Large Project/Scope of Ticket/ Ticket Life

Subcommittee Meeting

Meeting Notes

August 27, 2019

Meeting started and ended: 10:00 a.m. – 03:00 p.m.

Participants: Kevin Schimming, Alice Miller, Gilan Emam, Jeff Kursman, Liz Pyles, Les Schell, Mary So, Seamus Mulligan, Mark Niehe, Bryan Bedel

The purpose of this meeting is to continue discussing the large/complex process and the life of a ticket, and to develop a consistent, repeatable, clear method that can be universally used to determine if a given excavation activity necessitates a large and/or complex ticket and associated process.

Discussion: Large/Complex Project

The following items were identified at the last meeting as contributing factors to what may become a large/complex project ticket:

Geographical Size
Complexity of Excavation Work
Duration of Work
Work Progresses
Site Conditions
Number of Utility Conflicts
Complexity of Locating Efforts

The Group explored 2 different models/concepts that could be used in order to initiate some type of communication process to support damage prevention efforts in when some/all of the components of a large/complex ticket are present

EXCAVATOR/CALL CENTER MODEL

- Process could only be entered into at the time of the call by either the person making the call or at the suggestion/direction of CSR
- Potentially the "cleanest" model
- A comprehensive definition would be critical in order to guide tickets into this model/process
- Excavator/CSR will likely not have knowledge/ability to assess a number of the components we listed such as Number of Utility Conflicts & Complexity/Resource Intensiveness of Locating Efforts

HYBRID MODEL
Tickets could be entered into the "process" either at the time of the call (excavator and/or CSR using a definition) or after the ticket has been received by a utility and they have been able to evaluate the components listed above.

A utility would have a set period time in which it could classify a ticket as Large/Complex and request a meeting or additional information such as:

- True start date
- Starting location
- Anticipated production/ # of crews
- On Site contact
- Plans or maps

Committee discussed at length the logistics of how to accomplish such an exchange of information:

- Could one single utility request a meeting or additional info, would all have to request it, a percentage?
- Options for scheduling meetings etc.
    - OHIO811 Liaisons
    - Positive Response System
    - Require communication to come from utility owner, not 3rd party locator?
    - Don't designate means/methods in the ORC… allow industry to "figure it out"

Committee discussed some major challenges associated with this model

- How does this process affect the 48 hours? Should we build a process that does not infringe on the 48 hrs or do we consider allowing more time to respond due to the complexity?
    - 48 hrs could be based on when utility get the info requested
- Committee is very conscious of potential abuse of this system, either as a way of delaying markings or not responding to request for additional info
- Committee generally agrees that if this type of solution is utilized, it must be enforceable to all parties to discourage abuse

Discussion: Scope of a Ticket

Parameters were discussed – such as not to exceed 1,500 feet, intersection to intersection, unincorporated vs a corporate area. Suggestions included: Any quarter or one half mile adjoining ticket by an excavator requires a meeting.

Discussion: Life of a Ticket

Various timelines were discussed: 21, 24, or 30 days. The life of the paint may dictate the time line.

Discussion: White Lining

Kevin shared the following suggestion for language regarding white lining:

If the caller indicates the area has been white lined, they shall indicate the number of white lined locations and specify additional footage needed from each location. When this information is provided,

the scope of the ticket shall be the white lined area and any additional footage specified. If white lining is not indicated by the caller, the scope of the ticket shall be as described on the ticket.

The pros and cons of the proposed language were discussed and will be revised during our next meeting.

Next Steps: The Subcommittee will continue discussing each item at the next meeting.

Ajm 8/30/2019