






Statewide Damage Prevention Programs and the Nine Elements

The PIPES Act of 2006 placed strong emphasis on addressing and improving state damage prevention programs. PHMSA's position is that effective damage prevention programs should be developed and implemented at the state level. However, there is considerable variability among state damage prevention laws and related damage prevention programs.

PHMSA seeks to characterize and document the states' damage prevention programs relative to the nine elements of effective damage prevention programs defined in the PIPES Act. PHMSA's goal in this effort is to gain a better understanding of the variability in state damage prevention programs across the United States at a level of detail that will assist PHMSA with making decisions regarding where and how to apply resources. PHMSA has created this document as the foundation of the state damage prevention program characterizations.

The purpose of this effort is *not* to assign scores to states' damage prevention programs or to compare state programs against each other. Rather, this effort is designed to illustrate damage prevention program strengths and areas that could use improvement relative to the nine elements. PHMSA is interested in presenting a "Consumer Reports" style characterization of state damage prevention programs for presentation on PHMSA's [Stakeholder Communications website](#). Thus, the characterization for each criterion will be indicated by the following symbols:

-  = Largely implemented program element
-  = Partially implemented or not fully developed program element; actions are underway or planned for improvements
-  = Partially implemented or marginally effective program element that needs improvement; no actions are underway or planned for improvements
-  = Program element is not implemented and needs to be addressed
-  = No information available or not applicable

Sources of Characterization Criteria

PHMSA believes that the criteria listed under each element below are representative, for the most part, of the findings and recommendations of all parties (NAPSR, EDPI, PHMSA, and others) that were involved in interpreting and providing guidance for implementing the nine elements. In many cases, the Common Ground Alliance (CGA) Best Practices state the recommendations in the most clear and concise way and are aligned with the intentions of the parties listed above. However, the use of CGA Best

Practices as criteria should not be construed as a mandate for adoption of the CGA Best Practices. Please note that only a selection of CGA Best Practices was used in this document and only if the Best Practices aligned with one or more of the nine elements. PHMSA recognizes that effective damage prevention programs can take many forms and the intent of this effort is to simply document what state damage prevention programs are currently doing.

Certain elements are more easily analyzed than others. Accordingly, the number of questions for each element varies. The number of questions for each element should not be construed as an indicator of the importance of the element. All elements are considered equally important. Finally, this document is not intended to be used by PHMSA as a basis for adjusting scores or reducing funding for state pipeline safety base grants.

No single document was the driver for development of the criteria. The resources used to develop the criteria were:

- PHMSA personnel and support staff recommendations
- PHMSA's Damage Prevention Assistance Program (DPAP) Guide (<http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/publications/DPAP-Guide-FirstEdition-20080911.pdf?nocache=6648>)
- Common Ground Alliance (CGA) Best Practices v. 6.0 (http://www.commongroundalliance.com/Content/NavigationMenu/Best_Practices/Best_Practices_2009/Best_Practices_Version_6_0.htm)
- Integrity Management for Gas Distribution (DIMP) Phase I Report, December 2005 (http://www.cycla.com/opsiswc/docs/S8/P0068/DIMP_PhaseIReport_Final.pdf)
- Excavation Damage Prevention Initiative (EDPI) Guide to the 9 Elements (http://www.commongroundalliance.com/Content/ContentGroups/General_CGA/EDPI_GuideTo9Elements_CGAWebVersion.pdf)
- National Association of Pipeline Safety Representatives (NAPSR) member input

Documentation of State Damage Prevention Programs Not Included in This Document

- PHMSA's state damage prevention law review spreadsheet (currently under development)
- OCSI Resource Guide (2009-2010) one call law summary (p. 19)








Colorado – State Damage Prevention Program Characterization

Interviewer: Herb Wilhite, Cycla **Date of Interview:** November 11, 2009 **Persons Interviewed:** See end page.






Element 1 – Effective Communications

Overall Characterization:     






“Participation by operators, excavators, and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of methods for establishing and maintaining effective communications between stakeholders from receipt of an excavation notification until successful completion of the excavation, as appropriate.”

| | Characterization Criteria |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1.a | Unless otherwise specified in state law, excavators call the one call center at least two working days and no more than ten working days prior to beginning excavation. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 5-1; PHMSA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Fully compliant. Required by CO law (Colorado Revised Statute (CRS) 9-1.1-101 through -107. |
| 1.b | All excavators must request the location of underground facilities at each site by notifying the facility owner/operator through the one call center. Few excavation activities are exempted from the one call requirement. Please list exemptions. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 5-1; PHMSA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Required by law. Exemptions include: excavators, only if in agreement with facility owner/operator; landscapers for routine maintenance, limited to 4” mechanized digging depth (specific equipment list) or 12” hand digging; agriculture (rancher or farmer) on ranch or farm unless for non-agricultural purpose. |
| 1.c | The excavator has access to a one call center 24 hours per day, 7 days a week. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 5-7) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Online 24 x 7 and emergencies after normal |





| | Characterization Criteria | ● | ◐ | ◑ | ● | ⊗ | Notes |
|-----|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | business hours. Voice calls 7 AM – 5 PM, Monday - Friday. Homeowners must wait for next business day to call. Online, “Web ticket entry” for professionals and “Caller” for homeowners and professionals, are processed next business day. |
| 1.d | The one call center(s) serving a specifically defined geopolitical area is (are) structured so that an excavator need only make one call and a facility owner/operator need only belong to a single one call center. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 3-2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | UNCC is only one-call in CO. Caller may need to make additional calls to “Tier 2” members that are affected. UNCC will provide list. Discussion of requiring mandatory “Tier 1” membership but no specific actions underway. Excavators only have to make the additional calls to Tier 2 members about 1/3 of the time. This will affect about 15% additional tickets if Tier 2 members become mandatory. Tier 2 includes water, sewer, private owners and some municipals like the City of Aurora. Some municipals have their own call centers. Pipeline included in Tier 1 |

| | Characterization Criteria |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1.e | All facility locate requests result in a positive response from the facility owner/operator to the excavator. A positive response may include one or more of the following: markings or documentation left at the job site, callback, fax, or automated response system. A positive response allows the excavator to know whether all facility owners/operators have marked the requested area prior to the beginning of the excavation. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 4-9) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | All locate requests get positive response from the facility operator by law with either marking or communication of no conflict. There is no performance measurement to determine if this occurs. UNCC offers all Tier 1 members positive response tracking software, ~130 utilize. Many large utilities (including Tier 2) in the state document and provide positive response to 3rd parties. Law says excavator is responsible to maintain adequate and accurate documentation of positive response. Most operator's will provide excavator with photos, sketches of location of dig and utilities. |
| 1.f | The one call center, facility owners/operators, and excavators all have clearly defined written processes that define roles and responsibilities and facilitate communication between all parties. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 4-14) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Law says excavator must use "reasonable care" and defines other stakeholder roles and responsibilities. An Excavator Handbook is also produced and UNCC has procedures. |
| 1.g | The communications processes support and encourage feedback from stakeholders on how the communication process can be improved. (PHMSA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | State Damage Prevention Action Team (DPAT) and State Damage Prevention Councils (11 across the |






| | Characterization Criteria | | | | | | Notes |
|-----|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | state). All stakeholders are encouraged to participate. |
| 1.h | The one call center has a process for receiving and transmitting requests for meetings between the excavator and facility operator(s) for the purpose of discussing locating facilities on large or complex jobs. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 3-14). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Specific appointment request by facility owner/operator. |
| 1i | When the excavation site cannot be clearly and adequately identified on the locate ticket, the excavator designates the route and/or area to be excavated using white pre-marking (white-lining) prior to the arrival of the locator. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 5-2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Practice in place but not defined in state law. Promoted in Excavator Handbook and forums. Operators don't request. Need to implement on smaller, harder to define projects. |
| 1.j | A uniform color code and set of marking symbols is adopted. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 4-3) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | APWA |
| 1.k | There are processes in place to encourage facility owners/operators to respond to locate requests promptly, accurately, in compliance with state law. (NAPSR) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | UNCC encourages; state law says 2 business days. Process enables excavator to call UNCC to make a 2 nd request if facilities are not marked. Excavator Handbook also addresses. Some operators have internal processes. |
| 1.l | Facility owners/operators provide the one call center with mapping data that will allow proper notification of excavation activities near the facility owners'/operators' infrastructure. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 6-12) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | UNCC will take updates via GIS digital data, shape files, mapping on hardcopy, etc. Will work with operator to get data. Operator encouraged to update at least annually but can do so any |






| | Characterization Criteria |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | time needed. |
| 1.m | The locator provides feedback to the one call center on land base mapping and location discrepancies [and the one call center has a process in place to address these discrepancies]. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 6-9) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Excavator and operator will report discrepancies. Not required in law. One-call encourages frequently. Process in one-call to identify streets missing and ticket number and issue data base request to update land base map. County and state agencies provide accurate updates. |
| 1.n | The excavator notifies the facility owner/operator directly or through the one call center if an underground facility is not found where one has been marked or if an unmarked underground facility is found. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 5-21) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Excavator calls UNCC and operator is then notified. Excavator requests reverification. |
| 1.o | An excavator discovering or causing damage to underground facilities notifies the facility owner/operator and the one call center. All breaks, leaks, nicks, dents, gouges, grooves, or other damages to facility lines, conduits, coatings or cathodic protection are reported. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 5-24; 49 USC Section 60114(d)(3)(A)) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Law requires. Only ~30% of damages are reported (gut feeling by UNCC). DIRT requires facility owner reporting to UNCC. DIRT originated with UNCC. |
| 1.p | In the event of a damage that results in the escape of any flammable, toxic, or corrosive gas or liquid or endangers life, health or property, the excavator responsible for the damage immediately notifies 911 and the facility owner/operator. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 5-25; 49 USC section 60114(d)(3)(B)) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Encouraged in documents and presentations but not provided in state law. Included in Excavator Handbook and in the UNCC incoming call greeting. Operator public awareness materials promote. Implementation is adequate. |

Element 2 – Comprehensive Stakeholder Support

Overall Characterization:     

“A process for fostering and ensuring the support and partnership of stakeholders, including excavators, operators, locators, designers, and local government in all phases of the program.”

| | Characterization Criteria |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.a | There is a prominent and recognizable damage prevention program champion (organization or person) in the lead on improving the damage prevention program in the state.(PHMSA) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | UNCC is the most visible leader. The DPAT and DP councils are becoming prominent, assisted by a PHMSA DP Grant. Excavators (91%) know about one-call (Fleishman-Hilliard Survey). Generally combined efforts but not a solitary prominent organization. Many efforts are not coordinated. DPAT is attempting to improve coordination (e.g., development of DP portal) and by county DP report card which grades on damage reporting, public awareness, # tickets/population and composite. Future |

| | Characterization Criteria |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | component of report card is DP activities. |
| 2.b | There are ongoing outreach efforts to engage and recruit stakeholders as partners in the damage prevention process. (PHMSA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | As noted above by UNCC, DPAT, DP councils, PUC. |
| 2.c | There are few facility owners/operators that are exempt from one call membership. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 3-26) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | CDOT and railroads are only exemptions. Also homeowners with private facilities that cross public ROW. |
| 2.d | The one call center board of directors is composed of representatives of all stakeholders, assuring that the viewpoints of all stakeholders will be considered in the policies and programs of the one call center. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 7-2: Incentive – One Call Center Board of Directors, p. 53) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Locators are represented by operators. Board includes an excavator seat. |
| 2.e | All stakeholders have opportunity for providing input and feedback regarding the damage prevention process, including any efforts to change the state damage prevention law, rules, best practices, etc. (PHMSA; NAPSRS). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | As noted above and certainly in legislative process. |
| 2.f | The one call center or another entity routinely hosts and conducts in-house and field meetings with excavators, locators, and operators to educate, raise awareness, and encourage communication among stakeholders on how the damage prevention process can be improved. (PHMSA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | UNCC, DPAT, DP councils, operators, PUC. |






Element 3 – Operator Internal Performance Measurement








Overall Characterization:

“A process for reviewing the adequacy of a pipeline operator’s internal performance measures regarding persons performing locating services and quality assurance programs.”

Note: As stated in the PIPES Act, this element is focused on hazardous liquid and gas pipeline operators. The PHMSA DPAP Guidance expands the scope of this element to include all underground facility operators, although other facility operators are less likely to have such internal performance and QA programs.

| | Characterization Criteria |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 3.a | Pipeline operators have a quality assurance program in place for monitoring the locating and marking of facilities. Facility owners/operators conduct regular field audits of the performance of locators/contractors and take action when necessary. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 4-18, NAPSRS) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | CO has intrastate gas pipeline jurisdiction only. Excel Energy is largest gas and electric utility in the state and does have a QA program in place. Small operators are not likely to have QA programs. Medium operators may. COMMENT: PHMSA should develop suggested guideline in this area based on annual report data. |
| 3.b | Pipeline operators include performance measures in facility locating services contracts with corresponding and meaningful incentives and penalties. (NAPSRS) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Excel Energy does. Looks at both on-time and quality performance. Other operators are likely to, but can't say with |






| | Characterization Criteria | | | | | | Notes |
|-----|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | certainty. Expectation is that all operators should have a process in place for any OQ covered task. Again (COMMENT) – need guideline/standard. |
| 3.c | Locate contractors address performance problems for persons performing locating services through mechanisms such as re-training, process change, or changes in staffing levels. (PHMSA) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Excel Energy does in performance contracts. Other operators likely vary. Excel participates with locate contractors to provide training. |
| 3.d | Facility owners/operators periodically review the Operator Qualification plan criteria and methods used to qualify personnel to perform locates. (NAPSR) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | PUC does in OQ audits. Excel looks at contracts for OQ plans and takes actions when necessary for employees and contractor employees. |
| 3.e | During inspections of jurisdictional operators, the state pipeline safety agency reviews operators' locating and excavation <u>procedures</u> for compliance with state law and regulations. (NAPSR) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

| | Characterization Criteria |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 3.f | During inspections of jurisdictional operators, the state pipeline safety agency examines a sample of <u>records</u> to determine if locates are being made within the timeframes required by state law and regulations. (NAPSR) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | When possible. PUC works with operators and UNCC to determine. Locate timeframes are not maintained by UNCC. The rate of 2 nd notice requests give the big picture. Statistics on 2 nd notice requests by UNCC is improving. Suggested best practice for all one-calls is to track 2 nd notice requests, broken down by industry type. |
| 3.g | During inspections of jurisdictional operators, the state pipeline safety agency determines if locating and excavating personnel are properly <u>qualified</u> in accordance with the operator's Operator Qualification plan and with federal and state requirements. (NAPSR) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Element 4 – Effective Employee Training

Overall Characterization:

“Participation by operators, excavators, and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of effective employee training programs to ensure that operators, the one call center, the enforcing agency, and the excavators have partnered to design and implement training for the employees of operators, excavators, and locators.”






| | Characterization Criteria |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 4.a | A multi-stakeholder training committee or equivalent has been established, with participation by the one call center, facility owners/operators, the state enforcement agency, excavators, locators, and other interested stakeholders. Input from the committee is factored into the identification of training needs and the development and implementation of employee training programs for operators, excavators and locators. Damage prevention program training needs are systematically and periodically identified. (NAPSR; PHMSA) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Via DPAT and DP councils look at damage data, DP metrics, DIRT, etc. They participate in first responder excavation training. Excel Energy addresses frequent offender excavators. DP Report Card will help identify issues and target needed improvements. Report card is well-documented and goes to the individual county DP councils for review and action. Expect future efforts to look specifically at training, via PHMSA grants. Have discussed the need/possibility of a general DP certification. |
| 4.b | Training curricula are prepared, readily available, and | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | By all at the individual |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| | periodically reviewed for needed changes. (PHMSA) | | | | | | organization level. |
| 4.c | Employee training programs and the development process for these programs are periodically evaluated for effectiveness and needed changes. (PHMSA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | By all at the individual organization level. |
| 4.d | For all stakeholders, Employee training programs and needs are tailored to available data trends relative to performance, complaints, near misses or damage incidents and, if necessary, in response to specific incidents. (PHMSA) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | DP Report Card. A little more proactive than just reacting to incidents. |
| 4.e | A training calendar is maintained and training is scheduled in support of the needs of stakeholders. (NAPSR) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Individually by organization, via websites, meeting notices, etc. |
| 4.f | Training records for individuals are maintained. (PHMSA) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | For DPAT and DP council meetings attendance is documented and maintained. Often operators meet with stakeholders and keep individual records to document for RP 1162. One issue noted is operators using contractor or consultant trainers but not being present at their own meetings to respond to inquiries/input. |

Element 5 – Public Education

Overall Characterization:     

“A process for fostering and ensuring active participation by all stakeholders in public education for damage prevention activities.”

| | Characterization Criteria |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.a | Public education programs are used to promote compliance. A single entity is charged to promote comprehensive and appropriate programs to educate all stakeholders about the existence and content of the damage prevention laws and regulations. This is not meant to discourage individual stakeholders from providing educational programs. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 7-1 A) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | UNCC. State law requires UNCC to have state DP education program. |
| 5.b | The state damage prevention education program establishes strategic relationships in an effort to leverage common resources. These relationships are established between governmental agencies, emergency responders, associations of all types, media outlets, grass roots organizations, and others and involve partnering to further damage prevention education efforts. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 8-8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially. Strategic relationships haven't included emergency responders or governmental agencies, but will focus on that in the future. DPAT doesn't include emergency responders, but individual pipeline operators do. |
| 5.c | The state damage prevention education program includes a comprehensive, strategic marketing/advertising plan that focuses on setting realistic goals and allocating sufficient resources required to achieve these goals within specified timeframes. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 8-1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | DP councils are encouraged to identify their needs. Could use better coordination among statewide organizations. |
| 5.d | Damage prevention stakeholders, including facility | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | UNCC and operators do |

| | Characterization Criteria | | | | | | Notes |
|-----|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | owners/operators, locators, excavators, government representatives, and others use field representatives to provide education anytime and anywhere it is needed. (NAPSR) | | | | | | this. |
| 5.e | The state damage prevention education program includes identification of target audiences and their individual needs. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 8-2) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | This is assisted via the DP Report Card. |
| 5.f | The one call center has a documented, proactive public awareness, education and damage prevention program. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 3-1) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Element 6 – Dispute Resolution

Overall Characterization:


“A process for resolving disputes that defines the State authority’s role as a partner and facilitator to resolve issues.”

Interviewers: please ask for description of existing dispute resolution/enforcement process and description of any initiatives underway with respect to these elements. Document in summary paragraph on last page.






| | Characterization Criteria | | | | | | Notes |
|-----|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 6.a | A state authority is designated as having a clearly defined role as a partner and facilitator in resolving/mediating damage prevention disputes. (PHMSA) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | CO law CRS 9-1.5-104.3 addresses Alternative Dispute Resolution. Process is in place for UNCC to facilitate the process in resolving concerns, issues on a voluntary basis. |






| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | Documentation is on the UNCC website. No cases have been heard yet, but approximately 1/week is requested. Requests usually get parties talking and resolving issues without need for a formal meeting. ADR decisions are binding. PUC would like a more formal process with resolution directed by a state agency when it is needed. |
| 6.b | There is a due process for resolving disputes related to damage prevention issues. (PHMSA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | As noted above, ADR. |
| 6.c | The state authority operates under a transparent set of rules and procedures to resolve damage prevention disputes. (PHMSA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 6.d | Dispute resolution is accomplished through a balanced committee of stakeholders. (PHMSA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | All affected stakeholders are represented within an ADR request (e.g., excavator, operator, UNCC) |

Element 7 – Enforcement

Overall Characterization:     

“Enforcement of State damage prevention laws and regulations for all aspects of the damage prevention process, including public education, and the use of civil penalties for violations assessable by the appropriate State authority.”

| | Characterization Criteria |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 7.a | A damage prevention enforcement authority is defined by state law or regulation. (PHMSA) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | There is no enforcement authority defined by state law or regulation. The attorneys general would have authority in civil cases. State law is quiet on the issue. The law does define civil penalties for no call, or no call with damage, but the operator would have to pursue via civil action. |
| 7.b | The enforcement authority (if one exists) has a defined process for receiving reports of violations from any stakeholder. and a transparent violation review process and violation assessment considerations. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 7-5 A) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No enforcement authority defined. |
| 7.c | The violation review process and violation assessment considerations are transparent. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 7-5 A) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No enforcement authority defined. |
| 7.d | The enforcement authority (if one exists) collects and makes available to interested parties annual statistics on the numbers of incidents, investigations, enforcement actions, proposed penalties, and collected penalties. (PHMSA) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No enforcement authority defined. |

| | Characterization Criteria |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7.e | Damage prevention law and regulations are reasonably enforced. Reasonable enforcement refers to actions by enforcement authority officials and enforcement processes, both of which aim to fairly arrive at rational outcomes without imposing unnecessarily high transaction costs on any participant. The penalty system (if one exists) does not allow any violator or class of violators to be shielded from the consequences of a violation (i.e., all stakeholders are held accountable). (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 7-3) (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 7-2; NAPSR) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No enforcement authority defined. |
| 7.f | The compliance program (if one exists) includes penalties for violations of the damage prevention laws or regulations. Performance and penalty incentives are equitably administered among stakeholders subject to one call provisions. The penalty system (if one exists) uses a tiered structure to distinguish violations by the level of severity or repeat offenses (e.g., warning letters, mandatory education, civil penalty amounts). (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 7-3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Penalties defined in law include \$200 for no ticket with no damage; \$5,000 for no ticket with damage. |
| 7.g | The enforcement authority (if one exists) has a defined process for involving stakeholders in periodic review and modification of enforcement processes. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 7-5 A) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No enforcement authority defined. |
| 7.h | The enforcement authority (if one exists) has the resources to respond to notifications of alleged violations in a timely manner. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 7-5 A) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No enforcement authority defined. |
| 7.i | Any time a pipeline damage occurs, the enforcement authority (if one exists) performs a proper investigation. This is to determine not only the responsible party but also the root cause of the damage. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 4-16) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No enforcement authority defined. |
| 7.j | During investigations of incidents or accidents resulting from excavation damage, the state pipeline safety agency determines if | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

| | Characterization Criteria | | | | | | Notes |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | state laws and regulations on locating and proper excavation were followed. (NAPSR) | | | | | | |
| 7.k | A structured review process is used to impartially adjudicate alleged violations. The review process is performed by either: <input type="checkbox"/> Type 1: A single entity, like a state pipeline regulatory authority, Attorney General, etc. Please indicate the entity performing reviews in notes.. <input type="checkbox"/> Type 2: An advisory committee (made up of stakeholders) partnered with the enforcement authority. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No enforcement authority defined. |
| 7.l | Regardless of type, the review process is considered effective by most stakeholders. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 7 B) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No enforcement authority defined. |
| 7.m | The enforcement authority (if one exists) uses incentives, such as performance and education credits, to encourage compliance by stakeholders. (NAPSR) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No enforcement authority defined. |

Element 8 – Technology

Overall Characterization:

“A process for fostering and promoting the use, by all appropriate stakeholders, of improving technologies that may enhance communications, underground pipeline locating capability, and gathering and analyzing information about the accuracy and effectiveness of locating programs.”






| | Characterization Criteria | | | | | | Notes |
|-----|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| 8.a | A multi-stakeholder committee or equivalent has been established | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No such committee |






| | Characterization Criteria | | | | | | Notes |
|-----|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| | to evaluate technologies that may improve damage prevention processes. The committee includes participation by the one call center, facility owners/operators, the state enforcement agency, excavators, locators, and other interested stakeholders. Damage prevention program technology needs are systematically and periodically identified. (PHMSA) | | | | | | established. But, UNCC is looking at implementing technology similar to the VA Pilot Project and is always looking at other technology improvements. |
| 8.b | Implementation of technology among stakeholders is generally tailored to data trends relative to performance, complaints, near misses or damage incidents and, if necessary, in response to specific incidents. (PHMSA) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | DP Report Card will identify trends in performance and damages, and resolution would involve looking at new technology. For example, Excel Energy is looking at HDD damage data and looking for technology improvements to improve. |
| 8.c | Effective training accompanies the implementation of new technologies. (PHMSA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | For example, web ticket entry training is offered. All new technology would require training. |
| 8.d | Critical stakeholders (such as the one call center and the enforcement authority) maintain records of key technologies that have been implemented, including disaster recovery and continuity of operations plans. (PHMSA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 8.e | The one call center uses available technology whenever possible to enhance all aspects of its communications with members, excavators, and the general public. (NAPSR) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Element 9 – Damage Prevention Program Review

Overall Characterization:     

“A process for review and analysis of the effectiveness of each program element, including a means for implementing improvements identified by such program reviews.”

| | Characterization Criteria |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 9.a | Data analysis and program evaluation are used to support the effectiveness of the program and the One Call law, identification and implementation of program improvements, such as process changes, enforcement actions, legislative actions, rulemaking/regulatory actions, and decisions regarding resource allocation. (PHMSA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | DP Report Card |
| 9.b | The one call center establishes and monitors performance standards for the operation of the center, including average speed of answer, abandoned call rate, busy signal rate, customer satisfaction, locate request quality, and notification delivery. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 3-23) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 9.c | Facility owners/operators, locators, excavators, or stakeholders with an interest in underground damage prevention report damages to the CGA Damage Information Reporting Tool (DIRT) or equivalent. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 9-1; PHMSA) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | DIRT and virtual private DIRT are used. Excavators are not reporting adequately. Law requires for facility owner/operator, but there is no enforcement. All stakeholders are encouraged to report. |
| 9.d | Training and education on how and when to complete the damage reporting form (via DIRT or equivalent) is made available. (CGA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Via UNCC |

| | Characterization Criteria |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 9-8) | | | | | | |
| 9.e | The reported damages data is used to assess and improve underground damage prevention efforts. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 9-16) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 9.f | Results of damage reports are quantified against a standardized risk factor. The risk factor considers a stakeholder's exposure to potential damage. This risk factor may be based on factors such as the number of miles of line installed or the number of one call center notification tickets. For example, a risk factor may compare how many underground damages occurred in a certain time period versus the total number of notification tickets issued. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 9-20) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Can be done. All CO counties are rated and compared. Included in DP Score Card. |
| 9.g | Performance levels and trends are assessed against other organizations. (CGA Best Practices v. 6.0, Best Practice 9-21) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Can be done. All CO counties are rated and compared. Included in DP Score Card. Also broken down by facility owner type. |
| 9.h | The reported damages data (in whole or summarized) is made available to the public. (PHMSA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Would it have been helpful to have other people on this call? If so, who?

- No. Maybe excavator.

Summary: In a paragraph, please summarize results, key points, challenges and initiatives underway for each state.

- Participants agree that there is effective damage prevention communication and support in the state. All agree that enforcement needs to be improved via legislative action. Training programs and public education are done by various stakeholder entities as opposed to a “multi-stakeholder committee”, which are not always coordinated but seem to be adequate.

Interviewer: Herb Wilhite, Cycla Corporation

Persons interviewed/organization:

- J. D. Maniscalco, Exc. Dir., Underground Notification Center of Colorado (UNCC)
- Steve Pott, CO PUC
- Brad Vitale, Excel Energy
- Barry Miller, UNCC consultant
- Brent Sumner, UNCC Public Relations Administrator
- Sandy Samuelson, UNCC Member Services

Date: November 11, 2009