



OUDPC- Ticket Expiration

Minutes

7/11/24

Call to Order/Opening Statements: Jim Wooten

Roll Call: Jason Broyles, Jim Wooten, Frank Riegler, Alex McCann, Dave Coniglio, Chuck Muller, James Mandera, Greg First, Jim Collins, Lori Wade, Deron Large, Johnny Henson, Michael Wilson

Review/Approval of Minutes: No minutes to review/approve

Expiration of a Locate Request: Jim Wooten provided data that for Centerpoint, in the Ohio market, out of the 113 damages that have occurred, 21 of those had a root cause of having destroyed marks and no updates being made by the contractor. Jim Mandera questioned as to whether they looked at how many of the 21 had been more than 30 days, otherwise the data would not have any bearing on the current conversation. Jim Wooten to research and report back to group. Mr. Mandera continued to state that Enbridge has approximately 25-30 a year that exceed 30 days with no updates being requested. Mr. Mandera feels that with a life span of 30 calendar days, a lot of those could be avoided. Mr. Mandera also stated that he feels the by not defining the life of a locate request, it is one of the leading causes to contractors calling in more frequently than needed which is weighing the system down.

Dave Coniglio commented that he can see the utilities perspective, however if the updates are being done as part of a policy or safety culture within an organization, he can understand the contractors actions. He continued by stating that he does not understand how having a set ticket life provides any benefit to the industry overall. Mr. Coniglio stated that the OCA could possibly get behind conversations dealing with a contractor leaving a job for a specific number of days and having to update the request prior to resuming work, but not just a set number of days.

Alex McCann followed with statements on how his organization calls in for updates every 10 days in the Columbus market and understands how requesting those updates when the marks

are still visible puts a strain on the locating industry. It is done as a safety procedure as well as to ensure that they do not have to shut down an active job site while waiting for remarks. Lori Wade added that she has spoken with contractors who are updating every 8 – 10 days and will continue that behavior even if legislation changes. Mrs. Wade followed with a statement that she feels by having a specific life span, it could alleviate some of the confusion surrounding 10 days.

Jim Wooten posed the question, “How would we be able to track if an excavator had left the job and come back?”. Dave Coniglio stated that there would be a variety of ways: certified payroll, project manager time sheets, etc.

Jim Wooten stated that he really doesn’t see many issues on this topic from the larger contractors across the Centerpoint footprint. Mostly sees it with new construction/builds.

Dave Coniglio asks how the industry would differentiate between public and private? There is no magic number of days that the contractors are prepared to propose. Alex McCann adds by questioning if an expiration date is really going to be helpful since it is already in the Ohio Revised Code that locate requests are to be updated if marks are faded or destroyed? Jim Mander responded that if some of the locates are still visible, but some are destroyed, it will force an update to be called in which would provide the unknown missing information.

Jim Mander asks how many jobs are usually completed within 30 days? Dave Coniglio stated that he would research this, however, does not believe there are very many when focusing on road/heavy highway work. He also stated that the time frame doesn’t directly correlate to the size and scope of a ticket.

Johnny Henson stated that by having an expiration date, it helps to reduce noise in the system. Also, that it allows locators to help manage with the contractors involved with the work.

Jim Wooten questions as to whether this would create a burden on contractors? Alex McCann stated that he doesn’t really think it would, from his perspective, since his organization is already following internal safety procedures of updating every 10 days. Dave Coniglio added that it would depend on the contractor and what they are currently doing. Could be a major change for those who do not follow any internal best practices. Would be different depending on the individual company/contractor. Stated that the common theme is an educational issue and with increased training and knowledge, it could provide the desired results without changing legislation.

Jim Wooten stated that the 811 system, through technology, is much easier to update a locate request than it used to be. Dave Coniglio agreed.

The conversation then turned to discussing if the OCA had discussed what they were willing to support. Dave Coniglio stated that he doesn’t know if they will agree to a blanket number, however, might be willing to discuss an expiration based off a certain amount of time away from

a jobsite. He clearly stated that he is not proposing this, just stating that he feels they would be willing to discuss over a set expiration date. Dave Coniglio agrees to rough draft some language that the contractors might support dealing with leaving the jobsite. Jim Collins suggested that the ORC should mirror the CGA Best Practice 5-23. Jim Mander added that there is concern of PHMSA stepping in and mandating regulation and it would be better for the industry to handle within state legislation so they would have some say in the language. Chuck Muller added that comparing from state to state encompasses more than just ticket expiration.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.