

# FULL ANALYTICAL REPORT

## ITT Utility Challenges Survey Conference Responses Analysis

Based on 60+ response rows extracted from *ITT Utility Challenges Survey.xlsx*

---

### 1. Executive Summary

Across all three legs of the ITT stool — **INDOT, Consultants, and Contractors** — the same failure points repeat:

#### Top 3 Most Common Failures

1. **Utilities miss relocation schedules** (dominant response across the dataset)
2. **Conflicts not identified** (often tied to insufficient SUE, outdated information, or lack of early coordination)
3. **Communication breakdowns** (slow responses, no follow-up, email-only communication)

#### Top Structural Contributors

- Early-stage design misses or lack of SUE.
- Inconsistencies across districts or utility owners.
- No consequences for late responses or relocation delays.
- Overreliance on email (“send and forget”).
- Misconceptions that “the other party doesn’t care.”

#### Overall Insight

Every stakeholder attributes the root cause to *another* party. Nearly every group expressed the belief that another group either delays, doesn’t understand the process, or doesn't communicate adequately.

---

### 2. Cross-Question Themes

Across questions, several strong themes emerge.

#### Theme 1: Relocation Scheduling Is the #1 Failure Point

More than 25 responses explicitly state “Utilities miss relocation schedule” as the primary failure point or related barrier.

Examples appear in responses from Consultants, INDOT, and Contractors

### **Theme 2: Conflict Identification Is Too Late or Missing**

The phrase “Conflicts not identified” appears repeatedly as the failing step in the coordination process.

This correlates directly with requests for:

- More SUE
- Earlier SUE
- More accurate locates
- Master utility maps
- Earlier fact-finding by designers

### **Theme 3: Communication Failures**

Common patterns:

- Emails with no follow-up
- Slow response or non-responsiveness
- Poor or inconsistent contact info
- Misaligned expectations
- Not knowing who the correct contact is
- “Everyone thinks the other doesn’t care”

### **Theme 4: Inconsistent Processes Between Districts / Utilities**

Respondents repeatedly mention:

- A need for standardized UC schedule
- Uniform expectations for work plans
- Better alignment across INDOT districts

### **Theme 5: Lack of Accountability or Incentives**

Many respondents recommend:

- Penalties for missing schedules
- Incentives for timely relocation
- Legal/contractual requirements for utility responsiveness
- Consequences for inaccurate locates

### **Theme 6: Missing Stakeholders at ITT**

The most frequently mentioned missing groups:

- **Utilities** (far and away #1)
- **Utility representatives / owners**
- **811 locators**
- **Contractor utility subs**
- **Pipeline companies**

These counts are visible in the tool extraction

---

### **3. Detailed Question-by-Question Analysis**

Below is a distilled analysis tied to both response frequency and theme grouping, backed by the content of the file.

---

#### **Question: Who is missing today that we should invite?**

**Most common theme:** Utilities (dominant across all three ITT groups).

Utilities were referenced in over 20 different ways:

- Utility companies
- Utility reps
- Locators
- Specific companies (Duke, Comcast, AT&T)
- Pipeline companies
- 811 locators

Extracted counts show “Utilities” as the top response category

#### **Insight:**

This reinforces that the ITT conversation remains too agency-centric. Without owners of the assets present, coordination discussions are incomplete.

---

**Question: Which step of the UC process fails the most?**

**Top Failures:**

1. **Utilities miss relocation schedules**
2. **Conflicts not identified**
3. **Communication issues**  
Supported by extracted responses such as:
  - “Utilities miss relocation schedule”
  - “Conflicts not identified”
  - “Locates”, “Verification”, “Communication”, “Pre-construction coordination”

**Insight:**

All three legs observe the same failure but blame different root causes (design vs. utilities vs. INDOT processes).

---

**Question: What INDOT process change would have biggest impact?**

**Common Recommendations:**

- Earlier or more SUE (multiple responses including “SUE is always the answer”)
- Stage 3 earlier
- Front-loading environmental
- Improve turnaround time
- Provide more teeth behind Section 107
- More consistent UC across districts
- Allow relocations before letting

**Insight:**

Respondents see INDOT’s timeline structure as misaligned with the realities of utility coordination.

---

**Question: What information do contractors wish consultants provided earlier/clearly?**

**Top Needs:**

- Utility timelines / relocation schedules
  - Accurate existing utility locations
  - Conflict locations
  - Work plan status
  - As-builts
  - Elevations and depth information
- Extracts include “Utility timelines and as-builts”, “True completion dates”, “Total expected relocation time estimates”

**Insight:**

Contractors need earlier and more reliable data to plan constructability.

---

**Question: Would CMGC/Design-Build help?**

Responses were mixed — most rows show patterns like **Yes; No; Not Sure**.  
No clear trend toward consensus.

**Insight:**

Alternative delivery is not seen as a silver bullet, though several respondents said “Yes” in relation to earlier utility engagement.

---

**Question: What misconceptions exist between stakeholder groups?**

Top misconceptions:

- “They don’t care.”
- “Other party is making things harder.”
- “Utilities know where their lines are.”
- “811 marks utilities.”
- “Their piece is quick/easy.”
- “Everyone else has unlimited resources.”

Recurring sentiment: **Each stakeholder believes the other lacks urgency or competence.**

---

**Question: What communication habit causes the most issues?**

Most cited:

- Lack of follow-up
  - Emails only / no phone calls
  - Slow responses
  - No consistent communication channels
  - Not attending meetings
  - “Decision makers not getting together regularly”
  - “Climbing the hierarchy too quickly”  
Supports extracted lines like “Emails not being read”, “No follow up”,  
“Unresponsiveness”
- 

#### **4. ITT Stool Leg Insights**

##### **Consultants**

Most common perspectives:

- Need earlier SUE
- Need better schedules
- Frustrated by slow utility responses
- Want more accurate information on conflicts
- Feel caught between INDOT and utilities

##### **INDOT**

Most common perspectives:

- Utilities miss schedules
- Need earlier design conflict identification

- Need better mapping
- Need utilities to attend field checks
- Believe utilities are unresponsive

### **Contractors**

Most common perspectives:

- Want relocations completed before construction
- Need better utility schedules and data
- Believe consultants miss conflicts
- Believe utilities lack urgency

### **Cross-Leg Insight**

All three legs see **the same problems**, but point to **different root causes** based on their role.

This misalignment itself is a coordination barrier.

---