Utility Coordination Project (UCP) Process SC Meeting
February 26, 2020
George J. Igel Company

Participants: Roger Cox, Jeff Kursman, Kevin Schimming, Seamus Milligan, Roger Lipscomb, Jim Mandera, Mark Niehe, Bryan Bedel, Mary So, Alice Miller

Kevin Schimming began the meeting by providing a brief synopsis of the Committee's previous discussions and work. He highlighted the issues pertaining to the use of resources required when a complex project is underway, and pointed out the methods previously discussed that may be used to initiate such a project: Initiated by the excavator when making the call to OHIO811 (current) or the hybrid model – as soon as the ticket is distributed – it is determined , it is determined that the complexity of the project or other factors may suggest the need for Utility Coordination by the excavators, the CSR or one or more facility owners.

Roger Lipscomb provided background information regarding large project language since 1990. HB 458 suspends the 48 hour marking schedule and a joint-meet ticket is created. He pointed out that this general assembly will end on December 31, 2020. . While it would be the OUDPC preference to move any proposed changes to consideration during the current legislative session, the alternative would be to introduce any new language in January 2021.

Roger detailed the impact of excavators calling in tickets multiple times prior to starting their project, its impact on timely locates and expense to member utilities. He noted that educational outreach by the Center may help address this problem and that the SC does not need to address this issue.

****** The subcommittee will recommend the following changes to Ticket Life to the OUDPC:
In addition to current expiration of a ticket when marks are destroyed/no longer visible or when a project is not initiated by the required start date, "tickets will automatically expire at the end of the 30th day" (the day of the call is day one of the thirty. This would allow excavators on longer duration projects to update their ticket every 28 days without potential project disruption.)

The subcommittee also proposes that the required Start Date of excavation is changed from 10 business days to 16 calendar days after the ticket is called in (the day of the call is day one of the sixteen).

UCP language may point to a Best Practice housed at OHIO811. Discussion: UCP Best Practice may address the communication required within this structure and accountability.
A marking schedule is required.
Creating a clear, concise definition of a UCP is necessary. The SC has compiled a list of components that may be used as triggers to initiate a UCP, they are:

- Complexity of Excavation Work

- Duration of Excavation Work & Site Conditions
- Work Progresses from one area to another
- Number of Utility Conflicts
- Complexity of Locating Efforts
- Was a Design Ticket created for this work?
- Geographical Size

Mutually agreed upon marking schedule may be stored at the center – updated shall be adhered to.

White Lining

Current Draft Language:
If an excavator indicates the excavation site has been pre-marked, they shall also be asked to indicate the number of pre-marked excavation locations and specify any additional footages needed from each pre-marked location. When this information is provided, the excavation site/scope shall be the pre-marked area, along with any additional footage specified. If pre-marking is not indicated by the excavator, the excavation site/scope shall be as described on the notice of proposed excavation.

Beef up the law within the marking standards calling out signs and poles.
Jim Mandera asked if a caller says they have white lined a site – do those marks "supersede" the scope noted on the ticket? In this case the CSR asks for additional information about the excavation. Roger suggested a liaison will be able to help in many instances regarding white lining.

Scope of ticket: A quarter mile: It was suggested that "**within the right-of-way**" be added to the language.

AJ Miller/Kevin Schimming/Jeff Kursman
3/6/2020