

Brief Summaries of State Damage Prevention Program Characterizations

Alabama	Alabama One Call has been the key driver in the state’s damage prevention effort since inception of a one call center in 1975. The one-call center continues to try to improve the damage prevention efforts and education process through cooperative training, programs, and legislation. Alabama One Call and the state pipeline safety office have been unsuccessful in gaining support for legislative changes; however, there are ongoing efforts to work with those groups in opposition to change, to educate them and include them in the process. Many of the damage prevention issues are specific to the underground facility owner and changes must be supported at the corporate level. Alabama One Call continues to work to gain support for improved programs and laws.
Alaska	Alaska DigLine is the leader for the state damage prevention program. One-call membership is not currently mandatory. Juneau has a separate system for locate calls. Alaska DigLine would like to work collaboratively with stakeholders to make improvements that are appropriate for Alaska but is challenged in garnering stakeholder support. Damage prevention program characterization results are based on the knowledge of Alaska DigLine representatives. Element 4 could not be scored on a statewide basis for all stakeholders, but Alaska DigLine does have a strong training program for its staff. The uniqueness of Alaska may result in some program elements being impractical to implement. PHMSA representatives plan to work with Alaska stakeholders to assist in this effort.
Arkansas	The biggest challenges for the Arkansas program are in the enforcement process and the perceived need to adopt a process model to improve enforcement and damage prevention overall. Having an elected official as the designated enforcement authority is not considered effective. A consistent, qualified enforcement staff is needed, along with a defined enforcement process and resources. Use of additional state resources and grant monies would be needed. Discussions about needed changes are ongoing among stakeholders. This will be a long process that will require input and effort from all stakeholders. A second area of need is to improve the use of the CGA Damage Information Reporting Tool (DIRT) or an equivalent damage reporting tool, on a consistent basis.
Arizona	The Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) Pipeline Safety Program and Arizona Blue Stake Program are well-established programs. One challenge mentioned by both organizations is to get better reporting to the CGA Damage Information Reporting Tool (DIRT) or an equivalent system and to have more specific regionalized damage data.
California	California is a large state and has two one-call organizations. The biggest challenge seems to be to get the damage prevention law revised to identify and establish a single entity, composed of a balanced committee of stakeholders, for enforcement and dispute resolution. The CA Regional Common Ground Alliance (CGA) is looking at this issue. Another major area for improvement could be the consolidation/unification of public education efforts to provide consistent messages and leverage resources to increase effectiveness and efficiency.

Colorado	<p>Participants in the damage prevention characterization effort agree that there is effective damage prevention communication and support in the state. They 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. Colorado has for many years collected and analyzed damage data, and utilizes this information to direct resources.</p>
Connecticut	<p>The Connecticut damage prevention program includes mandatory reporting of all underground facility hits and enforcement through the Public Utilities Commission (PUC). The PUC also has authority over the one-call center budget and operations. Extensive use is made of data to analyze the damage prevention program. The PUC recently added an individual to its field staff whose role is 100% damage prevention including education of stakeholders. A current area of emphasis is outreach to gain grass roots support for damage prevention programs. Connecticut will consider establishment of local-level damage prevention initiatives and teams.</p>
Delaware	<p>Delaware is working to improve its damage prevention program. A legislative committee has been reviewing the damage prevention law, and is developing a program that focuses on education at this point. Resources are lacking at the Delaware Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to take on responsibility for enforcement, so at this point enforcement will stay with the state attorney general. It is anticipated that the one-call organization will have a program that incorporates education and warning letters and will refer violations to the attorney general’s office for pursuit of civil penalties when appropriate. The one-call organization has met with the attorney general’s office to propose this system and plans to continue with these efforts.</p>
D.C.	<p>The District of Columbia damage prevention program is quite similar to Maryland’s program. The DC Public Utilities Commission (PUC) enforces compliance for pipeline operators through its pipeline safety program. Enforcement for other parties would be through action brought by Corporation Counsel for DC in Superior Court, but this is not practiced. DC and Maryland recently began collecting high-level damage data on a voluntary basis. This data is not as granular as that collected by the CGA Damage Information Reporting Tool (DIRT) but will be used to target education activities as much as possible. Operators report damage data to DIRT.</p>
Florida	<p>The Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) did not participate in the state damage prevention program characterization teleconference but did provide comments and suggested characterization marks for all of the criteria in Elements 3 & 4, and for Criterion 5.e, 7.j, and 9.a. All of the responses noted for Element 3 are from FPSC in their entirety. Element 4 responses are combined from Sunshine State One-Call of Florida (SSOCOF) representatives and in consideration of FPSC input. Florida does not have a dispute resolution program and enforcement is not routinely practiced. Florida does have stakeholder input for developing the state damage prevention process. Efforts are underway to improve data collection and enforcement. Legislation was introduced in 2010 to address the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt low impact marking provisions to minimize the amount and duration of paint on the ground.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify the intent to have statewide damage prevention regulation. Local governments are passing ordinances (e.g., mandatory white lining, use of only chalk based paint, etc.) that will create requirements different from Chapter 556, F.S. and make it difficult for utilities and contractors to know the rules. • Require SSOCOF to establish a voluntary alternative dispute resolution process to resolve disputes arising from excavation activities. • Provide an increase in penalties for violations of Ch. 556, F. S., including development of a process to allow SSOCOF to contract with the Division of Administrative Hearings (DOAH) to determine appropriate penalties for serious "incidents" (death, hospitalization, significant property damage) involving pipelines (natural gas, gasoline) that are identified as "high priority" installations by the operators of those installations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Other Changes to Ch. 556, F. S: Clarify provisions for underwater marking; Delete the obsolete provision to conduct a feasibility study in 2007; Delete redundant provisions regarding a limited waiver of sovereign immunity; Prohibit using any member/s required and shared information from being used for sales and marketing purposes; Require reports to SSOCOF of Ch. 556, F. S., violations filed with Clerks of Court.
Georgia	Georgia has been actively pursuing effective damage prevention for several years. The program incorporates a comprehensive enforcement program. Current initiatives underway include virtual white-lining and improving transparency for enforcement cases.
Hawaii	pending
Idaho	Idaho has two call centers serving the state – one for northern five counties and the other for the rest of the state. They have defined territories. Idaho’s damage prevention program is in its early stages and not fully developed; however, organized efforts are underway to align the program with the nine elements on a statewide basis. There exists a network of Utility Coordinating Councils, and representatives from each of these councils serve on the statewide Damage Prevention Council. All stakeholders are invited and encouraged to participate.
Indiana	Indiana passed legislation in 2009 incorporating many changes to help align the state damage prevention program with the nine elements. Rules, processes and procedures are under development to implement the law and program changes. Indiana anticipates to be fully aligned with the nine elements upon completion of this process.
Illinois	Illinois has two one-call centers. Digger is for locates within the city limits of Chicago and JULIE for the rest of the state. The two centers appear to have some inconsistencies in their approach to the nine elements. Illinois also has a split enforcement system. In the outstate enforcement utilizes the Illinois Commerce Commission (ICC) enforcement agency, and appeals are made to an advisory board-type system and then to the ICC. In the Chicago city limits Digger follows the municipal code and transportation ordinance, with the city doing enforcement according to the administrative code of the city. This leads to some inconsistent actions within the City of Chicago. ICC data indicates damages to gas facilities per

	<p>1000 locates are much higher in Chicago than for rest of state. Elements 6 and 7 in particular need to be addressed to bring consistency to the Illinois state damage prevention program. Call Centers are beginning to take steps to address some inconsistencies. If the results were completed separately for the two call centers rather than at a statewide level, the JULIE results would reflect a stronger alignment with the nine elements. A new one-call law went into effect January 1, 2010. Illinois is also working on statewide marking standard. Several "Noteworthy Changes to the Illinois Underground Utility Facilities Damage Prevention Act" were appended to state damage prevention program characterization worksheet.</p>
Iowa	<p>The Iowa one-call law gives authority to Iowa One Call to set policy and provides a strong foundation for meeting many of the nine elements. Iowa has an active attorney general damage prevention enforcement process with a full time investigator and attorney. This process has taken actions including fines, injunctions and increased penalties for second offenses, although a limitation is that an action requires the filing of a complaint. Iowa Utilities Board staff review pipeline operator damage prevention performance during inspections, and additional documentation of this review is being added to inspection forms. Iowa's program does not provide for a dispute resolution process outside of enforcement, but Iowa representatives participating in exercise believe that the existing enforcement program is effective.</p>
Kansas	<p>Kansas has implemented mandatory reporting to its Virtual Private Damage Information Reporting Tool (DIRT) for operators who receive 2000 or more locate tickets per year. Kansas also has an active enforcement program in the two largest metropolitan areas. As more data is gathered, Kansas will be able to continue to target improvements in its damage prevention efforts.</p>
Kentucky	<p>Kentucky is taking steps to align its damage prevention program with the nine elements. Recently-passed legislation provides for enforcement of the state damage prevention law by state and local law enforcement. The one-call operator, KY 811, is working to educate law enforcement agencies about this new authority. A legislative bill introduced in 2010 addressed membership requirements, data reporting requirements and installation of locatable facilities; however, those legislative efforts were unsuccessful. Kentucky plans to review its enforcement authority and enforcement program to determine if changes are needed for improvement.</p>
Louisiana	<p>Enforcement of Louisiana's damage prevention program is conducted by the state police. The Regional Common Ground Alliance (CGA) is new for Louisiana and getting participation from as many stakeholders as possible is a current initiative. The Department of Natural Resources Pipeline Division has actively pursued getting gas operators to become members of Louisiana One Call.</p>
Maine	<p>Maine's state Managing Underground Safety Training (MUST) group is an organization largely focused on damage prevention training. The Regional MUST group is similar to a regional Common Ground Alliance (CGA) partner and involves a wide spectrum of stakeholders. Key program elements of Maine's damage prevention program include mandatory reporting of violations, enforcement, education, data collection and reporting. A current area of focus is on improving educational materials for notification requirements.</p>

Maryland	Maryland's one-call organization, Miss Utility, has a Subscriber Committee which is open to all facility owners to participate. Decisions are made by vote of this committee. The Maryland/District of Columbia Damage Prevention Committee is an active stakeholder group that meets monthly to address damage prevention matters. Current damage prevention enforcement authority in Maryland lies with the attorney general, but the Public Utility Commission and Miss Utility representatives are not aware of any enforcement activity, policies or procedures through the attorney general's office. Legislation was passed in January 2010 that established an advisory committee for enforcement and made other needed changes.
Massachusetts	Massachusetts appears to have a robust damage prevention program and there are no initiatives underway to make any changes in it. The New England Regional Managing Underground Safety Training (MUST) programs provide for much of the broad stakeholder input anticipated by the nine elements. Central to the Massachusetts damage prevention program is the state damage prevention law (Massachusetts General Law (M.G.L), Chapter 82, Sections 40 (a) through (e), and the Code of Massachusetts Regulation (C.M.R), State Of Massachusetts Dig Safe Rules, 220 C.M.R. 99.00: Procedures for the Determination and Enforcement of Violations of M.G.L. c. 82, s. 40 ("DIG SAFE"), Sections 99.01 through 99.12). Data on violations is available only upon request under Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) rules. Positive response is not fully implemented. There is no perceived need for changes and there are no planned changes to the program at this time. The requirement to call 911 upon release of hazardous materials is not included in the Massachusetts law but is encouraged.
Michigan	In lieu of changing the law, Michigan established damage prevention best practices and it is anticipated that these will be incorporated into a new damage prevention law. A legislative team is working to review options and develop legislative language that would meet the needs of the Michigan stakeholders. An education committee is working to close holes in the state damage prevention associations. Michigan's program faces challenges in that participants can only spend a certain amount of time on the damage prevention program as resources are limited.
Minnesota	Minnesota features a very active damage prevention program with all nine elements largely implemented. Minnesota has a strong working relationship between the state Office of Pipeline Safety and Gopher State One Call, the state's one-call notification system, which enhances the damage prevention effort. Minnesota is moving from reacting to damage data to trying to identify trends and preventing damages through education and awareness, and continues to seek ways to improve the program and reduce damages.

Mississippi	Mississippi has been working to improve its damage prevention program in recent years. It is anticipated that the Mississippi damage prevention program will be strengthened this year by the coalition of 35 local damage prevention councils into the Mississippi Damage Prevention Council (MDPC). This will function much like a state-level Common Ground Alliance (CGA). The one-call center (MS 811) currently has the lead in much of the damage prevention education and training. There is no enforcement authority designated in the state's damage prevention law. Consequently, most of the characterization criteria associated with dispute resolution and enforcement (see Elements 6 & 7) are not implemented at this time. Mississippi has had success in recent legislative efforts and hopes to continue to build stakeholder support for a stronger one call law through organized efforts such as the Damage Prevention Summit and the MDPC.
Missouri	Missouri has drafted several changes to its one call law that include language for performance measures for locators for all regulated utilities and is working to build consensus before introducing the bill. Recent studies show damages per year for other utilities to be about five times the number of damages to gas pipeline facilities. Missouri has proposed in the draft changes to have a clearly defined role in resolving/mediating damage prevention disputes. Missouri is also discussing with its attorney general the existing enforcement process and how to develop a more effective program.
Montana	UDIG is the one-call notification service that represents 2 of the 56 MT counties (Flathead and Lincoln). Utilities Underground Location Center (UULC) call centers in Washington or Oregon handle the rest. Answers in Montana's damage prevention program characterization relative to the one-call center generally address UULC only. The Montana Utilities Coordinating Council (MUCC) is not the official damage prevention lead recognized by state law. However, it has representatives of most stakeholder groups and its activities address many of the items noted in the characterization questionnaire for each element. MUCC and the Montana Public Service Commission will pursue legislative changes to Montana's damage prevention law in 2010 and beyond, to address the nine elements. A significant issue in Montana is that there is no enforcement authority and, thus, no enforcement of the current damage prevention law. Resolution of this situation will be pursued in upcoming legislation.
Nebraska	Nebraska's damage prevention program is considered robust by the representatives involved in the characterization discussion. The damage prevention statute has been in effect since 1994. Enforcement and dispute resolution are complaint-driven through the attorney general's office, and this process is considered to work. Efforts are underway to collect damage data and use this information to help direct damage prevention efforts. A regional Common Ground Alliance (CGA) is very active and brings stakeholders together to address the statewide program.

Nevada	The Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN) characterized the Nevada Damage Prevention Program as proactive, strongly enforced, and based on the following three key elements: 1) Keep the law basic, clear and simple, and enforce it. 2) Conduct strong, proactive enforcement – if not enforced, not effective. 3) Use random field inspections, this is strength. Nevada conducts a stakeholder forum through the Nevada Regional Common Ground Alliance (NRCGA), which has many initiatives underway. Nevada’s program emphasizes use of the NRCGA for stakeholder communications, public education, training, etc., and uses USAN for the mechanics of its one-call system.
New Hampshire	In New Hampshire the state Managing Underground Safety Training (MUST) group is used mostly for training. A regional MUST group is similar to a regional Common Ground Alliance (CGA) partner and involves a wide-spectrum of stakeholders. A current area of focus for New Hampshire is addressing exemptions for municipalities. They are also looking at making enforcement data more publicly available.
New Jersey	The one-call center in New Jersey is operated by a vendor under contract with the state. The call center operator recently changed, with the new operator, One Call Concepts, assuming the operation on February 17, 2010. The New Jersey damage prevention program is defined in New Jersey statute N.J.S.A. 48:2-73, et seq. and enabling rules N.J.A.C. 14:2 (Title 48, Chapter 2, Article 9 “Emergencies and Damage Prevention”. The Bureau of Public Utilities is the designated state agency to designate the operator of, and provide policy oversight to, the one-call damage prevention system and enforce the provisions of the act.
New Mexico	A significant program upgrade is in progress to fully implement the Common Ground Alliance (CGA) Damage Information Reporting Tool (DIRT). This program improvement is expected to be fully implemented during the first quarter of calendar year 2010. Funding concerns appear to restrict the ability to provide for a broad-based approach to Public Awareness (Element 5).
New York	Both the upstate and the downstate one call centers in New York make use of an organizational structure that includes damage prevention councils. There are eight such councils that serve the upstate regions and one that covers the downstate regions. These councils involve all stakeholders and appear to be an effective tool in getting out the damage prevention message. This process appears to be effective for involving multiple stakeholders on a regular basis. Defined processes are lacking with regard to pre-enforcement dispute resolution. With respect to regulations and processes for enforcement, there appears to be nothing used as a positive incentive for good performance; however, the New York Public Service Commission has an active enforcement program that incorporates civil penalties and data collection.
North Carolina	North Carolina faces challenges in developing stakeholder support for improved damage prevention programs and legislation. North Carolina plans to apply for a state damage prevention grant from PHMSA in order to conduct outreach, provide locator training and build support for legislation and improvement of damage prevention through a series of damage prevention meetings.

North Dakota	The North Dakota Public Service Commission (ND PSC) Damage Prevention Plan enforcement program is complaint-driven. Because the one-call center was not a participant in the characterization discussion, some elements lack the information needed to categorize the status of the program. North Dakota is in the early stages of developing a program that is consistent with the nine elements and drafted a written program in 2009. The ND PSC is transitioning, with the Program Manager retiring in early 2010.
Ohio	Ohio has implemented a process to draft changes to its damage prevention law. These proposed changes were included in Senate Bill 152. These changes would have addressed several sub-parts within the nine elements and would have significantly improved the Ohio damage prevention effort, making a major step toward having an effective damage prevention program. For example, Elements 6 & 7 would be fully implemented by the passage of SB 152. However, this legislation failed to pass in 2010. The stakeholders plan to continue to work to make legislative changes to improve the state law. Ohio is hoping to acquire a grant to assist in improving element 5, Public Education. Ohio has two one-call centers and SB 152 would have allowed the two to merge into a single one, Ohio Utilities Protection Service (OUPS). A virtual damage information reporting tool (DIRT) is being used to collect and analyze damage data.
Oklahoma	Oklahoma stakeholders are working to build support for legislation to make changes to the Oklahoma one-call law to include the establishment of an advisory board-type process for enforcement. Support for the bill is currently lacking. Oklahoma has an active training and education program and the Public Service Commission and one-call center both are engaged in the damage prevention process.
Oregon	Oregon Utility Notification Center (OUNC) is the state agency that administers Oregon's excavation laws and the statewide toll free "One-Call" number. The Governor-appointed Board of Directors serves to administer the OUNC, and also carries out a variety of public relations and educational programs, such as "Dig Safely" and "Call Before You Dig". The "One-Call Center" is located in Portland and is staffed by about 50 operators. The Center is available to process locate requests seven days a week, 24 hours a day. OUNC works closely with the Oregon Public Utilities Commission. Oregon's damage prevention program is well underway with respect to the nine elements, and stakeholders continue to work on improvement, particularly in the area of data analysis and transparency.
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania One Call System (PA One Call) is a progressive one-call center, currently working to streamline data collection efforts so reporting is consistent. Existing statewide damage prevention program current challenges relate to Elements 6 and 7. Dispute resolution processes are under development. The level of confidence in the existing enforcement program is not consistent among respondents, and it appears that the process could be improved. Pennsylvania has applied for state damage prevention grant from PHMSA.

Rhode Island	The Rhode Island Dig Safe damage prevention law was amended in February 2009 to enhance several aspects of damage prevention. There are no current initiatives to make further changes. One significant area of weakness in Rhode Island, as compared to other New England Dig Safe states, is training, including other areas where credit has been given to the efforts of the state Managing Underground Safety Training (MUST) Group. The Public Utilities Commission representative interviewed for Rhode Island noted that the MUST Group is not a notably effective organization and that it only meets annually.
South Carolina	The South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff is responsible for utility regulation, including gas pipeline safety, in South Carolina. The state's damage prevention program is challenged with respect to Elements 6 and 7, and there are no plans in place for legislative changes to address those areas. South Carolina does have a Regional Common Ground Alliance (CGA) as of 2009 with stakeholder participation.
South Dakota	The South Dakota One Call Board has a key role in South Dakota's damage prevention program. The Board has statutory authority to resolve complaints and issue civil penalties. Not all of the nine elements have been fully implemented, and in some cases it is considered by stakeholders that no changes need to be implemented, based on cost or lack of value for South Dakota.
Tennessee	Tennessee is currently working on legislation to incorporate mandatory one-call membership and damage prevention enforcement utilizing an advisory board-type system and is working to build stakeholder support for the bill. Enforcement responsibility currently lies with local law enforcement and enforcement is not regularly practiced. Tennessee One-Call, tn811, has an active damage prevention committee that involves all stakeholders as well as utility coordinating councils at grass roots level. Tennessee law requires positive response and white-lining. Tennessee encourages participation in the Common Ground Alliance (CGA) Damage Information Reporting Tool (DIRT) and plans to improve its processes for making program decisions and revisions based on reviews of appropriate data as the program develops. Regarding Element 3, the characterization is based on the Tennessee Regulatory Authority's knowledge of some jurisdictional pipeline operators. Interstate pipeline policies are not known, nor are small operators' policies. Regarding Element 4, training activities are generally done within each stakeholder group, but there is some crossover, and Tennessee hopes to improve coordination as its damage prevention program evolves.

Texas	Texas has three one-call organizations and all three are governed by a state governing board, the Texas One-Call Board (TX OCB). The TX OCB is composed of various stakeholder representatives appointed by the Governor. There are 6 industry and 6 public stakeholder members. Texas Utility Code Chapter 251 and Title 16 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 18 (TUC 251 and TAC 18, respectively) address damage prevention requirements in Texas. TAC 18 specifically applies when excavating near pipelines, but effectively applies to all excavators. Damage prevention relative to oil and gas pipelines is administered by the Texas Rail Road Commission (TX RRC) under TAC 18. TX Railroad Commission (TX RRC) enforces damage prevention requirements for pipelines. Other enforcement is by county attorneys general. Current areas of focus include making data enhancements and developing training programs for enforcement purposes.
Utah	Within the past two years Utah has passed legislation to strengthen its damage prevention program. The new legislation covered the areas of markings, roles and responsibilities, and requirement for contacting 911, and put in place the Damage Dispute Board. The state pipeline safety office has enforcement authority over operators. Other enforcement would be through the attorney general's office and it does not appear that this authority is being used. However, a dispute resolution board was established (see Element 6) to address violations. Utah reports seeing a reduction in gas pipeline damages as a result of the new initiatives and legislation.
Vermont	An important event for Vermont's damage prevention program was the receipt of a 2008 state damage prevention program grant from PHMSA. The grant provided the funds for contracting the University of Vermont to analyze Vermont's program, compare it to other states, and make recommendations for improvements. The University of Vermont report was issued in August 2009. Vermont was able to develop a better understanding of the successes and challenges of its damage prevention program with respect to the nine elements and begin to plan a path forward. Vermont Department of Public Service is hoping to receive a 2010 grant to fund the recommendations for improvements from the University of Vermont report.
Virginia	Virginia has a strong and active damage prevention program that addresses all nine elements. Virginia continues to seek ways to improve its program and has all stakeholders actively involved, with the Virginia Corporation Commission assuming the lead role. Enforcement provisions apply to pipelines only but any damage may be reported and investigated.
Washington	Current key challenges to Washington's damage prevention program are Elements 6 (Dispute Resolution), 7 (Enforcement) and, to a lesser extent, 9 (Program Review). Stakeholders are working on revisions to the state's dig law that they hope to introduce in the 2011 legislative session.
West Virginia	The Miss Utility organization is the central focus of damage prevention in the state. There is no recognizable means of dispute resolution or damage prevention enforcement authority in the state. As in many states, there is no "multi-stakeholder training committee" in place. Most damage prevention education is provided by Miss Utility or, perhaps, via the efforts of individual stakeholder organizations. West Virginia is applying for a state damage prevention grant from PHMSA in 2010.

Wisconsin	A rulemaking is underway in Wisconsin that will mandate participation in the Common Ground Alliance (CGA) Damage Information Reporting Tool (DIRT). A damage prevention enforcement process is not currently in place, other than Public Utility Commission (PUC) enforcement for jurisdictional pipeline operators, and no actions are underway for improvement at this time. Data collection is an important step in determining a path forward for the state's damage prevention plan. The State of Wisconsin will be laying off PUC employees for a couple of weeks in 2010 due to state budget constraints.
Wyoming	Wyoming enacted legislation in 2010 to incorporate enforcement into its damage prevention law. Items addressed include: civil penalties for damages to underground public utilities (through district or county court); notification requirements for excavations and damages; definitions; mitigation of damages; safety training programs; and membership requirements for operators. Wyoming has a strong locator training program and works in partnership with Casper College. The state is actively seeking stakeholder participation and working on developing a program that aligns with the nine elements.
Puerto Rico	pending