Large Project/Size & Scope/Life of Ticket
Report Out Topics for 4/30/19 OUDPC Meeting

LARGE PROJECT

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT?

- "Projects" utilize significantly more resources from a Utility Owner/Locator perspective.
- Difference between being required to mark 1,000 ft in 48 hours as opposed to 10,000 ft.
- Contractors continue to be frustrated with expenses related to downtime and delays that could have been mitigated through a workable, consistent and efficient process to handle Large Projects.
- Public Safety- by definition large projects exposes more residents to consequences of failure

CURRENT ISSUES/PROBLEMS WITH STATUS QUO

- It's not being used- Since 2013
    - 7,000 Large Project Tickets/7,795,674 Tickets= .088 % of tickets have used the LP process
- When it is used there is uneven participation and not taken seriously
- Significant confusion around what a large project is- there are no definitions, guidelines, best-practices etc. to help contractors determine if their project would benefit from a large project process
- Existing language allows only the Excavator to designate their excavation as a Large Project.
- Marking Schedule
    - What is it?
    - Who is responsible for the logistics of the list?
    - What if no one onsite has the "authority" to sign such an agreement?
    - What if an agreeable marking schedule cannot be agreed upon?
- What are reasonable expectations for all parties when deviations from the marking schedule are necessary due to unforeseeable circumstances?
- Knowledge gap in awareness of the Large Project Ticket process
- Interested parties, trade associations, etc. could do more to promote awareness of the process and potential benefits of using either the existing process or an updated/improved process that is the result of this legislative effort.

IDEAS THAT HAVE BEEN GENERALLY AGREED TO BY THIS SUBCOMMITTEE:

- Provide a consistent and repeatable process to determine what constitutes a Large Project.
- Provide Utility owners and/or Locators ability to designate an excavation as a Large Project.
- When an excavation meets the parameters of/ or is designated as a Large Project, require that the Large Project process be used.
- Require participation by all parties involved in the process
- Provide consistent and repeatable process to allow for execution/content/responsibilities/storage of a Mutually Agreed Upon Marking Schedule.
- Industry needs to provide input for determining appropriate means/methods/locations of storing information related to Large Projects.
- OHIO811 has indicated they would be open to the idea of being the repository for the Marking Schedule if the industry so desires.
- Regardless of outcome of this legislative effort, greater emphasis should be placed on providing the industry a higher level of education and awareness around the Large Project process including best-practices.

NEXT STEPS…

- Feedback from full Coalition
- Develop a framework for mitigating the current challenges & frustrations with existing processes

SIZE & SCOPE OF A TICKET

CURRENT ISSUES/PROBLEMS WITH STATUS QUO

- ORC provides no limit on the size and scope of ticket
- Utility owners/Locators are forced into non-compliance with ORC
- OHIO811 has procedures in place to help callers break down tickets into manageable segments. However they have no authority to apply those procedures, and must enter the ticket per the callers wishes
- Industry statistics are much less descriptive because of the huge variance in the current size/scope
- Great consensus around the idea of limiting size/scope, but many challenges in its application
    - One - 10,000ft ticket vs 10 1,000ft tickets
        - Which is better?
        - Which is safer?
- Changes in installation and locating techniques/technology may render changes obsolete
- One size doesn't fit all…

IDEAS THAT HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED OR BROUGHT TO THE COMMITTEE:

- There is no silver bullet that creates a one-size-fits-all
- Needs to be an agile and flexible solution
- Some have suggested a solution based on the Marking Standards Model-
    - Create logical limits on size/scope and reference those limits in the law
    - Create Size/Scope Review Committee whose job it is to review those limits on a predetermined and/or as needed basis… allowing changes in installation and locating techniques/technology to be considered
- Provide OHIO811 the authority to aggregate information from the caller, breaking down large tickets into smaller, more manageable pieces.

NEXT STEPS…

- Feedback from full Coalition
- Develop a framework for mitigating the current challenges & frustrations with existing processes

TICKET LIFE- DISCUSSION GROUP

CURRENT ISSUE/PROBLEM WITH STATUS QUO

- There is no defined Ticket Life in ORC
    - Many believe it is 10 days
    - Some have already moved to a defined ticket life model for internal op's and sub's (8-30 days)
- Feeling amongst many that creating a ticket life would increase communication between parties
- Creates challenges in maintaining marks, especially on projects that span several months, even years
- Confusion about what "starting" a job means
- Folks who call every 8 days but never start their project

IDEAS THAT HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED OR BROUGHT TO THE COMMITTEE

- Define the life of a ticket… A ticket is valid for X amount of days/weeks/months
- Some people believe this would increase ticket volume, thus increasing costs for Utility Owners; some believe it will decrease ticket volume, saving money for Utility Owners

NEXT STEPS…

- Feedback from full Coalition
- Because of the correlation between Ticket Life & Large Project gauge the willingness of the Coalition to address this topic either in full or as it relates to the Large Project issue