



MS216D Stakeholder Review Meeting Minutes

Friday, October 7th, 2016

SBM Fire Station #3, 11920 Ulysses St. NE, Blaine, MN 55434

Attendees:

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| 1. Bruce West | MNOPS |
| 2. Jon Wolfgram | MNOPS |
| 3. Mike Mendiola | MNOPS |
| 4. Dean Parker | Gopher State One Call |
| 5. Barb Cederberg | Gopher State One Call (via teleconference) |
| 6. Estelle Richard | Gopher State One Call |
| 7. Chuck Jensen | Connexus Energy |
| 8. Alicia Berger | Xcel Energy |
| 9. Jeff Murray | Xcel Energy |
| 10. Ben Wallace | USIC |
| 11. Adam McAlpine | USIC |
| 12. Ryan Zelenka | USIC |
| 13. Keith Novy | CenterPoint Energy |
| 14. Steve Olinger | CenterPoint Energy |
| 15. Dean Headlee | CenterPoint Energy |
| 16. Dan Maschka | Northern Natural Gas |
| 17. Chris Madden | City of Duluth |
| 18. Jon Blough | Owatonna Public Utilities |
| 19. Arnold Kraft | ARK Management Assoc., LLC |
| 20. Mike Moore | NuStar Energy |
| 21. Mike Broderick | NuStar Energy (via teleconference) |
| 22. Jerome Viske | Duininck Inc. |
| 23. Craig Knudsen | Dakota Electric |
| 24. Rick Schlegel | API |
| 25. Tracy Lipinski | MP Technologies |
| 26. Ward Westphal | MP Technologies |
| 27. Matthew Miller | BP Pipelines |
| 28. Jeff Law | Korterra |
| 29. Amy Asche | Montana-Dakota Utilities (via teleconference) |
| 30. Jodi Corrow | Minnesota Power (via teleconference) |
| 31. Todd Stansbury | MNOPS |
| 32. Elizabeth Skalnek | MNOPS |
| 33. Sylvia Schwarz | MNOPS |
| 34. Thomas Coffman | MNOPS |

35. Claude Anderson	MNOPS
36. Jeff Blackwell	MNOPS
37. Adam Ratzlaff	MNOPS
38. Sean Mangan	MNOPS
39. Ole Engebretson	MNOPS (via teleconference)
40. Joe Hauger	MNOPS (via teleconference)

MNOPS MS216D General Discussion

- MS216D Historical Overview
 - Last amendments in 2004 (over 20 years)
 - Purpose of stakeholder review and potential changes is to enhance safety regarding operating underground utilities and excavating around them
 - No changes to rules since adoption in 2005
 - Purpose of 2016-2017 stakeholder review meetings is to prepare for 2018 legislative session (if changes are deemed necessary)
- PHMSA Damage Prevention Rule
 - Part 196 – PHMSA enforcement on excavators. Primarily for states deemed inadequate in their own One Call enforcement.
 - Part 198 – PHMSA enforcement on state pipeline safety programs for damage prevention.
 - PHMSA audit on MNOPS’ damage prevention program – data to support current One Call exemptions?
- Damage Reporting Data & Exemptions
 - MNOPS utilizes mandatory damage reporting from pipeline operators and voluntary damage reporting from non-pipeline operators
 - In 2011, 115 non-pipeline companies reported their voluntary damage data, however the number of reports has declined since then
 - In an effort to support current One Call exemptions, MNOPS will seek support from industry stakeholders for increased reporting

MS216D Review Topics

- **Definition of Excavation key comments:**
 - Is the concerning issue more about the definition or the exemptions?
 - Pounding stakes in the ground – there are people getting hurt from driving stakes into underground gas and electric.
 - The definition should be reviewed – redefining so that pounding a stake would be considered excavation but using a hammer to put in lathe is not.
 - What was the feedback from PHMSA’s DP audit?

black = MNOPS comments

blue = utility operator comments

green = excavator comments

orange = one call center comments

purple = locator comments

- What data is MNOPS collecting to substantiate the current exemptions? We have data from mandatory reporting from pipeline utilities but less data from non-pipeline utilities (electric, fiber optic, telecommunications, sewer, water, etc...)
- Damage reporting from pipeline operators show damages from driving stakes resulting in burns and in some cases, fatalities.
- Driving a stake into a gas line can lead to a house explosion. This occurred in Indiana.
- Distinction between locating a line and pounding a stake – should there be a difference between probing for a line 18” deep vs. driving a stake 12” deep?
- Example of a concrete contractor driving pins – forms were put in on Friday. Monday the pins were pulled and they had a gas release in front of a daycare. Definitely a risk. How do we scope the language to be effective on those risks but not be so broad so that a One Call ticket is not needed for a (kid’s) tent in the backyard?
- Has MNOPS reevaluated the language that was developed during the last stakeholder meetings?
 - Yes, but we did want to bring it to this first meeting yet. There are attendees present today that were not involved during the previous meetings and we wanted to allow them the opportunity to provide feedback from a clean slate. After today’s meeting, we will evaluate both today’s feedback and the proposed language developed from the 2013 stakeholder review meetings and continue both discussions for future meetings.
- Are we aware of any other states who have addressed definition of excavation recently? Was driving stakes addressed?
 - Not aware of other states who specifically discussed the issue of driving stakes. We will reach out to other states and learn more.
- For those who operate in multiple states, does extra regulation of hand dig help? What can we learn from those states?
- Would likely have to look at two separate buckets: 1) exemption status and 2) operators & excavators using probes, driving anchors, driving forming pins...
- Does anyone operate in South Dakota? Their definition of excavation is any operation in which earth, rock, or other material in or below the ground is moved or otherwise displaced by means of tools, equipment, or explosives, and includes grading, trenching, digging, ditching, drilling, augering, tunneling, scraping, and cable or pipe plowing or driving. Exceptions are tilling, pot hole repair, vehicle operation less than 18”, road or ditch repair less than 18”, digging in cemetery, digging in planned landfill, and any bar test for suspected gas or liquid leaks.
 - We don’t have the same volume in SD as we do in MN
 - Also, SD’s laws are enforced by the One Call center. We can compare with other states but we just want to make sure we’re comparing apples-to-apples given other states’ enforcement abilities.
 - The violator appears before a panel in SD
- We can go back and review the damages per 1000 locates data and try to dissect further – driving a stake in the ROW, road construction, scoping work...
- Can anything be addressed with utilities having little cover? Utilities such as cable, telephone and electrical services are as shallow as 2” deep.

black = MNOPS comments

blue = utility operator comments

green = excavator comments

orange = one call center comments

purple = locator comments

- Not aware of any states One Call laws that currently enforce a standardized depth for utilities. Typically, the company has a depth standard that they use. For pipelines, there is a federal regulation for depth during construction but it doesn't cover post-construction (i.e. – grade changes).
 - Do we need to consider gravel pits as part of the definition?
 - If there is enough supporting information that is causing an issue then we can certainly discuss it.
 - Are there any stakeholders today and moving forward that we need input from?
 - Curb contractors, fence contractors, landscaping businesses. If you have contacts let's get in touch with them to ensure that we're including them. We don't want to get to a point where we're ready to propose to legislature then get derailed because of missing another stakeholder's input.
 - I would like to see the first and sixth exemptions removed: 1) the extraction of minerals and 6) planting of windbreaks, shelterbelts, and tree plantations
 - Regarding gravel pits, depending on the situation you probably don't need to call for locates every time. What if there are no lines through the gravel pit.
 - The ticket is good for 14 days but you can extend it
 - If you're going to operate the gravel pit for next 50 years with no lines through it, does it make sense to call for locates every time?
 - There's nothing in MS216D to prevent an excavator from calling. Good judgment and common sense may prevail.
 - Perhaps it's more of an educational process with MNOPS, GSOC and others?
 - An exemption for soil boring and core sampling?
 - Is there a reason for the difference between gardening and farming? 12" vs. 18"?
- Action Item: MNOPS and other industry stakeholders to reach out to concrete contractors, fencing contractors, landscaping business and other companies that perform staking work and invite them to upcoming MS216D stakeholder meetings.
-

- **Definition of Emergency key comments:**

- This issue relates to an increased number of emergency ticket complaints received by MNOPS and GSOC where municipalities and other groups question whether or not there is an emergency situation. The majority of complaints relate to sewer service companies who automatically default to calling in emergency tickets rather than determining if it should be an emergency ticket vs. a normal ticket.
- We have seen cases where multiple sewer service companies bid on the same job or location – 3-4 emergency locates requests for the same property. We have to respond to each ticket – mark three emergency locates if we get three emergency locate requests even if it's for the same location.
- We've had to send a locator to the same location three times because of three different emergency tickets.

black = MNOPS comments

blue = utility operator comments

green = excavator comments

orange = one call center comments

purple = locator comments

- In some cases, an emergency locate request will be submitted by the sewer service company but no excavation takes place.
 - If no excavation takes place, then why was it called in as an emergency? Was it truly an emergency? An emergency ticket is one of the excavation ticket types.
 - We've seen where sewer companies will call in an emergency ticket before they even get the job. They want the locates on site by the time they get there hoping they are awarded the job.
- As a homeowner, if my sewer is backs up I would consider it an emergency. I'd rather not wait 48 hours to have it fixed.
- Being a municipality, we are also a sewer operator. We consider sewer backups as an emergency.
- Some cases are legitimate emergencies that pose a clear and immediate danger to life, health, or property – where the backup is entering the house. Other cases are where the sewer service drains but not very well - it doesn't back up into the house. Are they both emergencies per the current definition?
- When we get the call of a sewer backup, we send a crew out to expose it. Until we expose it, the cause is labeled as 'unknown' until we see it after we excavate and expose. Similar to a grade A leak, we can't downgrade an 'unknown' until it is investigated.
- If they are doing the bid but not excavating, then it's not an emergency – installation of a pool, deck, dog fences, trees, etc...
- MNOPS can deal with abuses of emergency locate requests
 - Correct. And we have, but it has to be reported to us first. I'm sure there's many that aren't reported to MNOPS.
- Doesn't the One Call center make that judgment when they receive the request?
 - The CSR's have to put the ticket in after reading the definition of emergency to the requestor. One the operator gets the ticket, they have to respond to it and mark.
- If the excavator didn't white mark, that should be enforceable. It would prevent them from doing it next time.
- What is MNOPS telling municipalities?
 - We ask muni's and other groups that if feel you an emergency locate request didn't meet the definition of 'emergency', then please contact us and we can investigate. We are aware that there are groups who automatically call in for emergency tickets without assessing the nature of the emergency. We've seen emergency tickets where there was argument for a normal ticket.
- Perhaps training and education would be a better fit rather than language of law. We sent mailings to customers to address this stating that we would bill you. The problem lessened after that.
- Other people's thoughts? Address this issue via education vs. law change?
- Only address sewer line backups. General public may not understand what exactly what constitutes an emergency under the One Call law.
- What is MNOPS' authority? If someone abuses, what can MNOPS do?
 - MNOPS can enforce the misuse of an emergency ticket.
 - Can you fine them?

black = MNOPS comments

blue = utility operator comments

green = excavator comments

orange = one call center comments

purple = locator comments

- Yes.
 - Municipalities can refuse to issue a permit if they see problem.
 - Plumbers and sewer service companies have to utilize Call Before You Clear if they encounter a conflict during camera verification.
 - There is also the option to submit a scheduled emergency ticket. Some may not be aware of this. Perhaps that's another effort we need to educate further.
- Action Item: MNOPS and other industry stakeholders to reach out to sewer service companies and invite them to the upcoming MS216D stakeholder meetings. At this time, more feedback may be required to consider new language proposal vs. stronger educational efforts.
-

- **Boundary Survey key comments:**

- MNOPS and GSOC have received increased complaints involving boundary survey requests the past 3-4 years. Engineering, land surveying and subsurface utility engineering (SUE) firms are submitting more of these tickets for the purposes of acquiring information of existing utilities so that they can design their projects accordingly. The majority of the complaints are that the boundary survey tickets are not getting located and/or no response.
- Misuse of boundary survey tickets – 2 block radius for a Taco Bell on ¼ block but they call in for the whole campus for a small section, thus inundating our locators and taking them away from normal tickets that they must also locate.
- We have dealt with cases where the entire MN Zoo area was requested to be located. Also large park areas in the metro area.
- In many cases, there was no intent to excavate. SUE companies request flags and paint so they can use their tools to gather that data then sell the information to...? This information should be utilized for damage prevention, not for profit only.
 - Mn/DOT is requiring more SUE work. That could be one reason for the increase.
 - It can be valuable for persons planning work to minimize interruption for all parties. There are boundary survey tickets where there is no intent to excavate, only to sell information to clients who may buy property. When we ask who the client is, they won't tell you.
 - Boundary survey tickets are a non-excavation ticket type, so no excavation should be taking place. But yes, there were many meet tickets where SUE was involved and we had to address this <above>. Meet ticket is an excavation type ticket.
- The GSOC Handbook states that "if you are a licensed surveyor, use this type of ticket to request facility markings". However, this isn't described in MS216D. Perhaps operators and facility owners are not responding to boundary survey requests because of this?
- Per MS216D, "unless otherwise agreed to between the land surveyor and operator, an operator shall locate and mark or otherwise provide the approximate horizontal location of the underground facilities."
- Cannot have a boundary survey unless prepared by licensed surveyor per MN laws.
- Where are the limits?

black = MNOPS comments

blue = utility operator comments

green = excavator comments

orange = one call center comments

purple = locator comments

- If I as an owner or buyer of property was going to the point of having a registered land surveyor prepare a survey then it is not a casual request. Under NSPS construction quality surveys, a buyer of a survey can request that locates can be done. This is new in 2016. Not sure if this was done through CGA? National movement that goes beyond MN.
- There's also an engineering/pre-con ticket for the development of plans. However, a lot of groups don't call in that ticket because there is no expectation of flags and paint. They want the flags and paint so they can pick it up with their survey rods and GPS equipment and export the data into GIS. Don't want engineering drawings from 1964 which may not be accurate. Hence, also the increased issues with boundary survey tickets.
- GSOC would be interested in hearing about perceived abuses of boundary survey tickets. The intent is the request should not cover any more than what is necessary, not for the intent to sell information.
 - The concern of SUE companies doing SUE work and selling that information related to meet tickets. We met last year with those parties involved. MNOPS has seen less complaints regarding that issue but some still occur.
- Perhaps we need to consider newer technology and expand the issue to licensed engineers and engineering companies. More and more work is required in the pre-design and planning stages.
- Part of the reason for the MS216D stakeholder meetings is to consider new technology and how it impacts the industry. If technology is driving a need for change for language change, then it should be considered.
- Possibility of looking at all non-excavation tickets to see what is needed? Maybe redo the types of tickets – restructure them?
- Provide GIS mapping of facilities?
 - If the requestor feels that the GIS information is accurate, then may feel more comfortable receiving it.
- GIS maps or other mapping would have to be detailed to 2 feet. If service map only shows that it is in a corner of the yard, then that would not be accurate.
- If you send an engineer a map, they will claim that it is accurate. The paint should be on the ground.
 - Disagree – when they are ready to dig, then would call in a locate ticket and then have the utilities marked. Should trust map enough for planning. If something is wrong, it can be dealt with at that time. Marking twice doesn't seem fair.
 - But the pre-planning and the actual excavation could take place a year apart.
- If the data that the SUE and other engineering companies collect will be for creating plans to sell and make a profit, why can't we charge them for our time? If they're not doing for damage prevention, then it's likely for something to help them make money.
- So if the purpose of a normal locate ticket is to prevent damage and a boundary survey ticket is for profit – what if we separate the two tickets? Can one be charged for?
- Especially if the boundary survey people want it.
- One process for both digging and planning – alleviate damage by designing for less conflict.
- Argument for boundary survey for safety. We can start by working with GSOC to clarify the process. In the meantime, feel free to email or call with boundary survey thoughts and comments.

black = MNOPS comments

blue = utility operator comments

green = excavator comments

orange = one call center comments

purple = locator comments

➤ **Action Item: Continue discussion during future stakeholder meetings.**

- **48-Hour Notification key comments:**

- Currently, MN's One Call law requires operators to mark their utilities within 48 hours. In some states like WI, they have 72 hours. In other states, operators have until the end of the second day (11:59pm) to finish a locate request. It appears there is success with this in those states. Would MN benefit from allowing locate requests to be completed incumbent upon an end-of-second day requirement vs. a 48-hour requirement?
- CO have the end-of-day requirement. ND has the end-of-day language awaiting approval. For CO, this has streamlined the ability to plan and perform locates. No need to worry about what time the locate was submitted. Also allows excavators to start at 6am or 7am the following day instead of having to wait for a specific start time. For locators, it allows them to prioritize their work by geographic location vs. chasing start times.
- It could also help minimize damages. Example – there was a significant damage that shut down a railroad because the excavator thought his ticket was good to start digging on in the morning when in fact it wasn't due to start until 2pm. By allowing the start time to be 12:01am after the second day, it's less confusion for the excavator.
- MN does have the "agreed upon" language if excavators want to start early.
 - "Agreed upon" doesn't work so well. When you talk to a lot of excavators, many don't have their ticket in the truck so they end up calling the locators asking "what time does my ticket clear?"
 - So automatically allowing the ticket to clear after the end of the second day eliminates the need to look up information?
 - Correct.
- It's better than the 72-hour rule. Technology has changed. Locators have better prints and equipment but in the end it is still a human being who is walking on foot and locating. There are a lot more utilities in the ground.
- 2 days is a tight window. 3 days is too long but the midnight due date is a good compromise.
- For CO, did they have problems changing the excavators' thought process? There is an advantage of always knowing what time ticket is good rather than trying to figure out when it is due. Many call in early to avoid issues but this can lead to other complications.
- Most crews start their work right away in the morning. Knowing their ticket is good at 12:01am affords the ability to do so.
- I believe MO also has the end-of-second day requirement.
- It sounds like there is general acknowledgment by this group that this would benefit MN. If so, we would likely seek to form a subcommittee to continue discussions and formulate proposed language.

➤ **Action Item: Review similar language adopted by CO, ND, and MO and request stakeholders to form a subcommittee.**

black = MNOPS comments

blue = utility operator comments

green = excavator comments

orange = one call center comments

purple = locator comments

- **Civil Penalties key comments:**

- Currently MNOPS has the ability to fine up \$1,000 per day per violation. Exact amounts may vary based on the violation, previous history of the company, level of prudency, degree of impact to public safety, etc... Per MN law, pipeline operators can have higher penalty amounts. Is the current amount adequate to minimize recurrence of damages?
- Simplify the fines so that's it's consistent for everybody? From an enforcement perspective, it would be easier. Still a difference between pipeline and others.
- \$10,000 cap on pipeline operator. Per pipeline safety regulations, it can be \$100,000 or \$200,000 per day. For non-pipeline, MNOPS doesn't always penalize to the \$1,000 cap. It can be less.
- Why are we reviewing this?
 - Some stakeholders feel fine caps should be raised.
 - Goal is to prevent excavation damages. Are the current penalties enough to achieve safety?
- What is PHMSA's input? Do they feel it is significant enough of a deterrent? Wasn't WI scrutinized because of no civil penalties?
 - What PHMSA looks at for each state is: 1) is there state oversight over damage prevention? 2) is there a civil penalty structure? 3) do rules drive damages down? Overall, MN has had a downward trend in damages.
- What are other states doing?
 - \$1,000 is used in other states in some fashion.
 - And that's for states that have enforcement. Some states don't have an authorized agency to pursue enforcement.
- Can MNOPS shut an unsafe excavation down?
 - No, but OSHA or law enforcement can.
- From an excavator viewpoint, if hit then more cost in downtime. If no ticket, the fine amount should be much higher than \$1,000.
- If no ticket, the find should be double.
- For us (muni operator), we can double the fine on an excavator for repeat violations and double the cost of the permit. We can also choose to deny a permit after too many damages.
 - Correct, muni operators can seek support from their city council to enhance their policies to prevent damages. One of which is to choose to deny a permit.

➤ **Action Item: Continue discussion during future stakeholder meetings.**

- **Abandoned Facilities key comments:**

- GSOC and MNOPS have had to address the issue of what should be done with underground facilities where a company goes out of business. When a company goes defunct but the lines are still there, who is responsible to locate those lines?
- If I cut out steel then I can't locate any more. Very difficult to keep record and locate abandoned lines. Typically, it is abandoned because it is in the way of something. Example – I had a utility in a service area but it's not locatable anymore.

black = MNOPS comments

blue = utility operator comments

green = excavator comments

orange = one call center comments

purple = locator comments

- We had a location where we installed a new line at 8' depth. We encountered abandoned lines at 3' depth. There was no information on the abandoned line. We spend time on the phone trying to determine if it was live or dead. If we knew it was dead before hand, we could cut it and move it out of the way and make it easier to compact our trench. Very few abandoned lines are located.
 - A good scenario is where the excavator can at least reach a contact with utility operator(s) who can help identify the abandoned line. In many other cases, excavators encounter abandoned lines with no contact and no maps.
 - **The One Call center has polygons for abandoned facilities but no maps.**
 - For underground utility operators with abandoned facilities, GSOC keeps track of that information.
 - In the more recent case related to this, GSOC was able to address the issue after the fact, but in the future, as more companies possibly go defunct, we need to consider a proactive approach to handle abandoned lines.
 - **Are we looking to change the law?**
 - If it's in the best interest of the state and its stakeholders. Remember also that the current language requires utility owners to maintain maps and other information of their abandoned lines after December 31, 1998.
 - We could also look at a process where if a company goes out of business, they have to submit their maps to someone.
 - **Like superfund sites – EPA will go after existing companies who can pay for it.**
- **Action Item: Continue discussion during future stakeholder meetings.**
-

- **Depth of Utilities key comments:**

- Many utilities are installed via directional drilling. Some HDD work is very deep. By law, we have to pothole at each crossing but sometimes we pothole and still don't find it because it's so deep. A lot of time is spent.
- Provide depth information?
- If grade gets cut then it's tough to say a correct depth.
- The typical depth should be known. If you pothole and still don't find it, you can call the locator to assist.
- Locators won't tell you how deep. Some sewer pipe is 26' deep. When we don't find it we also have to question if it's located in the right spot.
- Is there a method, tool or practice to find depth accurately? Perhaps we could apply this topic to the MNCGA best practices group.
- Maybe the permitting authority could maintain location information because they would be knowledgeable of grade changes.
- Most utilities have ideal depths for their utilities but may have to go deeper if necessary. How do we find it once that occurs?
- Natural gas companies have minimum service depths. However, changes in depth of existing facilities is always an issue.

black = MNOPS comments

blue = utility operator comments

green = excavator comments

orange = one call center comments

purple = locator comments

- We have found lines as shallow as 2". When we installed utilities, there is an inspector there to make sure it is installed according to plan.
- Natural gas projects also have inspectors on site.
- Mn/DOT lines follow the easiest route that tend to zigzag.

➤ Action Item: Consider this topic for the Best Practices group.

- **Each Excavator to Have Their Own Ticket key comments:**

- GSOC Handbook (page 18) suggests that everyone must have their own ticket. However, MS216D can be interpreted differently. Multiple subcontractors will work under the general's ticket.
- There have been cases where there were multiple tree contractors. Don't know which contractor will plant on each street.
- MNOPS and GSOC have conveyed at damage prevention meetings and elsewhere that if you are an excavator, you should have your own ticket.
- Propose verbiage to require everyone to have their ticket?
- Need to add a requirement that each excavator must have their own ticket.
- Interpretation – page 65 of GSOC Handbook – attorney general. Not an exclusive statement. Not every person is required to have a ticket.
- MNOPS enforcement?
 - Violation is that they are doing something careless or expired, etc... Someone else can work under a ticket as long as all other requirements are met.
- What is the benefit of keeping it the way it is?
 - Having a sub with their own ticket = ownership of their excavation.
- If you have a ticket and the sub is working in the same area, does it make sense to require another ticket?
 - It would be in the best interest for subs to have their own ticket
- All subs should have their own
- From locators view, if subcontractors don't have tickets, it is difficult to know who is excavating and to ensure that things are marked for all excavators. They will generally say "I thought he had a ticket".
 - It would fall to the sub if agreement doesn't cover sub's work
- General contractors cover themselves by saying that subcontractors must get their own tickets for liability reasons.
- The general expectation is that subs should have their own ticket
- Is this similar in other states?
 - Shouldn't matter. If people are not generating tickets, then it's not safe.
- When Michels bores for us they get their own ticket
- We are getting own tickets for Xcel jobs
- Consensus to consider language change to require every excavator to have their own ticket?
 - I think we need to have more contractor presence than we have today. Sometimes contractor and subcontractors are both excavating at the same job.

black = MNOPS comments

blue = utility operator comments

green = excavator comments

orange = one call center comments

purple = locator comments

- Action item: Stakeholders to reach out to additional contractors and invite them to upcoming MS216D stakeholder meetings.
-

- **Meet Tickets key comments:**

- Do we still have the language that was drafted last time?
 - We do and I apologize again for not having it available for this meeting. Since we have members here today that weren't part of the last stakeholder meetings, we wanted to allow everyone a fresh viewpoint to start with. After today's meeting, we will include and reconsider the draft language that the group then proposed.
 - We will also publish that information on our website along with meeting minutes and other draft language developed during these ongoing meetings.
- Meet tickets stacked too close time-wise. Makes is difficult for our locators to attend some meets.
- Everyone wants to meet at 8am on Monday.
- We usually call to request a different time for a meet if we can't make it.
- We talked about a software tool to schedule meets. Did not go anywhere.
- Tool proposed for excavators to schedule a meet. Could see all the meets already scheduled in an area to see times that might not work. Some states schedule meets. It may be a one call or other type of operation.
- How do states address meet tickets in 12:01 ticket due time schemes? Half of meet tickets give an area bounded by XX:XX starting tomorrow. Could be a concern for locators.
- How about "parent" and "children" tickets. Notice of meet ticket – "sibling" tickets would know of meet tickets. This would address issues in a communication fashion rather than a law change.
- Meets can save utility locators a lot of time rather than individual tickets. Do a whole town – initial meet and try to call in new meet every two weeks. Advantage for locators – tickets are called in every two weeks to ensure they can be paid.
- Also need telephone number of operator contact. We can get the number for locators but not operators.
- Phone numbers for all locators and operators should be on the ticket.
- It has changed. In the past, there were three separate columns. One for locator, one for utility operator, one for emergency contact. Not sure when it changed, but for some time now, tickets only provide one column for utility operator contact. Sometimes those numbers lead you to customer service centers who don't have knowledge of the site.
 - Excavators are required to call the utility operator in case of a hazardous condition but that number for an emergency is not available on the ticket.
 - We could go back and look to have operator's and locator's numbers back on the ticket.
- Substantial number of homeowners – if emergency numbers added back on tickets, we may also get non-emergency calls from homeowners. May need to receive more input to ensure that everyone wants emergency numbers.
- We can form a user's group to discuss further.

black = MNOPS comments

blue = utility operator comments

green = excavator comments

orange = one call center comments

purple = locator comments

- Action Item: Consider forming a user's group to develop enhancements for meet tickets.
 - Action Item: One Call center to consider reestablishing locator and emergency contact info on tickets.
-

Moving forward, the plan is to continue meeting quarterly and continue discussions as needed. For topics where language change is deemed prudent, we will consider forming subcommittees. All stakeholders are welcome to volunteer as lead facilitators for subcommittees. MNOPS will coordinate such efforts appropriately.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 15:30 CDT

*** Please join us for the next MS216D stakeholder review meeting on January 19th, 2017 at Connexus Energy, 14601 Ramsey Boulevard, Ramsey, MN 55303 from 10am to 3:30pm.**

black = MNOPS comments

blue = utility operator comments

green = excavator comments

orange = one call center comments

purple = locator comments