**Workshop Survey Summary**

**Background**

The Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (IURC) conducted an underground plant protection (UPP) workshop on Aug. 7, 2015. The purpose of this workshop was focused on determining next steps to be taken with the new UPP Account and its collected funds, established by Indiana Code 8-1-26-24. Pooling subject matter experts from various pipeline safety disciplines, including representatives from the pipeline excavation, operation and location community, allowed for increased transparency regarding the existence of the UPP Account and its statutory spending rules as well as allowed the IURC to take suggestions from a variety of pipeline safety experts.

The workshop itself was guided by LEAD Management Solutions, to ensure independence from the IURC as a regulatory body.

**Research Goals**

Research goals were threefold:

1. Determine participants’ feelings regarding the usefulness of the workshop itself.
2. Determine participant’s feelings regarding the quality of the management provided by LEAD Management Solutions during the workshop period.

**Methodology**

Project manager Darby Miller emailed Survey Monkey link and asked all 74 non-IURC registered attendees to participate in a survey with a maximum total, including questions using skip logic, of 17 questions. The survey was sent on 8/20/2015 and made available for two weeks. Participants were contacted a total of three times (the initial request and two reminders) over that period.

The majority of questions were scaled along five points from *Strongly Agree* to *Strongly Disagree* with a *Not Sure* option available.

**Key Observations**

The survey generated 36 responses, or a response rate of approximately 49 percent – a strong response rate for an external survey indicating participants are engaged and interested.

The vast majority of participants indicated they learned about the workshop by direct contact from the IURC (approximately 70 percent). Future outreach will continue to focus on collecting direct contact information and will look to improve other outreach methods.

Participants were closely split between excavators and operators (10/13 respectively) and those who indicated their specialization under “other” were included. However, there were few locator participants (3), which may skew results from the locating community due to a small sample size. Improved outreach to locators is needed to have a complete picture of pipeline safety.

**Summary Research Findings**

The workshop was viewed as a success. With very few outliers, participants found the workshop to be a good use of time and a valuable tool.

A per question breakdown\* follows:

\*Numbers rounded to the nearest whole

1. **What is your role in the 811 process?**
- 33 percent Identify as pipeline operators
- 22 percent identify as excavators
- 8 percent identify as locators
- 36 identify as *other* -- *Others* included: members of Indiana’s one call system, pipeline safety consultants, association members,
 excavators with multiple roles, and operators with multiple roles.
2. **How did you find out about the workshop?**
The vast majority of operators (83 percent) and 100 percent of locators were informed about the workshop through
direct contact by the IURC. Based on these overwhelming numbers, direct outreach will be the focus to inform
operators and locators for future meetings.

Excavators were not nearly as one-sided. Thirty-eight percent of excavators learned about the workshop through direct IURC contact, 38 percent learned about the workshop from a co-worker, and the remaining 25 percent of operators indicated *other*. *Other* write-in responses included two indicating the “South West Indiana Damage Prevention Council” one indicating “Indiana 811” and one indicating “all of the above” as the primary source of workshop information.
3. **Whose social media platform helped you find out about the workshop?**This was a skip-logic question. No one indicated *social media* as his or her primary source of workshop information. Therefore, no one was shown this question.
4. **I was provided sufficient notice to attend the workshop.**Of those surveyed, 100 percent of operators, 100 percent of locators, and 88 percent of excavators either *agree* or *strongly agree* with this statement. No attendee indicated a negative opinion. One excavator indicated *not sure*. The attendees overwhelmingly feel sufficient advanced notice was provided. Overall, when those who filed as *other* roles in the 811 process are considered, 97 percent of attendees felt they were given sufficient notice.
5. **The workshop was a valuable experience**Of those surveyed, 100 percent of Locators, 92 percent of operators, and 88 percent of excavators *agree* or *strongly agree* with this statement. No attendee indicated a negative opinion and only 1 operator and 1 excavator indicated *not sure*. Attendees appear to have found the experience to be valuable almost across the board. Overall, when those who filed as *other* roles in the 811 process are considered, 92 percent of attendees felt the workshop was a valuable experience.

1. **Would you attend similar meetings in the future?**

No attendee indicated he or she would avoid similar events in the future. Eighty-three percent of operators, 75 percent of excavators and 100 percent of locators indicated they would definitely attend future meetings. Two operators (17 percent) and two excavators (25 percent) indicated they would *maybe* attend similar meetings in the future. Overall, when those who filed as *other* roles in the 811 process are considered, 100 percent of attendees indicated they would definitely attend or they might attend future events.

1. **The questions were easy to understand.**

Overall, the attendees found the questions easy to understand with 89 percent indicating *agree* or *strongly agree* to this question. However, a closer look at the numbers does indicate a few discrepancies between the different types of groups. Although excavators, operators, and locators indicated overall agreement with this statement, excavators were far less likely to indicate *strongly agree* (13 percent) compared to operators (50 percent), or locators (33 percent).

Two excavators (25 percent) indicated d*isagree* and two operators (17 percent) indicated *not sure.*

Although they were in overall agreement, excavators had the most concerns with the questions that were asked during the workshop. Though results are still broadly positive, reaching out and working with excavators to craft questions may be beneficial to ensure the IURC is addressing everyone’s needs as thoroughly as possible.

1. **The questions led to useful discussions between stakeholders.**

All operators and locators indicated *agree or strongly agree* to this statement while 88 percent of excavators indicated agreement. One excavator (13 percent) indicated *disagree*. Again, this statement was far more likely to be answered *strongly agree* by a locator or operator. Only 13 percent of excavators *strongly agree* compared to 50 percent of operators and 33 percent of locators.

Overall, when those who filed as *other* roles in the 811 process are considered, 94 percent of attendees indicated the questions led to useful conversation.

1. **Minimizing the IURC’s presence at the workshop**

The IURC minimized direct participation in the workshop in order to keep conversation as honest and unbiased as possible. It was thought that having a regulator directly involved might skew the workshop’s results.

Although the majority of attendees indicated that the efforts to remove the IURC from the workshop *made no difference* (50 percent of operators, 63 percent of excavators, and 100 percent of locators), a significant percentage felt the effort was worthwhile and *encouraged honest debate* (50 percent of operators and 25 percent of excavators).

Only one excavator (13 percent) found that the decision to distance the IURC *made conversation harder*. This indicates that stepping back form the proceedings and using an independent moderator was the correct choice.

Overall, when those who filed as *other* *roles in the 811 process* are considered, 97 percent of attendees indicated the IURC stepping back and using a facilitator was a positive decision or made no difference to the outcome compared with only 3 percent who indicated disapproval.

1. **I felt my view was respectfully considered.**

All operators and locators indicated *agree or strongly agree* to this statement while 88 percent of excavators indicated agreement. One excavator (13 percent) indicated *disagree*. Again, this statement was far more likely to be answered *strongly agree* by a locator or operator. No excavators selected *strongly agree* compared to 42 percent of operators and 33 percent of locators.

Overall, when those who filed as *other* *roles in the 811 process* are considered, 94 percent of attendees indicated a respectful experience with three percent indicating *disagree* to this statement and three percent indicating *not sure.*

1. **The workshop’s format encouraged my participation.**

Overall, when those who filed as *other* *roles in the 811 process* are considered, 95 percent of attendees indicated *agree* or *strongly agree* to this statement.

Locators responded 100 percent positively, Operators 92 percent positively (with one operator selecting *not sure)*, and excavators responded 87 percent positively with one excavator selecting *disagree*.

1. **Directions by the facilitators were easy to follow.**

This was our second-lowest scoring issue. Although total approval of all participants was still 88 percent, nine percent of respondents selected *disagree* (2 respondents)or *strongly* disagree (1 respondent) for this statement. One respondent (3 percent) indicated *not sure*. Disagreement was spread between operators and excavators.

1. **The facilitator provided appropriate direction for the workshop at each stage of the day.**

This statement received our lowest score overall with 83 percent of respondents indicating a positive opinion. Nine percent of the respondents indicated a negative opinion and eight percent reported *not sure* to this statement. While 100 percent of Locators *agreed* or *strongly agreed*, negative opinions and *unsure* opinions were evenly present among operators, excavators and contractor association members, with excavators recording the only *strongly disagree* response.

Although the majority of attendees from all disciplines reported a positive experience with the facilitators, our single largest complaint was clarity of directions.

1. **The workshop’s format allowed sufficient time for discussion.**

Overall, when those who filed as *other* *roles in the 811 process* are considered, 92 percent of respondents indicated *agree* or *strongly agree* to this statement.

All locators indicated satisfaction with the 15-20 minute discussion period per question, while eight percent of operators (1) and 13 percent of excavators (1) disagreed with the time limit imposed.

1. **The facility was comfortable.**

The facility was considered comfortable by all but one attendee. Ninety-seven percent of respondents answered this statement favorably. One excavator indicated the facility was not comfortable.

1. **The lunch provided was**

The lunch provided was considered *better than I expected* or *as I expected* by 97 percent of attendees. One excavator indicated lunch was *worse than I expected*. Lunch provided by the hotel catering services appears to be seen positively.

1. **Please provide feedback about the workshop (open ended)**

Overall impressions of the workshop were positive and respectfully correlate with the responses preceding. Suggestions for improvement included:

* More time to discuss issues
* Opportunity to answer all question in the group setting
* Increased structure from moderators
* Questions which ask for more specificity/less generic questions
* More variety in attendees – include gas company reps.

**Recommendations**

Based on the survey results, future meetings should consider:

* Focusing additional efforts on contacting locators
* Drilling down to more specific questions regarding pipeline safety improvements
* Using a smaller group that would allow all participants to answer all questions and take more time on each question
* Using a facilitation style other than World Café

*Complete summary of survey results is available in* ***Appendix A***

*Detailed fill-in responses/other responses by anonymous participants available in* ***Appendix B***

*Responses broken down by identified role – excavator, operator, or locator available in* ***Appendix C***

**Appendix A – Complete summary of survey results**

Q1 What is your role in the 811 process?

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

**Operator**

**Excavator**

**Locator**

 **Other (please specify)**

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer Choices** | **Responses** |  |
| Operator (pipeline owner) | **33.33%** | 12 |
| Excavator | **22.22%** | 8 |
| Locator | **8.33%** | 3 |
| Other (please specify) | **36.11%** | 13 |
| **Total** | **36** |

Other (please specify)

* Contractor Association
* Consulting/Training
* Excavator and also a UPPAC Committee Member
* One Call
* Regulatory filing only when contact has occurred
* Pipeline Operator, Indiana811 Board of Director and UPACC Panel member
* State Consumer Advocate
* Research issues with locates requested
* Government
* One call marketing contractor
* All of the above
* Communications Provider operator
* Excavator and key damage prevention worker

Q2 How did you find out about the workshop?

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

 **Direct communication from IURC**

**IURC website**

**Co-worker**

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

**Social media**

**News service**

**Other (please specify)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer Choices** | **Responses** |  |
| Direct communication from the IURC | **69.44%** | 25 |
| IURC website | **2.78%** | 1 |
| Co-worker | **13.89%** | 5 |
| Social media | **0.00%** | 0 |
| News service | **5.56%** | 2 |
| Other (please specify) | **8.33%** | 3 |
| **Total** | **36** |

Other (please specify)

* SW Damage Prevention Council
* Southwest Damage Prevention Council
* Indiana 811
* All of the above

Q3 Whose social media platform helped you find out about the workshop?\*

**Answered: 0 Skipped: 36**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer Choices** | **Responses** |  |
| 811 (Holey Moley) | **0.00%** | 0 |
| Indiana Department of Labor | **0.00%** | 0 |
| OUCC | **0.00%** | 0 |
| Other (please specify) | **0.00%** | 0 |
| **Total Respondents: 0** |  |

**\*Skip logic question only displayed if participant selected “social media” as source of knowledge about the workshop. No participant selected social media.**

Q4 I was provided with sufficient notice to attend the workshop.

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** | **Weighted Average** |
|  | **58.33%**21 | **38.89%**14 | **2.78%**1 | **0.00%**0 | **0.00%**0 | 36 | 1.44 |

Q5 The workshop was a valuable experience.

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** | **Weighted Average** |
|  | **36.11%**13 | **55.56%**20 | **8.33%**3 | **0.00%**0 | **0.00%**0 | 36 | 1.72 |

Q6 Would you attend similar meetings in the future?

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Yes** | **Maybe** | **No** | **Total** | **Weighted Average** |
|  | **83.33%**30 | **16.67%**6 | **0.00%**0 | 36 | 1.17 |

Q7 The questions were easy to understand.

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** | **Weighted Average** |
|  | **38.89%**14 | **50.00%**18 | **5.56%**2 | **5.56%**2 | **0.00%**0 | 36 | 1.72 |

Q8 The questions led to useful discussions between stakeholders.

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** | **Weighted Average** |
|  | **47.22%**17 | **47.22%**17 | **2.78%**1 | **2.78%**1 | **0.00%**0 | 36 | 1.58 |

Q9 Minimizing the IURC's presence at the workshop

**Answered: 35 Skipped: 1**

 **Encouraged honest discussions**

 **Made conversation Harder**

 **Made no difference**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer Choices** | **Responses** |  |
| Encouraged honest discussion | **37.14%** | 13 |
| Made conversation harder | **2.86%** | 1 |
| Made no difference | **60.00%** | 21 |
| **Total** | **35** |

Other (please specify)

* I think the commission should be involved.
* I wish they would have had a maximized presence.
* I believe it was important that the IURC was not present for the discussion. Since there is so much passion around this subject and the agendas of the various stakeholders were so different, I believe there would have been some attempting to use this as an opportunity to pitch their agenda rather than consider possible solutions.
* I think you need to be present, I think you need to hear the truth.

Q10 I felt my view was respectfully considered.

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** | **Weighted Average** |
|  | **36.11%**13 | **58.33%**21 | **2.78%**1 | **2.78%**1 | **0.00%**0 | 36 | 1.69 |

Q11 The workshop's format encouraged my participation.

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** | **Weighted Average** |
|  | **38.89%**14 | **55.56%**20 | **2.78%**1 | **2.78%**1 | **0.00%**0 | 36 | 1.67 |

Q12 Directions by the facilitator were easy to follow.

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** | **Weighted Average** |
|  | **19.44%**7 | **69.44%**25 | **2.78%**1 | **5.56%**2 | **2.78%**1 | 36 | 1.94 |

Q13 The facilitator provided appropriate direction for the workshop at each stage of the day.

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** | **Weighted Average** |
|  | **19.44%**7 | **63.89%**23 | **8.33%**3 | **5.56%**2 | **2.78%**1 | 36 | 2.00 |

Q14 The workshop's format allowed sufficient time for discussion.

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** | **Weighted Average** |
|  | **25.00%**9 | **66.67%**24 | **2.78%**1 | **5.56%**2 | **0.00%**0 | 36 | 1.83 |

Q15 The facility was comfortable.

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** | **Weighted Average** |
|  | **47.22%**17 | **50.00%**18 | **0.00%**0 | **2.78%**1 | **0.00%**0 | 36 | 1.56 |

Q16 The lunch provided was

**Answered: 36 Skipped: 0**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Better than I expected** | **As I expected** | **Worse than expected** | **Total** | **Weighted Average** |
|  | **19.44%**7 | **75.00%**27 | **5.56%**2 | 36 | 1.86 |

Q17 Please provide any additional feedback about the workshop. \*\*

**Answered: 20 Skipped: 16**

* Looking forward to a summary of findings
* Very well done...should be helpful to the decision making process.
* Still a lot to do.. but a real good start...
* Great Job!
* A lot of the questions were too similar in nature. After lunch, going through everything that we had created in the morning I felt was not necessary and too time consuming and lead to frustrated participants.
* would have been nice to be able to comment on all \* did not like that one person had to stay at same table all day & that person was not able to comment on any other questions \* made me not want to be a "table captain" so I could participate at other tables \* did not like being told to only write "positive" comments to keep everything upbeat \* by its nature feedback comments are not always positive because there are 2 sides to every coin.
* A more balanced crowd would encourage a more equal outcome. Heavy presence from the operator side can skew the results.
* Need a bigger workshop and mix in the Gas companies with the excavators. The contacts are huge to help prevent dig-ins.
* Talked about the same stuff that's been discussed for 2 years. When is something going to happen? Don't waste money on focus groups just do something!
* A couple of the questions were vague as to the intended target. That may have been on purpose but made finding solutions difficult, at times.
* I felt the questions paralleled each other too closely, A broader base of questions should be considered. Also with that many SME'S in one room a preliminary research of targets may have directed more specific result in response.
* Many of the questions seemed very similar/redundant.
* It was hard to hear at times during the workshop.
* The workshop may have been more effective if there were specific questions that asked about potential solutions rather than focusing the discussion on the problems. Asking questions such as "How could the locate call in process be improved?" rather than "What information is required when calling in a locate?" would have produced better ideas rather than listing items that are already required and most in the room were well aware of the requirements.

Additionally, it seemed as though each question prompted the same discussion. Once again, this may have been a product of how the questions were asked.
* I got the sense that myself and many other people there had been in this type of knowledge work shop environment in the past, therefore making this a very productive day. I believe the point was made that all utilities have an impact on the environment and safety of people and property if their utility was damaged.
* Excellent opportunity for individuals representing different entities to meet and communicate.
* I have witnessed great strides in damage prevention both from excavators and facility operators. This must continue.
* There are a few myths out there that need to be "busted". I strongly doubt there is scientific or engineering evidence to support the claim that gas facilities change elevation underground significantly from the time of installation. There is little accountability for installation elevations of gas facilities and poor chain of custody of those records into "as built drawings."

Often the results of poor installation or violations of the minimum safe burial depth get unfairly passed on to excavators.

This creates mistrust.
* It seems the facility operators get a "bye" on failure to have accurate record drawings because "they just bought such and such company." and the "as builts" did not come with the sale. It still seems there is a sentiment that if we just "fix the excavators" most of the problems will be solved. I have evidence to disprove this sentiment.
* I look forward to a summary of the data and information being shared. This was an excellent way to get quality data from a group of industry experts. Well done.
* Need to communicate timeline for next steps. What the next steps are. How participants will be communicated with pertaining to next steps. For example, goal is to roll out program beginning 2016. Will recap all notes, committee will consolidate findings and make 3 recommendations. Recommendations are reviewed / announced with final feedback by x date. Will there be flexibility in the program to allow funds to be used on area's that appear to be successful or will it be divided equally for awareness, training, education, incentives? How will the IURC measure success of how the funds are allocated? I enjoyed being a part of the meeting and look forward to the success of this important program.

**Appendix B – Fill in and “Other” answers by anonymous participants**

**Q1: What is your role in the 811 process?** Other (please specify)

* Contractor Association
* Consulting/Training
* Excavator and also a UPPAC Committee Member
* One Call
* Regulatory filing only when contact has occurred
* Pipeline Operator, Indiana811 Board of Director and UPACC Panel member
* State Consumer Advocate
* Research issues with locates requested
* Government
* One call marketing contractor
* All of the above
* Communications Provider operator
* Excavator and key damage prevention worker

**Q2: How did you find out about the workshop?** Other (please specify)

* SW Damage Prevention Council
* Southwest Damage Prevention Council
* Indiana 811
* All of the above

**Q9: Minimizing the IURC's presence at the workshop** Other (please specify)

* I think the commission should be involved.
* I wish they would have had a maximized presence.
* I believe it was important that the IURC was not present for the discussion. Since there is so much passion around this subject and the agendas of the various stakeholders were so different, I believe there would have been some attempting to use this as an opportunity to pitch their agenda rather than consider possible solutions.
* I think you need to be present, I think you need to hear the truth.

**Q17: Please provide any additional feedback about the workshop.**

* Looking forward to a summary of findings
* Very well done...should be helpful to the decision making process.
* Still a lot to do.. but a real good start...
* Great Job!
* A lot of the questions were too similar in nature. After lunch, going through everything that we had created in the morning I felt was not necessary and too time consuming and lead to frustrated participants.
* would have been nice to be able to comment on all \* did not like that one person had to stay at same table all day & that person was not able to comment on any other questions \* made me not want to be a "table captain" so I could participate at other tables \* did not like being told to only write "positive" comments to keep everything upbeat \* by its nature feedback comments are not always positive because there are 2 sides to every coin.
* A more balanced crowd would encourage a more equal outcome. Heavy presence from the operator side can skew the results.
* Need a bigger workshop and mix in the Gas companies with the excavators. The contacts are huge to help prevent dig-ins.
* Talked about the same stuff that's been discussed for 2 years. When is something going to happen? Don't waste money on focus groups just do something!
* A couple of the questions were vague as to the intended target. That may have been on purpose but made finding solutions difficult, at times.
* I felt the questions paralleled each other too closely, A broader base of questions should be considered. Also with that many SME'S in one room a preliminary research of targets may have directed more specific result in response.
* Many of the questions seemed very similar/redundant.
* It was hard to hear at times during the workshop.
* The workshop may have been more effective if there were specific questions that asked about potential solutions rather than focusing the discussion on the problems. Asking questions such as "How could the locate call in process be improved?" rather than "What information is required when calling in a locate?" would have produced better ideas rather than listing items that are already required and most in the room were well aware of the requirements.

Additionally, it seemed as though each question prompted the same discussion. Once again, this may have been a product of how the questions were asked.
* I got the sense that myself and many other people there had been in this type of knowledge work shop environment in the past, therefore making this a very productive day. I believe the point was made that all utilities have an impact on the environment and safety of people and property if their utility was damaged.
* Excellent opportunity for individuals representing different entities to meet and communicate.
* I have witnessed great strides in damage prevention both from excavators and facility operators. This must continue.
* There are a few myths out there that need to be "busted". I strongly doubt there is scientific or engineering evidence to support the claim that gas facilities change elevation underground significantly from the time of installation. There is little accountability for installation elevations of gas facilities and poor chain of custody of those records into "as built drawings."

Often the results of poor installation or violations of the minimum safe burial depth get unfairly passed on to excavators.

This creates mistrust.
* It seems the facility operators get a "bye" on failure to have accurate record drawings because "they just bought such and such company." and the "as builts" did not come with the sale. It still seems there is a sentiment that if we just "fix the excavators" most of the problems will be solved. I have evidence to disprove this sentiment.
* I look forward to a summary of the data and information being shared. This was an excellent way to get quality data from a group of industry experts. Well done.
* Need to communicate timeline for next steps. What the next steps are. How participants will be communicated with pertaining to next steps. For example, goal is to roll out program beginning 2016. Will recap all notes, committee will consolidate findings and make 3 recommendations. Recommendations are reviewed / announced with final feedback by x date. Will there be flexibility in the program to allow funds to be used on area's that appear to be successful or will it be divided equally for awareness, training, education, incentives? How will the IURC measure success of how the funds are allocated? I enjoyed being a part of the meeting and look forward to the success of this important program.

**Appendix C**

# Q1 What is your role in the 811 process?

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

 **Operator**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
|  |

 Excavator

 Locator

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Operator (pipeline owner) Excavator Locator Other (please specify)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Operator (pipeline owner)** | **Excavator** | **Locator** | **Other (please specify)** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **100.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **52.17%** |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **0.00%** | **100.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **34.78%** |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Q1: Locator | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **100.00%** | **0.00%** | **13.04%** |
| 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| **Total Respondents** | 12 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 23 |

# Q2 How did you find out about the workshop?

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

 **Q1: Operator**

Excavator

 **Locator**

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Direct communication from the IURC IURC website Co-worker Social media News service Other (please specify)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Direct communication from the IURC** | **IURC****website** | **Co- worker** | **Social media** | **News service** | **Other (please specify)** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline | **83.33%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **8.33%** | **8.33%** | **52.17%** |
| owner) | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **37.50%** | **0.00%** | **37.50%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **25.00%** | **34.78%** |
| 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| Q1: Locator | **100.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **13.04%** |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| **Total Respondents** | 16 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 23 |

# Q3 Whose social media platform helped you find out about the workshop?

Answered: 0 Skipped: 23

! No matching responses.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **811 (Holey Moley)** | **Indiana Department of Labor** | **OUCC** | **Other (please specify)** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Q1: Excavator | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Q1: Locator | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total Respondents** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

# Q4 I was provided with sufficient notice to attend the workshop.

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

Operator

 Excavator

 Locator

0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 1.2 1.4 1.6 1.8 2

|  |
| --- |
| **(no label)** |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **41.67%** | **58.33%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **52.17%** |
| 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **37.50%** | **50.00%** | **12.50%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **34.78%** |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Q1: Locator | **100.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **13.04%** |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

# Q5 The workshop was a valuable experience.

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

Operator

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
|  |

 Excavator

 Locator

0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 1.2 1.4 1.6 1.8 2

|  |
| --- |
| **(no label)** |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **33.33%** | **58.33%** | **8.33%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **52.17%** |
| 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **12.50%** | **75.00%** | **12.50%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **34.78%** |
| 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Q1: Locator | **0.00%** | **100.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **13.04%** |
| 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

# Q6 Would you attend similar meetings in the future?

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

Operator

 Excavator

 Locator

0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 1.2 1.4 1.6 1.8 2

|  |
| --- |
| **(no label)** |
|  | **Yes** | **Maybe** | **No** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **83.33%** | **16.67%** | **0.00%** | **52.17%** |
| 10 | 2 | 0 | 12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **75.00%** | **25.00%** | **0.00%** | **34.78%** |
| 6 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
| Q1: Locator | **100.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **13.04%** |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

# Q7 The questions were easy to understand.

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

Operator

 Excavator

 Locator

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

|  |
| --- |
| **(no label)** |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **50.00%** | **33.33%** | **16.67%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **52.17%** |
| 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **12.50%** | **62.50%** | **0.00%** | **25.00%** | **0.00%** | **34.78%** |
| 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
| Q1: Locator | **33.33%** | **66.67%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **13.04%** |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

# Q8 The questions led to useful discussions between stakeholders.

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

Operator

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |

 Excavator

 Locator

0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 1.2 1.4 1.6 1.8 2

|  |
| --- |
| **(no label)** |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **50.00%** | **50.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **52.17%** |
| 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **12.50%** | **75.00%** | **0.00%** | **12.50%** | **0.00%** | **34.78%** |
| 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| Q1: Locator | **33.33%** | **66.67%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **13.04%** |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

# Q9 Minimizing the IURC's presence at the workshop

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

Operator

 Excavator

 Locator

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Encouraged honest discussion Made conversation harder Made no difference

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Encouraged honest discussion** | **Made conversation harder** | **Made no difference** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **50.00%**6 | **0.00%**0 | **50.00%**6 | **52.17%**12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **25.00%**2 | **12.50%**1 | **62.50%**5 | **34.78%**8 |
| Q1: Locator | **0.00%**0 | **0.00%**0 | **100.00%**3 | **13.04%**3 |
| **Total Respondents** | 8 | 1 | 14 | 23 |
|  | **Other (please specify)** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | 1 | 1 |
| Q1: Excavator | 1 | 1 |
| Q1: Locator | 0 | 0 |

# Q10 I felt my view was respectfully considered.

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

Operator

**(no label)**

 Excavator

 Locator

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

|  |
| --- |
| **(no label)** |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **41.67%** | **58.33%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **52.17%** |
| 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **0.00%** | **87.50%** | **0.00%** | **12.50%** | **0.00%** | **34.78%** |
| 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| Q1: Locator | **33.33%** | **66.67%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **13.04%** |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

# Q11 The workshop's format encouraged my participation.

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

Operator

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |

 Excavator

 Locator

0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 1.2 1.4 1.6 1.8 2

|  |
| --- |
| **(no label)** |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **25.00%**3 | **66.67%**8 | **8.33%**1 | **0.00%**0 | **0.00%**0 | **52.17%**12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **12.50%**1 | **75.00%**6 | **0.00%**0 | **12.50%**1 | **0.00%**0 | **34.78%**8 |
| Q1: Locator | **66.67%**2 | **33.33%**1 | **0.00%**0 | **0.00%**0 | **0.00%**0 | **13.04%**3 |
|  |
|  | **Q1: Operator (pipeline owner)** | **Q1: Excavator** | **Q1: Locator** | Total |
| **Other (please specify)** | **0** | **0** | **0** | 0 |

# Q12 Directions by the facilitator were easy to follow.

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

Operator

 Excavator

 Locator

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

|  |
| --- |
| **(no label)** |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **16.67%** | **75.00%** | **0.00%** | **8.33%** | **0.00%** | **52.17%** |
| 2 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **12.50%** | **75.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **12.50%** | **34.78%** |
| 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| Q1: Locator | **33.33%** | **66.67%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **13.04%** |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

# Q13 The facilitator provided appropriate direction for the workshop at each stage of the day.

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

Operator

 Excavator

 Locator

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

|  |
| --- |
| **(no label)** |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **16.67%** | **66.67%** | **8.33%** | **8.33%** | **0.00%** | **52.17%** |
| 2 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **12.50%** | **62.50%** | **12.50%** | **0.00%** | **12.50%** | **34.78%** |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| Q1: Locator | **33.33%** | **66.67%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **13.04%** |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

# Q14 The workshop's format allowed sufficient time for discussion.

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

Operator

 Excavator

 Locator

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

|  |
| --- |
| **(no label)** |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **16.67%** | **75.00%** | **0.00%** | **8.33%** | **0.00%** | **52.17%** |
| 2 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **0.00%** | **75.00%** | **12.50%** | **12.50%** | **0.00%** | **34.78%** |
| 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| Q1: Locator | **33.33%** | **66.67%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **13.04%** |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

# Q15 The facility was comfortable.

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

Operator

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |

 Excavator

 Locator

0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 1.2 1.4 1.6 1.8 2

|  |
| --- |
| **(no label)** |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Not Sure** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **58.33%** | **41.67%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **52.17%** |
| 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **12.50%** | **75.00%** | **0.00%** | **12.50%** | **0.00%** | **34.78%** |
| 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| Q1: Locator | **33.33%** | **66.67%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **13.04%** |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

# Q16 The lunch provided was

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

Operator

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |

 Excavator

 Locator

0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 1.2 1.4 1.6 1.8 2

|  |
| --- |
| **(no label)** |
|  | **Better than I expected** | **As I expected** | **Worse than expected** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **25.00%** | **75.00%** | **0.00%** | **52.17%** |
| 3 | 9 | 0 | 12 |
| Q1: Excavator | **25.00%** | **62.50%** | **12.50%** | **34.78%** |
| 2 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| Q1: Locator | **0.00%** | **100.00%** | **0.00%** | **13.04%** |
| 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |

# Q17 Please provide any additional feedback about the workshop.

Answered: 12 Skipped: 11

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Please provide any additional feedback about the workshop.** | **Total** |
| Q1: Operator (pipeline owner) | **100.00%** | **50.00%** |
| 6 | 6 |
| Q1: Excavator | **100.00%** | **41.67%** |
| 5 | 5 |
| Q1: Locator | **100.00%** | **8.33%** |
| 1 | 1 |
| **Total Respondents** | 12 | 12 |