OUDPC Misuse of OHIO811 Subcommittee Meeting

05/18/2026

11:00AM

Attendees: Kevin Campbell, Jason Broyles, Alex McCann, Brad Shoemaker, Collins Cranmer, Matt Hines, Scott Mergler, Russell Johnson, Jim Wooten, Davy Myers, Sean Travis, John Kelly, Chris Russ, Mike Lawson, Dave Coniglio, Liz Pyles, Shawn Hudgel, Rodney Troxell, Griffin Weasel, Brad Hegwood, Brian Holden, Jake Wright, Joel Johnson, Kurt Leib, Larry Harvey, Blake Ross, Wendi Snyder, Garry Lee, Greg First, Deborah Harris, Adam Pietrzyk, Brent St. Clair, Joshua Thieman, Frank Riegler, Hampton Lawrence, Dominick Belsar, Roger Lipscomb, Jimmy Stewart, Jim Mandera, Gregory Vergamini

Alex McCann opened the meeting at 11:01am.

Jim Wooten made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from February's meeting. Blake Ross seconded the motion.

Meeting minutes approved unanimously.

Alex McCann- A few things we talked about last meeting were to reach out to OHIO811 to see what they are seeing at the center to see what they feel the misuse of the system is. The two biggest things we saw were true emergencies, and calling in tickets too far in advance. Have some other states we looked at to see what they had, and how they address it. Those are the two areas that the center seems to see the most as far as misuse of the system. As for true emergencies, there is a definition of what an emergency is, want to go back to that and see if there is language to come up with give the center some authority to refuse some of those tickets that aren't true emergencies.

Chriss Russ- The one call center is not going to turn down an emergency, but if we make it enforceable that may help. Also, the utility coordination subcommittee, they were saying maybe having this committee look at people not using the large project tickets.

Roger Lipscomb- I agree with Chris, giving the center the tools they need, the center needs to be able to refuse a ticket that isn't a true emergency. If we know the swimming pool ticket isn't an emergency, we still have to take the ticket. We could still take the ticket, but we would send it out as a routine ticket. If we did anything with language, give the center

the authority, it doesn't meet the definition, and shut it down. Before HB 458, the definition of an excavator was different, we had piggybacking, that was creating a big issue for the industry. Only the person responsible for making the excavation is the excavator. What has crept up, is the use of subcontractors. Some of our members have 200 cable drops or 200 laterals, 4 contractors, and all 4 get the same 200 tickets, and whoever gets there first gets the job. One location could generate 4-5 tickets and get repeated until someone gets there. So how do we work is so that the definition of an excavator can be expanded to cover this situation. When some of the work is being subbed out, maybe have the subs named on the ticket. This would eliminate some of the clutter and could have some sort of piggybacking again. That way those tickets only get called in once. Need to find a way to eliminate that practice. Also, could make it to where the UTC can hold them accountable.

Alex McCann- right, if there are 3-4 subs working under a company, then that company can call in that ticket and list those subs.

Roger Lipscomb- In that situation it wouldn't cover that, cause those subs are all doing something different. If each sub is doing the same exact work, then that would be different. When the same work is being distributed to 4-5 companies and they all call in tickets for it, it creates a lot more tickets. Also, figure out how to enforce that there are only 4 ways a ticket is closed at this time, marked, cleared, cancelled, or work is already completed. People are still hung up that every 10 days that ticket has to be refreshed, and they don't need to. That is another big issue to consider during the discussions.

Scott Mergler- Just hit it on the last one, had one of my contractors calling it in every 10 days, and spoke with them saying that they didn't need to do that, and showed them where it was in the ORC. Sometimes you do need to refresh, but there are a lot of times when it is not needed.

Alex McCann- Right or wrong, I know that is what is happening a lot of times in the Columbus area just to make sure we have paint on the ground. Know a couple of other contractors who are doing something similar just to make sure we have good marks on the ground. As we continue to work, a lot of those marks are getting destroyed.

Roger Lipscomb- Little bit of background, many years ago the call center prior to me coming, we were paid by the ticket, so more tickets were good for us. We were also educating to call tickets in every 10 days, and it was treated by the industry as an expiration ticket, so those got called in every 10 days. As an industry, it has been held onto. If remarks are needed, then that's understandable, but just to keep a ticket "alive", that's a mis use. A lot of folks, because of the 10 days, they call it in on the 8th day to make sure the marks were still good. Now we have changed it to 16 calendar days, so those tickets that get

automatically renewed. Contractors need to back off that idea, and there needs to be language to hold those accountable that won't back off of that.

Dave Conigliio- How do we come up with something to differentiate between abuse, and what is a legitimate update. Just because a ticket is called in every 10 days, doesn't mean its abuse, certain jobs need updated.

Roger Lipscomb- The need for remarks is different, but the 10-day time period is different. If the scope doesn't change, and the marks are still good, then there is no need to call it back in.

Dave Coniglio- Not saying I am against it, just not sure how we can come up with something to differentiate between remarks, and abuse of just updating every 10 days. Once the ticket goes in, someone is going out to remark it. If you need remarking's, then call the ticket back in stating you need remarking's. If you are just refreshing a ticket, but you don't need marks, then there is no need to "refresh" that ticket back in. But we see that happening over and over again. The ones who receive this have to go back to those tickets again, and it's wasting time.

Scott Mergler- To help answer, the situation I was referring to, they called in 10 tickets again, then when the locator called they only needed 2 of the 10 tickets marked. I agree that there are going to be conditions, and do need to look at how to put that language in.

Jim Wooten- Scott hit on one of the things I was talking about, when a guy calls in 10 tickets for a job, but 3 are completed, that is abuse, and if you are calling in remarks because you need them, then there is nothing wrong with that. It would rely on the person who files a complaint to prove that remarks weren't actually needed.

Stephen/Andrew- is the intention to put a specified time limit for expiration so we can get away from tickets being called in every 10 days? If we have a set time line that the ticket is good as long the marks are still visible, then we could eliminate some of this because there is a set expiration timeline.

Jason Broyles- that conversation has been going on for 2 years, utility coordination subcommittee, 50/50 split, some want a timeline, and some say that we already have one with the condition of the paint and flags

Stephen/Andrew- Keeping in mind the "abuse" of the system, we create language to keep people from calling unless they know that they are going to be doing the work. They think they are going to get the job and keep calling it in for 10 days in hopes they get the bid.

Jason Broyles- Yes, and I think a lot of that is what Roger was talking about earlier.

Chris Russ- Did we get the language into 227 that the utility coordination subcommittee about if they leave the site for 16 days it needs recalled?

Jason Broyles- No it did not, it is agreed upon to go into the next bill. And notification is 2 working days not including the day of notification, but not more than 16 calendar days.

Chris Russ- If we have update as a ticket type still, updating a ticket but the work has been completed, it should be a violation, and if the work has not started in the 16 calendar days, that should be a violation as well. Contractor updates a ticket 3-4 times without working, and the utility marks it one time all but one time. The "just in case" tickets are a problem, especially in the high-capacity time of the year and are spending time marking things that don't need marked.

Kyle Mangione- just wants to reiterate, see a lot of the abuse go away if we have an actual expiration date. Really think we should push for that.

Chris Russ- We have been advocating for that, have other states that have that, but will still have abuse unless we have language that makes the abuse enforceable.

Kyle Magione- Understand that, if we have an expiration date, I think it will still help, and it will help spread things out, and not marking things that waste time.

Roger Lipscomb- Think of it like this, the 16 calendar days is kind of like an expiration date. You have to start that job in that time. The issue we have here, we have tickets that have been called in 15 times, every 10 days, and the work has never started. The reason it is being called in so often, is because it reached that "expiration" date. If we had it every 30 days, in this scenario, it wouldn't matter, those tickets would still be getting called in. Plus, the tickets that are being called in have to be able to worked on during that time. Been trying to push the suspend feature on I dig to allow people to put tickets in without having them marked yet, so they can release it when they are actually going to go do the work. How many tickets that are called in are necessary, and how much is clutter? We had an all-time record month last month, 175,000 plus, and would bet at least 25% of those were not necessary. We have to put parameters around it so we can hold people accountable. If we don't have a mechanism in place for the center to say no, then we are going to continue to have these issues.

Stephen/Andrew- I also think that language will help with accountability.

Kyle Magione- If we have an expiration, then it would help track and help hold them accountable.

Roger Lipscomb- Parameters around enforcement of the abuse and giving the center the ability to refuse the call will be a couple of ways to help alleviate some of the abuse. Some

instances where even though it is in the law, it's still not getting done. So, giving the center the ability to refuse a ticket is going to be best.

Stephen/Andrew- I would be ok with giving the center that ability

Brent St Clair- Lots of companies have a policy on updating tickets every 10 days, and they do it to cover themselves even though its not needed. I would like to circle back to the piggybacking, if we have multiple contractors on a ticket, it will be hard to tell who is going the work ad who to make contact with.

Dave Coniglio- Just a couple questions, asking if it will be done in 16 days and they say yes, and then it doesn't? How do we decide if it is abuse? If we get rained out for a few days and can't start, would it be abuse if we have to call that back in? Also, every 10 days it gets called in, and the company has that as a safety policy, how do we tell them that it is wrong and they can't do it.

Roger Lpscomb- Absolutely right on the first part, before someone can say the system is being misused or abused, they have to establish a pattern of behavior, not just a one off. If someone says, how do we know, well here is 50 tickets to demonstrate the issue in the last 2 months that is demonstrating this behavior. 1-2 tickets, things happen, and I get that. We are talking about patterns of behavior that needs to go before the UTC. And as for the second question, their policy would be in violation of the state law, so we would need to educate them on the process. If they adopt a safety policy to call in every ticket every 16 days, then they are in violation. We aren't telling them what their safety policy should be, but it should be in alignment with the law.

Dave Coniglio- I hear what you are saying, just have to chew on that one for a little while.

Shawn Hudgel- Only thing I see is we must make sure the wording is put in correctly, if the marks are still visible, then it is good to work on. Visible markings could be up to interpretation depending on who is looking at it. Will have to be careful with that language, I am with you, just need to be careful with the wording.

Roger Lipscomb- If it is a safety issue, absolutely, if they are there, but unrecognizable, then it needs to be remarked. That wouldn't be a problem. Trying to combat issues that are generating thousands of tickets a month. Want to address the bigger picture stuff that creates a lot of clutter in the system. We can craft language that defines that and give a reasonable person the ability to call in because marks aren't all the way visible.

Shawn Hudgel- Are those stats available to be viewed by this committee?

Roger Lipscomb- Absolutely, Jason and I will pull back, pull some of the data, and show you some of the issues I am talking about. When you think of the volumes we are dealing with,

and have tickets called in 15 times, every 10 days, that is not an anomaly, it is happening. And we can get that data for the committee to see to help paint the picture of what this committee really needs to look to accomplish. We will get it together and circulate. At the next meeting we will present it, so make sure we have time for it on the agenda.

Alex McCann- Managing the tickets a little bit better is going to help. From our perspective, we don't have 1 person who handles things, we have multiple people calling in, and maybe the foreman on the job for us would just need to handle those tickets better.

Roger Lipscomb- I applaud you guys, and Igle does great as well, you are doing a great job educating your foreman and have reduced some of those unnecessary tickets.

Alex McCann- Utilizing the large project ticker as well will help to reduce it as well, having that communication with the locators.

Roger Lipscomb- We have a process in place today, and when it gets followed it works great. Less issues, and less damages. We need to define what a complex project is as well. The biggest problem we have is it calls for a joint meeting, everyone agrees to the schedule, and then the different phases get called in. Currently, that marking schedule is not enforceable, which creates issues when something does happen.

Jason Broyles- That is also being discussed in another subcommittee, and their starting point is trying to define what a large/complex project is.

Alex McCann- I think that is what it comes down to, managing tickets in a little different way. From our end, we aren't doing the large complex project ticket, but meeting locators on site, and a lot of communication. That way only the area that is being worked in is getting marked.

Alex McCann- Anyone else have any questions or comments?

Jason Broyles- Challenge to everyone here, do a hard reset to everyone in the industry about not needing to update these tickets every 10 days, or 16 calendar days now after June 9th, take it back, and make sure we get our own houses in order.

Roger Lipscomb- If you know you aren't going to get to it in the 16 calendar days, then let's wait to call it in.

Shawn Hudgel- Props, on your webpage, the PowerPoint presentation is on there over 227 and added the training tab as well to put you in compliance, I am implementing that into our onboarding process and get it out to every individual in our company. I think it is fantastic, and if you haven't seen it, please go check it out.

Jason Broyles- Thank you! That's awesome, that was our goal, want to make sure we were fulfilling our goal to make the training easy to get ahold of.

Alex McCann- Second that, I thought it was great.

Roger Lipcomb- Want this committee to understand this is a massive problem, from the center perspective. Thank you for letting me jump on and give some background information.

Alex McCann- Appreciate the input, thank you. Any other questions or comments before we adjourn.

Motion to adjourn- Dave Coniglio

Shawn Hudgel seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 12:01pm