Utility Coordination Subcommittee

4/13/2026

Attendance- Kevin Campbell, Jason Broyles, Justin Freudeman, Collins, Crammer, Jim Wooten, Greg First, Patrick Murphy, Brad Shoemaker, Melvin Henson, Dominick Belser, Elizabeth Pyles, Bryon Bedel, Davy Myers, Matt Hines, Lori Wade, Mike Burroughs, Frank Riegler, Blake Ross, Griffen Weasel, Kyle Mangione, Kyle Ward, Jim Collins, Greg Vergamini, Jimmy Stewart, Micheal Evans, Brooke Ebersole, Deanna DeWitt, Fletch Zimpher, Chris Glass,

Jim Wooten opened the meeting at 10:01am, no previous meeting minutes to approve.

Had group review proposed language on size and scope of a locate request.

Had 3 comments about proposed language…

Curious to learn more around the reason for including “public utility right of way”

Jim Wooten- Do we know where that came from or was it mentioned in any previous meeting minutes.

Jason Broyles- Didn’t see anything in the previous notes about it.

Jim Mandera- Want to say that we wanted it to pertain to linear distance along the road, not wanting it to apply to distance off the road.

Jim Wooten- Any other discussion needed on this, or does anyone want it struck from the document?

Jim Mandera- I’m ok with it but do want to discuss the multi lane roadway systems. Most of the areas where we have gas lines are on those types of roads. Want to kick around with the group here about better defining the types of roadways that can have a mile requested.

Jim Wooten- Good point.

Jason Broyles- With other discussions we have had with 227, what if we stated that if it was only outside corporation limits?

Jim Mandera- Not a fan of that because most people won’t know if they are or not. The point is to keep the tickets smaller. Fine with interstates, but not the rest.

Jim Wooten- Thinking that county engineers wanted that included.

Greg Vergamini- I believe that ODOT is fine keeping the language the way it is. Would need to take a look at that if the language changes.

Michael Evans- County engineers agree that if language changes, they will have to take a look at it again as well.

Kyle Mangione- I agree with Jim, it doesn't seem to accomplish the goal of getting these tickets to be smaller.

Jim Wooten- I agree with you as well, would like ODOT and County engineers to think about even in downtown Columbus you have those types of roads and that's a lot to put on one ticket.

Jason Broyles- That was why I mentioned separating incorporated and not incorporated. Can still call in the area needed, it just needs to be on multiple tickets.

Jim Wooten- On a highway, you wont have hours and hours of locating because there isn't a bunch of utilities in that area. The idea is to shorten up the locates.

Jason Broyles- example, state route 32, majority is country highway.

Michael Evans- County engineers, clarification. Hear what you are saying with the downtown areas, to Jason's point, there are multiple entities involved, and not everyone operates the same. Think that if we include incorporated and unincorporated in this, that it would be beneficial to how we do our work.

Jim Wooten- Do you have any ideas on proposed language?

Michael Evans- Do think what Jason proposed is close to what we would be looking for. Most of what you all seem to be looking for is the areas that are incorporated. We do see the need for that, but will take it back to the county engineers and figure out how to address it.

Patrick Murphy- (Chat) Didn't we agree to a 1320 ft long ticket before? For every ticket?

If they want the length longer, give the locators 2 or 3 extra days?

Jason Broyles- This language also came about while working through the complex project language. Do we want to keep having this conversation separate, or do we want to bring that in again and work the complex project language into this?

Jim Wooten- Agree, but that is what caused this language to not get into HB227. Think we were all in agreement with this language previously. I'm afraid if we bundle it all together it will hang things up. But I will let the committee decide what they want to do. Any thoughts from the group?

Jim Mandera- At the end of the day, whether we put a restriction on the length or not, I believe what we are trying to accomplish is get footages called in that is reasonable for a locator to go out in mark. Even if every ticket is 1320 across the board, if you call in 10 tickets, it wouldn't be reasonable that the locator can get that marked in the required time.

Jim Wooten- There are tickets that are 1320 ft long, and it still takes a long time to locate because it is so congested. And there are highways that could be a mile long that doesn't take much time to locate because there isn't much there.

Jim Mandera- Everyone has their own perspective and hopefully we can all bend a little bit to make things fair and need to see how we define it.

Jim Wooten- The things we have agreed to already in the past, do we think it is going to hinder things? We could look at this as a starting point.

Jim Mandera- a mile ticket through Cleveland or Columbus isn't going to be marked in the required time, and it opens us up to getting complaints filed against us through the UTC. We need to craft this in a way that gives us a chance.

Mike Burroughs- I agree with what Jim was saying, even if you limit the footage, you're just going to have more tickets called in. Think lumping it back in with the complex project would be a good idea.

Melvin Henson- Just think that this coupled with the complex project makes it workable. If you don't utilize that with it then it doesn't make sense. But if you couple them together, then it makes sense.

Collin Crammer- I'm with Melvin, the complex project gets the communication going.

Kyle Magione- We are more on a time crunch than anything. The same footage will get called in, it will just be more tickets requested. Still going to have to get them done in the required time. So, bringing it back in with the complex project or doing something with the timeframe to get marked, that would be good.

Dominick Belsar- Echoing the same thing or bringing the complex project language back into it to help solve some of the problems we are having now.

Jim Mandera- I don't think we have a choice due to all the reasons we have mentioned.

Jim Wooten- we will move onto Mary Logan So's comment…

For those of us with tickets that may currently be larger, what does

Jim Wooten- If we have tickets in already, if this goes into law, we would have 90 days to get prepared and prepped. I would think folks would call them in the way the new law would require before things would take effect. But that's my opinion.

Jim Mandera- Tickets generated before the go live date would be treated as they are, then once it takes effect, it would fall under the new requirements.

Jason Broyles- Do we need to add day forward language to it.

Jim Wooten- If we did, it would be very short lived. Anyone have any other opinions on this?

Collins Crammer- I see both sides, I think I am more aligned with you Jim, we got the 90 days to revise and initiate new tickets.

Jim Wooten- If no other comments, then I think what we have decided to do is to combine this with the complex project language. Is that what we want to do?

Jason Broyles- that's what it sounds like from the conversations we have had today. Even if this does get combined with another subcommittee, we can look at if there is a better way to word this so things don't get missed.

Jim Wooten- If we put it back together, we will have 3 months until our next full coalition meeting, and would like to see us have something together to bring to the full coalition.

Jason Broyles- One of the big issues from before was the complex project meeting was written by LCS that it had to be a “public meeting” which caused a lot of concerns. Could go back to that language and revise it to what we want it to be.

Jim Wooten- You are right, I don’t remember us wanting to put the public meeting language in there. I agree that we need to make sure that it doesn’t get put in this time. Let’s put this all together back as one, and hopefully we can get this language ready. We will need another comment period again, right?

Jason Broyles- Yes, we would.

Jim Wooten- Lets go ahead and get some meetings scheduled and give us time to get the comment period and review period and have it ready for the next coalition meeting.

Jim Wooten- to clarify, we are going to leave the “public right of way” language in there, correct?

Kyle Mangione- Kyle McCleod made the comment, I can check with him on what he was meaning with his comment.

Jim Wooten- Ok, we will leave it in, and we can discuss it later if needed. Any last comments? Thank you to everyone for being in the meeting. We will get the meetings scheduled here soon.

Meeting adjourned at 10:43am.