

## OUDDPC Survey Results

June, 2018

Twenty-eight OUDPC Members answered the survey seeking input in order to determine which topics should be considered for legislative action.

*Please rank the following topics (1-6, with 1 being the highest priority).* Scores were calculated based on the number of 1's, 2's, and 3's, etc. Not simply which topic had the most 1's.

Size and scope of ticket: What reasonable perimeters should be set for establishing the amount of work that can be accomplished within a given time frame? 4.71

Exemptions: Municipal and/or other 4.29

Large Projects: Definitions used, and clarification of, large project process. 3.86

Life of a ticket 3.46

Forty-eight hour waiting period: Should the 48 hour waiting period be redefined? 2.57

Training Requirements: What constitutes a competent damage prevention professional? 2.11

*List any other topics that you feel the OUDPC should consider when discussing legislative changes that will help protect Ohio's underground infrastructure, environment, and workers.*

Respondents (by number) Answers/Comments

3:

Requirements for utility owners to know where their infrastructure is installed or is going to be installed with the use of 21st century technology, GIS/AutoCAD, etc. Any utility owner should be required to have someone on staff for mapping purposes.

4:

Marking and white lining the approximate location within an excavation site. Is it required when the approximate location can't be determined before acquiring a ticket? What alternatives exist when only the excavation site is known?

7:

Aggrieved party. With the potential of an explosion for working without marks or not digging correctly around the marks EVERYONE in the area is at risk.

8:

That anyone doing any kind of construction type of operation needs to call before they do that op. such as saw cutting, pot holing, and directional drilling.

11:

Is this necessary at this time?

13:

Abandoned lines and public safety

14:  
None, currently. I believe PUCO and the UTC need at least another year to "feel out" the current laws.

17:  
1) Identification / locate requirements for Utility Owners for their abandoned utilities. 2) Municipalities - They need to fully participate in the one call process. They may be members but they rarely locate on time and do a complete job. 3) Reduction in the codes for "Positive Response." There are too many and they create confusion. Should be go / no go type of response.

19:  
require field marking for all design tickets unless accurate digital as-built plans can be furnished

21:  
There needs to be more definition on a contractors responsibility to "maintain marks". As a Utility, we find many contractors do not protect the marks already placed. When they destroy the existing marks they call in another ticket expecting us to delay marking first time requests to revisit their project, even though they did not maintain the marks. OUPS Law requires a contractor to maintain marks, but also requires a Utility to remark upon request. This conflict needs to be resolved.

22:  
Nothing at this time.

28:  
Minimum depth for installed utility, we should not encounter any utility in or just under the pavement!

28 Respondents		Ranking by importance (1-6) 1 being the highest					
Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	Score
Size and scope of ticket: What reasonable perimeters should be set for establishing the amount of work that can be accomplished within a given time frame?	9	8	8	1	1	1	4.71
Exemptions: Municipal and/or other	10	4	4	4	6	0	4.29
Large Projects: Definitions used, and clarification of, large project process.	4	6	6	7	4	1	3.86
Life of a ticket	3	6	4	8	2	4	3.46
Forty-eight hour waiting period: Should the 48 hour waiting period be redefined?	0	3	5	5	7	8	2.57
Training Requirements: What constitutes a competent damage prevention professional?	2	1	1	3	8	13	2.11