OUDPC Large Project / Scope of Ticket Subcommittee and Ticket Life Discussion Group
Conference Call 6/11/19

Call Participants: Mark Neihe, Bryon Bedel, Mary Logan So, Kevin Schimming, Les Schell, Liz Pyles, Joe Igel, Alice Miller, Gilan Emam and Jeff Kursman.

Joe Igel began the call by thanking the committee and discussion group members for tackling the most multi-faceted of issues. "Despite the old adage that 'If it ain't broken, don't fix it,' it may be time for a refresh/update."

Kevin reviewed the broad Information and discussions from the initial meetings, recommending that the subcommittee and discussion group focus on a framework for "issues we want to solve," generating bullet points and ultimately, proposed language.

1) <u>Large (Complex) Projects</u>
   - Need to develop a consistent, repeatable, clear definition of what constitutes a large (complex) project
     - Every situation is different – geography vs. complexity
     - Need to be fair – enough parameters so that claiming a large project can't simply be used as a way to delay or avoid locating
   - Provide utility owners, locators and excavators with the ability to designate a large project
     - It is problematic for designation to be required by the excavator at the time of their call/ticket if they don't understand or know the potential complexities of the excavation site
   - Mutually agreed upon marking schedules and procedures must be followed by all parties; currently doesn't occur due to a lack of a mandate
     - The logistics of the marking schedule and execution of the ticket require ongoing online communications
   - Identification and utilization of the large/complex project process will require a robust educate effort
     - Emphasis by the Ohio811 center and liaisons: "What is a large/complex project, how to use it, what is required, etc."

2) <u>Size and Scope of a Ticket</u>
   - Clarification needed regarding which takes precedence: Scope of ticket as described on the ticket versus onsite white lining. Lack of consensus amongst call participants.
     - While white lining may be easier or more efficient for locators, will excavators continue to white line if the ticket always takes precedence?
     - Why wouldn't the white lining, which is more defined and more efficient, trump the ticket?
     - White lining originally intended to augment ticket information and assist onsite locators.
     - Large geographies and real estate are being called in for a small quantity of work (ex; 4 city blocks of locating for installation of 7 light poles, or homeowners and landscapers calling in an entire property for the planting of a single tree)
     - Is a legal opinion available?

- Some excavators call in too many extraneous tickets, while others lump too much geography on a single ticket.
- Should OHIO811 be empowered to define the size and scope of a ticket (dividing or aggregating as necessary)?
    - Concern with convenience creating potential liability issues; need to protect the center
    - Consider adding "abuse" of locate work order system to aggrieved party issues that can be brought to UTC through the compliant process.
    - Ex: Igel directed that their tickets were too large in scope- today generating 400 tickets every week or ten days, vs. 260.
- Is legislative action necessary to rewrite the law necessary or could marking standards, best practices and/or broader education solve this problem?
- Concern expressed that the new (Summer 2018) iDig online training places too much emphasis on the technology of the process and not enough emphasis on proper completion and content of the locate work order.

3) <u>Life of a Ticket</u>
    - Should every ticket have an "expiration date," or is the group focused exclusively on large and complex projects?
    - "They should all have a life"
        - Many large contractors and excavators including Igel and Kokosing have adopted a defacto ticket expiration, repeating every 8 days from the end of the positive response required waiting period, due to legal precedent and the inability to prove when the first shovel penetrated the ground.
    - Small contractors and excavators claim to find it more manageable to repeat a ticket after 10 days, versus their concerns/"fear" alleging the challenges of tracking multiple projects and managing the repeating of tickets due to a 21- or 28-day ticket life.
        - Expressed that establishing a ticket life or expiration date would face strong opposition
        - While a "True 48 hours" would be an education issue, "Ticket Life" is a maintenance issue requiring time and resources.

Next Meeting:

- Kevin will connect with Alice offline to schedule. Consensus by call participants that the next meeting would be more productive face-to-face. Kevin suggested Columbus, possibly the City or a Franklin County building.
- Mary offered to host in Columbus.