

Complex/Large Project Subcommittee

8/28/2026

1:00pm

Attendance: Kevin Campbell, Jason Broyles, Bruce Jones, Sean Travis, Seamus Mulligan, Mike Chglebowski, James Finucan, Melvin Henson, Scott Mergler, Josh Thieman, Brent St. Clair, James Mander, Kyle Mangione, Brad Shoemaker, Greg First, Les Schell, Jim Collins, Chris Russ, Lawrence Hampton, Kara Arnold, Deborah Harris, Garry Lee, Pat Ginnetti, Dominick Belser, Don Huck, Kyle Cross, Emmy Elkins, Stephanie Kromer, Michael Lambdin, Julie Beaschler, Brittany Colvin, David Koren, Joseph Dragovich, Greg Vergamini, Wendi Snyder, Michael Evans, Davy Myers, Collin Crigger, John Kelly, Collins Cranmer, Elizabeth Pyles, Richard Thompson, Jim Wooten, Kyle McLeod, Jaime Gillen, Jimmy Stewart,

Meeting opened at 1:01pm

Motion to accept minutes from last meeting by Seamus Mulligan, Chris Russ seconded the motion. Minutes passed unanimously.

Two proposed definitions of “Large/Complex Project” read to the group.

Other states using a definition commonly have over a mile or will take over 90 days. Takes it out of the hands of the excavator or facility owner to determine if it is a large project and leaves it to the center. Would like to see a more concrete definition on what a large project is.

As an excavator, may have a large area of work, but may have very few conflicting utilities. A smaller project in Columbus for example could be complex with all the utilities in place. Concerned about the vagueness, and who has the authority to label is a large/complex project.

Want to make sure that when utilities and excavators are communicating, want to make sure that as it moves along, the large/complex project label could be removed.

Would like to see some more numeric thresholds, number of tickets, duration, working days of excavation, linear footage. Terms complexity, utility density would be subjective. Need a more firm definition.

Could be 1 mile maximum before it is a large project. So greater than a linear mile and will take longer than 90 days to complete.

Concern from contractors surrounding the way it is written and that OHIO811 would be the only entity that can designate a project as large/complex. OHIO811 may not always have what they need to put the appropriate label. The excavator would be the one to know if it is large/complex. Just because it is a large geographical area, doesn't mean it is complex, and a smaller area can be complex due to the amount of infrastructure. Want to focus as a group on other possibilities that the excavator can go ahead and designate it as a large/complex project.

Don't want to restrict people from communicating. Think that is a good thought.

Could combine definitions so that the excavator can designate it as a large complex project as well.

How do you all feel as utilities about being able to designate a project as large/complex. Want to make sure the locate vendor can trigger it, just the utility.

Have to have parameters.

Haven't been able to use complex projects right now because we don't know for sure what a large complex project is. The definition should not be subjective. Has to have defined parameters.

You set the parameters, get it out, and then the call center designates it as a large/complex project because it meets the parameters. Then there are no questions.

There may be only a couple utilities in conflict, and once the planning meeting happens, the utilities and the excavator can discuss and get things taken care of quickly.

Example, excavator calls in, call center designates it as large/complex, next 2 weeks we have a meeting. Everyone in the meeting agrees it is not a large/complex project, then it is determined at that point it is not a large project. Is there a process we could put in place to handle that as well.

In South Carolina, it doesn't revert back, but the marking schedule is marked within 2 days. The tickets remains open in case something happens until that phase is complete.

They still have to call in an excavation notification, correct?

Depends how you set it up. Sometimes once the large project ticket is called in, it stays open.

It is not working in Mississippi because it is voluntary.

Ohio, you have to call in routine notices in addition to the large/complex project before excavation starts. The 2 working days not including day of notification goes out the window and reverts to the agreed upon marking schedule.

Could have project put behind schedule due to this process, so want to make sure that we are looking at those hurdles now and get them taken care of.

Could have heartburn over that, there is a lot of scheduling issues that come into play. When projects get pushed and don't know when the start date is, things could get rushed when the start date is given and have a rushed timeline.

From a utility perspective and production locator perspective, the definition of large and or complex is when the job asks us to locate more than what can be located in 2 plus days. Can't drop everything and locate everything that is needed by the time the ticket is due. Every area can be different, and some places and limited resources. A fiber company wanting to get 50,000 ft located is not realistic. The guardrails are the next phase, but say we say, anything over 5,000 ft, which could still be challenging. Someone calls in a mile, and it is a large project, then determine when they are starting, and where. What if they can install or excavate 2,000 ft a day, and the locators can only mark 300ft a day, then what happens? Alos fine with an excavator calling in the job as a large/complex project if they know it is one. So, the center can do it and the excavator. Will have to be some minimum expectations around what can be located, and what can be excavated in a particular time. Things would have to be reasonable and would be the second tier of this conversation.

I think we all agree that it should not be in the hands of the locator.

Showed the group a proposed definition from all the points made and made it into a bullet point list to make it easier to read.

It needs to cover a large area, or, it does this, or this, or this. Etc...

Needs to be broken down and shows that it could be multiple things that could trigger it.

Each bullet point would trigger a large/complex project.

Need to define what a large geographical area is, that makes it subjective.

Maybe we put in greater than a mile.

Normal would be single address tickets, not complex. Just a general locate, which the majority of them are, and it takes less than 2 days to complete.

This layout provides a level of clarity but need to define each bullet point.

I think we are going to have to put a footage requirement for it to be defined and not just say a large geographical area.

One of the big sticking points that was brought up in previous committees is that the footage only came into play with specific type of work is being done. A cap and fill or under drain on a heavy highway job is going to be different than a utility install in downtown Columbus.

The second bullet point, a job that extends beyond the 2 working days. Is that completion of the job, or the time to locate.

That needs to be reworded to provide clarity.

Could we just add "locating efforts" would extend more than 2 days.

The only person that would know that is the locator, so we need to keep that in mind. There needs to be coordination with the utility company.

Seeing the bullet point of one or more design or locate request. The design could come out 2-3 years before the job actually starts and not sure how to track it. Also, should number of tickets at a given time come into the equation too.

A drop company could be calling in 100 locates all at the same time, and it collectively covers a large area. Like the footage parameter to at least initiate the discussion.

Think that we have to go there otherwise people will just call in more tickets that are shorter.

Does the new system have the ability to track something like that?

If a company is calling in a ton of tickets every single day, can we lean on that to trigger a large project.

There is no relationship between calling in a lot of tickets, and a large project. The way that the Ohio state law is written, if one part of the law will change, then that will need to be included in here as well.

If someone called in 50 tickets that were all 800' long, can that be recognized and flagged.

At this time, no.

Is it possible to ask them to see if it can be done?

We will ask Norfield and see.

Feel like that needs to be able to happen to help catch some of these that are broken down into more, smaller tickets.

Want to be able to capture those 150 drop tickets called in by the same contractor.

Anything that gets included in this, we would have that discussion with Norfield.

Would like to inquire about this point specifically. If the system can be used to flag larger areas of work regardless of number of tickets.

If the system would be able to flag them, would there be more than 1 contractor involved?

Would have to probably go with a single contractor.

Maybe search work done for, i.e. 10 different contractors working for Spectrum, can it pick that up?

Could have 3 or 4 crews in multiple areas that are further away, and don't want all of those combined, so has to be within a certain area and or footage.

Chat- In local government talks, is there some way we can create a streamlined pathway for public road authorities' routine maintenance programs (resurfacing, guardrail, culvert, ditch programs) so that ordinary multi-day, multi-segment county work is not automatically swept into the heavier process absent a genuine complexity or disruption factor?

Want to make sure as we have these conversations and come up with a definition, a 10-mile paving project for example, it needs to not fall under that stipulation. So yes, it is in the plans and want to have a process in place and not delay anyone.

To help with the next meeting, everyone seems to like the bullet points, can we send this information back out and people can come up with some language to share with us, and we can discuss those points and continue to be productive.

Statehouse update, there are a handful of legislatures that have circulated their own language and have reached out to OHIO811 and some of the utility lobbyist. The large/complex project is something that they are focusing on to create communication. This area in particular is something that has a lot of pressure with it. Nothing is close to being ready to go, and these are rough drafts. We want to get it done but want to get it done right. Don't want to put bad legislation out there and have to fix it later. Let's take our time and get it right, but there is pressure to get it moving forward. Otherwise, we may be stuck with a legislatures language that we didn't have any say in.

Appreciate those who are participating, and want everyone to think about the proposed definitions, and give us feedback. We want to make Ohio safer.

Meeting adjourned at 1:55pm