Utility Coordination- Ticket Life Focus Group

06/05/2025

10:00AM

Attendance: Jim Wooten, Jason Broyles, Alex McCann, Jana Bruen, Frank Riegler, Brad Shoemaker, Lori Wade, Kevin Campbell, James Mandera, Chris Russ, Kara Arnold, Deborah Harris, Deanna DeWitt, Jim Collins, Melvin Henson, Dave Coniglio, Jimmy Stewart, Mary Logan So, Mike Lambdin, Chuck Mueller

Jim started the meeting at 10:04am with the review and approval of the previous meeting minutes.

Motion made by Brad Shoemaker, Melvin Henson seconded, minutes approved unanimously.

Current language is under the 45 day review, review period ends June 11th.

Clarification on what constitutes leaving the job site.

Jim Mandera- This has been a struggle historically, the intent is, physically leaving the site. If new facilities are installed after the locate has been generated, the contractor would not know about it. Do we need to add something to this to define it, and where. Just because you have a piece of equipment on site doesn't mean you are on site if you don't have anyone physically on site.

Lori Wade- Agrees with Jim Mandera, do need to define what is leaving the site. Something along the lines of "having personnel on site. How many days of non-activity, not just equipment on site.

Jana Bruen- Operates in other states, has two questions, discuss a ticket renewal? Jim Wooten, yes we did. Jana- excavation is actively occurring or taking place. Instances where contractors just parked equipment on the job site. Jana's organization checks up on jobs every 10 days, and takes photos when on the site. Not sure how to address the installation of new facilities. Need something to tie to a violation, or a point of discussion that the law states xyz.

Dave Coniglio- Agee with everything that has been said thus far, the challenge is not defining, the challenge is how do you track it. Will end up being left to the contractor to know and track the days. Thinks it needs to be if you are absent or away from the set number of days.

Jim Wooten- Valid point, if you are on site, and someone comes to install something new, then you see it and are aware of it. As far as tracking it, it is difficult to know for sure if the excavator has been gone off the site for the set amount of days. Will be very difficult to prove.

Dave Coniglio- To Jana's point, does not think that just having equipment on site is the way to go either.

Mary Logan So- Ditto to everything that Dave said, if something new is installed, how soon is that facility making it into the database so the locator would actually be locating that line. If it takes a while, even calling in a new request will not get that line marked because it wont be on the database to be marked.

Jim Mandera- To Mary's point, updated records can be very challenging, some struggle more than others. Maybe a solution (Mental note for future conversations) If utilities are required to back flagged after install, that may solve the issue. It would be easier in the short term to have happen.

Jason Broyles- Made a note of it for future discussions.

Jim Mandera- Should we add, a continual physical presence.

Jim Wooten- thinks that helps. Feels like people think today that if you drop equipment off at a job site that it is considered starting before the 10 days. Jason, can you provide clarification on this?

Jason Broyles- Would need to see if there have been any cases about this in the UTC.

Mary Logan So- If someone is on the job site, but not excavating yet, and are doing job site analysis, checking soil, etc.. they are on the job, and able to see the marks.

Dave Coniglio- thinks physical presence on the job site is the way to go, but need to define what "physical presence" on the job site means.

Jim Wooten- Would "absent" mean that you are away from the job site? Not just having equipment on the site.

Jim Mandera- If we put the word, "physically" absent? Does that fix the issue.

Jim Wooten- If we change something at this point, does it need to go back out for review?

Jason Broyles- Yes, if language changes, then it will have to go back through review. Not sure if it would need to go through a full 45 day review, maybe a shorter amount of time, but needs to check and see what we would need to do. Not changing the intent, just adding more clarity.

Jana Bruen- Wants to read the statement with the change.

Brad Shoemaker- Adding personnel after excavator may be the way to go.

Melvin Henson- Wants to see what it would look like with adding personnel before absent.

Jana Bruen- Is the 16 calendar days a firm thing, and where did that come from.

Jim Wooten- Talked about coming up with a day, 45-30-21, mirror some of the other states. Some decided that it wouldn't work for them. Settled on 16 consecutive days as a group as a compromise. 16 calendar days instead of 10 working days to make it easier to track. Mirrored that to match this.

Kevin Campbell- Should it say "their" personnel to specify that it is the excavators personnel.

Mary Logan So- Should it say updated request instead of new request. Content remains the same, so it would be an update and not a new ticket.

Jana Bruen- If the ticket expires, it would have to be a new request wouldn't it?

Jason Broyles- In Ohio, you can update an expired ticket. It is a new ticket, but it is still an updated ticket because all the language is the same.

Mary Logan So- Even though it is a "new" ticket, contractors consider it an updated ticket.

Jim Wooten- For this conversation, the updated ticket still has a 48 hour wait, and a new ticket number. Think whether it says new, or updated, it will still mean the same thing in the end.

Jana Bruen- When talking about a homeowner, would they know what that term means in relation to their ticket. Do they need to be a member to do an updated ticket?

Jim Wooten- No, they do not need to be a member to update a ticket.

Jim Mandera- Does the update ticket change the response date?

Jason Broyles- Yes it does, it goes off the time it was updated, and the new response date would be on the new request.

Jim Wooten- Would like a set number of days for expiration but also feel good about the fact that the ticket is expired once the paint and flags are no longer visible.

Jim Wooten- Any other points or questions.

Jason Broyles- Needs to do some research, send it back out for review, and have it ready for the full coalition meeting in July. Recommends that if we get good feedback and need another meeting, we can try to find a day prior to the July meeting so it can be ready. If we don't get any comments back, then we can just present it at the full meeting in July.

Jim Wooten- Agrees

Chris Russ- Not opposed to the language, wants to mention, CGA recommends that a ticket life be between 10-20 days for a ticket life. Do think we will have to address it at some point.

Jim Wooten- Agree, and need to come up with something at some point that we can all agree upon. For now, this is what everyone has been able to come to a mutual agreement on at this point.

Jimmy Stewart- One comment, assuming you get everyone to sign off on this, timeline wise, the legislation is still in committee in the house, introduced a substitute bill to include the ODOT stuff on asphalt grinding. Imagine they would come back in September, still have time to make changes to it if it ends up working out.

Jason Broyles- Sub bill was unanimously accepted by the committee at the state house with the ODOT language.

Jim Wooten adjourned the meeting at 10:50AM.