



Date: June 9, 2022

Location: Virtual via Google Meet

Present:

	Chris Kampmann		Jeannette Jones	R	Mark Williams	R	Rob Martindale
	Dale Kishbaugh	R	Jim Moody		Patrick Fitzgerald		Ted Jensen
R	Dana Bijold		Julie McCaleb	R	Raymond Swerdfeger		Terri King
	Esther Williams		Lori Warner	R	Rob Ellis		

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 10:00 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 few minor edits were made to correct typos.

A Motion was made to approve the minutes from the May 12, 2022, meeting: A vote was taken to approve the minutes. It was approved.

BEST PRACTICE DISCUSSION:

CO 811 was invited to share their current workflow for Large or Complex projects:

Melissa Craven & Carla Sanchez:

- Do not have a current definition for Complex/Large Projects.
- Have multi-day (multiple) tickets:
 - a. Anything over 1,000 linear feet, is either given a 10 day ticket and/or is broken into multiple tickets with no more than 1,000 linear feet per ticket.
 - b. Ideally a locator is on site all those days to stay ahead of the excavator.
 - c. Mapping system will not allow more than 5 miles or crossing of county lines on 1 ticket.
- Commission asked if there is a way for CO 811 to help develop a pre-ticket communication (before a SUE/Engineering ticket or excavation ticket is submitted)?
 - a. In the past, CO 811 has given phone numbers to excavators for utility owners; no communication ticket exists.
 - b. When excavators go online and map an area (beginning the process of submitting a locate request), they will see what utilities are in the area, and that includes utility owner contact information (that ticket does not need to be submitted to get that information) = sample. If it is submitted as a ticket, they will similarly get the utility owner contact information.
- Regarding points of communication for utility owners/operators:
 - a. CO 811 can display multiple phone numbers for each utility owner/operator (e.g., 1 for locate questions and 1 for damages).
 - b. Owners/operators choose the phone numbers - whether it is a 800 number or more local.

- c. Could collect info for pre-construction communication (not done yet).
- Meets: 2 types currently offered through CO 811:
Note: CO 811 tickets can only show 1 meet time (can't do an 8am and then a 2pm if half of all can only meet in AM or PM); something to consider if you want to allow 1 meet time or 2 if a new process was developed.
 - a. Guaranteed meets (offered by utility owners/operators) - specific times that CO 811 puts into tickets that the owners/operators select.
 - b. Other meets are requests and are not guaranteed.
 - Mandating meets may not be possible based on resources; file attachments might help with communication instead.
 - Emergency/damage tickets are also a resource and time priority.

During discussion:

- The Commission noted the challenges of getting an “on site” meeting and asked CO 811 if there could be a ticket that “mandates pre-construction meeting attendance.” In response, CO 811 noted:
 - Need to define Complex/Large projects.
 - This topic is on the Procedures Committee agenda - need from the industry is seen.
 - In their notes, they looked at a 2-week pre-meet and zoned areas of work.
 - Regarding Meets: see above notes.
 - Other states do define complex/large projects: New Mexico, Utah, Georgia, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania (all very different); CO 811 has notes from that research and can talk to their counterparts in those states to gather more information.
- Regarding “mandating” attendance: the law in Colorado may not allow it to be a requirement, and it might be more about creating the system and communicating the importance or value of attendance. It might be an incentive for owners/operators to attend vs being stuck with a 2-day ticket and no prior information.
- Perhaps the goal/benefit is to develop a Best Practice or framework to:
 - Create consistent expectations around what a Complex/Large Project is; exception (not standard work) so that the # of meets is not a burden.
 - What the process is that they have available.
 - How much lead time is recommended for meetings (XXX # of days? Maybe 10 days or 2 weeks).
 - If you can't make it to the meet agree, to a call with maps/emails.
- Need to include the aspect of the Statute that requires the maintaining of marks for the duration of the project/noted location of utilities to hold excavators accountable and not require locators to come out frequently.
 - Also reference “predetermined agreement...provide on-site assistance” (9-1.5-103(4)(a)(IV)).
- Commissioners discussed what comes first/next - developing a Best Practice or updating the procedures within CO 811.
 - Option to develop a Best Practice with/for CO 811 to improve efficiency.
 - CO 811 will ask about the ability to share past Procedures Committee notes to collaborate in the effort to develop a process.
- The Commission asked CO 811 if there is a way to “label” tickets that are all tied to the same area or job - not negating individual tickets; rather, being able to alert the locator that the tickets are tied to the same project. The Commission is considering this aspect of creating efficiency as part of their Best Practice.
 - CO 811 is not currently able to label or put a header on a ticket, but the open source note field can be used to express this fact.
- The Commission noted that it would be helpful to understand how 3rd party locators define complex/large projects and that Communication/fiber utilities should be a part of this discussion. Can they join a Best Practice meeting to share what might work for them?
- CO 811 was asked about changing fields (e. g., duration of excavation expectation field); response: this field change is at the software development phase and is not live yet.
 - Under “work type,” CO 811 could put a “Complex/Large project” type and could help communicate this new language. This might help since some companies parse out work based on type.
 - “Meet” field already exists, and a utility company could flag those that say “yes,” but it depends on the owner's/operator's process.
 - Tickets are sent out by email, and depending on the management system and format they receive them in, it may or may not be able to “flag” tickets. The system CO 811 offers can flag tickets based on type.

- The Commission summarized their takeaways (that are all also on the DRAFT: Best Practice document):
 - See what other states have done
 - Make recommendations to CO 811 per the statute
 - Develop a Utility notification/coordination meeting request?
 - 5-10 days prior to excavation; could be up to 60 days out
 - NOT a locate request
 - Excavator suggests date, time, location (Can be virtual or on site)
 - Project documentation provided at time of the meeting by the GM - this includes zones and phasing of project (starting point, etc.)
 - Connect all related subcontractors' tickets to the project?
 - GC has to ask all subs to commit to submitting the tickets within a certain time (e.g., same 24 hours)
 - Reference GC's number on the sub's tickets (aka have a parent ticket of some sort) OR CO 811 designates a complex project number with separate ticket numbers for each excavator?
 - Best Practice should reference "predetermined agreement"
 - This clause could be invoked once the excavation ticket is submitted
 - Attending the meeting might allow locators to have extra locating time (as long as it stays ahead of the excavation work)
 - Encourage locator to come to site once to perform locates for all facilities at once
 - If someone can't be at the meet, they should call/connect another way/time
 - How to encourage fiber companies to participate in meets and not mark locates as "all clear" when facilities are in the area
- (Seperate best practice?) Large fiber/communication projects: what can be done to encourage the project owner to inform other facility owners about forthcoming projects while maintaining necessary/strategic confidentiality?
 - What can be done to encourage some level of specificity (location/project dates)?

OTHER BUSINESS

- Discussed what to cover in the next few meetings, including:
 - July: invite Terri King in her role as the telecommunications/broadband representative commissioner - staff to follow up
 - Pre-July: Commissioners to review notes from past meetings and take the key points from each to develop draft
 - August: potentially another stakeholder meeting with Communication companies (tbd)

The next meeting is July 14, 2022.

Meeting adjourned at 11:51 am.