



OUDDPC- Size/Scope of a Locate Request Focus Group

Minutes

9/4/2024

Call to Order/Opening Statements: Jim Wooten opening remarks followed by a safety message from Greg First focusing on the importance of getting the proper amount of sleep/rest.

Roll Call: Jason Broyles, Jim Wooten, Dave Coniglio, Jim Collins, Chris Russ, Greg First, Scott Tustin, Jessica Burlett

Review/Approval of Minutes: Minutes approved with no opposition

Size/Scope of Locate Request: Jim Wooten went through the current draft language:

"If an excavation will cover an area exceeding 5,280 feet in linear length or is determined that existing utility facilities will have to be relocated and will progress from one area to the next over a period of time, the excavator shall provide written notice to the utility owners in the affected area through the use of the state notification center. This notification shall be made with a "Large/Complex Project" notification with projected timelines for segments of the excavation as the excavation progresses in order to coordinate the marking of underground utility facilities with actual excavation schedules. Under such circumstances, the utility and excavator shall determine a mutually agreed upon marking schedule based on the project schedule. Once such a schedule is established, the marking and notification requirements set forth in division (A)(1) of section 3781.29 of the Revised Code shall not apply.

If an excavator is not willing or able to provide notification as set forth in ORC 3781.28(E) through the use of a "Large/Complex Project" notification, the excavator shall not exceed 1320 feet in linear length for each notification. If the location request pertains to interstate roadway systems, the excavator shall not exceed 5,280 feet in linear length for each notification.

If a notification is deemed to be a “Large/Complex Project”, it shall be mandatory for all utilities and the requesting excavator to participate in a meeting to determine a mutually agreed upon marking schedule based on the project schedule. Once such a schedule is established, the marking and notification requirements set forth in division (A)(1) of section 3781.29 of the Revised Code shall not apply.”

Jim Collins commented that he is in support of the 1-mile distance on interstate roadway systems. Chris Russ commented that he is in support of the language. Dave Coniglio commented that the language gives contractors options and feels that the general contractor basis would support the language as presented, however reiterates that he needs to discuss before committing. Jim Wooten and Dave Coniglio both reference that this language helps with the large/complex project notice by holding utilities accountable to participate in the meetings. Chris Russ asks where the agreements would be housed? Scott Tustin states that industry partners currently involved would need to discuss where to house with their legal teams. Jason Broyles comments that potentially the Notification Center would be the best place to house this. Chris Russ then asks if there is any discussion around making the meeting(s) mandatory vs being completed virtually. Jim Wooten responds that that decision would be left up to those involved in the process and he feels there should not be legislation mandating in what format the meeting(s) would have to take place.

Next Steps: Follow up on where language would be housed. Finalize proposed language and get sent out to subcommittee.

Adjournment: Meeting adjourned.