OUDPC Large Project SC and Ticket Life DG # 2
Conference Call 2/21/19
12:30pm

Call Participants: Mark Niehe, Bryon Bedel, Tim Schwartz, Mary So, Kevin Schimming, Les Schell, Alice Miller and Jeff Kursman.

Due to the nature of overlapping discussions, the members of the Ticket Life Discussion Group were invited to join this call.

Per the prior meeting, Kevin discussed with Roger the possibility of the OHIO811 Center maintaining agreed upon marking schedules and other documentation related to Large Project discussions. Roger responded that the OHIO811 Center is open to maintaining these records if that is what the coalition/industry want.

Information requested from the initial meeting including the process OHIO811 CSRs follow for assisting contractors identify potential large projects and shared feedback from the OHIO811 liaisons was distributed by email to the subcommittee members. In addition, Mary So and Alice shared feedback from Large Project "owners."

Mary stated that none of the Large Projects from which she collected feedback was originally labelled as a large project. The process was initiated by either the OHIO811 Center or at the request of utilities/locators.

Feedback obtained by Mary and Alice:

> "We just made old school verbal deals with locators."
> "Where was the information kept? We didn't establish backup documentation."
> "The process didn't save as much time because the entire project didn't engage. We needed to bring in subs, general contractors, all utilities, etc."
> "The process needs to be comprehensive enough to include all impacted parties."
> "A very smooth and successful process."
> "Need to promote large project tickets more often."
> "Not everyone showed up and marking schedules were not placed on time. The process needs to be taken seriously by all parties."

Mary and Kevin shared their own experiences, collaborations and familiarity with various large projects. Each process was distinctive. In some cases, pre-project meetings went extremely well, with digital mapping used to identify plans, progress, and clear schedules for locating sites with regular onsite meetings and progress reports. In other cases, simply calling in multiple tickets as the project progressed in half mile increments may have worked more effectively.

There is a knowledge gap in awareness of the Large Project ticket process.

Mary identified a few challenges including concerns regarding using the Large Project more often because its not well defined. Out of concern that the agreed upon process may not align with the law, some parties have brought lawyers to meetings. Mary suggested perhaps creating best practice scenarios for large projects.

Igel Company always relied upon email, documentation, and maps that we used to talk to locators corresponding to schedules. The work was extensive including Monday morning field meetings, provision of main and backup contacts for each party, drawings, escalation sheets, primary and backup plans based upon progress and inclement weather. Kept 48-Hour ticket process ongoing.

When communication channels are open and process was followed in detail, only one utility was damaged and it was deemed “unavoidable”.

Future considerations:

1) Broaden who can make the classification for Large Projects. Utility owners in addition to contractors, although the majority of players would need to agree.
2) We don’t want every single positive response to be identified as 07.
3) No matter who classifies it, mandate that all involved parties must participate.
4) Conduct a promotional campaign for the use of large projects, including more in-depth liaison presentations on the benefits.
5) Time permitting; perhaps OHIO811 liaisons can participate in one or two Large Projects to obtain firsthand experience.

Next Call: Tuesday, April 9th at 2:00 p.m.