Date: May 12, 2022
Location: Virtual via Google Meet

Present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Kampmann</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannette Jones</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Williams</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Martindale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Kishbaugh</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Moody</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Fitzgerald</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Jensen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Bijold</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie McCaleb</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Swerdflger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Dale Kishbaugh</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Jim Moody</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Patrick Fitzgerald</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Ted Jensen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Dana Bijold</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Julie McCaleb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Raymond Swerdflger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Terri King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Rob Martindale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Jim Moody</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Patrick Fitzgerald</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Ted Jensen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Dana Bijold</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Julie McCaleb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Raymond Swerdflger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Terri King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Rob Martindale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I indicates in-person attendance   R indicates remote attendance
* Indicates arrival after roll call   - indicates technical difficulties during roll call

Note: The meeting was recorded and started at 10:01 am. 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.

MINUTES APPROVAL
A Motion was made to approve the minutes from the April 14, 2022 meeting: A vote was taken to approve the minutes. It was approved.

BEST PRACTICE DISCUSSION:
Excavators were invited to share their current workflow for Large or Complex projects:

Mark Fanning from AJ Ventures:
- 28-30 excavators working daily, mostly vacuum excavation work
- 10-day ticket used, perhaps a longer ticket for larger projects might be helpful. However, that only works if by the end of that time the marks are actually done. Waiting for marks is problematic.
- Looking for a solution to get everyone on the same page; how can an excavator escalate when issues arise (marks are not done)?
- Permits, locates, and digging equipment are all getting mobilized at the same time, and determining how to coordinate that with locators can be challenging. When the ticket gets submitted and then halfway through there are no marks yet, things get behind.
- ‘Large/Complex’ defined as: Right-of-Way to Right-of-Way in a complex area, meaning other utilities already exist and/or there are pedestrians to deal with.
- In pre-project meetings (utility coordination through UNCC), not everyone is coming to the meeting.
- Don’t always have SUE plansets available, and locators can make errors, all of which complicate the ability to start work.

Jeff Fagler from Connell Resources:
- Civil contractor, does various types of excavation for all utilities and also road work.
- Definition of large/complex:
  - Lots of subcontractors
  - Potential to lose marks
  - CDOT project/lots of distance
Lots of zones in a single site

- Jeff will build a map and reach out to utility owners before submitting tickets. Over time he has built a contact/resource list and can usually reach someone if an issue arises with a utility owner.
  - Reaches out to utility owners as quickly as possible once work is known about. Sometimes it is months, sometimes only a week.
  - Uses phone and direct email to pre-advise utility owners of projects.
- Contract locators are the most challenging to work with and are the ones who don’t come to pre-project meetings.
- Typical process is to break the site into zones, call in separate tickets for each zone, then call in a 10-day ticket for the entire site and work with the locators on what gets covered daily.
  - Batches of site-specific tickets are spread out over several days; they are not all put into the CO 811 system on the same day to not overload the system.
  - This worked, and then with new management, there was a period of time where it was not working because they would close the 10-day ticket since they felt it was already marked, but it is getting better.
  - The reason for the 10-day ticket on top of the initial tickets is in case marks are getting erased or to confirm locations, etc.
- Only sees 15-20% of companies attending on-site meetings.
- Does try to work with subcontractors to submit tickets to CO 811 on the same day to help locators when possible. Coordinating ticket requests helps when feasible and can include the same map if all (sub)excavators have the same map.

Ron Erickson from Q3 Contracting:
- Does SUE work (sometimes also design work) for Xcel Energy in CDOT rights-of-way.
- CDOT set up a process to help minimize issues.
- During the SUE process, there are utility owners who refuse to provide locates or maps. Also, utilities might be added in the dig area between when SUE occurred and the project starts.
  - If maps or locates are provided, they aren’t always accurate or detailed. 50/50 on what is provided (maps or marks).
- Lack of agreement within CO 811 and utility owners to provide personnel to a pre-project meeting. If there was a way that utility owners were required to provide staff to this, that would be helpful.
- Ticket refresh and similar efforts to get the locator on-site can be challenging. If locators are paid by the ticket, sitting on-site during a large project isn’t financially worth it for them, as they want to get to the next project.
- The CO 811 App is very helpful in tracking and keeping information on what utilities are marked.
- If someone is submitting a positive response with the code for “marked, see paint on site” and there is no paint on-site, you can use that to escalate (file a complaint).
- White lining reduces the workload for locators since it might eliminate the volume of work they are doing to paint areas that are not a part of the excavation work.

Rob Martindale from CDOT, Specification 105:
- Standard specification for utility notice coordination that the contractors are responsible to complete.
- All contacts for utility owners are listed.
- CDOT is considering a pay/line item to hire and pay utility locators, as that work is so important. CDOT may even have the SUE engineering companies oversee that process since they stamped the location of lines.
- Shared slides of CDOT ticket management process.
  - CDOT uses a mobile app (CDOT custom E-locate Form) to manage data around existing utilities and those that might be replaced, removed or that have been abandoned.
  - Yellow dots (on the map) represent the data points of exposed utilities.
  - CDOT App is integrated with the CO 811 system.

Dana Bijold from an Engineer’s perspective:
- SUE engineers have a similar desire to streamline this process from design to construction. Currently, SUE is done, marks can be off from the planset, and then potholing is required, all of which delays the contractor from performing the work.
- When CO 811 locates are called in after a SUE investigation and utility information does not align, it would be helpful if there is a way to carry information from design through construction.
Heath Buster (communicating via Esther Williams’ computer) from Xcel Energy (also chair of CO 811 Procedures Committee):

- Pre-meet is helpful; perhaps the CO 811 Procedures committee can look at how to make a meet request stand out on a ticket request.
- Consider going back to the old procedure with times included and CO 811 being involved in this communication request.
- **Asked by Best Practice UDP SC members to attend the next (future) meeting to further continue this discussion.**
- Utility owners will have to work with the third-party locate companies, and it might be helpful to have some of them also join this Best Practice discussion.

**General discussion from comments raised:**

- Defining what Large/Complex projects are will help so that people know when to implement this Best Practice. This might look like guidance; the excavator can determine if their project qualifies, and the contractor can determine whether the project will benefit from a pre-project meeting. Key descriptors are:
  - Long/linear
  - Complex because of (develop list of factors) e.g., lots of existing utilities in place
  - Is a SUE project
  - Duration of construction might also be a determinant (e.g., over 30 days)
- High turnover in locators creates problems, especially if they leave mid-locate on a site on a multi-day ticket.
- Differences in ticket numbers per day (some days have 3 tickets, others can have 100s) also causes inconsistent work for locate companies’ staff.
- Also, the complexity of an area impacts how long it takes to mark (e.g., if the area only has 1 gas line vs 6 that cross each other).
- Pre-project meeting might negate some issues, including agreeing to keep 1 locator on the entire project, and potentially getting that locator at the pre-project meeting.
- If Utility owners are not making it to meetings, that is an issue.
  - If map attachments included the map for the project, like the kind Jeff develops, then at least those that don’t attend the meetings will have that.
  - Currently, ticket refreshes and updates don’t forward the attachment, so excavators need to reattach the maps.
- Some contractors use private locate companies to help deal with delays caused by locating not being done by utility owners and/or their subcontractors. How to address this in a Best Practice?
- For people who don’t have a utility owner contact list, is there a way to submit a map through CO 811, like Jeff has developed, to give utility owners a heads up (a pre-locate ticket request)?
- Is there a way to help locate companies prioritize pre-project meetings?
  - Might the complaint process be used if someone did not show up to a pre-project meeting?
  - Perhaps a Regulation might be developed, as long as it lines up with the Statute, that might be enforceable. Statute does reference meets, and in a previous complaint hearing, not showing up for an agreed-upon meet was listed as a part of the violation.
  - Currently meets are requested and they are not responded to; this might be different from agreeing to be there and then not showing up. Best Practice can include the Statute language, and does not require it to happen within 48 hours (in connection with a locate request), but it should still occur in the project.
  - If a meet request is offered and not used/attended, and then marks are not provided within the required timeline, perhaps that can be where the complaint process is used for enforcement.
  - Pre-project meeting might actually save time so everyone knows what is actually being asked.
  - Whitelining as part of the Best Practice?
- Can a mechanism be developed where each excavator submits their own tickets yet they are all tied together since they are all on the same site for the same project - so that 1 locator can know and do 1 response and get the responses done simultaneously?
- Next Best Practice meeting might include CO 811, their process and the potential to improve that.
- Using the App as a tool to track all the information might be a part of the Best Practice.
- Should third-party locating companies join the discussion of developing the Best Practice alongside utility owners?
In the past, CO 811 had meet times on tickets with zones, and people seemed to make it to meetings, as long as they were not taken that day. Now it is only “predetermined” and without the organization through the CO 811 system, you can have meetings requested on the same day and time. Also, if they don't open the ticket to read the words, they only see the normal header and don’t realize a meeting has been requested.
  o When locators would show up to a meeting, the locator was then expected to stay on-site to complete the locate for that ticket, which was contentious since they had other on-site meetings and responsibilities and still had time on the ticket. A meeting should be different from the expectation to complete the locate.

Industry trade associations and CO 811 have always prioritized spreading the information from completed UDPSC Best Practices.

Discussion for another time: how does the data from CDOT’s tracking app get used to help the next project?

OTHER BUSINESS

The Best Practice group developed a list of questions for CO 811, including:
  o How they might define Large/Complex projects
  o How they note when a meet is requested by an excavator
  o Contact information for utility owners is a generalized (800) number; can it be more local or allow for pre-ticket point of contact to be established? Does the ticket limit the ticket to only 1 phone #, or can a second phone number be added per utility owner?
  o Discussed what to share with the larger Commission.

The next meeting is June 9, 2022.

Meeting adjourned at 11:55 am.