

Michigan Utility Coordination Committee
August 21, 2017
Meeting Minutes

1. May Meeting Minutes
 - a. Accepted
2. Utility Relocation Issues on LAP Projects with Private Utilities
 - a. MDOT form 0260 was handed out, and discussed.
 - b. Concerns were raised that Local Agency managers will not treat updates to this form seriously, regardless of how the language in the form is revised.
 - c. It was pointed out that the concern is mostly with municipalities (townships and cities), not counties
 - d. It was stated that MML does not want mandates, and are mostly concerned about added costs
 - i. MDOT asked about a cost/benefit ratio for time spent in design vs delay and extra costs in construction
 - e. Starting with an educational approach was discussed and
 - i. This was agreed upon as a good next step
 - ii. ACEC recently created a “how-to” short video and recommended a similar approach could be taken for LAP utility coordination processes.
 - f. The utility coordination checklist was discussed and agreed upon to still be a valid document that should be used by LAP
 - i. One challenge is that MDOT does not have authority to enforce adherence to a checklist
 - i. Concerns that ACEC would have a hard time promoting were discussed, since local agencies could view their involvement negatively
 - ii. MDOT/MITA agreed that message should come from MML, CRA, or potentially MITA if needed
 - g. It was reported that the City of Dearborn follows a good process for utility coordination that mimics MDOT’s approach.
 - i. Dearborn staff handles this all with internal staff
 - ii. Their coordination efforts could be used as an example of best practices
 1. Could be a good presentation for MUCC Conference.
 2. **Action: Adolfo will reach out to the City of Dearborn about the idea**
 - h. A sub-team meeting including CRA/MML, ACEC, MITA and MDOT should take place to brainstorm educational options
 - i. **Action: Rachelle will set up this meeting**
3. Utility (Municipal & Public) Outreach
 - a. MISS DIG was not in attendance
 - b. Nick has been giving the 21st Century Infrastructure Commission updates on the GUIDE initiative
 - c. The Commission is looking for MUCC participation
 - i. Rachelle and Nick will be attending a meeting representing MUCC before the commission on 8/30, for a utilities data discussion

1. A second meeting is planned to discuss a pilot for coordination and communication
 2. MDOT believes this will focus on local projects and processes
 - d. The commission is planning 2 pilot projects, one on the west side and one on the east side of the state, focusing on the following:
 - i. Type of data to be collected
 - ii. How data is managed
 - iii. Coordination and communication
 - e. SEMCOG will manage the eastern project, Grand Valley Metro Council will manage the western project
 - f. Consumers Energy stated concern that a new communication process will conflict with current MISS DIG design ticket process, which works well for CE
 - g. Concerns were raised with the MISS DIG design ticket process
 - i. Some tickets tend to result in “useless” information
 - ii. It was agreed that the concept is good, but execution needs improvement since utility owners do not always respond with good information
 - iii. When staking is requested of utility owners, it sometimes takes months to get a response, if a response is received
4. Permit Process – Permitted Work Conflicting with Projects
 - a. **Action: Rachelle will review notes and follow up with specific examples of what the key issue is**
 - i. *Post-meeting follow up: This item was from an Operations Program Electrical Committee (OPEC) discussion, and Rachelle volunteered to take the item to MUCC for further discussion since it seemed an appropriate topic for the MUCC team. The next OPEC meeting is 11/8 and Rachelle will follow up with OPEC at that meeting and report back.*
 - b. Some issues were discussed relating to permitted work involving third party utilities working within project limits prior to or during construction without the contactor’s knowledge
 - c. It was asked if MDOT’s permit website could alert permit applicant that there’s a project in design or construction in the vicinity
 - d. MDOT questioned if the issue is happening on Region-led projects.
5. MDOT Format for Utility Conflict Matrix and Conflict Sheets
 - a. HNTB presented a proof of concept for improvements to the Utility Conflict Matrix and Conflict Sheets
 - b. The MUCC attendees agreed that the concept would be beneficial and recommended the following:
 - i. Add “R” for relocated lines
 - ii. Color code bubbles for mitigated conflicts
 - iii. Add levels for mitigated conflicts
 - c. **Actions:**
 - i. **Dave to present to MDOT/ACEC Design Technology Forum**
 - ii. **I-94 Advanced Bridges Phase 2 will serve as pilot for this format**
6. 2018 MUCC Conference
 - a. The next MUCC meeting will be the kickoff for planning purposes

b. Action: Bring presentation ideas to the next meeting

Next Meeting:

October 3rd, 9 AM at Benesch (4660 S. Hagadorn Road, Suite 315, East Lansing, MI)

SUBJECT: MUCC Meeting Attendance

DATE: 8/21/17 -5/22/17-

LOCATION: MITA Conference Room

Initial	FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	COMPANY	EMAIL (if not already on file)
	Laura	Arnold	MISS DIG	
<i>ARB</i>	Ron	Brenke	ACEC	
	Bruce	Campbell	MISS DIG	
<i>A.C.</i>	Adolfo	Castillo	DTE Energy	
<i>KB</i>	Al	Dionise	AT&T	
<i>DKD</i>	Dirk	Dunham	Consumers Energy	
<i>SA</i>	Scott	Greene	MDOT	
<i>MR</i>	Dave	Langlois	HNTB	
<i>MR</i>	Nick	Lefke	MDOT	
<i>MR</i>	Mark	Loch	OHM	
	Steve	Puuri	County Road Association/MML	
<i>KS</i>	Kristin	Schuster	MDOT	
<i>ES</i>	Erik	Smith	DTE Energy	
	Travis	Stokes	Rauhorn	
<i>DS</i>	Doug	Strauss	Alfred Benesch & Co.	
<i>RV</i>	Rachelle	VanDeventer	MITA	
	<i>Erik</i>	<i>Smith</i>		