



Agenda

Abandoned Lines Subcommittee, virtual
9/12/2023

Committee Members of Record		9/12/2023
Chan, Tony	Duke Energy Gas	Present
Chelius, Lauren	Kokosing Construction	Present
Collins, Jim	Duke Energy Gas	Absent
Coniglio, Dave	Ohio Contractors Association	Present
Harvey, Jason	PRUS Construction	Present
Henson, Johnny	Davey Resource Group	Present
Hocevar, Bill	Great Lakes Construction	Present
Johnson, Joel	City of Columbus	Present
Large, Deron	Alta fiber	Present
Logan So, Mary	George J. Igel & Co., Inc.	Present
Mandera, Jim	Dominion Energy	Present
Moore, Isaac	Centerpoint Energy	Absent
Plurien, Tim	RLA Utilities	Present
Pyles, Elizabeth	Franklin County Engineer	Present
Ross, Blake	Marathon Pipeline	Absent
Schafer, Steve	First Energy Corp.	Absent
Schell, Les	Kinder Morgan	Present
St. Chair, Brent	Kinder Morgan	Present
Tustin, Scott	Columbia Gas	Present
Wade, Lori	Columbus Gas	Present
Williams, Drew	Great Lakes Construction	Present
Wooten, Jim	Centerpoint Energy	Absent
OHIO811 Staff		
Broyles, Jason	OHIO811	Present
Thayer, Zack	OHIO811	Present
Industry Guests		

First, Greg	Conie Construction Co.	Present
Lindamood, Marcia	ABC of Ohio	Present
Muller, Chuck	Metro Net, Inc.	Present
Russ, Chris	USIC	Present
Stovall, Chris	Texas811	Present
Troxell, Rod	City of Cuyahoga Falls	Present

I. Welcome/Opening Statements

Mr. Tustin called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Ms. Logan So took roll call of those present.

III. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

Mr. Tustin noted that the notes had been sent to all committee participants. He asked for any changes. Ms. Logan So noted that there were a few editorial updates with Company names. Mr. Tustin made a motion to approve the minutes with the editorial changes. Mr. Mander seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.

IV. Chris Stovall, TX811, presentation of abandoned lines initiative

Mr. Stovall said that the Texas initiative started with Kinder Morgan. The organization was looking for a way to solve the abandoned line process. CGA has looked into it for years, but there has not been a lot of consensus. Mr. Stovall credited Kirk with Kinder Morgan for approaching Chris Stovall to see if the digital lines effort in Texas had the potential to meet the needs the company was looking to solve .

Kinder Morgan wanted to register abandoned line service area anonymously with as much detail as possible. Whenever an excavator is digging near the area, a digital locate of the last known location is transferred to the excavator. There is a legal disclaimer that the information is last known. When you click on the link, it shows work area that is drawn during locate request, and then the relevant information is show regarding any reported abandoned lines.

After Kinder Morgan signed up, they found it very successful and Texas does click through reporting and provides it to the facility owner. This is officially provided through a third-party company called Line-Scape. Excavator feedback has been very positive.

Got a call out of the blue from an excavator who was working at a jobsite and called because he didn't receive a digital locate. It turns out that there were not any known abandoned facilities, but he noted that it changed the behavior to where the excavator expected the notification.

Oklahoma went live three weeks ago with information

Energy Transfer came on board in Texas after Kinder Morgan. Since the initiative started, 19,000 digital locates have been sent out with zero incidents reported. In the next two weeks, they are expecting four total users. Mr. Stovall noted that maps are only transferred in cases where there are digital maps available.

Currently, no other facility owners participate except pipeline. Mr. Stovall noted that this is the most common question he gets. Current customers are following the same model, but he noted that it may not be for everybody. There was a desire based on a philosophy in Texas that when they abandon a line, it is completely turned over to the landowner, and they completely wash their hands of it. This program is about choosing to be a “good actor.” The goal is to register is anonymously, so the owner is no longer important. It’s more like “here’s what we know.”

Is there a separate member code for an abandoned line?

It is registered as “abandoned line member.” While Texas has the information to separate where the data code is from, the information provided to the excavator is just anonymous.

Why is the information being reported anonymously?

That was a special request by Kinder Morgan. Les Schell commented that the agreements in Texas specify that there is no maintenance of right-of-way or line after abandonment. They do not want it affiliated with Kinder Morgan any longer.

Is there a per-ticket cost when the abandoned ticket goes out?

Yes, participants pay a per-ticket price. The price is paid by facility owner who provided the information to the One Call Center.

Mr. Mandera clarified the price of the notification for abandoned lines is ongoing. Chris Stovall provided clarity that much of the reason for confusion is that the rules apply different from state to state. Chris believes that Kinder Morgan’s attempt to initiate a program like this was to offer a proposed solution without necessarily adding additional regulation or government interference.

As far as communication to the excavating community, sometimes those facilities get used by other facilities. What is communicated to those excavators in Texas? Has that test case occurred in Texas?

Texas811 expects excavators to treat all abandoned facilities as “live.” The additional piece of information with abandoned may also help indicate that there may be an additional line in the general vicinity. This is outlined in the disclaimer.

Have there been any distribution companies who have expressed interest in this program?

None have presented expressed interest in joining the Texas811 project. The technology would work for all types of facilities. Mr. Stovall met with some PHMSA staff, and they were very interested in the program. They offered up their videographer and staff to assist, which may lead to some material for training videos.

Texas has a set of marking standards. Are all companies required to put material size, kind, and owner in Texas currently today?

No. Texas is kind of behind in this area. There are two overlapping regulations. Many facility owners do it as a best practice, but it is not a current legal practice.

In many areas where distribution is abandoned, it's hard to abandon a facility back to a landowner since it is often residential; however, have there been any instances reported since implementation?
Received first notice of damage to an abandoned line. Investigation showed the facility was unknown.

In regards to the information that is needed by the Center to map the facility, is it just GPS coordinates with attributes? Is it as much as people can give you?

The goal is to get as much as people can give us about the data. In some cases, we have centerline data where as other areas have only had buffer zone area information. The center tries to operate with whatever is available.

Mr. Manderer suggested minimum standards.

As a contractor, it's hard to hear "treat it as live" when it's in direct conflict with the work. What does "treat it as live mean?"

Texas falls back to the CGA Best Practice. Texas doesn't endorse a specific area. In Texas, there is the Railroad Commission where that data is reported, so the Center can help track down the owner. Currently, while the Railroad collects it, they do not have a notification process but the Center can assist in that.

The conversation has been around large pipelines, but as a Company, it's more common to run across communication lines and even locating one of them doesn't determine if you hit the abandoned or the "live" line. RLA has put everything in place to avoid that, and the frustration is the precautions being taken. The daily distribution – cable that's the big issue for us.

Texas811 says fiber is being laid near copper, but there is nothing currently technological available to deliver that information today. There is a cost to doing that so the question would be whether or not there is appetite for the expense.

Is there anything currently at the legislative level to push more facility owners to participate in this process?

There is no conversation and historically, Texas has been somewhat "allergic" to legislative requirements.

V. Open Discussion

Ms. Wade said that for as much effort as we spend on pipeline, with as much fiber that is being put into the ground, it would be great to have more input from other communications companies.

Mr. Muller said that MetroNet, Inc. is relatively new so they don't currently have abandoned lines. They also don't direct bury, so everything is in ducts. He doesn't foresee MetroNet, Inc. abandoning ducts. Moving facilities because of a new road would be assumed to be a rare occurrence.

Mr. St. Clair said that most of what he sees is the facility being put into conduit. He agrees with RLA that it is common to run into that be it small abandoned distribution gas lines because of upgraded technologies and you run into abandoned facilities while locating new ones. They require new lines to be pulled through.

Ms. Harris said that for AEP when lines are abandoned, they are abandoned from the mapping internally. Dave Losinski has mentioned in the past that if they have moved the lines when replacing

underground, there is an attempt to put them in the same place as to where they were last time. Obviously during construction projects, they get moved. She was going to follow up with Mr. Losinski to see if he can share anything.

Would contractors have any interest in pushing information back to the Center about the facilities being discovered regardless of whether or not an owner or former owner comes forward?

Mr. Troxell said there are a lot of direct bury lines. Commercial retail is gone or lines still out there from abandoned houses. City of Cuyahoga Falls will go out and verify whether or not it is live. A few years ago, the City started to keep track of where they were abandoned facilities and then sharing the information with contractors through Positive Response. They are not sure about whether not they would go out to mark facilities.

Ms. Wade thinks there would be a lot of pushback if markings were required because of some owners requiring that all marks get located.

There has been a lot of conversation on both sides of this issue. His challenge to the group was to jot down some notes and shoot them over to Ms. Logan So, Mr. Tustin and Mr. Broyles. What kind of language could we look at trying to create a day-forward?

VI. Adjournment

Mr. Broyles made a motion to adjourn. He noted that Mr. Deering was no longer with OHIO811, so please direct all correspondence through Mr. Broyles. The meeting was adjourned at 2:59 p.m.