OUDPC Meeting

Abandoned Lines Subcommittee

10/14/2025

Roll Call: Jason Broyles, Johnny Henson, Greg First, Bob Gates, Alex Turner, Dave Coniglio, Brooke Ebersole, Jim Wooten, Mike Lambdin, Collins Cranmer, Mary Logan So, Cheryl Burchard, Blake Ross, Rod Troxell, Jim Mandera, Richard Thompson, Don Huck, Lori Wade, Kyle Mangione, Greg Vergamini, Stephanie Kromer, Chris Russ, Bruce Jones, Deron Large, John Kelly

Mary Logan So opened the meeting. Prior meeting minutes were reviewed and motion to accept as presented made by Mary So. Lori Wade seconded the motion. Vote was taken: unanimous to accept meeting minutes as presented.

Mary shared with the group that the following topics were the focus:

1) Follow up to the facilities who said they were checking with legal about what information could be shared (specifically Deron with Altafiber and Deb with AEP)
2) Agreeing to a definition of "abandoned"
3) Staged rollout? By facility type? One year after signing into law to get information ready for transfer?
4) Proposed language from 10/8/24 was provided by the contractors. A few suggestions for amendments:

Proposed language:

Facility owners must maintain maps, drawings, diagrams, BIM information, or other records regarding the location of any underground facilities that have been abandoned, out-of-service, inactive, deactivated, disconnected or otherwise as of ~~XX/XX/202X.~~ (date of signed legislation)

Facility owners have a one-year period following the signed legislation to develop a format to transmit the aforementioned information to the One Call Center for transmission to the excavator.

All facilities, abandoned, out-of-service, not-in-use, inactive, deactivated, disconnected, or otherwise, are deemed the responsibility of the facility owner unless transfer or ownership is completed, submitted and approved by the PUCO. This information shall also be transferred, with

DRAFT

accompanying map data, to the One Call Center for maintenance as a database of such lines. Excavators shall be furnished records of such potential conflicts during the submittal of a utility locate request.

Wherever feasible, abandoned, out-of-service, inactive, deactivated, disconnected, or otherwise should be removed from public right-of-way under the direction of the last known owner reported to the PUCO. ~~All removal costs are ultimately the cost of the facility owner.~~ Resulting damage from excavating activities around unmarked facilities is presumed to be the responsibility of the facility owner.

Deron Large was unable to speak with legal due to timing of Govt Shutdown. Debbie Harris was not available to join the meeting so no update from AEP at this time.

Mary So discussed the fact that CGA as well as a few other states have defined "abandoned". Jason Broyles to research and present definitions at next subcommittee meeting. Jim Mandera stated that their contract locate provider is instructed to mark everything but abandoned lines so does not necessarily see the need in calling out other line types (ie: out of service, inactive, etc). Lori Wade commented that based on her experience, different line types are different depending on the utility type. Something for the group to consider throughout this conversation.

Jim Mandera questions as to the intent of the language. Are we looking to get just primary and mains or does it also include services. Mary So responded that the contractor basis is looking for any information that would assist them in being able to identify any type of line that is not being actively marked. Jim Mandera states that asking for data on a service line is much more difficult that mains due to the data being captured and tracked at the utility level. Jim Wooten added that Centerpoint has service cards going back to the early 1900's that can be referenced to pull location data on service lines. Asks if the ask for the utilities to actively mark abandoned lines or just provide information. Mary So responded that this is all dealing with the storage of data pertaining to the lines, not looking for active locating. Conversation ensued confirming for the group that this is, and has been, being discussed from a "point forward" time frame. Mary So continued by stating that ownership status would be tracked through the PUCO to alleviate concerns in situations where the ownership of the facility transfers back to the property owner at time of abandonment.

Don Huck spoke to the point that if utility companies are already giving this data to OHIO811 for their active lines, it should help with creating the abandoned layer to mapping. Jason Broyles asks the group to keep in mind that most utility members do not provide OHIO811 with specific location of each line, but sets up based off of general geographic location of the utilities. Jason then asks what the process could look like getting abandoned line ownership information from the PUCO in the cases where the ownership gets transferred to someone else? Something to keep in mind as conversation ensues.

Jim Wooten and Jim Mandera voice concerns over situations where an excavator, using information on possible abandoned lines in the vicinity of their excavation, assumes that a line they have uncovered is abandoned and digs through it without care. Concerns from both a safety and a liability perspective. Jim Mandera continued by stating that we need to come to an agreement on 1) who is the clearing house going to be, 2) what data is going to be required to be maintained, 3) Define abandoned. Jim Mandera concludes that the third line of the proposed language is not feasible due to the cost associated with removing lines. Conversation ensues that there is already a cost associated with removing abandoned lines that is shared by the industry and the focus needs to be on safety and not cost. Jim Mandera confirms that he is in agreement with the communication but not removal.

DRAFT

Mary So states that she is open to suggestions from everyone. Currently it is just the contractors coming forward and making the ask and utility companies are not really saying or committing to what information they can and are willing to provide.

Deron Large states that the subcommittee keeps having the same conversation(s) with no progress which is becoming frustrating. Requests that the subcommittee start taking items one at a time to facilitate more forward movement. Suggests going back to the foundation of defining specific terms and confirming the clearing house. Don Huck agrees and states that we need to focus on 1) OHIO811 being the clearing house and 2) being clear and specific on "point forward".

Dave Coniglio states that the contractor basis was not intending to saddle the utilities with blanket liability. Contractors are just asking for whatever information they can get. There is no "fix" to this issue but with maintaining records and sharing that information, it is a starting point.

Mary So states that up to this point, no one has had any issue with OHIO811 taking on the roll of the clearing house. Asks if there is any contention with that thought now? No one spoke of any concerns.

Lori Wade stated that the group may want to consider language such as: "After all options to determine status of facility in question have been completed, the resulting damage from excavation will be the responsibility of the facility owner" as the last sentence in the proposed language. Jim Mandera requests that the last sentence be removed all together as abandoned lines will never be marked.

Mary So brings the group back and re-asks the question if anyone has any issues with OHIO811 being the clearing house? Again, no one voiced any issues. Deron Large asks if we are sure OHIO811 is willing and able to handle. Mary So stated that after talking with Roger Lipscomb, OHIO811 is in a position and is willing to take this on for the industry. Possibly be able to see some demos in Q1 of 2026 as OHIO811 rolls out the CenterLogix Platform.

Don Huck starts conversation in respect to mapping information for abandoned lines that are historical. States that if companies have this information, it would be shared on a voluntary basis. Supports "point forward" but does find value in historical data if the company is willing and able to supply. Should NOT be considered mandatory for historical data. Intent of subcommittee is and has been "point forward". Don also states that the voluntary information would carry no liability on the utility company.

Jim Mandera asks how do we ensure that the excavator does not assume that any particular line is live or abandoned and digs through the live assuming it was the abandoned? Jim also poses the question of how the center would utilize the information and get to excavators? Mary So responds stating that the sharing of information, size, type, and other information that would assist the excavator in properly identifying the live and abandoned lines on the jobsite. Jim states that this language needs to focus on liability. Mary So asks if it would be possible to consider making legislation surrounding mandating gas companies to tap lines to ensure abandonment? Jim Wooten responds that, specific to CenterPoint, that is not what they would want. They will do their best to properly identify and confirm status of a line but they will always look for another option before tapping lines.

Lori Wade asks what exactly would be sent to excavators? The intention is only to get data on the lines that are not actively being located and marked.

Next Steps:

DRAFT

- Report from utilities on what data they are willing and able to supply
- Research definitions: determine definition of “abandoned line” for Ohio
- Continued conversation and adjustments on proposed language from the contractors

DRAFT