



**Date:** June 22, 2021

**Location:** Remote via Google Meet

**Present:**

	Chris Kampmann	✓	Jim Moody	✓	Patricia McKinney-Clark		Ted Jensen
	Dale Kishbaugh	✓	Lori Warner	✓	Patrick Fitzgerald		
✓	Dana Bijold		Mark Frasier		Ray Swedfeger		
✓	Jeannette Jones	✓	Mark Williams	✓*	Rob Ellis		

\* Indicates arrival after roll call . - indicates technical difficulties during roll call

**Note:** The meeting was recorded and started at 1:00 pm. These minutes represent a summary of this meeting and are not intended to be a verbatim document. Audio recordings of the meetings can be obtained by contacting [cdle\\_safetycommission@state.co.us](mailto:cdle_safetycommission@state.co.us).

**MARKING BEST PRACTICE**

- Follow up re: *Marking Standard Survey*
  - 180 responses (178 unique response; a couple repeat respondents)
  - APWA is slightly favored over CGA (52% of respondents), however pretty even.
  - Almost 70% of respondents stated that if the Safety Commission adopted a specific standard it would not negatively impact interactions
  - While APWA and CGA are used in most CO counties, there are a few counties that only use APWA or CGA.
  - Of the 180 respondents, there were only a few sets of responses from multiple people from the same company; however, they had some varied responses as to what they currently use.
  - The Commissioners discussed the results:
    - “company based marking standard” and whether or not it might include aspects of APWA or CGA - and the history of the internal document is unknown. While some Commissioners discussed this potential, others felt it was not based on anything other than putting colored paint on the ground. It might also be that companies exceed the standards of CGA & APWA which is why they referenced a “company based” option.
    - About 35% responded “unsure” or “none” (to which standard you use) - that is concerning and overall consistency is important - especially in color coding. Ultimately the person excavating needs to know what marks mean.
    - In looking at the “impact if the Commission designates APWA and CGA” - a majority said it would not negatively impact their operation. Commissioners discussed how they got to the point of potentially recommending something specific.
  - Commissioners discussed the need for consistency and whether or not operators need to explain their marks, or use APWA or CGA.

- Commissioners discussed which standard to use - APWA or CGA or a combination of the two. It was noted that CGA's document references APWA; due to publication dates that is not the case the other way around. A lengthy discussion ensued with support for incorporating a combination of both vs just referencing CGA (which then references APWA). The Commissioners present determined that CGA was the path forward.
  - No matter what, the color code will be APWA (referenced in Statute).
  - The Commissioners reviewed the # of times the current draft references APWA vs CGA.
    - One of the key areas CGA is referenced is "multiple utilities in a joint trench" - a comment was added to the draft document to determine next steps with this item.
    - Within the draft document the # of references to APWA and CGA are fairly similar.
  - The Commission re-reviewed the APWA & CGA comparison developed by staff for a previous meeting.
- ❖ Potential action item: Create a "reason to implement this best practice/why a certain marking standard was chosen" to help the industry see the value in this change - once the Best Practice is ready to be published.
- Follow up re: *CO 811 Positive Response Codes*
    - Codes -023, -008, and others that have "comments required" were discussed at the last meeting.
    - The Commission has been advised that some of the codes are being used in ways that delays work being done or contact being possible between both sides. With that in mind, what can the Safety Commission do to help with these issues?
    - A Commissioner that also participates in the CO 811 Procedures Committee shared that there are challenges with writing criteria for what comments should include, and what qualifies as adequate (e.g., is a text that gets no response adequate? What time of the day is ok?). Instead, the suggestion was made to look at whether certain codes should even exist.
    - While some personnel may use positive response codes to close a ticket when they shouldn't, there are also valid reasons to use said codes. The lack of communication or information provided in the comments is the challenge.
    - Positive response codes prevent an automatic renotification from being sent. It does not mean that the marks have been done.
    - The Commission looked at draft content; the issue of those that abuse the codes is a challenge in writing the best practice.
    - The Commission took a straw poll regarding whether to include language in the Best Practice about 'locates not being done on time due to staffing/time' - the Commission wanted to include language.
    - Staff was asked to share the draft language for this and the point about 'proceeding with care' if the utility can't be located with Commissioners to generate feedback and prepare new language for the next meeting.
- ❖ Potential action item: The Commission discussed writing the Best Practice, with current CO 811 positive response codes in place and potentially, in parallel, making recommendations to CO 811 to change positive response codes.
- Follow up re: *Draft Content*
    - CO 811 Access Statement included in the draft. The Commission had asked that the AG's office review this language. The AG's office is in support of including this language if the Commission wants to.
    - The Commission, in the remaining meeting time, reviewed various sections of the Best Practice.

## OTHER BUSINESS

- Members acknowledged the effort of Jeannette Jones in leading the group through this process.
- Members discussed potential topics for the next Best Practices meeting and assigned selves with action items.

The next meeting is scheduled for July 8, 2021.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 pm.