Summary: **File Specification**
Feedback ID: 500170
Created: 2006-04-24 14:14 MDT
Submitter: karen.butler@dot.gov, ph. 816-329-3835, of PHMSA
Assigned: 2006-04-24 15:13 MDT to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement

<div align="center">**Submitted Comment**</div>

```
Can we modify the File Upload Specification document to include to the user that you
can submit exact values for the following fields:
Excavator_Down_Time
Excavator_Down_Cost
Outage_Hours
Customers_Affected
Restoral_Cost
Number_People_Injured
Number_Fatalities?


If a user doesn't know this, this may be a big turn off before they have even tried
the ADL out.
```

Summary: **Data Grant Indentification**
Feedback ID: 500354
Created: 2006-06-16 05:41 MDT
Submitter: mikeshallow@UP.COM, ph. 402-544-0570, of Union Pacific Railroad Company
Type: Request for Enhancement

<div align="center">**Submitted Comment**</div>

```
Following up on our recent meeting and the discussions regarding a Reporting Agency
being provided the identity of those companies that have given that Reporting Agency
access to their data, how about adding a new "Action" button that would give the
company providing access to their data the option on making their identity known? This
way the CGA is not involved and eliminates the confidentiality concerns this committee
has labored on for so long.
```

Updated 2006-06-16 10:16 MDT by dhagberg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of Colorado

```
[Copying email feedback from Karen B. into this feedback item:]
Could we modify this request slightly?

Could we state that the identity is known to the reporting agency that they have
granted access to their data, and that this is only shown upon entering a damage
report? For example, their name only needs to appear to AGA when they have submitted a
damage report because the data grants shows who they are but it still won't answer the
question about how many have actually entered damages and this is the real question
for a reporting organization. So maybe the button that is checked is something like
"This company has entered damage reports and wish for the reporting organization to
know that." This would need to be reset for each company at the beginning of each
calendar year.

What do you think Mike?
```

Updated 2006-06-16 13:14 MDT by dhagberg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of Colorado

```
[copying in email reply from Mike Shallow <mikeshallow@up.com>:]

I would agree.
```

The current system attaches the company registration number for each record that is created. In my simplistic request each record that the Reporting Agency has access to would indicate by record not only the company registration number but also the company name. If I understand your modification there would not be any company number nor company name seen by the Reporting Agency for each record. Instead there would only be a summary table, perhaps shown on the Data Grants page, that indicates the following Company names have granted you [the Reporting Agency] access to their records.

The main point I am trying to make is to take the CGA out of the identification process. By leaving the identification process solely to the Company, the CGA will not have any liability regarding giving up a confidential source to a private company's incident records. It will be left to the Reporting Agency to educate their group to give access.

Updated 2006-06-16 13:15 MDT by <u>dhagberg@uncc.org</u>, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of Colorado
[Copying in email reply from Karen B <<u>karen.butler@dot.gov</u>>:]

Thanks Mike. I agree that the CGA needs completely out of that process.

Summary: RFE: emails when changes made on Data Grants screen
Feedback ID: 500353
Created: 2006-06-29 12:29 MDT
Submitter: <u>erikaa@commongroundalliance.com</u>, ph. 703-836-1709, of Common Ground Alliance
Type: Question/How-to
Submitted Comment
Question/suggestion from data committee meeting 6/14-15 (Lenexa)

"Should the administrator of a Reporting Organization get an email when another company grants them access?"

(no vote was taken by the committee)

Summary: Field defaults
Feedback ID: 500352
Created: 2006-06-29 12:38 MDT
Submitter: <u>karen.butler@dot.gov</u>, ph. 816-329-3835, of Pipeline & Hazardous Material Safety Administration
Type: Question/How-to
Submitted Comment
[Suggestion from Data Committee Meeting, Lenexa KS, June 14-15 2006]

For better usability, consider having a mechanism where DIRT can remember the user's default values for inputs on the DIRT form.

For instance, the user will likely be entering several damage reports, all likely to be entering from the same state (possibly same county), probably in date order, possibly with similar work performed and other selections.

Possible solution: for each user, remember their last selection(s) on the DIRT form.

Summary: add 'Emergency' to Type of Wrok Performed
Feedback ID: 500146
Created: 2006-06-30 10:46 MDT
Submitter: brian.toolet@mci.com, ph. 972-729-5536, of VzB
Assigned: 2006-06-30 13:29 MDT to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement

Submitted Comment

```
Need to add "Emergency" to this field with discussion. We might need to add this as it
may be a reason 'No Notification' was made.
```

Summary: Greater Youngstown Damage Prevention Council
Feedback ID: 500142
Created: 2006-07-27 10:05 MDT
Submitter: karen.butler@dot.gov, ph. 816-329-3835, of Pipeline & Hazardous Material Safety Administration
Assigned: 2006-07-27 16:42 MDT to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement

Submitted Comment

```
Category: Request For Enhancement (RFE)

Great request for continued usability study of the DIRT user interface.
A feature along these lines was built by the DIRT Engineers for the "CGA 811
Implementation Tracking software" on http://www.cga-811.com (as reference) where the
"Implementation Date" is tracked in this manner.
```

Updated 2006-07-27 10:05 MDT by karen.butler@dot.gov, ph. 816-329-3835 of Pipeline & Hazardous Material Safety Administration
```
The members of this regional CGA requested that a calendar drop down option be added
to enter any date fields in the tool.
```

Updated 2006-07-27 10:07 MDT by karen.butler@dot.gov, ph. 816-329-3835 of Pipeline & Hazardous Material Safety Administration
```
This idea was presented by Joe Dunlap, Council Chair and Bob Suttle of Ohio Edison
Company.
```

Summary: Modify Tool Choices to the following:
Feedback ID: 500137
Created: 2006-10-18 11:41 MDT
Submitter: karen.butler@dot.gov, ph. 816-329-3835, of Pipeline & Hazardous Material Safety Administration
Assigned: 2006-10-18 12:02 MDT to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Question/How-to

Submitted Comment
```
Please discuss with the team modifying the tool such that the following be considered:
1. Change Who is Providing the Information" to look like the following:

Electric
Engineer/Design
Equipment Manufacturer
Excavator
Insurance
Liquid Pipeline
Locator
Natural Gas
One-Call Center
Private Water
```

```
Public Works
Railroad
Road Builders
State/Federal Regulators (please note change)
Telecommunications
3rd Party (please note change)
Unknown/Other
```

2. After selecting "Insurance", "One-Call Center", "State/Federal Regulators", or "3rd Party" from the above menu, please add the following dropdown menu selections to the title "Submitting on Behalf of":

```
Electric
Engineer/Design
Excavator
Liquid Pipeline
Locator
Natural Gas
Private Water
Public Works
Railroad
Road Builders
Telecommunications
```

Updated 2007-03-06 11:53 MST by rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of Colorado
Update:

#185 was reviewed at March 6, 2007 by committee at Data Reporting Meeting in Orlando.

Request in Summary:
1.) Stakeholder Group: Change State Regulator to State/Federal Regulator
2.) Add new entry called '3rd Party'

If the user selects one of 'Insurance', 'One Call Center', or 'State/Federal Regulator'
Then a new drop down menu would appear that would include:
```
Electric
Engineer/Design
Excavator
Liquid Pipeline
Locator
Natural Gas
Private Water
Public Works
Railroad
Road Builders
Telecommunications
```

Group Discussion and decision on this request:
* The data drives education

The DIRT developers explained to the group what would happen if this change were to take place:

If the changes were completed as requested here is what would happen when the user chooses one of 'One Call Centers', 'State/Federal Regulators', 'Insurance' then the options in the new sub-pulldown menu would have all the existing entries of

```
Stakeholder pull-down as is with the exception of the following: 'Unknown/Other', 'One
Call Centers', 'Insurance', 'Equipment Manufacturer'.


*****
Summary
* * *
The direction is that a sub-committee will be assembled (Mike Shallow, Randy (El
Paso), Karen B, DIRT Dev. Team, and the statistician(s)) to come up with the best way
to implement this request. This group is tasked to come up with a recommendation to
implement within one month
* * *
```

Summary: Multiple Damaged Facilities

Feedback ID: 500133
Created: 2006-10-31 15:21 MST
Submitter: nathan.dyson@cusinc.com, ph. 402-403-1082, of Digger's Hotline of Nebraska
Assigned: 2006-10-31 15:32 MST to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement

<div align="center">

Submitted Comment
</div>

```
From a One-Call standpoint we run across Damage Tickets with multiple damaged parties
at times. We as the call center create a single ticket for both damage facilities at
this address. Would it be benificial to have the ability to report 'Multiple' Damaged
facilities under a single ticket within the DIRT tool?
```

Summary: Root cause analysis

Feedback ID: 500239
Created: 2006-11-01 14:19 MST
Submitter: mike.marrero@cusinc.com, ph. 402-334-8150, of Consolidated Utility Services, Inc
Assigned: 2006-11-10 14:24 MST to steven_blaney@dps.state.ny.us
Type: Request for Enhancement

<div align="center">

Submitted Comment
</div>

```
The 20 reasons listed for the cause of a damage is adequate for most stakeholders and
it makes the data entry process less of a hassle for most of them. However, as a
contract locating company, we track our damages with more detail. For example we use
10 different categories with a total of 70 different reasons the damage could have
occurred. This in-depth data that is pulled from our web-based damage report creates
great root cause analysis reports. They will break a damage down to find our
weaknesses in a particular region to a supervisors group to a single technician. It
seems to me the contract locating group has a need for much more in-depth analysis to
help find where improvements can be made. I'd like to see the damages dig a little
deeper on the reason why they occurred. My only concern with the potential added
feature is... does it make the data entry process to DIRT more of a burden?
```

Summary: Virtual Private DIRT - add links to other Websites?

Feedback ID: 500275
Created: 2007-01-19 16:24 MST
Submitter: gloria.grev@swgas.com, ph. 702-876-7121, of Southwest Gas
Assigned: 2007-01-22 15:34 MST to dhagberg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement

<div align="center">

Submitted Comment
</div>

```
Good afternoon!
The chair of Nevada's CGA data sub-committee is interested in Virtual Private DIRT for
Nevada damage reporting.
Her question is:
```

```
Can links to websites such as USAN (Nevada's One-Call center) be added to Virtual
Private DIRT.
Or, what would the additional cost be?
Thanks and have a wonderful weekend!
```

Summary: **To be Discussed with the Committee**
Feedback ID: 500122
Created: 2007-01-22 08:04 MST
Submitter: karen.butler@dot.gov, ph. 816-329-3835, of Pipeline & Hazardous Material Safety
Administration
Assigned: 2007-01-22 10:09 MST to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement

<div align="center">**Submitted Comment**</div>

```
We will have the same situation in Nevada as the state will collect damage data and
submit to DIRT.

At that time, I would not upload Southwest's Nevada data to DIRT myself since it will
be included with the state's upload. I would simply sort out Nevada damages and delete
them from my Excel file and then upload the Arizona and California damages. This would
prevent duplication of my data in DIRT.
Thanks and have a great week!
Gloria :)
```

**Updated 2007-01-22 08:04 MST by karen.butler@dot.gov, ph. 816-329-3835 of Pipeline & Hazardous
Material Safety Administration**

```
I know that we have begun to adopt a policy for locking down the tool but at this
time, I am not sure exactly where we sit in that process so for that reason I am
asking that we discuss this potential enhancement as a way to assist us as a team in
data review.

Our existing data duplication does have challenges that we have not figured out yet as
indicated to us by our consultants reviewing the data. This promises to be come more
complicated not less as more data begins to be entered.

While at a recent CGA partnership meeting, the state of Kansas announced that it has
just implemented mandatory damage reporting to them (I believe as of the second week
in January) and then they will be submitting this data to DIRT. Some of the operators
are already submitting to DIRT so the only field that may be different is the
Stakeholder submitting the data but it could be several others in reality. The
operators in general indicated that they will not provide the ticket number and this
is currently not required in the Kansas State Law. So the thought occurred to me that
rather than making this difficult on ourselves to know whether or not this data is
reported in other states for example, or also by a one-call and a state regulator, or
also by a state regulator, a trade association and the individual reporting, that
maybe we should allow the person inputing the data to indicate if it will be reported
by more than one source and duplicates should be looked for within the data submitted
by a specific agency. This could mean two fields, "will this same event data be
provided to DIRT by any other source" and if the answer is yes, allow them enter by
whom. Of course it would be optional but this would also allow us to narrow down
duplications automatically in the event that addressing by some is not the same, root
cause is not the same and ticket number is not provided.

THIS IS FOR DISCUSSION ON THE TEAM ONLY and I am sure in advance that your solutions
will be much better.
```

**Updated 2007-01-22 10:09 MST by rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of
Colorado**

DIRT - OPEN FEEDBACK ITEMS - 2008-07-24

Thread Update: Jan 22, 2007 9:48 AM MST

From: "MIKESHALLOW@up.com" <MIKESHALLOW@up.com>
Good morning Karen,

I will try to provide some feedback on some of your questions and comments.

A policy for Data Retention, which will also impact the Lock Down policy, is moving
forward and should have some definitive proposals for the whole committee review and
direction at the Orlando meeting in March. Currently upon the lock down point for the
data reporting year, DIRT is closed and does not currently allow for data submissions
for past data reporting periods. Whereas the committee has previously discussed this
particular element, I am not sure we have completely settled the issue of "old" data
being allowed to be inserted within the tool.

I agree that future reporting years, in which more data is available, will indeed
become more challenging. I suspect it would be appropriate that a TASK Team be formed
to addressed that element.
One of the recommendations needed is how to address within future Annual Reports what
to do with known duplicate data.

At this time the DR&EC committee has agreed to lock DIRT down for any
additional software modifications. As you may recall, this was done to provide some
stability for new users. Perhaps, if a recommendation is proposed to make some type of
modification, we can address the situation at that time.

By all means if anyone else has additional thoughts lets discuss them
within this forum.

**Updated 2007-01-22 10:11 MST by rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of
Colorado**
Thread Update:
From: "steven_blaney@dps.state.ny.us" <steven_blaney@dps.state.ny.us>

For the lock-down policy, we're trying to limit revisions to the data fields so Users
don't have to keep changing their investigation procedures, re-issue field forms,
train people, etc. But we can still make software changes that are "behind the scenes"
or as Rudy says: "under the hood." Let's keep that in mind as we think of possible
solutions.

**Updated 2007-01-22 10:17 MST by rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of
Colorado**
From: Karen.Butler@dot.gov" <Karen.Butler@dot.gov
I think I did a poor job of clarifying my first concern ! sorry about that so let me
try again.

I wasn't sure that a problem like this should be submitted through feedback, through a
new form, or through some other means in order to get it discussed at the team
meeting. Since I have continued to see enhancement requests for the tool by others, we
obviously are accepting them and I thought by our policy would then review these on
some regular basis with the team. Based on the team discussion, an emergency change or
a planned change would be voted on and then a time frame established for the changes
if approved to be implemented (implemented simultaneously with training, user manual
and other revisions) Because of that, I wasn't sure how to officially submit this at
this time. I am not suggesting an immediate change to the tool and forgive me for not
being clear about that. I am however asking that we discuss it, that we potentially
encourage the use of the free form J field to record other data sources with this same
information that is being submitted (potentially separated by a ;) until we could
either approve to deny a change to the tool or revise our duplication detection. There

is no way the developers should be expected to keep track of what state is requiring
what and thereby automatically look for duplicates for that state. I just didn t know

how or by what mechanism we are supposed to be as members of the team submitting
issues for review, discussion and resolution. This wasn't clear to me at the last
meeting and I apologize.

Updated 2007-01-22 10:37 MST by rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of Colorado
Thread Update:
From:"steven_blaney@dps.state.ny.us" <steven_blaney@dps.state.ny.us>

Karen: Thanks for the clarification. You bring up an issue that I don't think we've
got a clear policy on - How should Committee Members raise an issue that needs
Committee discussion? As I see it, submitting a Feedback Item throught the tool is a
good way to get a dialog going, but the drawback is the Devlopers have to open up a
case that stays open for who knows how long. Maybe an alternative would be to create
an e-mail list or discussion page for Committee members to discuss these things, but
outside of the DIRT Feedback loop. That way the Feedback can be reserved mainly for
things like software problems, error messages when loading data, or needing a password
or Adminstrator name changed. Another (or additional) alternative could be to contact
a Co-Chair and ask for an agenda item to added to the next scheduled conference call
or meeting, but that leaves out the opportunity for dialog prior to the meeting.

Updated 2007-03-06 09:25 MST by rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of Colorado
Update:
Reviewed by Data Reporting & Committee Meeting March 6, 2007.

Rudy and D.J. agree to take a look at Fuzzy Matching in DIRT North America and
determine if there is anything that can be done to help.
Status to be reported back by the development team at the June 2007 Data Reporting &
Committee Meeting.

Summary: RFE: Extended Customization & Personalization of Virtual Private DIRT
Feedback ID: 500121
Created: 2007-01-25 10:21 MST
Submitter: rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069, of Utility Notification Center of Colorado
Assigned: 2007-01-25 10:21 MST to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement
Submitted Comment
Inserting as new Feedback & Support RFE discussion/focus item as we get into the
Virtual Private DIRT (VPD) deployments and attempt to create the "linkage" or
"connection" between the client's web pres. and their new Virtual Private DIRT
instance.

Virtual Private DIRT instances - Color Scheme Selection
1.) Extend customization of color scheme look & feel to the embedded body areas of the
DIRT user interface.
Example: Changing to Alabama Damage Reporting look & feel should incorporate the color
scheme throughout the software functional and presentation areas, i.e. table data
headers, rows, and everything currently done with Cascade Style Sheets today. The Site
Administrator of VPD would be able to select their color scheme and have the 4 hex
color pallette ripple through the *entire* application - instantly. Currently, the
color scheme is applied to the wrapper of either layout chosen.

The need is now apparent as we begin work to build & deploy the 4th Virtual Private
DIRT instance since December 2006. Creating the connection between the customer
website, i.e. missdig.org and their new Damage Reporting software is definitely
possible without this. The "disconnect" is in user experience of visual look & feel
consistency and potentially. We are aiming to provide the highest level of
professionalism in not only functionality, but also with user experience and look &
feel.

Current Virtual Private DIRT subscribers include:

Utility Notification Center of Colorado – J.D.
Alabama One Call – Annette R.
Michigan One Call – Kathy F.
NTDPC – Brian T.

Note: Alabama and Michigan came on board January 2007. Virtual Private DIRT for NTDPC
is currently underway.

Summary: Frequently Asked Questions link needed
Feedback ID: 500228
Created: 2007-04-17 11:29 MDT
Submitter: mikeshallow@up.com, ph. 402-544-0570, of Union Pacific Railroad
Assigned: 2007-04-17 11:53 MDT to mikeshallow@UP.COM
Type: Request for Enhancement
<div align="center">**Submitted Comment**</div>
For discussion by the DR&EC in Myrtle Beach in May, that we introduce into the DIRT &
VP DIRT screens a link to a FAQ database that can be populated with the questions
originally developed by this committee along with repeat questions currently fielded
by the DIRT Development team.

Summary: Please add box for extension in phone field
Feedback ID: 500091
Created: 2007-05-31 13:26 MDT
Submitter: bberzins@tnonecall.com, ph. 615-367-1110, of Tennessee One-Call System, Inc.
Assigned: 2007-05-31 13:26 MDT to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement
<div align="center">**Submitted Comment**</div>
Please add box to allow for extension in phone field area of DIRT (specifically, in
Feedback & Support).

Summary: Add photo & handheld submission
Feedback ID: 500087
Created: 2007-06-08 13:46 MDT
Submitter: wgkiger@pa1call.org, ph. 412-464-7111, of Pennsylvania One Call System
Assigned: 2007-06-08 13:48 MDT to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement
<div align="center">**Submitted Comment**</div>
Requests For Enhancement to DIRT North America & Virtual Private DIRT

* ability to upload a photo of incident, e.g. aerial photography

* submission to DIRT from GPS enabled handheld device, e.g. lat/long aware blackberry
device

Summary: Increase Ticket Number Field Length
Feedback ID: 500084
Created: 2007-06-20 11:59 MDT
Submitter: rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069, of Utility Notification Center of Colorado
Assigned: 2007-06-20 11:59 MDT to rudyg@uncc.org
Status: Open
Type: Request for Enhancement

<div align="center">**Submitted Comment**</div>

```
DIRT Support has received requests to *increase* the size of the ONECALL_TICKET_NUM
field from 16 in length to 26.

Currently, the application sets a maxlength value of 16 in the user interface (UI) and
is enforced in the business logic and at submission time. The change would affect the
three layers below and is very low risk in terms of tool stability.


User Interface
Business Logic (error checking and parsing)
Database Column size increase

This change can be put into place in the next release of DIRT North America if so
desired. The change would ripple down into the Virtual Private DIRT instances
automatically.
```

Summary: "No Damage" Funtionality/Documentation
Feedback ID: 500263
Created: 2007-06-21 10:05 MDT
Submitter: jdman@uncc.org, ph. 303-205-6301, of Utility Notification Center of Colorado
Assigned: 2007-06-21 10:37 MDT to dhagberg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement

<div align="center">**Submitted Comment**</div>

```
Consider adding functionality in the DIRT application to document "No Damage". The
suggestion would be to track on a yearly basis.

This functionally would allow users to communicate registration and use of the
application and document when no occurrences have taken place.
```

Updated 2007-06-21 10:52 MDT by rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of Colorado
```
The enhancement would be useful by all -- user community, dirt support, staticticians
and analysts, etc.

It would be nice to provide a quick screen that a representative (Company
Administrator) of the company/organization could visit and simply state - "No damages
to report for X year". This would give the DIRT Support Team a way of indicating how
many more data loads to expect, etc. It also provides end to end involvement, i.e. I
registered my Company with DIRT and I either report my damages or report that I have
none. The latter is assumed, currently if there a no (zero) records included in the
report. Alternatively, it could also be that the Company ran out of time and didn't
supply the data (deadline) or they ran into issues that prevented them from supplying.
For DIRT, this would mean "three buckets". The bucket of active submitters, the bucket
of companies that registered and did not have any data to report, the bucket of orgs
that we could then follow up with that have the data and are willing but have issues
in alignment.
```

Updated 2007-07-09 15:08 MDT by rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of Colorado

-- thread update --
Updating to document user community ticket open in Colorado VPD July 2007 with regard
to this topic.

Colorado Feedback & Support Ticket

Summary: No Damages
Created: 2007-07-09 13:09 MDT
Submitter: lbishop3@swbell.net, ph. 918-712-8828, of Williford Resources, LLC
Type: Question/How-to
Submitted Comment
Is anything further required? We do not have any damages to report?
Updated 2007-07-09 14:33 MDT by jdman@uncc.org, ph. 303-205-6301 of Utility
Notification Center of Colorado
If there were no damages to your facility in 2006 no further action is required on
your part. However, we are considering an enhancement to the tool that would
capturing/audit no damage occurrences.

Future correspondence from UNCC will address this issue.

Thank you,
J.D. Maniscalco
UNCC 303-205-6301

**Updated 2007-08-15 13:35 MDT by rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of
Colorado**
-- Ticket Update --
"No Damage to Report" functionality was discussed during the Colorado Springs,
Colorado Data Meeting on July 25/26 2007. The DR&E agreed for the software development
team to draft a proposal for addressing this functionality.

-- Development Team Update --
Proposal: Prop2007D-r01 has been drafted and is being finalized for delivery.

Summary: **What if we have no events to report?**
Feedback ID: 865348
Created: 2007-06-28 14:35 MDT
Submitter: sue@kci.net, ph. 970-522-8107, of Kentec Communications Inc
Assigned: 2007-06-28 16:13 MDT to dhagberg@uncc.org
Type: Question/How-to

How do I complete this form if we have no damage events to report?

**Updated 2007-06-28 16:22 MDT by vpdadmin@damagereporting.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of (virtual dirt
admin)**
Sue: Thank you for making the time to issue a Feedback & Support Ticket to communicate
your question. Currently, there is no action needed on part of your company/
organization if there are *no* records to submit to Damage Reporting. You probably
raise this question since you are based in Colorado where it is mandatory to report
under state law.

Moving forward, the DIRT software team has an open action item to follow up on in this
regard. The Executive Director [J.D. Maniscalco 303-205-6301 jd.maniscalco@uncc.org]
of Colorado's One Call Center [Utility Notification Center of Colorado] has open a
Request For Enhancement for DIRT that would allow an active Company/Organization to
indicate that there are no damages to report for the reporting period.

Stay tuned for updates on this in future version of DIRT (possibly).

Again, there is no action needed on your part if there are no damages/incidents to report. Thank you for contacting Colorado Damage Reporting Support Team and thank you for using DIRT!

This ticket will now be closed in Colorado's DIRT Tool and will be re-opened for tracking and follow through purposes in DIRT North America.

Summary: No Damages

Feedback ID: 865350
Created: 2007-07-09 13:09 MDT
Submitter: lbishop3@swbell.net, ph. 918-712-8828, of Williford Resources, LLC
Type: Question/How-to

Is anything further required? We do not have any damages to report?

Updated 2007-07-09 14:33 MDT by jdman@uncc.org, ph. 303-205-6301 of Utility Notification Center of Colorado
If there were no damages to your facility in 2006 no further action is required on your part. However, we are considering an enhancement to the tool that would capturing/audit no damage occurrences.

Future correspondence from UNCC will address this issue.

Summary: Virtual Private DIRT link to other documents

Feedback ID: 500065
Created: 2007-10-16 09:29 MDT
Submitter: steven_blaney@dps.state.ny.us, ph. 518-486-2647, of NYS Dept. of Public Service
Assigned: 2007-10-16 12:05 MDT to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement

Submitted Comment
I was demonstrating some DIRT features to some people and they asked a question that morphed into an idea for enhancement. This would probably apply more to VPD than DIRT North America - Would it be possible to have a link to other documents? For example, the User could scan a copy of a sketch of the damage area, a One Call Ticket, a memo or a photo, etc. Then when they go back in on the internet they can call up a record and have instant electronic access to these other pieces that are often part of a damage event file.

Updated 2007-10-16 12:05 MDT by rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of Colorado
Assigned to Support
Hi Steve: Yes, this is possible by way of an enhancement to DIRT North America (would ripple into VPDs as well) or on an individual VPD instance.

Currently, there are two OPEN RFEs that are requesting similar function:
#210 OPEN Category - Adding links to other websites
#294 OPEN Category - Adding photos (and handheld submissions)

We'll place your RFE #384 in the OPEN Category for further review by committee. The general pattern has been that the DIRT releases are being produced out of the OPEN category since the user community drives this area.

Thanks for the submission.

Rudy T. Gonzales
DIRT North America – Development & Support

Summary: **Cable TV Stakeholder Group**
Feedback ID: 500063
Created: 2007-10-16 19:18 MDT
Submitter: sherrieb@bluestakes.org, ph. 801-208-2113, of Blue Stakes of Utah
Assigned: 2007-10-16 19:19 MDT to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement

<div align="center">**Submitted Comment**</div>

Submitted on behalf of Sherrie Bowman of Blue Stakes of Utah.

DIRT Support fielded incoming phone call on DIRT Support line.

Blue Stakes of Utah is preparing for their own reporting and find the Quick Reports and Power Query Wizard useful in retrieving data. It is being requested that a new Stakeholder Group be created with DIRT North America to represent Cable TV. Sherrie advises that the current grouping of Cable TV into the Telecommunications Stakeholder Group does not allow for % (percentages) between Cable TV and a Telecom.

Rudy and Sherrie agree that there is a single color code in the industry that represents Phone and Television -- Orange.

Rudy shared that Cable TV can certainly be part of the overall report as it is a selection in a few places within the DIRT form, i.e. 'Type of facility operation affected' in Part C:, and also Part D: Excavation Information -- Type of Work performed.

Sherrie is not asking for a color change -- just consideration for adding an additional Stakeholder Group.

Conversation recorded in DIRT North America as Request For Enhancement.

DIRT Software Support

Summary: **User Guide Help in DIRT FORM - Tool Tip like per section**
Feedback ID: 500061
Created: 2007-10-25 12:57 MDT
Submitter: rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069, of Utility Notification Center of Colorado
Assigned: 2007-10-25 12:58 MDT to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement

<div align="center">**Submitted Comment**</div>

During the data meeting in Dallas it was suggested that the DIRT form have tool tip like help built in for User Guide assistance.

-----Original Message-----
From: Butler, Karen <PHMSA>
Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2007 9:11 AM
To: 'ebusiness@uncc.org'; cga_dr_tech@uncc.org
Subject: RE: [cga_dr_tech] DIRT North America - Feedback

I am not sure how best to add this to the following request but I believe it would save all of us time and effort if in the process of linking the DIRT Form to the USER Guide, we could also link it or supply the information for the associated field from the Specification Guide. This could help in making people familiar with it and they could just go to the tool and click on that

field to see what specification requirement may be awry. This could assist in new
users setting up data field collection information accurately. Just a thought. I think
if we design this option with this in mind now, it could save a great deal of work
later.
Thanks much.

--Update --
Karen: We've added your notes to the ticket for tracking the item. The comments/
updates you've added here make lots of sense. I believe that we'll look to design the
feature functionality in a way that will have the most impact while being easy to
support and update. Thanks for making the time to think through this. It's very
helpful.
--rudy g. -> DIRT North America - Software Team

--begin thread update--
From: Karen Butler
Date: 11/8/2007 8:15AM Mountain

I should have also indicated my thoughts for this in the previous email. I believe it
was a Marketing Manager from Anheuser Busch that indicated you need to look at
something at least 7-8 times before you get it. My thought is looking at it repeatedly
will help with recognition - the more you see it, the more you keep it.

Summary: Query Wizard: Industry Benchmarks
Feedback ID: 500052
Created: 2007-12-07 22:57 MST
Submitter: brian.tooley@verizonbusiness.com, ph. 972-729-5536, of Verizon Business
Assigned: 2007-12-07 22:58 MST to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement
                                Submitted Comment
-- original email thread --
From Brian Tooley <brian.tooley@verizonbusiness.com>

Based on comments from the DPC DIRT preso, please add "Industry Benchmarks" or
industry data available for stakeholders to compare themselves against in the Query
Wizard. This question was asked What is the benefit to me? We give, give, give data

and cannot measure ourselves against the industry!!! I responded that the data was
there in the annual reports. However, submitters should not have to wait until the
next report or have to go searching.

This concept has been discussed before; I believe Karen originally introduced it.

, this feature or benefit to the user should be added to the development !Road Map!
for 2008!!

Also, education and awareness is needed as several were not aware of DIRT and reported
that many others in their industry/locale were not either. Including that some One-
Calls were not promoting it at their safety meetings and such!

BST

-- Follow Up Thread
From Karen.Butler@dot.gov
Please, oh, Please make this possible. I have heard an additional request for it in
the past week.

Summary: **VPD Screencast/Flash Video**
Feedback ID: 500042
Created: 2008-02-11 15:03 MST
Submitter: Jennifer.codd@cityofmesa.org, ph. 480-644-4795, of City of Mesa
Assigned: 2008-02-11 15:03 MST to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Request for Enhancement

<div align="center">**Submitted Comment**</div>

```
Request For Enhancement: VPD Screencast/Flash Video of "Virtual Private DIRT in
Action ..."


Feedback and RFE received from Jennifer Codd at City of Mesa during our discussion of
Virtual Private DIRT. The "one pager overview" is just not enough information and City
of Mesa would like to see something in a demo/screencast format. This may potentially
be useful for others as well.
```

Summary: **Root Cause Suggestion**
Feedback ID: 901559
Created: 2008-04-30 06:14 MDT
Submitter: jame383@dom.com, ph. 330-301-1484, of Dominion East Ohio
Assigned: 2008-04-30 10:55 MDT to mikeshallow@UP.COM
Type: Request for Enhancement

<div align="center">**Submitted Comment**</div>

```
There currently is no root cause to describe an expired one call ticket.

"Expired One Call Ticket" - is an addition to the root cause list.
```

**Updated 2008-04-30 10:55 MDT by rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility
Notification Center of Colorado**
```
* * * Ticket Update From Email Thread * * *


From MIKESHALLOW@up.com
Good morning,


Thank you for your feedback regarding your question on Root Cause. When a One-Call
notification has expired it is to be considered the same situation as if you never
called in the first place. State laws dictate who long the ticket life is. When the
ticket expires the excavator must establish a ticket. Therefore as the applicable
choice please use as a First Level cause, One Call notification practices not
sufficient followed by the Second Level cause of No notification made to the one-call
center.
```

**Updated 2008-04-30 10:56 MDT by rudyg@uncc.org, ph. 703-229-6069 of Utility Notification Center of
Colorado**
```
* * * Ticket Update From Email Thread * * *


From James.M.Mandera@dom.com
Mike,


We have and will continue to utilize "No notification made to the one-call center" for
DIRT purposes, but the root cause is in fact different for an expired ticket vs not
calling at all. We have an internal system where we continually improve the root cause
descriptions, and this was identified as an improvement. I believe this addition would
add value to your system.
```

```
Thanks,
Jim Mandera
Damage Prevention Specialist
Western Shop
```

Summary: description for locator type "none"
Feedback ID: 956871
Created: 2008-07-16 16:38 MDT
Submitter: gc.morris@state.vt.us, ph. 802-828-4073, of Vermont Dept. of Public Service
Assigned: 2008-07-17 09:17 MDT to rudyg@uncc.org
Type: Question/How-to

<div align="center">**Submitted Comment**</div>

```
Often there is no locator related to a damage incident. Obviously an underground
facility does not get located if an excavator does not notify the one-call-center
regarding the proposed excavation. The choice should be NONE, because the information
is not DATA NOT COLLECTED or UNKNOWN/OTHER (see DIRT user guidance below). Should the
type of Locator category be left blank in these common situations? Will the upload to
DIRT accept a blank for this?
*Type of Locator:
See definition of "locator", in Glossary. Select one of the following from the drop-
down menu.
• Utility Owner: The locator is employed by the same entity that operates the buried
facility being located.
• Contract Locator: The locator is employed by a firm that performs locating services
on a contract basis for operators of buried facilities or others.
• Data Not Collected: The reporting entity does not currently collect this data.
• Unknown/Other: Select if none of the above apply. To distinguish from "data not
collected" - the reporting entity does attempt to capture this information, but in
this instance the type of locator could not be determined.
```