



**DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION**  
**Office of the State Fire Marshal**  
**Underground Facilities Safe Excavation Board**

2251 Harvard St., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95815  
(916) 568-3800  
Website: <https://digsafe.fire.ca.gov>



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

June 10-11, 2019

Office of the State Fire Marshal  
Sequoia Conference Room  
2251 Harvard St., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95185

**MEETING MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Carl Voss, Chair  
Jessica Arden, Vice Chair  
Ron Bianchini  
Randy Charland  
Marjorie Del Toro  
Bill Johns  
Marshall Johnson  
Amparo Munoz

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**STAFF:**

Tony Marino, Executive Officer  
Brittney Branaman, Policy and Budget Manager  
Jason Corsey, Chief of Investigations  
Carla Newman, Supervising Investigator  
Dennis Fenton, Special Investigator  
Jon Barkley, Special Investigator  
Michael Ehgott, Special Investigator  
Kerstin Tomlinson, Education & Outreach Officer  
Jon Goergen, Research Specialist  
Jenni Reed, Policy Analyst

---

June 10, 2019  
10:00 a.m.

Office of the State Fire Marshal  
Sequoia Conference Room  
2251 Harvard Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95815

**OPEN SESSION**

Chair Voss called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.

**Agenda Item No. 1: Executive Officer's Report**

Policy and Budget Manager Brittny Branaman discussed the departure of the Board's Administrative Analyst, the interview process for the Board's newly created Operations Manager position, and a state accounting form Board members needed to fill out before the end of the Board's two-day meeting.

Executive Officer Tony Marino discussed the hiring of the Board's new attorney, Jeff Brooks, and gave background information about Mr. Brook's career.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the Board. There were none.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the public. There were none.

**Agenda Item No. 2: Board Member Public Engagement Reports**

Chair Voss asked for Board member engagement reports. Mr. Voss shared his work to engage farmers regarding online ticketing for the Area of Continual Excavation (ACE) ticket, and discussed an upcoming meeting in Bakersfield involving Board staff, representatives of the one call centers, and farmers.

Chair Voss asked for additional Board member engagement reports. There were none.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the public. There were none.

**Agenda Item No. 3: Discussion on Select Preliminary Investigations**

Chief of Investigations Jason Corsey gave a summary of the three preliminary investigations being presented, and discussed the current investigation process.

Special Investigator Dennis Fenton presented the first case. Mr. Fenton told the Board he received a Google Alert about a two-inch plastic gas main strike, and summarized the details of the case including a mismarking of the gas line. He also discussed the need for more locator training, based on his findings.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the Board.

Member Johns asked whether the excavator had an Underground Service Alert (USA) ticket.

Mr. Fenton clarified that the excavator was a local municipality responding to a broken water main and had called in an emergency ticket.

Member Del Toro asked about the type of tool the excavator was using, and how quickly emergency crews responded to the scene.

Mr. Fenton told the Board the excavator was using a backhoe when the gas main was hit. He discussed the response time of emergency crews and the utility who owned the gas line.

Member Voss asked for clarification about how the Board was notified of the incident.

Mr. Fenton discussed the method by which he received notification of the incident, through a Google Alert, then a search of the USA North 811 ticket database to find out whether there was a ticket.

Member Del Toro asked about the time it took to put together the preliminary report.

Mr. Fenton discussed the investigation process in this case, from the moment he received the Google Alert, to his final call from the utility operator the Friday before the Board's meeting. He told the Board the total investigation time was about two weeks.

Member Charland asked whether the excavation crew was still on scene the day of the dig-in.

Mr. Fenton told the Board this was a desk investigation.

Member Johnson asked about the utility response to the emergency USA Ticket.

Mr. Fenton told the Board all the utilities responded by either marking their lines, or telling the excavator there was no conflict.

Vice Chair Arden asked Member Charland about the process for locating and marking the lines using a map versus using signals.

Member Charland discussed the process for locating the lines, including what his locators do when there is a mark on a map but they pick up a stronger signal somewhere else. He told the Board they usually get the utility involved.

Vice Chair Arden asked if this could be an opportunity to educate to with a letter.

Executive Officer Tony Marino told the Board no letters have been sent out at this point, because the Investigations Division is conducting preliminary investigations. He discussed the future letters that will be sent out to violators, and what they will entail.

Member Charland asked if violators can be asked to review their policies.

Mr. Marino told the Board if a violation were found, the Board could ask them to change their procedure as a corrective action.

Mr. Fenton told the Board the excavator in this case updated their procedure following this investigation.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the public.

A representative from West Valley Construction asked whether Board investigators tried to contact the parties involved using the information provided on the USA Ticket.

Mr. Fenton discussed the use of contact information provided on the USA Ticket, telling the Board it was very accurate for the gas company, but he ran into issues contacting the municipality involved.

A representative from USA North 811 asked for clarification about the mismarking of the line, and asked whether there were two lines on the map.

Mr. Fenton discussed his request for the utility map, but told the Board he never received it.

A representative from the Southern California Contractors Association (SCCA) asked about the Board's criteria for investigating incidents.

Mr. Marino discussed the criteria for the Board's preliminary investigations begins based on no call and no ticket damages. He also discussed the criteria for investigations once enforcement begins on July 1, 2020.

A representative from the Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) asked why the Board considered no call damages a priority.

Mr. Marino discussed the reason the Board chose to investigate no call and now show cases, including the interest from a policy standpoint.

Chair Voss asked for additional comments from the Board and the public on case one. There were none.

Special Investigator Michael Ehrgott presented the second case, discussing the location of the excavation on a residential property, the conditions where the work took place, the type of work taking place, and the circumstances surrounding the hit which involved an abandoned line.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the Board.

Member Munoz discussed her experience with abandoned lines, and thanked the investigators for bringing this case before the Board. She asked about the process to remove the lines once they are abandoned.

Member Johns discussed Common Ground Alliance (CGA) Best Practices regarding abandoned lines, and told the board he would like to see a push toward operators documenting the locations of the lines they abandon.

Member Arden asked who is responsible for marking the lines once the operator

abandons it, and asked the Board and stakeholders to think about how abandoned lines are documented.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the public.

A representative from USA North 811 asked the investigators who owned the as-built drawings for the line.

Mr. Ehrgott told the representative from USA North 811 the contractor had access to the as-builts.

The representative from USA North 811 brought up the issue with homeowners owning as-built files, and discussed how that will make it difficult for the one call centers, and the Dig Safe Board investigators to access the files.

Chair Voss asked for additional comments from the Board and the public on case two. There were none.

(Meeting recessed at 10:59 a.m. and resumed at 11:15 a.m.)

Special Investigators Jon Barkley, Dennis Fenton, and Michael Ehrgott presented the third case, involving a gas line strike during track maintenance for a municipal light rail line using a PowerPoint presentation. They discussed the excavation work that took place, the absence of a ticket for the work, the circumstances of the line strike, and the changes to the excavator's policy following this investigation.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the Board.

Member Munoz asked whether the excavator involved in this case would be willing to partner with the Board for an educational video, and how the process for producing such a video.

Executive Officer Tony Marino discussed the Board's education and outreach plan currently in development, and told the Board the idea of using investigations as future case studies is still being developed.

Member Johnson asked whether the excavator was certified to work on the light rail tracks.

Mr. Ehrgott clarified that the excavator was also the owner of the tracks.

Member Johnson discussed the responsibilities of railroad companies to keep their own records of facilities, and how most railroad companies have strict requirements regarding excavation in their right-of-way.

Mr. Ehrgott discussed the changes the excavator made to their standard operating procedures following this incident.

Board members and staff reviewed photographs of the damaged gas pipe included in the PowerPoint presentation, discussing the depth of the line, the nature of the excavation work, and what happened at the time of the strike.

Mr. Ehrgott discussed the depth of the gas line, and why it was so shallow at the location of the strike. He told the Board the line was reburied at a deeper depth.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the public.

The SCCA representative thanked staff for their investigation, and told the Board it was a good example of how not all excavators are equal. He discussed the importance of education and training.

The West Valley Construction representative asked whether staff had an opportunity to bring training into their discussions with senior management.

Mr. Ehrgott discussed his conversations with senior management, and their commitment to do some in-house training. He discussed the development of the Board's education and outreach plan.

A representative from the California Farm Bureau Federation (CFBF) asked about the Board's plan to use information from this investigation to develop educational materials. She asked if the Board had developed a general timeline.

Mr. Marino discussed the education and outreach plan currently being developed.

The CPUC representative asked about the violations to 4216 in this case, and what the Board's recommendations for enforcement would look like.

Mr. Marino discussed the process for the Board's enforcement recommendations, including the role of the Board's new attorney in providing enforcement guidelines, the role of Board members in determining whether violations will or will not be stacked, and the process for determining violations.

A representative from Flatiron Construction asked staff about the municipality's safety procedure and whether reading the procedure was part of the Board's investigation.

Mr. Ehrgott discussed the standard operating procedure he reviewed as part of the excavation, and how it did not include anything about calling 811 to request a ticket. He told the Board, the company issued a memo requiring all staff to call 811 for any excavation project and is currently in the process of updating their procedure.

Chair Voss asked for additional comments from the Board. There were none.

Chair Voss asked for additional comments from the public. There were none.

(Meeting recessed at 12:00 p.m. and resumed at 1:39 p.m.)

**Agenda Item No. 4: Draft Regulations on Area of Continual Excavation Ticket Renewal Requirement and AB 1914 Implementation**

Executive Officer Tony Marino gave an overview of the proposed regulation sections for the Area of Continual Excavation (ACE) Ticket Renewal Requirement (4305, 4310, and 4345), and the changes made since the Board's last meeting in May.

Chair Voss asked Mr. Marino if the Board could discuss each section individually.

Mr. Marino discussed section 4305 and the addition of language similar to what was included on the ACE Forms that were approved by the Board at its February meeting. He discussed how the addition of the language to the regulations would assure the language applies to all ACE tickets, and not just high priority agreements.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the Board.

Member Munoz asked Board members whether everyone was clear with the language.

Member Charland asked for clarification.

Mr. Marino clarified that the excavator must communicate the location of the facilities, the work area, and any safety information to anyone authorized to work under the ACE Ticket.

Member Munoz asked about the process to authorize excavators under the ACE Ticket.

Mr. Marino discussed the idea of the land owner authorizing excavators to work under the ticket, but told the Board the manner in which authorization happens is not defined.

Chair Voss discussed the intent behind the high priority onsite meeting ACE agreement form the Board voted on in February, and how this language is meant to cover non-high priority facilities where no meeting is required.

Member Johns discussed the authorization process, and requirement for the ACE Ticket holder to relay all safety information to the employees he authorizes to work under his ticket.

Mr. Marino discussed how the language allows excavators who request an ACE Ticket to include their yearly excavation plan on their ticket for operators to see and agree to.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the public.

A representative from the California Farm Bureau Federation (CFBF) expressed her appreciation for the language, and discussed how the ACE Ticket was meant to simple for the land owner to relay their plan to the operator.

A representative from USA North 811 asked for clarification about subcontractors working under an ACE Ticket. He discussed the current requirements for subcontractors to request their own ticket under GOV 4216.8.

Chair Voss discussed the Board's field visit in July, where members and stakeholders observed common crop planting operations with farm staff. He discussed the farmer's responsibility to know who is working on the property and to relay all excavation safety information to anyone digging.

Member Munoz voiced concern over the proposed language not being clear enough for the farmer to understand they are responsible for all activity being performed on the property.

Mr. Marino discussed the purpose of regulations being to direct people to do something, and the dangerous of regulating outcomes. He discussed the importance of making sure the Board is clear about what they want the ticket holder to do.

A representative from the Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) voiced concern over the lack of an agreement for non-high priority facilities.

Chair Voss clarified that there is no requirement for an onsite meeting for non-high priority facilities, but they can request one. He also discussed the idea that the operator would agree to the plan the excavator included on the ACE Ticket.

A representative from Sprint asked how the ACE Ticket gets communicated to the non-high priority operators.

Mr. Marino discussed the new field on the Underground Service Alert (“USA”) Ticket that will indicate that the ticket is annual.

The representative from Sprint discussed the need to educate operators about the ticket changes.

A representative from Pacific Gas and Electric Co. (PG&E) addressed Member Munoz’s concerns about clarity in the proposed regulation language and read from GOV 4216.10. He told the Board when section 4305 of the proposed regulation language is read in context, it makes sense.

The Board, staff, and stakeholders discussed concerns over ACE Tickets for flood control operations, and the Board’s narrow definition of the flood control work that would qualify for an ACE Ticket being limited to water storage facilities only.

Chair Voss asked for additional comments from the Board. There were none.

Chair Voss asked for additional comments from the public. There were none.

Mr. Marino discussed section 4310 of the proposed regulation language, and the changes that had been made since the Board’s May meeting in San Francisco.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the Board. There were none.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the public. There were none.

Mr. Marino discussed the addition to section 4345 to the proposed regulation language, explaining the section was necessary to clarify that an onsite meeting for high priority facilities would need to take place prior to the renewal of an ACE ticket.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the Board.

Member Johns voiced concern over the Board’s limited knowledge of flood control operations, and asked staff to research flood control issues so the Board could potentially add to the regulation language in the future, if needed.



Chair Voss asked for comments from the Public.

A representative from DigAlert asked for clarification about new area of continual excavation plan, and whether they would qualify for renewals or need a new ticket.

Mr. Marino clarified that a new ticket would need to be requested for a change in the plan.

Board members and staff discussed changes to the proposed language to clarify when a ticket can be renewed, and when the excavator needs to apply for a new ticket.

The representative from Sprint asked whether definitions of terms used in the proposed language will be available for stakeholders to review.

Mr. Marino discussed the definitions being a part of the regulations currently in public comment. He discussed the idea of the one call centers including the definitions in their newer versions for their excavator guides.

Chair Voss asked for additional comments from the Board. There were none.

Chair Voss asked for additional comments from the public. There were none.

(Meeting recessed at 3:02 p.m. and resumed at 3:17 p.m.)

Mr. Marino gave an overview of the proposed regulation sections for the implementation of AB 1914 (4003, 4401, 4500, and 4501), and the changes made since the Board's last meeting in May. He then read through section 4003 regarding contact information for members of the regional notification centers regarding power tool use in the tolerance zone and discussed the reasoning for the changes made.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the Board.

Member Del Toro expressed her support for the changes to the language.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the public.

The representative from DigAlert voiced concern over the use of the word and between telephone and email address in the proposed language, telling the Board some one call center members do not have an email address. She asked if the language could be changed to say "and/or."

Member Del Toro asked if the Board could strike the part of the language that asks the one call center members to provide their name, telling the board it can be confusing for the excavator.

Board members and staff discussed the proposed requirement for the one-call center members to include a name in their contact information. They discussed the issues of excavators getting tied up in a phone tree and the idea that the name could be a department or entity and not a person. Board members and staff also discussed whether an email address should be required. They discussed the prevalence of email in society, the idea that the email needs to reach a person who is authorized to respond

the request, and asked utility operators and excavators to share their experience in this arena.

Member Johnson discussed AT&T's internal process for responding to locate or damage inquiries, and the methods by which the company's damage prevention managers can be reached. He discussed the idea that most large utilities offer one number that connects the caller to a phone tree.

Member Bianchini discussed his experience using 800-numbers that connect to phone trees. He told the Board his employees have to sometimes escalate the issue to a higher department, just to get a response.

Member Munoz discussed how this is a common problem across the industry.

Chair Voss asked for public comment.

A representative from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) shared the department's process for triaging calls, including 24-hour staffing that can route calls to the correct people.

A representative from PG&E discussed how the company encourages excavators to reach out to its investigators if they have a problem.

A representative from West Valley Construction discussed the idea of building relationships with utility representatives in the field to allow his employees reach out directly if there is an issue. He also discussed the idea of calling the one-call centers to get the issue documented.

A representative from the United Contractors (UCON) raised concerns about contractors encountering dead numbers when they are calling for help with an issue.

A CPUC representative suggested the Board add language about promptly updating contact information to ensure one-call center members update their information quickly.

Member Bianchini discussed the regulations passed in February, and how the language requires the one-call center members to update their contact information when it changes. He raised concern with including a specific timeline, and how that might lead to information not getting updated until the deadline arrives.

Board members, staff, and stakeholders discussed the idea of asking for one-call center members to provide an email address, and whether it should be required, or an option. The Board decided to require the one call center members to provide an email address.

Chair Voss asked for additional comments from the Board. There were none.

Chair Voss asked for additional comments from the public. There were none.

Executive Officer Tony Marino discussed section 4401 regarding contact information for excavators using the regional notification centers, the changes made since the Board's May meeting, and the reasons for the changes.

Chair Voss asked for comments from the Board.

Member Bianchini discussed the idea of the excavator being held to the same standard as the utility operators, who also must give both a phone number and an email address.

Chair Voss asked for public comment.

A representative from PG&E voiced concern with current excavator contact information directing utility operators to an office technician.

Member Charland discussed the proposed regulation language requiring contact information for a knowledgeable person.

A representative from USA North 811 voiced concern with requiring small excavators to provide an email address.

A representative from DigAlert discussed the email requirement, and why smaller one-call center members might take issue with it. She told the Board some members may only use email for a ticket management system. She also raised concern about requiring an email from excavators and how that might deter homeowners from calling in, because they don't want to receive spam.

Chair Voss clarified that homeowners are not covered by the regulation.

A member from Southern California Contractor's Association commented via the webcast, requesting that the Board not require an email address.

Chair Voss asked for additional comments from the Board. There were none.

Chair Voss asked for additional comments from the public. There were none.

#### **Other Business**

None.

#### **Public Comment**

Chair Voss asked for comments from the public. There were none.

#### **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

---

June 11, 2019  
9:00 a.m.

Office of the State Fire Marshal  
Sequoia Conference Room  
2251 Harvard Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95815

**MEETING MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jessica Arden, Acting Chair  
Ron Bianchini  
Randy Charland  
Marjorie Del Toro  
Bill Johns  
Marshall Johnson  
Amparo Munoz

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Carl Voss

**STAFF:**

Tony Marino, Executive Officer  
Brittney Branaman, Policy and Budget Manager  
Carla Newman, Supervising Investigator  
Dennis Fenton, Special Investigator  
Jon Barkley, Special Investigator  
Michael Ehrgott, Special Investigator  
Kerstin Tomlinson, Education and Outreach Officer  
Jon Goergen, Research Specialist  
Jenni Reed, Policy Analyst

**OPEN SESSION**

Chair Arden called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

**Agenda Item No. 4: Draft Regulations on Area of Continual Excavation Ticket  
Renewal Requirement and AB 1914 Implementation**

Executive Officer Tony Marino gave an overview of the proposed language in section 4501 of the draft regulations, regarding the use of equipment other than hand tools to determine the exact location of a subsurface installation. He detailed the changes to subdivision (a), and discussed the reasons for the changes.

Chair Arden asked for comments from the Board.

Member Charland reminded the Board of the discussion at its May meeting, and clarified that the subdivision assumes that the person using the equipment is familiar with the soil types.

Member Bianchini discussed standard excavation practices on a construction site, including the requirement to have a competent person on site who classifies the soil at the beginning of the day, and any time the crew leaves the trench for a break or lunch.

Board members and staff further discussed the competent person on a construction site, the OSHA training requirements for a competent person, and OSHA's definitions for the different soil types.

Chair Arden asked for comments from the public.

A representative from United Contractors (UCON) asked for clarification about hand tool use regarding sections 3 and 4 under 4216.4, and whether a contractor would run into a conflict with a fiber optic company over the use of power tools.

Member Bianchini discussed the requirement to use hand tools is only prior to the location of the facility, and that excavators can use any tool once the location of the facility is determined.

A representative from the Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) asked where the competent person documents soil classifications on the worksite.

Member Bianchini discussed the Cal/OSHA rules for a competent person, and how soil classifications are often recorded in a report that is located on the worksite.

Chair Arden asked for additional comments from the Board. There were none.

Chair Arden asked for comments from the public. There were none.

Executive Officer Tony Marino discussed subdivision (b) of section 4501, the reason the section remained unchanged, and asked Policy Analyst Jenni Reed to present her research on power tools.

Ms. Reed discussed her research on tool specs, and the samples she pulled for eight different models. She elaborated on her findings regarding tool weight and the use of "T" handles, and the weight range for tools being between 27 and 37 pounds without any accessories added. Mrs. Reed discussed compliance with the Board's regulations regarding the weight of the tool.

Member Charland asked about the weight of the bit.

Ms. Reed discussed her research on bits, and explained that she only considered the width, not the weight because the regulation only deals with width. She elaborated on the average width of the bit being between four-and-a-half and five-and-a-half inches.

Member Bianchini discussed the research being informative, and proposed that the regulations should restrict the weight of the tool to no more than 40-pounds.

Member Munoz asked about the number of models that were compatible with the five-and-a-half-inch bit.

Ms. Reed clarified that only one model was compatible with the five-and-a-half-inch bit.

Chair Arden asked the Board if it approved of restricting the weight to no more than 40-pounds, and restricting the bit width to no more than four-and-a-half-inches.

The Board discussed their consensus for the changes.

Chair Arden asked for public comment.

A representative from West Valley Construction expressed concern with limiting excavators to sizes of bits, and discussed the original equipment manufacturer requirements.

Member Bianchini discussed subsections b and c of section 4501 of the regulations, which addresses the manufacturer specifications.

Chair Arden asked for additional comments from the Board. There were none.

Chair Arden asked for additional comments from the public. There were none.

Executive Officer Tony Marino discussed subdivision c of section 4501, the changes made to the section since the Board's May meeting, and the reasons for the changes.

Chair Arden asked for comments from the Board.

Member Charland voiced concerns over locators being asked to make decisions on behalf of the operator, stating they don't have the authority.

Member Bianchini discussed the provision that required the excavator to contact the operator with any questions.

Board members discussed the current process for requesting to use a power tool prior to finding the location of an underground facility, including the check box on the USA Ticket indicating vacuum truck use and field meetings with operators to discuss safe excavation practices.

Chair Arden asked for comments from the public.

A representative from United Contractors asked for clarification about the "in writing" provision included in the draft text, including a definition and timeline for when the operator would have to respond.

Member Bianchini clarified that "in writing" incorporated electronic methods of communication, like email but discussed the need for the Board to better clarify what "in writing" means.

A representative from LADWP asked what a reasonable amount of time for a response to a request to use power tools to locate an underground facility would be.

Board members, staff and stakeholders discussed the timeframe in which an operator should respond to an excavator's request, including using the two-working day timeline already used for locating and marking a delineated worksite as a jumping off point. They discussed the importance of remaining consistent.

(Meeting recessed at 11:06 a.m. and resumed at 11:22 a.m.)

Mr. Marino asked the Board to discuss a discrepancy in subdivision (c) a representative from Sprint brought up. He read from the draft text, and discussed how the section only applies to power tool use, and not hand tools the way it is written, which limits what excavators and operators can come to an agreement over in the field.

Board members asked staff to redraft the section for discussion at the Board's next meeting.

Chair Arden asked for additional comments from the Board. There were none.

Chair Arden asked for additional comments from the public. There were none.

Mr. Marino discussed subdivision (d) of 4501 of the proposed regulation language regarding vacuum excavation, and read from the draft text. He then asked a representative from the California Regional Common Ground Alliance (CARCGA) to present a prepared letter to the Board.

The CARCGA representative read a prepared letter, discussing vacuum excavation, the process for requesting vacuum excavation and the problems with the current process. She asked the Board to consider not excluding vacuum excavation as a possible alternative to hand tools.

Mr. Marino clarified that the Board would have to request a change in statute to include vacuum excavation as a possible alternative to hand tools, and that it could not be included in the current regulations the Board is working to pass.

Board members, staff, and stakeholders discussed the idea of recommending a change to statute regarding vacuum excavation, and the Board directed staff to consider making a recommendation to the legislature in the future.

Chair asked for additional comments from the Board. There were none.

Chair asked for additional comments from the public. There were none.

### **Other Business**

None.

### **Public Comment**

Chair Arden asked for public comments.

A representative from DigAlert discussed the impact the Dig Safe Board regulations would have to the one-call centers talk time.

Chair Arden asked for additional public comments. There were none.

**Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 12:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Tony Marino

---

Tony Marino  
Executive Officer

Attest:

/s/ Carl Voss

---

Carl Voss  
Chair