
***California Underground Facilities Safe Excavation Board
("Dig Safe Board")***

November 16, 2020

Staff Report

Strategic Objectives 2020 Review

SUMMARY

This report summarizes the progress made towards completion of the Strategic Objectives and Strategic Activities that the Board set out as goals in the 2020 Annual Plan. Staff recommends that the Board review the completed, ongoing, and pending work as it considers what to include in the 2021 Annual Plan. As many goals necessitate ongoing work, staff recommends the Board consider focusing its attention on continuing to grow and improve on its 2020 Strategic Objectives before adding additional objectives or activities.

BACKGROUND

During the second half of 2019, the Board met to develop the 2020 Annual Plan using the framework from the 2020 Strategic Plan as a guide to identify priorities for the coming year. The 2020 Annual Plan included Strategic Objectives that were continued from the 2019 Annual Plan. Similarly, to analyze what work still needs to be completed for 2021, the Board must understand the work that was completed during its operations in 2020.

The COVID-19 pandemic affected the Board's operations and impacted its ability to fully achieve its 2020 plan. Although Board staff adapted and implemented changes to accomplish many of its activities amid this continuously evolving public health emergency, many activities planned for 2020 were delayed.

DISCUSSION

Each Strategic Objective is supported by a focused set of Strategic Activities that detail the tasks set to achieve the objective. The following pages contain details on the status of completion for each of the Strategic Objectives and Strategic Activities included in the 2020 Annual Plan.

The following terms are used to define the status of each activity:

- Complete – Activities that require no significant future work
- Ongoing – Activities that have substantially begun but require continued future work
- Pending – Activities that have not substantially begun

Strategic Objective #1: Foster Compliance with New and Existing Laws Through Education and Outreach

Finalize an Education Course – Complete

Materials for the education course were completed in summer 2020. As COVID-19 safety precautions preclude in-person gatherings, staff have made changes to deliver the course online. The course is ready for the first batch of violators this fall.

Targeted Education and Outreach for Area of Continual Excavation (ACE) – Ongoing

Staff worked with the one-call centers on presentations and guides for excavators on how to apply for a 1-year ticket. Additional materials are in development and will be made available through the call center websites. Staff also created forms to encourage communication between excavator groups and operators and made these forms available through the Dig Safe Board website.

Electronic Positive Response

Regulation Development – Complete

The Board created emergency regulations for extending the deadline by which operators must comply with this new requirement.

Education & Outreach – Ongoing

With the deadline to provide electronic positive response, the Board will have to continue its outreach on this requirement. While distanced outreach was conducted by Board staff and the call centers, responses received to emails sent out explaining the requirement largely indicated that many operators were unaware of the requirement and were unprepared to comply with it.

Power Tool Use in Tolerance Zone

Regulation Development – Complete

Regulations were effective in October 2020.

Education and Outreach – Pending

Due to COVID-19 impacts, outreach activities planned for this activity were curtailed. Work is expected to continue in the coming year.

Build Board Name Recognition through Education & Outreach

Targeted Outreach - Ongoing

Many activities in the Outreach and Education area were delayed as in-person gatherings and events were eliminated as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Board continued to receive feedback from stakeholders in various areas of excavation via virtual workshops and surveys, as well as through the Idea Register. This type of outreach will continue to inform the Board on how to improve excavation practices and assist in standards development. Work is expected to continue in 2021.

Annual Education and Outreach Meeting – Ongoing

The Dig Safe Act directs the Board to annually hold a meeting to discuss education and outreach needs.

Spring Open Forum – Complete

The Spring Open Forum was replaced by the Idea Register. Details are provided below under Strategic Objective #4: *Continue Building a Foundation for Board Operations*.

Develop Online Educational Resources – Ongoing

One of the most fundamental educational tools available to the Board is its website. While the website has largely served to provide information about Board meetings and regulatory requirements, efforts to improve functionality and user experience while delivering pertinent information to stakeholders are expected to continue.

Looking Ahead

Outreach to low-awareness excavator groups – Ongoing

Staff created a flyer to educate excavators on the steps for safe digging. Outreach conducted on the new ACE ticket process also serves to benefit general one-call knowledge among farmers, a historically low-awareness excavator group.

Strategic Objective #2: Improve Excavation and Location Practice Safety

Develop Standards for Demonstrating Compliance – Ongoing

Requirements were implemented for operators to keep their contact information updated with call centers, facilitating investigation and enforcement.

Develop Reasonable Care Standards – Ongoing

The Board began outreach on what constitutes reasonable care prior to commencing the rule-making process. To develop these standards, Board staff held several industry workshops and surveys to gather information from various stakeholders for Trenchless Excavation techniques. Analysis of information gathered during workshops is ongoing, and it is likely additional targeted outreach activities will be needed prior to commencing rulemaking in this area.

Looking Ahead

Abandoned Lines – Ongoing

In June, staff presented on the issue of abandoned lines and measures adopted by other states. The discussion noted that this issue impacts all forms of excavation and may be best looked at through the lens of reasonable care standards. Further work remains in this area.

Model Scoping of Underground Work in Public Works Projects – Pending

Some information has been gathered from operators and excavators as part of reasonable care standards, however research is currently preliminary.

Strategic Objective #3: Build Foundation for Accident Cause Identification

Conduct Investigations into Accidents and Violations – Ongoing

The investigative process for responding to damage reports and complaints received via the call centers and the Board's websites was developed and implemented.

Tool Development for Assessment – Ongoing

Staff is working on accident root cause modeling that will help to evaluate data captured in investigations.

Building Data Capture into Investigative Activities – Ongoing

Leveraging the Case Management System, data from investigations will be available for analysis to inform Board decision making in this safety area.

Looking Ahead

Accident Data Reporting – Ongoing

Investigate accidents and model their causes to develop sufficient understanding to allow the Board to prioritize and target its interventions. This activity has not

commenced.

Integrated Stakeholder Input into Data Modeling – Pending

Test stakeholder beliefs through preparation of hypotheses and mature management of existing “hard” quantitative data. This activity has not commenced.

Strategic Objective #4: Continue Building a Foundation for Board Operations

Develop internal and external policies to continue to establish a well-functioning government organization that promotes safe excavation throughout the state.

Improve Reporting by Creating a Complaint Process – Ongoing

Criteria and supporting processes were created for accepting, tracking, and responding to complaints before they are submitted to the Board.

Build and Test Case Management System – Ongoing

The Case Management System is in the final stages of being implemented. The system is currently being tested. Staff are still developing processes and documentation for procedural use, being trained to operate the system, and building a data collection module.

Review of the Board’s Fee Regulation – Complete

Board staff analyzed issues with fee implementation and presented the Board with proposals for changes to fee implementation. The Board approved changes to the fee regulation with the goal of improving the process for one-call center members. With the revised regulation, staff will need to conduct outreach as well as create new administrative procedures. Staff will continue to monitor any issues with implementation of the fee and assess if new procedures need to be created.

Policy and Procedure Development – Ongoing

Development of policy and procedures for Dig Safe Staff was initiated. This project will continue as the Board transitions from CAL FIRE to the Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety. Ensuring that the Board has a strong operating foundation and business processes will ensure its ability to respond to future safety policy needs.

Building Enforcement and Hearing Process – Ongoing

A hearing process to implement requirements outlined in statute and Board regulations was implemented. A process for Notice of Probable Violations (NOPV) hearings and appeals and was created, and the Investigations Division began

issuing NOPVs. The first set of hearings took place in September 2020, where the Board reviewed violations and voted on sanctions.

Enhance Strategic and Annual Planning through the Creation of an Idea Register – Ongoing

Board staff created and implemented the Idea Register to prioritize ideas from stakeholders and identify areas of concern. Staff created forms and made them available on the Dig Safe Board website and developed a process for the Board to review the ideas. Board staff is currently tracking idea submissions and plans to create an Idea Summary Report, reflecting statuses of all idea submissions. The Board will be able to review these ideas for potential incorporation into its next annual plan. An email was sent out to stakeholders encouraging use of the Idea Register. More outreach is needed to generate more ideas and feedback for the Board through this channel.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Board review the 2020 Strategic Objectives and Strategic Activities that were completed and those that remain ongoing or pending as it considers development of the 2021 Annual Plan. In light of the significance and complexity of ongoing and pending activities, staff recommends the Board consider and weigh the impact that additional workload would have on advancing its safety mission.

ATTACHMENTS

A: Status Summary of 2020 Strategic Activities

B: Idea Submissions *IR-2020-07-24-001* to *IR-2020-10-18-007*

ATTACHMENT A: STATUS SUMMARY OF 2020 STRATEGIC ACTIVITIES

Objective #1: Foster Compliance with New and Existing Laws Through Education and Outreach

Activity	Status
Finalize an Education Course	Complete
Targeted Education and Outreach for Area of Continual Excavation (ACE)	Ongoing
EPR Regulation Development	Complete
EPR Education & Outreach	Ongoing
Power Tool Use in Tolerance Zone Regulation Development	Complete
Power Tool Use in Tolerance Zone Education & Outreach	Pending
Targeted Outreach Building Name Recognition	Ongoing
Annual Education & Outreach Meeting	Ongoing
Spring Open Forum	Complete
Develop Online Educational Resources	Ongoing
Outreach to Low-Awareness Excavator Groups	Ongoing

Objective #2: Improve Excavation and Location Practice Safety

Activity	Status
Develop Standards for Demonstrating Compliance	Ongoing
Develop Reasonable Care Standards	Ongoing
Abandoned Lines	Ongoing
Model Scoping of Underground Work in Public Works Projects	Pending

Objective #3: Build Foundation for Accident Cause Identification

Activity	Status
Conduct Investigations into Accidents and Violations	Ongoing
Tool Development for Assessment	Ongoing
Building Data Capture into Investigative Activities	Ongoing
Accident Data Reporting	Ongoing
Integrated Stakeholder Input into Data Modeling	Pending

Objective #4: Continue Building a Foundation for Board Operations

Activity	Status
Improve Reporting by Creating a Complaint Process	Ongoing
Build and Test Case Management System	Ongoing
Review of the Board's Fee Regulation	Complete
Policy and Procedure Development	Ongoing
Building Enforcement and Hearing Process	Ongoing
Enhance Strategic and Annual Planning through the Creation of an Idea Register	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT B

IR-2020-07-24-001

SD 1

Staff Summary: Large delineated areas can lead to safety hazard for locators in traffic. Enforcement of standards for delineated areas.

Contributor: David Mateo

Industry Role: Locator

Organization: Att

WHAT IS THE SAFETY CONCERN?

The safety concern is exposure to traffic for locators on a 50 foot wide trench that expands anywhere from half a mile to 3 miles. Also the failure of the company to follow the USA guidelines. Here is a quote from the USA handbook.

“ Continuous Excavation Marking

Mark in white the proposed centerline of planned excavation using 6 in. to 12 in. × 1 in. arrows approximately 4 ft to 50 ft apart to show direction of excavation. Reduce the separation of excavation marks to a length that can reasonably be seen by the operator's locators when the terrain at an excavation site warrants. Mark lateral excavations with occasional arrows showing excavation direction from centerline with marks at curb or property line if crossed. Dots may be used for curves and closer interval marking.”

By calling in a 50 foot wide trench they are using USA for engineering purposes and when I contact the county they have them narrowed down to within a foot of where they are allowed to put the 2 inch conduit they are boring.

UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES DOES THIS CONCERN ARISE?

WHO DOES THE CONCERN AFFECT?

Excavators:	Off	Facility Operators:	Off
Locators:	Yes	Project Owners:	Off
Engineers:	Off	One Call Centers:	Off
Other:	Customers		

HOW ARE THESE PARTIES AFFECTED BY THIS CONCERN?

Increased traffic hazard and graffiti that is left out for over a year

HOW DO THESE PARTIES CURRENTLY MANAGE THIS CONCERN?

WHAT PART/S OF GOVERNMENT CODE 4216 DOES THIS CONCERN RELATE TO?

Please see 1

WHAT IS YOUR IDEA TO ADDRESS THIS SAFETY CONCERN?

Enforce current regulations and require excavator to start within 14 days.

WHAT ORGANIZATIONS DO YOU BELIEVE MIGHT BE WILLING TO HELP DEVELOP OR IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE BOARD ACTION TO IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

Enforcement

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

Reduce the number of tickets being called back in and reduce chance of locators being exposed to traffic

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL DOWNSIDES OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

None

What new hazards could be created in pursuing your idea, or what existing hazards could be worsened by your idea?

None

WHAT DATA OR OTHER INFORMATION DO YOU THINK IS NECESSARY TO MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION ON THIS ISSUE?

I have several ticket numbers if you need them

Does the required data exist today? If so, please identify potential public data sources.

IR-2020-09-22-002
SD 4

Staff Summary: Operators excavating near their own lines may statutorily be required to contact 911 in non-emergency situations.

Contributor: Steve Cleaver

Industry Role: Facility Operator

Organization: Pacific Gas & Electric, Co.

WHAT IS THE SAFETY CONCERN?

Nuisance calls to 911 when non-emergent or non-hazardous damage is discovered to a high priority facility. GC 4216.4(c)(2)(B)

UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES DOES THIS CONCERN ARISE?

When a facility owner/operator is excavating in proximity to their own high priority facility and discovers or causes non-hazardous damage to a facility. This is often the case when excavating after in-line inspections (ILI) when anomalies are discovered, or when crossing facilities and potholing using hydro excavation techniques. Damaged wrap or the discovery of a non-hazardous leak would potentially require a call to 911 despite no intent for action from first responders.

WHO DOES THE CONCERN AFFECT?

Excavators: Off	Facility Operators: Yes
Locators: Off	Project Owners: Off
Engineers: Off	One Call Centers: Off
Other: 911 Call centers	

HOW ARE THESE PARTIES AFFECTED BY THIS CONCERN?

The current law requires a call to 911 when causing or discovering damage to either of the following:

(A) A natural gas or hazardous liquid pipeline subsurface installation in which the damage results in the escape of any flammable, toxic, or corrosive gas or liquid.

(B) A high priority subsurface installation of any kind.

Because an operator is also an excavator when digging in proximity to their own facilities, this often results in a requirement to call 911 in non-hazardous and non-emergency conditions. If the operator is not in a hazardous situation, calling 911 is an unnecessary requirement that puts confusing and unneeded call volume on emergency dispatch centers and potentially puts operators in violation of law for failing to do so.

HOW DO THESE PARTIES CURRENTLY MANAGE THIS CONCERN?

They either chose not to call because there is no need or logical explanation for a call to 911 (and are potentially out of compliance), or they call 911 for these non-emergency conditions.

WHAT PART/S OF GOVERNMENT CODE 4216 DOES THIS CONCERN RELATE TO?

4216.4(C)(2)(B)

WHAT IS YOUR IDEA TO ADDRESS THIS SAFETY CONCERN?

Provide an exemption for operators when the situation does not meet the definition of an emergency AND the facility involved is exclusively their own

OR

revert to past language (pre SB661) or similar that requires an emergency or the inability to contact the owner/operator of the facility.

WHAT ORGANIZATIONS DO YOU BELIEVE MIGHT BE WILLING TO HELP DEVELOP OR IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

All operators of high priority facilities

WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE BOARD ACTION TO IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

Other I don't know if a clarifying regulation or statutory change is the most appropriate.

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

Limit occurrence of technical (but non-safety related) non-compliance by operators or reduce times where operators are needlessly contacting 911 in non-hazardous and non-emergency situations

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL DOWNSIDES OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

None that I am aware of

What new hazards could be created in pursuing your idea, or what existing hazards could be worsened by your idea?

Potentially increasing response times of first responders if a non-emergency situation escalates unexpectedly, though this is VERY unlikely.

WHAT DATA OR OTHER INFORMATION DO YOU THINK IS NECESSARY TO MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION ON THIS ISSUE?

I don't know how reliable it would be, but knowing the number of times an operator was excavating and discovered damage to a facility in a given period. This would give an idea of how many times 911 should have been called to give context to the true call volume absolute compliance with this statute would have burdened and potentially confused the 911 call centers.

Does the required data exist today? If so, please identify potential public data sources.

I doubt it does. At least not consistently across operators.

IR-2020-10-09-003
SD 3

Staff Summary: Large ticket areas as a contributing cause to delays in locating and miscommunications between parties. Standards for geographic areas of ticket sizes.

Contributor: Ryan White

Industry Role: One-Call Centers

Organization: USA North 811

WHAT IS THE SAFETY CONCERN?

Contact center ticket size standards. On a regular basis the contact center experiences issues working with excavators to create tickets within an appropriate size. Each of the CA contact centers have standards about this, but there is no regulation or legislation to give it any teeth. Large over sized tickets lead to locating delays in the field, and regular difficult conversations with angry excavators who don't want to fit within a size limit.

UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES DOES THIS CONCERN ARISE?

The happens on a regular basis. Excavators who submit over sized work areas on a single ticket, and refuse to work with operators/locators on a marking schedule, impact the operators/locators ability to get to all of the jobs on time.

WHO DOES THE CONCERN AFFECT?

Excavators: Yes	Facility Operators: Yes
Locators: Yes	Project Owners: Yes
Engineers: Off	One Call Centers: Yes
Other:	

HOW ARE THESE PARTIES AFFECTED BY THIS CONCERN?

Large, oversized tickets lead to locator delay. If a locator is bogged down at one large site because the excavator hasn't done the appropriate thing and broken his job up into several smaller areas and established a marking schedule with the locator/operator, it creates a delay in the system that affects other excavators in the area and ensuring they get locates on time. Larger organizations might be willing to wait the extra time for the locates, but smaller companies oftentimes just start the job

and either assume nothing is there, or are simply unwilling to wait for a locator to show up which impacts them being able to complete a job on time so they can move to another job.

HOW DO THESE PARTIES CURRENTLY MANAGE THIS CONCERN?

Locators will attempt to reach out to excavators to set up a marking schedule for the large projects, but there are many times excavators refuse to work with them to create a marking schedule and simply state that its the locators job to mark it within two days.

WHAT PART/S OF GOVERNMENT CODE 4216 DOES THIS CONCERN RELATE TO?

4216.2

WHAT IS YOUR IDEA TO ADDRESS THIS SAFETY CONCERN?

Create appropriate contact center ticket size standards that will facilitate on time markings for all excavators, and eliminate the opportunity for some excavators to hold locators hostage.

WHAT ORGANIZATIONS DO YOU BELIEVE MIGHT BE WILLING TO HELP DEVELOP OR IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

The two contact centers, along with a group of their board members, have been working on this for two years. That group would definitely be willing to help further develop what the appropriate size requirements should be.

WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE BOARD ACTION TO IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

Regulation

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

Create ticket size standards for California that all excavators must adhere to when submitting a ticket.

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL DOWNSIDES OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

Frustration on the part of some excavators that like to submit larger tickets and don't want to manage multiple tickets for one site/job.

What new hazards could be created in pursuing your idea, or what existing hazards could be worsened by your idea?

Potential increased cost to DigAlert utility members due to increase in tickets (DigAlert funding model based on a per ticket cost, if tickets go up costs go up). USA North 811 has a percentage of tickets model, the impact to the USA North 811 utility members would be less.

WHAT DATA OR OTHER INFORMATION DO YOU THINK IS NECESSARY TO MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION ON THIS ISSUE?

As I noted earlier, the two centers have been working on this for two years but have yet to finalize anything or come to agreement on an acceptable plan. At this point I believe direction from the Dig Safe Board would help that process and allow us to have something to point to when an angry excavator doesn't want to comply with the standards.

Does the required data exist today? If so, please identify potential public data sources.

We can pull data related to average polygon size of tickets. Operators and 3rd party locators might have some data as well related to locate time due to large projects and possibly late locates.

IR-2020-10-13-004
SD 4

Staff Summary: Increase education and outreach initiatives in association with industry groups, specifically to outreach to those unaware of safe excavation practices.

Contributor: Steve Woo

Industry Role: Excavator Contractor—Utility Specialist

Organization: Director, California Regional Common Ground Alliance

WHAT IS THE SAFETY CONCERN?

Lack of Education and Training.

Miss understanding of the 4216 and CalOSHA Title 8 rules

UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES DOES THIS CONCERN ARISE?

Recent DIRT reports illustrates that 45% of damages occur with Excavators without Tickets

WHO DOES THE CONCERN AFFECT?

Excavators: Yes	Facility Operators: Yes
Locators: Yes	Project Owners: Yes
Engineers: Off	One Call Centers: Off
Other:	Those who believe that the 4216 rules do not apply to them.

HOW ARE THESE PARTIES AFFECTED BY THIS CONCERN?

Excavators that do not have tickets think that the rules do not apply to the work that they are doing.

They are unaware that Cal OSHA rules require training.

Also unsure what training is provided by Utility operators to their employees.

HOW DO THESE PARTIES CURRENTLY MANAGE THIS CONCERN?

Since they think that the rules do not concern their work, they ignore the rules or are ignorant of the rules.

Largely they are aware of "Dig Alert" but not of the rules or the requirements.

WHAT PART/S OF GOVERNMENT CODE 4216 DOES THIS CONCERN RELATE TO?

4216.2

California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1541, (A) (D)

WHAT IS YOUR IDEA TO ADDRESS THIS SAFETY CONCERN?

Create a Education and Training Division

Partner with various professional associations that represent the Industry.

Partner with municipalities

Partner with Industry training facilities

WHAT ORGANIZATIONS DO YOU BELIEVE MIGHT BE WILLING TO HELP DEVELOP OR IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

Professional Industry Associations. (Utilities, Contractors)

State , CPUC and Cal OSHA

Municipalities

Utility Operators

Technology Developers

WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE BOARD ACTION TO IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

Education/Outreach

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

As it is best to avoid incidents, education, training and awareness is preferable to enforcement after the fact.

Prevention begins with education and awareness. It is in the best safety interests of all Excavators, Utility Operators to be aware of not only the hazards but the best practices available to avoid incidents.

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL DOWNSIDES OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

None

All Stakeholders share the responsibility for safety and damage prevention.

The curriculum of the education/training would come from Board approval.

What new hazards could be created in pursuing your idea, or what existing hazards could be worsened by your idea?

None

WHAT DATA OR OTHER INFORMATION DO YOU THINK IS NECESSARY TO MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION ON THIS ISSUE?

Damage Incident Reporting Tool, DIRT

Does the required data exist today? If so, please identify potential public data sources.

yes DIRT

IR-2020-10-13-005
SD 1

Staff Summary: Evaluate contractor training materials and reinforce education of safe excavation practices with partner agencies.

Contributor: Chris Davy

Industry Role: Facility Operator

Organization: Southwest Gas Corp.

WHAT IS THE SAFETY CONCERN?

Adequacy of training provided/ emphasis placed on safe excavation for contractors obtaining new/ renewing licenses.

UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES DOES THIS CONCERN ARISE?

Approximately half of the damages incurred by my company are caused by contractors that did not obtain a dig ticket. The overwhelming majority of damages are caused by first-time offenders.

WHO DOES THE CONCERN AFFECT?

Excavators: Yes	Facility Operators: Yes
Locators: Off	Project Owners: Off
Engineers: Off	One Call Centers: Off
Other: Public and Emergency Responders	

HOW ARE THESE PARTIES AFFECTED BY THIS CONCERN?

Damages caused by the contractor's failure to obtain a dig ticket can lead to damages during excavation. emergency responders must secure the area and protect affected persons/ property. Utility operators must respond to eliminate the hazard.

HOW DO THESE PARTIES CURRENTLY MANAGE THIS CONCERN?

Training among emergency response personnel and operators. Operators also provide free training to contractors.

WHAT PART/S OF GOVERNMENT CODE 4216 DOES THIS CONCERN RELATE TO?

The part that requires a contractor to possess a dig ticket prior to excavating.

WHAT IS YOUR IDEA TO ADDRESS THIS SAFETY CONCERN?

Identify potential gaps in contractor testing materials to obtain licensure in CA. Reinforce critical concepts by ensuring they are included in testing materials.

WHAT ORGANIZATIONS DO YOU BELIEVE MIGHT BE WILLING TO HELP DEVELOP OR IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

CA Contractor State License Board, CARCGA

WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE BOARD ACTION TO IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

Education/outreach

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

Contractors understand the importance and seriousness of safe excavation practices early-on.

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL DOWNSIDES OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

None.

What new hazards could be created in pursuing your idea, or what existing hazards could be worsened by your idea?

None.

WHAT DATA OR OTHER INFORMATION DO YOU THINK IS NECESSARY TO MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION ON THIS ISSUE?

Evaluate current testing materials for contractors to obtain licensure. Add excavation safety materials to existing test(s), or create a supplemental test or course material.

Does the required data exist today? If so, please identify potential public data sources.

Yes, CSLB has the current test and standards

IR-2020-10-14-006
SD 4

Staff Summary: Clarification of operator record keeping for abandoned lines and the abandonment process.

Contributor: Nicole Goi

Industry Role: Facility Operator

Organization: SMUD

WHAT IS THE SAFETY CONCERN?

What are the industry standards and the regulations regarding record retention of underground "abandonments?" Currently, Govt. Code Sec. 4216.3(a)(4) states that, "An operator shall amend, update, maintain, and preserve all plans and records for its subsurface installations as that information becomes known. IF there is a change in ownership of a subsurface installation, the records shall be turned over to the new operator. Commencing January 1, 2017, records on abandoned subsurface installations, to the extent that those records exist, shall be retained."

Question is what is the definition of "all plans and records" consist of? Do all previous maintenance records need to be kept, etc.? And is it for the life of the facility operator? What is the timeframe?

UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES DOES THIS CONCERN ARISE?

When an operator abandons underground facilities must they maintain ALL records regarding the facility for the life of the remaining facility? For the life of the facility owner's existence? Or other?

WHO DOES THE CONCERN AFFECT?

Excavators: Yes	Facility Operators: Yes
Locators: Yes	Project Owners: Yes
Engineers: Yes	One Call Centers: Off
Other:	

HOW ARE THESE PARTIES AFFECTED BY THIS CONCERN?

HOW DO THESE PARTIES CURRENTLY MANAGE THIS CONCERN?

Unsure whether facility owners who abandon underground facilities are

currently keeping ALL records regarding the abandoned facility for the life of the facility owner.

WHAT PART/S OF GOVERNMENT CODE 4216 DOES THIS CONCERN RELATE TO?

4216.3(a)(4)

(4) An operator shall amend, update, maintain, and preserve all plans and records for its subsurface installations as that information becomes known. If there is a change in ownership of a subsurface installation, the records shall be turned

WHAT IS YOUR IDEA TO ADDRESS THIS SAFETY CONCERN?

WHAT ORGANIZATIONS DO YOU BELIEVE MIGHT BE WILLING TO HELP DEVELOP OR IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE BOARD ACTION TO IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

Other Other

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL DOWNSIDES OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

What new hazards could be created in pursuing your idea, or what existing hazards could be worsened by your idea?

WHAT DATA OR OTHER INFORMATION DO YOU THINK IS NECESSARY TO MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION ON THIS ISSUE?

Does the required data exist today? If so, please identify potential public data sources.

IR-2020-10-18-007
SD 3

Staff Summary: Standards for locate and mark painting including returning property to pre-existing condition. Possible damages from misinterpretation of pre-existing marks.

Contributor: Ian Bryant

Industry Role: Member of the Public

Organization: _____

WHAT IS THE SAFETY CONCERN?

The fact that fully improved properties are being damaged at a higher level than ever before because of the sprayed marking process. Properties are not returned to the pre-marking conditions. Knowing their properties will be damaged from marking, property owners will not be participating at the highest level in the process. This fact creates a major danger for all involved! Dig safe and Dig alert is not and will not be viewed in a very positive way in the communities when they leave a trail of damage with no concern for the property.

UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES DOES THIS CONCERN ARISE?

Every city has spray paint marking that were never removed

WHO DOES THE CONCERN AFFECT?

Excavators: Yes	Facility Operators: Yes
Locators: Yes	Project Owners: Yes
Engineers: Off	One Call Centers: Off
Other:	

HOW ARE THESE PARTIES AFFECTED BY THIS CONCERN?

More utilities will get damaged, therefore excavators, locators, facility operators, project owners would all have to work at a riskier, more dangerous emergency work site.

HOW DO THESE PARTIES CURRENTLY MANAGE THIS CONCERN?

They are home with their families and not having to respond to a high risk emergency repair site.

WHAT PART/S OF GOVERNMENT CODE 4216 DOES THIS CONCERN RELATE TO?

4216.12 b1,2. Coordinate education and outreach activities that encourage safe excavations practices, as described in section 4216.17

Develop standards, as described in sections 4216.18

WHAT IS YOUR IDEA TO ADDRESS THIS SAFETY CONCERN?

Don't allow spray marking to damage property which causes the public to view dig safe/dig alert in a negative way.

Maintain a good reputation in the communities. Have the public want to contact dig safe and this will result in less accidents with less loss of lives.

WHAT ORGANIZATIONS DO YOU BELIEVE MIGHT BE WILLING TO HELP DEVELOP OR IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

All currently participating organizations

WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE BOARD ACTION TO IMPLEMENT YOUR IDEA?

Standards

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

Improves knowledge of facility locator

Improved safety

Less accidents

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE POTENTIAL DOWNSIDES OF YOUR IDENTIFIED SOLUTION?

Minimal cost to educate and modify current standards

What new hazards could be created in pursuing your idea, or what existing hazards could be worsened by your idea?

If new policies are not followed, the current process would still be in carried out. Therefore no potential downside will exist.

WHAT DATA OR OTHER INFORMATION DO YOU THINK IS NECESSARY TO MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION ON THIS ISSUE?

Review any and all complaints regarding marking paint. Contact and review any and all information from manufacturing companies of marking paint, regarding the safe removal of their products on various surfaces and

the life expectancy of the paint if not removed in various climates.

Does the required data exist today? If so, please identify potential public data sources.

Yes, the data is currently available. However, I feel you should independently verify this information first. If you would like me to provide it contact me.

Ian Bryant