

Complex/Large Project Subcommittee

7/24/2026

1:00pm

Attendance: Kevin Campbell, Jason Broyles, Al Tonetti, Collins Cranmer, Jennifer Reams, Scott Mergler, Blake Ross, Melvin Henson, Russell Johnson, Griffin Weasel, Joel Johnson, Mike Lawson, James Mander, Chris Russ, Mike Wartko, Frank Riegler, Greg First, Kyle Mangione, Jim Collins, Joseph Dragovich, James Finucan, Lawrence Hampton, Deanna DeWitt, Lori Wade, Bradley Shoemaker, Garry Lee, Davy Myers, Jimmy Stewart, Matt Hines, Pat Ginnetti,

Meeting opened at 1:00pm

Will show group proposed language to start the conversation about where to go from there.

Group reviewed previous meeting minutes.

Motion to accept Russell Johnson

Second- Lori Wade

Minutes approved unanimously

Jennifer Reams (co-chair) introduced herself, stated that utility owners want to be able to designate a project as a large/complex project. Thinks that in the design phase is when that should be called out. Project owner is to design the job with minimal impact to existing facilities. At this time, since things are being determined as far as moving of existing facilities, it would be the time to call out the large/complex project. Thinks that it is impossible to define what a large project is in the law, but the excavator would know. Contractor will know things that the project owner and the facility owner would not know. Contractors will know how long and how complex the job will be. Because of the factors stated, a large project cannot be determined by size of the job necessarily. Caution against putting a definition on it so we don't back ourselves into a corner.

This subcommittee was given clear instructions from the coalition to attempt to define what the definition of a large/complex project is, keeping in mind the points that Jennifer made. Keep an open mind and remember the rules of engagement that apply to these

subcommittee meetings as well as the full coalition meetings. All here for the benefit of the industry moving forward.

A lot of what has been said is agreed upon for the most part with the group. Hard to define it directly, and don't want to create a barrier for an excavator. Want better openness and communication.

The language being shown in the same information, but in two different versions. Just depends on how you like it worded.

Proposed language was read to the group as well as shown on the screen.

This language was created based on conversations that were had in the last meeting. This is a rough starting point to get the conversation going for the group. Would like to hear feedback and start getting through this.

Are these different definitions or a whole definition.

Noted that it is a whole definition, not separate.

Excavators and facility owners have always been pitted against each other, there are sections of the law that mandate the project owner be involved to minimize conflict with existing utilities. One issue in the second paragraph may consist of multiple locate requests of the same or similar work type. On these projects people are doing what is the average ticket for a road construction project. Could be 10-20 tickets on a project for traffic control issues. Don't think multiple tickets being called in should trigger a large project ticket.

Would depend on the type of work being done, also note that a contractor does not have to call in every 10 days, and even if they leave the site for an amount of time, if the paint and flags are still visible, then that ticket is still good. Can have a large number of notifications come in by multiple subcontractors for fiber for example. That could trigger a large project but need to look at other contributing factors.

On the third paragraph, what is the pre-determined criteria?

That should probably be struck out, trying to allow a facility owner/excavator to trigger a complex/large project. Looking to give the facility owner the ability to trigger that large complex project. The second paragraph is where we were trying to catch all that fiber overbuild, same project owner, multiple subs, can still trigger that large/complex project.

3781.27 (E) (3) states the project owner is to design the job in a way to minimize impact to existing facilities.

How much construction/excavation goes on that there is no design done prior to? Heavy highway work usually always has design work, but wondering about utility install job, how much of that goes through design before going out to bid?

Unless it is an emergency repair, almost all utility install projects have to go through design, which includes fiber as well.

A lot of the fiber installs in Enbridge's footprint does not go through the design phase.

Would have to ask the ones putting them in as well. If there is a massive amount of work being done, you would think some design work was being done.

Agree, it should be, but we don't see it.

Have had conversations with utilities who do not call in design tickets for redoing an entire municipality because it would be a massive number of tickets.

Noted that the public authority can withhold the permits if the design work has not been done. Only particular reasons that it would not have to be done. Facilities still have to be notified as well and provide information.

When fiber first came to our county, they initially came in with the approach of calling 811 and started construction trying to navigate through existing utilities. Townships and municipalities can be different than what the county expects. Require engineered plans before a permit is granted for installation.

Just wanted to re emphasize that just having it triggered through the design phase could be a problem due to the amount of work that is done without it going through the design phase.

How does a utility close out a design ticket by law?

Through positive response using the design ticket response. (008)

Either through physical marks, or through provided plans that meet the criteria required in the ORC

Having problems getting dig tickets completed, how can I be expected to get designs done?

Purpose of this is to be able to help the facility owner know what's coming, look at that design, and be able to trigger that large/complex notification. More of being aware of the project coming, not as much about the markings.

Thinking that would be different than the construction portion, engineers would work with project owner, so the plans are developed to alleviate conflict and to find out if something needs to be relocated.

In the last paragraph, large project designation can be removed upon mutual agreement with the excavator and facility owner when that enhanced coordination is no longer needed.

If the locate schedule is established, what would that do to the locate schedule halfway through the project if it is no longer designated as a large/complex project? Would all those notifications have to be called back in and then follow the two working days not including day of notification?

Won't require additional markings because we are no longer in conflict, or that the project is done.

Not necessarily completion of project, but the utilities are no longer in conflict.

What would be the benefit to that last paragraph?

Opportunity for us to talk about it.

If the group thinks it is unnecessary, then it can be removed.

Second to last paragraph, it can be designated at any time during excavation activities. That could cause an excavator some concern. Could be 3-4 weeks into a project, and know that at any point in time, it could be shut down and designated as a large project and now a locate schedule has to be established. Think the group needs to look at this, and it should be designated prior to excavation taking place. Safety factors in play here with trenches and holes in the road that would already be open are concerning.

Want to create cooperation and communication. So, at any point during the project, if the excavator or facility owner needs assistance, then they need to be able to stop and rethink it and make things safer. Could state that there needs to be good communication between the excavator and facility owner.

Think that the designation of the large/complex notification needs to be done during the design phase. Could economically hurt a contractor or shut down a small excavator due to bond issues. Prior to excavation or the project being called in is when it needs to be done, needs to be triggered during the design phase.

Unfortunately, designs are not always called in.

Understanding the challenges with this topic, have multiple points to make here, we talked through the design phase. Reality is, it is hard to determine a large complex project based off of the plans. Could vary based on the speed of their installation. If they only install 50' a day, the locators can keep up with that, but at 5,000 ft a day, that changes things. The large fiber builds that are moving quickly are not in the design phase. Language here allows the facility owner or excavator to designate it as a large complex project and think it will lead to abuse. What happens if we can't come to an agreement on a locate scheduled, and what does that do to the process? Allowing a utility or excavator to call it large can lead to problems but would like to find some way for it to just be triggered by OHIO811 at the center.

That is where the definition of a large/complex project is going to be important, so we can trigger that at the center.

If you can't agree, then it would just be a regular notice ticket. This isn't just about fiber, gas line replacements, water replacement jobs that don't get called in for design work. When we talk about this, just know that locators are having a hard time getting the excavation notifications marked, so calling in a bunch of designs will be hard to handle as well.

This is the third time the OUDPC has revisited this topic, and we will continue to until we can get something figured out. Not just about the fiber builds, but the infrastructure is aging and is being replaced portions at a time, and there will constantly be utilities that need updated and replaced.

I feel like there needs to be predetermined criteria so the center can trigger the large complex project notification. If the facility owner or excavator has to trigger it, it will not go well.

It is in law that the designs have to be called in, and if they don't, then they need to be reported to the UTC. If it is in the plans prior to bidding, then they have to follow it. Also, utilities are not mandated to go to these meetings so even if an excavator wanted to do it, there is nothing to make the utility go to that meeting. The project owner has the power to have everyone do what is required to be done. This information should be taken care of prior to bid/excavation. If laws were followed on the front end, then there would be less problems on the back end. If it gets designated as a large/complex project, then it has to be done.

Get a design firm who says, we called this ticket in, don't see marks. The design markings were done months ago, then it gets called back in. Not saying it happens all the time but do see it happening more often. Igle construction does a great job coordinating these

meetings, and it's a great opportunity for everyone to work together. Guidelines are set then, and it has had a lot of success.

Designs may not always have markings in the field, sometimes you just get prints. Dig tickets are obviously marked. The more accurate your plans are, the better the designs will be, and you will minimize the number of issues during construction.

A lot of design firms are not local and are generally just looking to see if there is something on the site.

Even the local companies rely heavily on GIS data, they are intended to be used as references and are not survey grade. Also just show the lines that the utility owns and not any of the private utilities.

Some prints give depth as well, and that can lead to issues if they are not accurate.

I would also hesitate to provide depth on plans that are not verified in the field. Will want to know where your facility is depth wise depending on the type of work that is being done around it. How is that addressed without giving depth? Or determine whether you need to relocate.

Depths do change, but if the plans have an accurate benchmark based on sea level, you can recreate that and get it close enough to avoid disruption.

Will take comments that were given and re do some of the wording. Want to make sure we stay on track and get a definition hammered out to take back to the OUDPC, then we can move on to the next steps.

Thank you everyone for being on the call, we will work on the wording and help create a definition that takes it out of the hands of the facility owner and the excavator.

Meeting adjourned at 2:05pm