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Research Methods

- Target population: Washington State city and county planners
- Email contacts with web-survey link and unique login code
- Total qualified respondents N=85 (49% response rate)
- Survey included approximately 35 questions
Findings: Awareness

As far as you know, are there any transmission pipelines operating through or immediately adjacent to your jurisdiction?

- Definitely: 57%
- Probably: 12%
- Probably not: 13%
- Definitely not: 9%
- Don't know: 9%

N=93
Findings: Awareness

Are there currently accurate, up-to-date maps available to your planning department that show where the pipelines are in your community?

- Yes, definitely: 28%
- Yes, probably: 20%
- No, probably not: 27%
- No, definitely not: 17%
- Don't know: 8%

N=85
Findings: Awareness

How well are transmission pipelines in your community marked, so developers and property owners know where they are?

- Very well marked: 17%
- Somewhat well marked: 29%
- Not very well marked: 14%
- Don't know: 40%

N=85
Findings: Awareness

In your day to day work, how often do you encounter issues relating to transmission pipelines or pipeline safety?

- **Rarely or never**: 74%
- **Sometimes**: 25%
- **Often**: 1%

N=85
Findings: Awareness

How often has the growth of your community brought roadways, housing, business and industry within close proximity to pipelines in your community?

- Very often: 7%
- Somewhat often: 25%
- Very little: 35%
- Not at all: 17%
- Don't know: 16%

N=83
Findings: Awareness

How effective has 'Call Before You Dig' been in preventing damage to underground utilities in your community?

- Very effective: 43%
- Somewhat effective: 33%
- Don't know how effective: 23%
- Not very effective: 1%

N=83
Findings: Awareness

• 45% have additional protocols besides Call Before You Dig
  – Focus is primarily on notification of utilities and sometimes safety personnel (e.g. fire department)
  – Documentation emphasized on plans, locating existing utilities, and some use review processes
  – Three require notification of pipeline companies with some additional consultation mentioned in two of the three cases
Findings: CZ Effectiveness

How would you describe the planning department's relationship with Pipeline Operators in your area?

Don't know: 34%
Excellent: 6%
Very good: 16%
Good: 25%
Poor: 10%
Fair: 9%

N=83
Findings: CZ Effectiveness

Do you think Consultation Zones would be any more effective than what your community currently does to take pipeline safety into consideration?

- Yes, much more effective: 22%
- Yes, somewhat more effective: 37%
- No, no more effective: 17%
- Don't know: 24%

N=83
Findings: CZ Effectiveness

Whether or not you think they would be more effective, how willing would you be to propose adoption of Consultation Zones for your community within the next two years?

- Very willing: 16%
- Somewhat willing: 37%
- Not willing: 12%
- Don't know: 35%

N=83
Findings: Consultation Zone Size

How likely are you to consider adopting Consultation Zones using the recommended 660' area?

- Very likely: 12%
- Somewhat likely: 29%
- Not very likely: 22%
- Don't know: 37%

N=83
Findings: Time to adoption

- Most planners said that it would take up to a year to adopt Consultation Zones (71%).
- 92% thought it could be done in 2 years.
- The range for adoption was from 1 month to 96 months.

- In addition 95% have visited the MRSC website before.
Findings: Consultation Zone Size

How likely to consider proposing Consultation Zones if 660' area were changed to be...

- A reasonable average
  - Much more: 11%
  - Somewhat more: 68%
  - No more: 21%

- Customized to each pipeline
  - Much more: 19%
  - Somewhat more: 57%
  - No more: 24%

- A zone size more like other standards (50'-200')
  - Much more: 21%
  - Somewhat more: 47%
  - No more: 32%

N=57
Findings: Barriers

How likely are the following to be barriers to implementing Consultation Zones?

- Concerns that permitting will slow: 44% Very likely, 48% Somewhat likely, 8% Not very likely
- Concerns that permitting costs will increase: 43% Very likely, 48% Somewhat likely, 9% Not very likely
- Staff may not have time: 38% Very likely, 53% Somewhat likely, 10% Not very likely
- Proptery-rights advocates see a threat: 22% Very likely, 58% Somewhat likely, 19% Not very likely
- Not a priority for decision makers: 12% Very likely, 57% Somewhat likely, 31% Not very likely

N=75
Findings: Incentives

How valuable are the following incentives for implementing Consultation Zones?

- **Grant funding**
  - Very valuable: 66%
  - Somewhat valuable: 32%
  - Not very valuable: 3%

- **Sample ordinances**
  - Very valuable: 61%
  - Somewhat valuable: 36%
  - Not very valuable: 3%

- **Free technical assistance**
  - Very valuable: 54%
  - Somewhat valuable: 41%
  - Not very valuable: 5%

N=75
Findings: Messaging

Importance of Consultation Zone beliefs and knowledge items

Size of CZ area is seen as reasonable
- Extremely: 47%
- Very: 42%
- Somewhat: 10%
- Not very: 1%
- Not at all: 1%

Community focused and meets stakeholders needs
- Extremely: 38%
- Very: 42%
- Somewhat: 17%
- Not very: 3%
- Not at all: 1%

Does not impact planning staff authority
- Extremely: 30%
- Very: 36%
- Somewhat: 29%
- Not very: 4%
- Not at all: 1%

Explanation of risk compared to cost of implementation
- Extremely: 28%
- Very: 43%
- Somewhat: 21%
- Not very: 7%
- Not at all: 1%

Identify potential problems early in the permitting process
- Extremely: 28%
- Very: 49%
- Somewhat: 17%
- Not very: 3%
- Not at all: 3%

Do not require specific standards are met
- Extremely: 26%
- Very: 49%
- Somewhat: 17%
- Not very: 4%
- Not at all: 4%

Proactive approach
- Extremely: 25%
- Very: 51%
- Somewhat: 23%
- Not very: 1%
- Not at all: 1%

N=75
Findings: Messaging

Importance of Consultation Zone beliefs and knowledge items (potential message-related content)

- Size of CZ area is seen as reasonable: 47% Extremely, 42% Very, 10% Somewhat, 1% Not very, 1% Not at all
- Community focused and meets stakeholders needs: 38% Extremely, 42% Very, 17% Somewhat, 3% Not very, 1% Not at all
- Identify potential problems early in the permitting process: 28% Extremely, 49% Very, 17% Somewhat, 3% Not very, 3% Not at all
- Proactive approach: 25% Extremely, 51% Very, 23% Somewhat, 1% Not very, 1% Not at all
- Do not require specific standards are met: 26% Extremely, 49% Very, 17% Somewhat, 4% Not very, 4% Not at all
- Explanation of risk compared to cost of implementation: 28% Extremely, 43% Very, 21% Somewhat, 7% Not very, 1% Not at all
- Does not impact planning staff authority: 30% Extremely, 36% Very, 29% Somewhat, 4% Not very, 1% Not at all

N=75
Findings: Messengers

Who do you trust most to provide helpful and accurate information about implementing Consultation Zones? (N=79)

- Assoc. of Washington Cities or Counties: 46%
- Washington Utilities and Transp. Commission: 22%
- Pipeline Safety Trust: 10%
- Other: 9%
- America Planning Association: 6%
- Pipeline operators: 6%
- Pipeline & Hazardous Materials Safety Admin.: 1%
Findings: Messengers

Who do you trust most to provide accurate information about pipeline risks? (N=79)

- Assoc. of Washington Cities or Counties: 25%
- Pipeline Safety Trust: 22%
- Pipeline operators: 10%
- Other: 9%
- Washington State Fire Marshal: 5%
- Pipeline & Haz. Materials Safety Admin: 4%
Findings: Channels

Sources of information about zoning and planning initiatives (N=79)

- Professional planning association: 49%
- Other planners: 35%
- Professional periodicals/journals: 28%
- Conferences: 25%
- Other: 19%
- Regular news media: 18%