| Ontario Regional ORCCCC Common Ground Alliance | June Teleconf Start | Committee Meeting Minute 28, 2016 erence/Webex 9:02 a.m. de 11:02 a.m. Company: ORCGA ORCGA ORCGA Terra Discovery Competers AOLS MTO Enersource Toronto Hydro Union Gas TransCanada | Sta Sta Equ Lar Ele Gas | |
|--|--|---|--|-------------|
| Item # | | Item | | Action Item |
| 1 | Jeremy welcomed attendees | via teleconference. | | |
| 2 | Priority 1 and 2: BP proposals feedback from Regional Partners organized into Priority 1 & 2 by CCGA. Request is to respond to CCGA task team comments, not to make further edits. | | | |
| 3 | The Committee Reviewed Priority 1's:Ian to take forward to CCGA Best Practices Committee MeetingTR 2015-023: BP 2.8 Retention of Voice Records According to Applicable Statutes Eliminates "voice". The word "must" has been replaced with "shall". ORCGA Position: agrees with Task TeamIan to take forward to CCGA Best Practices Committee MeetingTR 2015-025: BP 3.3 Colour Code Proposal wants to add "black" as well as white lining. CCGA task team suggests revising to align with CSA Z247. ORCGA Position: agrees with CCGA Task TeamIan to take forward to CCGA task team suggests revising to align with CSA Z247. | | | |
| | TR 2015-003: BP 3.14 Locate Report Ontario agrees with the task team. Decision | | | |

| SCGA objection to regional references. CCGA Task team corrected editorial error of incorrect web link on p.42 & p.44 and noted regional element on p.45 is an example not a reference. ORCGA Position: agrees with CCGA Task Team | |
|--|--|
| TR 2015-029: BP 4.3 White Lining SCGA proposal makes changes to be consistent with black/white lining proposal for BP 3.3 Colour Code (TR 2015- 025). CCGA task team rewrote the suggested practice statement. Practice Description: As a method of reducing damages to underground infrastructure, pre-marking of the boundaries of the work area using white paint or equivalent (or alternate colour during the winter as noted on the locate request) by the excavator should be completed prior to locating. Note: Electronic or virtual pre-marking can be an alternative. Ref – CSA Z247-2015 ORCGA Position: agrees with CCGA Task Team. | |
| TR 2015-034: BP 4.3 White Lining ABCGA proposal similar to SCGA's above (TR 2015-029), both are concerned with white lining on snow. CCGA task team has same comments. ORCGA Position: agrees with CCGA Task Team. | |
| TR 2015-027: BP 4.10 Facility Owner/Operator Failure to Respond Current practice statement suggests response within 2 hours. SCGA proposes change to "mutually agreed to time". CCGA task team suggested changing this to "reasonable time". Original BP based on emergency response times in ON. Task team wants to leave this up to regional partners to decide/legislate. We think reasonable time should be decided by an impartial party like a provincial One Call. The provincial One Call would have regional stats to determine "reasonable" and "emergency". ORCGA Position: agrees with CCGA Task Team but notes there is opportunity for further improvement if BP states who decides the reasonable response time. | |
| TR 2015-014: BP 4.12 Work Site Review with Company Personnel SCGA proposal expands competent person to "excavator's designated competent person". | |

| CCGA task team revised this to simply that the excavator reviews the location of underground facilities with site personnel. ORCGA Position: agrees with CCGA Task Team. | |
|--|--|
| TR 2015-005: BP 4.15 Federal and Provincial Regulations SCGA proposal changes BP from being specific to occupational health and safety regulations and references all federal and provincial legislation. We were opposed to this in 2015; point of BP was to emphasize need to focus on occupational health and safety. CCGA Task Team revised SCGA proposed wording but remained aligned with inclusion of all federal and provincial legislation. ORCGA Position: CCGA task team has not improved BP and we prefer to stay with original wording. | |
| TR 2015-017: BP 4.20 Unidentified Facilities SCGA proposal adds "with clearance from the facility owner" to the practice statement, and "the unknown facility is not identified and" to the practice description. CCGA task team rewrote and expanded this well beyond SCGA's proposed wording. We agree with CCGA task team's intent but feel that the result is not a practical statement. ORCGA Position: CCGA task team has not improved BP and we prefer to see 4.20 revisited as a major exercise rather than a simple edit. | |
| TR 2015-019: BP 4.21 Exposed Facility Protection SCGA proposal adds "and those methods must be approved by the underground facility owner/operator". CCGA task team changed this to "and those methods must comply with the requirements of the infrastructure owners and, if necessary, according to a plan signed by an engineer". We feel the last part of this referring to a plan signed by an engineer is unnecessary. ORCGA Position: agrees with CCGA Task Team but notes there is opportunity for further improvement if "and, if necessary, according to a plan signed by an engineer" is deleted. | |
| TR 2015-009: BP 4.21 Exposed Facility Protection ABCGA proposal similar to SCGA's above (TR 2015-019), both are concerned with adding need for approval from infrastructure owner/operator. CCGA task team has same comments. | |

| | ORCGA Position: agrees with CCGA Task Team but notes there is opportunity for further improvement if "and, if necessary, according to a plan signed by an engineer" is deleted. |
|---|--|
| | TR 2015-007: Glossary ORCGA prosed adding definitions for "Marks or Marking", "Limits of Locate" and "LSP". CCGA task team adjusted proposed wording to align with definitions in CSA Z247. ORCGA Position: agrees with CCGA Task Team. |
| | End Priority 1 discussion. |
| | Another meeting will be scheduled to discuss Priority 2's. Ian will take this information back to the national meeting. |
| 4 | Roundtable:Jeremy asked each attendee if there any local issues arising.The group had nothing to report at this time. |