilities, contractors, locators, one-call centers, regulatory agencies, and industry groups.

Once a baseline for reporting is established, data can be evaluated to create a continuous improvement environment for the mutual benefit of decreasing and eliminating damage to underground facilities.

9.2 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

The motivation for this project was to specifically identify those practices concerning reporting and evaluation that are most effective in preventing damage to underground facilities. The mission of the Reporting and Evaluation Task Team was, “To Develop Best Practices for Reporting and Evaluation of Data Relative to Damage Prevention Effectiveness and Damage Statistics.”

The Reporting and Evaluation Task Team established goals for the project. These goals included the following:

- Assure that input is received from each effected industry type (utilities, contractors, locators, insurance companies, one-call notification centers, and regulatory agencies).
- Define minimal/critical data reporting requirements.

- Recommend a data evaluation process.
- Produce ‘easy to use’ form(s) and methods for adoption.

9.3 TEAM MEMBERS

The Reporting and Evaluation Task Team was composed of individuals who represent groups having an interest in preventing damage. These individuals had previous knowledge of aspects affecting damage prevention, including collecting and evaluating damage data. During the project, Team members had the means and ability to communicate to the groups they represent. A brief biographical sketch of each Team member, that serves to validate their participation in the Study effort, is included in Appendix F, “Common Ground Study Team Member Biographies.”

Team Member	Representing²²	Employer
Dave Barnes	API, AOPL	Amoco Pipeline Company
Raul Bernal	NTDPC	Pacific Bell
James Book	Mississippi DOT	Mississippi DOT
Amy Brox, Co-Chairperson	NARUC	Missouri Public Service Commission
Ted Eynon	NULCA	Heath Consultants, Inc.
Ronny Jones	NUCA	Ronny D. Jones Enterprises, Inc.
Bill Turner, Co-Chairperson	OCSI	Tennessee One Call System, Inc.
John Zizolfo	AGA	Con Edison of New York

Others that participated in the Task Team’s discussions but did not participate in the consensus decision process include:

Team Participant	Representing	Employer
Donna Erat, Linking Team Liaison	APWA	APWA
John Healy, Steering Team Member	NTDPC	Telcordia
Angela Wallace, Emerging Technologies Liaison	OCSI	Utilities Protection Center, Inc. of Georgia

²² See Appendix D for a detailed list of acronyms.

9.4 DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATION PROCESS

The Reporting and Evaluation Task Team conducted a review of current practices concerning reporting and evaluation of data related to damage prevention. Existing damage prevention reporting and evaluation practices, processes, and forms were collected from major industry groups, including utilities, excavators, one-call notification centers, insurance companies, locating companies, and regulatory agencies. (The complete list of references assembled by the Task Team is provided in Appendix E.) This data was reviewed and evaluated by the Team during its meetings and served as the foundation for the issues and findings that are provided in Sections 9.5 and 9.6.

To objectively evaluate potential best practices, the Reporting and Evaluation Task Team established selection criteria. These criteria were considered before the Team reached consensus on any best practice. These selection criteria for best practices include the following:

- The practice is practical and useful.
- The practice is easy to implement.
- There is evidence that the practice works; the practice has been implemented by an organization.
- The practice promotes consistency between one-call notification centers.
- The practice is supported by industry.
- The practice is cost effective.

9.5 ISSUES IDENTIFIED

9.5.1 Purpose for Improving the Reporting and Evaluation of Data Relating to Damage Prevention

Several issues drive the need to improve the reporting and evaluation of data related to excavation damage prevention. At this time, few performance-based measures are available and useful for assessing excavation damage prevention programs. Existing measures are specific to selected states or industries, or are maintained by individual companies for a specific underground system. Data concerning underground damage for all types of systems is needed to:

- Determine if changes to state damage prevention programs are effective in decreasing underground facility damages.
- Assess the benefits of different practices followed by one-call notification centers.
- Identify the risks and benefits of different field practices used by facility owners/operators, locators, and excavators.

- Allow facility owners/operators to evaluate their company's excavation damage prevention programs.
- Assess the needs and benefits of training.
- Perform risk assessment for the purposes of business, insurance, and public policy decisions.

Reference: National Transportation Safety Board Safety Study: Protecting Public Safety Through Excavation Damage Prevention (NTSB/SS-97-01).

9.5.2 Issues that Define Data Reporting and the Evaluation Process

The Reporting and Evaluation Task Team defined several topics related to the reporting and evaluation process. These topics are delineated and discussed below.

1. Who should report facility damage data?

- To fully understand which problems need attention, each stakeholder involved in the excavation process needs to report the damage prevention information.
- There are few universal and comprehensive programs where all groups with an interest in underground damage prevention report qualified information on incidents that could have, or did, lead to a damaged underground facility.

2. What data should be reported?

- It is difficult to track and evaluate data that is not consistent. Not all companies, excavators, or states have a reporting program. Those persons who collect data are not collecting the same information.
- If the requested data on the form does not gather enough data, then the data cannot be properly analyzed.
- To prevent damage, it may be necessary to track problems before a hit has actually occurred. This data, strictly related to prevention, may be evident when near-misses or downtime have occurred.
- Excavators may be able to identify problems that will prevent future damage. A prudent excavator who continually encounters problems with the one-call system will find it beneficial to report those problems before damage occurs.

- Due to litigation or other reasons, some data may not be available at the time that the event is reported.
- Requested information, especially root causes, will change as the state's damage prevention program evolves and technology changes.

3. How do we get the data to be reported?

- There is no universally adopted standardized form or completion/returning methodology that has been distributed to all facility owners/operators, locators, excavators, and other appropriate stakeholders.
- Facility owners/operators, contractors and locators will need to be educated on how to submit information. This education can be provided by one-call notification centers and trade associations.
- To encourage the reporting of data, those persons providing the information need to be offered flexibility when completing the form. Current reporting programs offer this flexibility through several methods including providing self-addressed forms, offering fax numbers for returning completed forms, providing blank forms on a web page, or allowing an individual to report information over the phone by calling the one-call notification center or the state's commission.
- There is a limited number of formal requirements for damage reporting at local, state, or federal levels. Some states have reporting requirements, but not all groups with an interest in underground damage prevention, including contractors, are required to report qualified information. Some reporting of facility damage information is required at a federal level, but these reporting requirements are often based on monetary losses or fatalities.
- Often, companies that track damage prevention information do so at their own incentive.
- Incentives are needed to encourage stakeholders to submit the data. For example, stakeholders that submit information should know that their data will be used to promote better damage prevention.

4. Who should collect the data?

- Current programs that collect damage prevention data at a state level often utilize the state's commission or the one-call notification center.
- There are a limited number of comprehensive programs that use a centralized and independent organization or methodology to receive and accumulate completed

information forms from all groups with an interest in underground damage prevention.

- Whoever collects the data must have the resources to support the collection.

5. Who should evaluate the data and how should it be evaluated?

- Current programs that evaluate damage prevention data at a state level often utilize the state's commission or the one-call notification center.
- There are a limited number of comprehensive programs that use a centralized and independent organization or methodology to evaluate and publish evaluation data.
- Whoever evaluates the data must have the resources to support the evaluation.
- It would be beneficial for the evaluation to include recurring problems that have not yet, but may, lead to facility damages. This evaluation can be used to target public awareness/education resources, locate unmarked/abandoned facilities, identify stakeholders who are not performing well, or identify other problems with the one-call system process that can be improved before damage occurs.

9.6 FINDINGS

Reporting

1. All stakeholders report information.
2. Standardized information is reported.
3. Identify the non-compliant stakeholder.
4. Person reporting provides detailed information.
5. Requested information may change.
6. A standardized form is adapted.
7. The form is simple.
8. Training is provided.
9. Flexibility on completing and returning form is provided.
10. The form is one page.
11. Stakeholders complete the same form.
12. An organization is identified to receive the information.
13. The organization is able to interface with all stakeholders.

Evaluating

14. An organization evaluates the data.
15. The organization has representation from all stakeholders.
16. Data is used to improve damage prevention efforts.
17. Data is used to elevate underground damage awareness.
18. Data is summarized by key components.
19. Root causes are identified.
20. Results are quantified against a standardized risk factor.
21. Performance levels and trends are assessed.

9.6.1 Best Practices Associated with Reporting Damage Prevention Data

The following is a list of best practices related to the reporting of damage prevention data, as developed by the Reporting and Evaluation Task Team. Under each best practice is a list of references. These references were used as examples during the Task Teams discussions and may not be inclusive of all stakeholders that utilize the best practice.

1. All stakeholders report information.

Practice Statement: Facility owners/operators, locators, excavators, or stakeholders with an interest in underground damage prevention report qualified information on incidents that could have, or did, lead to a damaged underground facility.

References:

- API/AOPL Voluntary Accident Tracking Initiative.
- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
- Florida Sunshine State One Call.
- Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Pennsafe Bureau, Department of Labor and Industry.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.
- Tierdael Construction Company - General Contractors.
- United States Department of Transportation, Office of Pipeline Safety.
- Virginia State Corporation Commission.

2. Standardized information is reported.

Practice Statement: The requested data is standardized and consists of minimum essential information that can be analyzed to determine what events could, or did, lead to a damaged facility. This means that collected data should include damage information, downtime and near-misses.

References:

- API/AOPL Voluntary Accident Tracking Initiative.
- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
- Florida Sunshine State One Call.
- Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Pennsafe Bureau, Department of Labor and Industry.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.
- Tierdael Construction Company - General Contractors.
- United States Department of Transportation, Office of Pipeline Safety.
- Virginia State Corporation Commission.

3. Identify the non-compliant stakeholder.

Practice Statement: It is important to identify the non-compliant stakeholder (facility owner/operator, excavator, locator, or one-call notification center) so that this group can be targeted with education and training. It may not be necessary to pinpoint the names and addresses of the offenders for the purpose of improving the damage prevention program.

References:

- API/AOPL Voluntary Accident Tracking Initiative.
- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
- Florida Sunshine State One Call.
- Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Pennsafe Bureau, Department of Labor and Industry.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.
- Virginia State Corporation Commission.

4. Person reporting provides detailed information.

Practice Statement: If all of the requested data is not available, the person reporting the information provides the most complete information possible.

Reference: Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.

5. Requested information may change.

Practice Statement: Requested information changes as additional or different data is deemed necessary for the evaluation process. The report is revised, as needed, to adapt to the changes in the state's statutes, the evolution of industry technology, and the awareness of root causes.

References:

- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.
- Virginia State Corporation Commission.

6. A standardized form is adapted

Practice Statement: A standardized form is adopted and distributed to all facility owners/operators, locators, excavators, and other appropriate stakeholders.

References:

- API/AOPL Voluntary Accident Tracking Initiative.
- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Pennsafe Bureau, Department of Labor and Industry.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.
- United States Department of Transportation, Office of Pipeline Safety.
- Virginia State Corporation Commission.

7. The form is simple.

Practice Statement: Data is reported using a simple, standardized form. By limiting the number of hand-written responses, the information is easy to complete. Check-boxes or other simple answering techniques help the person reporting the information and make the evaluation process easier.

References:

- API/AOPL Voluntary Accident Tracking Initiative.
- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Florida Sunshine State One Call.
- Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Pennsafe Bureau, Department of Labor and Industry.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.

- United States Department of Transportation, Office of Pipeline Safety.
- Virginia State Corporation Commission.

8. Training is provided.

Practice Statement: Training and education on how and when to complete the form is made available.

References:

- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.

9. Flexibility on completing and returning form is provided.

Practice Statement: Flexibility is provided for both completing and returning the form. This may include providing self-addressed forms, web page forms, faxing completed forms, and/or telephone reporting.

References:

- API/AOPL Voluntary Accident Tracking Initiative.
- Florida Sunshine State One Call.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Pennsafe Bureau, Department of Labor and Industry.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.
- Virginia State Corporation Commission.

10. The form is one page.

Practice Statement: If possible, the form is limited to one page.

References:

- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Tierdael Construction Company - General Contractors.

11. Stakeholders complete the same form.

Practice Statement: If possible, facility owners/operators, excavators, locators, and anyone else involved in the damage prevention process complete the same form.

Reference: Virginia State Corporation Commission.

12. An organization is identified to receive the information.

Practice Statement: A centralized and independent organization is identified to receive and process completed forms.

References:

- API/AOPL Voluntary Accident Tracking Initiative.
- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Florida Sunshine State One Call.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Pennsafe Bureau, Department of Labor and Industry.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.
- United States Department of Transportation, Office of Pipeline Safety.
- Virginia State Corporation Commission.

13. The organization is able to interface with all stakeholders.

Practice Statement: The organization collecting the information is able to interface with all groups to promote completion and return of completed forms.

References:

- API/AOPL Voluntary Accident Tracking Initiative.
- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
- Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.

9.6.2 Best Practices Associated with Evaluating Damage Prevention Data

The following is a list of best practices related to evaluating damage prevention data, as developed by the Reporting and Evaluation Task Team. Under each best practice is a list of sources. These sources were used as examples during the Task Teams discussions and may not be inclusive of all stakeholders that utilize the best practice.

14. An organization evaluates the data.

Practice Statement: A centralized and independent organization, such as a Damage Prevention Committee, is identified to evaluate the completed forms and publish the data.

References:

- API/AOPL Voluntary Accident Tracking Initiative.
- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.

15. The organization has representation from all stakeholders.

Practice Statement: The Damage Prevention Committee, with representation from all interested stakeholders, is utilized to assist in the evaluation process.

References:

- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.
- Virginia State Corporation Commission.

16. Data is used to improve damage prevention efforts.

Practice Statement: The reported data is used to assess and improve underground damage prevention efforts.

References:

- API/AOPL Voluntary Accident Tracking Initiative.
- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
- Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.
- Virginia State Corporation Commission.

17. Data is used to elevate underground damage awareness.

Practice Statement: The reported data is not primarily used to penalized or punish; rather, it is used to elevate underground damage awareness through recommended training and education.

References:

- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.

18. Data is summarized by key components.

Practice Statement: The reported data is summarized by key components.

References:

- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.
- Virginia State Corporation Commission.

19. Root causes are identified.

Practice Statement: Root causes of damages or near damages are identified.

References:

- API/AOPL Voluntary Accident Tracking Initiative.
- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy.
- Virginia State Corporation Commission.

20. Results are quantified against a standardized risk factor.

Practice Statement: Results are quantified against a standardized risk factor. The risk factor considers an stakeholder's exposure to potential damage. This risk factor may be based on factors such as the number of miles of line installed or the number of one-call notification tickets. For example, a risk factor may compare how many underground damages occurred in a certain time period versus the total number of notification tickets issued.

References:

- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
- National Transportation Safety Board Safety Study: Protecting Public Safety Through Excavation Damage Prevention (NTSB/SS-97-01).

21. Performance levels and trends are assessed.

Practice Statement: Performance levels and trends are assessed against other organizations.

References:

- API/AOPL Voluntary Accident Tracking Initiative.
- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.

9.6.3 Sample Form for Reporting Damage Prevention Information

Using the best practices from one-call notification center, regulatory agency, facility, locator, excavator, and industry group report forms, the Reporting and Evaluation Task Team drafted a sample report form to demonstrate what data may be reported. This one page form would be used to gather data from all stakeholders involved in the damage prevention process, including facility owners/operators, excavators, and locators. The sample report form is shown on the next page in Figure 9-1. Following the report form is a brief explanation of each part of the form.

The following list of references were used as examples during the Task Teams' discussions and the development of the composite report. These sources do not include all stakeholders that may report any of the same information shown on the sample form.

References:

- Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control/Call Before You Dig, Inc.
- Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc
- Florida Sunshine State One Call.
- Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy.
- National Transportation Safety Board Safety Study: Protecting Public Safety Through Excavation Damage Prevention (NTSB/SS-97-01).
- New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
- Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.
- Tierdael Construction Company - General Contractors.
- Virginia State Corporation Commission.

Figure 9-1 Damage Prevention Reporting Information

Provide the following information as completely as possible.

PART A – WHO IS SUBMITTING THIS INFORMATION

Who is providing this information? <input type="checkbox"/> Excavator <input type="checkbox"/> Locator <input type="checkbox"/> Facility owner <input type="checkbox"/> Property Owner <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	Name of the person providing information: _____
--	---

PART B – DATE AND LOCATION OF THE EVENT

Location of the excavation and/or damage (include city and county): _____	Date the damage or downtime occurred: _____
---	---

PART C – AFFECTED FACILITY INFORMATION

What type of facility operation was affected? <input type="checkbox"/> Telephone <input type="checkbox"/> Water <input type="checkbox"/> Petroleum Pipeline <input type="checkbox"/> Gas <input type="checkbox"/> Sewer <input type="checkbox"/> Cable TV <input type="checkbox"/> Electric <input type="checkbox"/> Steam <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	What type of facility was affected? <input type="checkbox"/> Transmission <input type="checkbox"/> Service <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
Is the facility owner a member of one-call? <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	

PART D – EXCAVATION INFORMATION

Type of Excavator: <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> Municipality <input type="checkbox"/> Railroad <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Developer <input type="checkbox"/> County <input type="checkbox"/> Occupant <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Utility <input type="checkbox"/> State <input type="checkbox"/> Farmer	Type of Excavation Equipment: <input type="checkbox"/> Explosives <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Tools <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanized Equipment type of mech equip: _____
Type of work performed: <input type="checkbox"/> Sewer <input type="checkbox"/> Storm Drain <input type="checkbox"/> Petroleum Pipeline <input type="checkbox"/> Fencing <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Signal/Sign <input type="checkbox"/> Landscaping <input type="checkbox"/> Gas <input type="checkbox"/> Steam <input type="checkbox"/> Curb/Sidewalk <input type="checkbox"/> Street Light <input type="checkbox"/> Bldg. Demolition <input type="checkbox"/> Driveway <input type="checkbox"/> Water <input type="checkbox"/> TV Cable <input type="checkbox"/> Transit Authority <input type="checkbox"/> Drainage <input type="checkbox"/> Bldg. Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Lot Grade <input type="checkbox"/> Electric <input type="checkbox"/> Road Work <input type="checkbox"/> Railroad Maintenance <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> Site Development <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	

PART E – NOTIFICATION

Did the excavator notify the one-call notification center? <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	If yes, provide the one-call notification ticket number. ticket number: _____
--	--

PART F – LOCATING AND MARKING

Type of locator: <input type="checkbox"/> Utility Owner <input type="checkbox"/> Contract Locator <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	Were the facilities marked correctly? <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
Were facility marks visible in the area of excavation? <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	

PART G – DESCRIPTION OF EXCAVATOR DOWNTIME

Did the excavator incur downtime? <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no If yes, how much time? _____	Estimated cost of the downtime: <input type="checkbox"/> \$0 – 5,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Over \$25,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$5,000 – 25,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
--	---

PART H – DESCRIPTION OF DAMAGE

Was there damage to a facility? <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	Estimated cost of damage and repair/restoration: <input type="checkbox"/> \$0 – 5,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Over \$25,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$5,000 – 25,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
Did the damage cause an interruption of service? <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no If yes, duration of the outage: _____	
Approximately how many customers were affected? _____	Number of people injured: _____ Number of fatalities: _____

PART I – DESCRIPTION OF THE ROOT CAUSE

What was the root cause of the damage, downtime, or near-miss?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Facility marking or location not sufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> No notification made to the one-call center
<input type="checkbox"/> Facility was not located or marked	<input type="checkbox"/> Notification to the one-call center made but not sufficient
<input type="checkbox"/> Facility could not be located	<input type="checkbox"/> Excavation practices not sufficient
<input type="checkbox"/> Abandoned facility	<input type="checkbox"/> Previous damage
<input type="checkbox"/> Incorrect facility records/maps	<input type="checkbox"/> One-call notification center error
<input type="checkbox"/> Wrong information provided	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Deteriorated facility	

PART J – ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If useful, provide additional information to describe the details of the event. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a sketch or photographs. • Provide additional written explanation. • In your opinion, what could have prevented this event?
--

The following is a short explanation of each part from the report form.

Part A - Who is Submitting the Information

The person providing the information is described. The name of person providing the information is requested to improve the legitimacy of the report.

Part B - Date and Location of the Event

The location and date of the event are requested so that multiple reports of the same event can be correlated. The location is also requested to track areas that may have a higher occurrence of a problem than another area.

Part C - Affected Facility Information

The type of facility that was involved is described. This may be used to evaluate if a recurring problem involves one type of facility more than another. Facility terminology may vary.

Part D - Excavation Information

The type of excavator that was involved is described. This may be used to evaluate if a recurring problem involves one type of excavator more than another.

Part E - Notification

Requesting the ticket number helps limit duplications; if the same event is reported by more than one stakeholder then the forms can be correlated. This information also provides evidence that the one-call center was notified.

Part F - Locating and Marking

The type of locator that was involved is described. This may be used to evaluate if a recurring problem involves one type of locator more than another.

Part G - Description of Excavator Downtime

This part describes the downtime an excavator may incur.

Part H - Description of Damage

The part describes any damage incurred by a facility.

Part I - Description of the Root Cause

This part describes the root cause of the event. Care is taken when describing the root cause. For example, terms such as “miss-marks” or “line cut by excavator” are avoided. Many states may not be aware of their most frequent root causes because they have never had a reporting program in place. As root causes are recognized, this part is revised to include root causes that occur most often or warrant attention. A more detailed description of some of the root causes listed on the form is provided below.

Abandoned Facility: This event was caused by an abandoned facility issue. For example, the abandoned facility may have been located, instead of the active facility. Or, an abandoned facility may have been located, but it may have been found active after the excavation exposed the facility.

Incorrect Facility Records/Maps: Incorrect facility records or maps may have led to an incorrect locate.

Wrong Information Provided: This error may have occurred because an excavator provided the wrong excavation location to the notification center. Or, there may have been a mis-communication between two stakeholders.

Deteriorated Facility: An excavation disrupts the soil around a facility and a failure results. However, the failure was caused by the deterioration of the facility and not the excavation.

Notification to the One-Call Center Made But Not Sufficient: The excavator contacted the one-call notification center but did not provide complete information, or the excavator may not have given sufficient lead time notification according to state law.

Excavation Practices Not Sufficient: The excavator did not use proper care or follow the correct procedures when excavating near a facility.

Previous Damage: A significant amount of time has passed between the time the damage occurred to a facility and the time when the damage was found.

Part J - Additional Information

The final section of the report requests that the person reporting the information provide any additional details that may be useful. Especially important to improving damage prevention is asking the person reporting the information to describe what could have prevented the event.

9.7 MEASURING IMPROVEMENTS

Measuring improvements which may result from the implementation of these best practices can be viewed in several ways. Initially, improvement measures will be evident as we move from having no uniform data collection process (there being no standard format and content to reporting and evaluating data) to promoting a common framework for collecting relevant data. Once the initial baseline has been established, data can be evaluated from many perspectives and steps can be taken to create a continuous improvement environment for the mutual benefit of decreasing and eliminating damage to underground facilities. This forum will encourage shared learning as well as enable the identification of specific target areas to enhance damage prevention efforts.

9.8 PATH FORWARD

Within a year after publication of the *Common Ground: Study of One-Call Systems and Damage Prevention Best Practices*, it is recommended that an analysis be made on the implementation of the best practices concerning the reporting and evaluation of damage prevention data. The effectiveness of the best practices would be measured on its value to the damage prevention community, and its effect on actually reducing underground facility damages. The analysis would measure the use and significance of the Damage Prevention Reporting Form, and the successes or failures associated with collecting and evaluating field damage data. Revisions should be made to the process if it is determined to be necessary.

Future recommendations to encourage consistent damage reporting may include establishing state specific goals. This may include implementing incentive programs to reward and recognize those states, agencies, companies, or individuals responsible for a program's success.

9.9 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Reporting and Evaluation Task Team would like to acknowledge the following persons:

- All industry and government organizations that supported this project by providing the Task Team members an opportunity to participate.
- Don Brown from CNA Commercial Insurance.