

# OUDDPC Exemptions Subcommittee

9/8/2025

1:00pm

Attendance: Jason Broyles, Kevin Campbell, Jim Wooten, Kyle Mangione, Alex McCann, Shawn Hudgel, Greg First, Scott Mergler, Michael Burroughs, Dave Coniglio, Brian Hickman, Wendi Snyder, James Mandera, Deborah Harris, Jim Collins, Michael Lambdin, Drew Willaims, Chris Russ, Cicic Bojan, Colling Crigger, Rod Troxell, John Dorsey, Jana Bruen,

Jim Collins opened the meeting at 1:00pm

Gave a quick level one safety message

Had group review meeting minutes from the previous meeting

Jim Collins made a motion to approve the minutes James Mandera seconded.

(Need to add Michael Burroughs and Jim Wooten to the last meetings attendance)

Minutes approved with the corrections stated above

2 items to be discussed today

Jim Collins asked to focus on getting the language in general set so that way we can get this sent over the LSC, we can work on the particular wording at a later time.

Discussion topic #1, (

No comments made after review of topic one, motion made to vote on number 1. Jim Collins motioned, Jim Wooten seconded.

James Mandera- Where are we on the 12” rule?

Jim Collins, for number one, there is no 12” rule for this part.

Motion approved unanimously. Number 1 will move forward.

Jim Collins reviews the discussion point number 2.

Opened number 2 up for discussion

No comments by the group

Dave Coniglio- For clarification wants to make sure he understands, the 12 by 12 with the definition of appurtenances, are we still talking 12 x 12, or alongside a water line that runs 100'. Wants to make sure he is clear.

Jason Broyles, the intent behind it is that is a 12" x 12" around the appurtenance.

Shawn Hudgel- Agrees with Dave, the way it is written, it does cause some confusion, do think we need to clarify the definition of appurtenances to show where the 12 x 12 is actually at

Cicic Bojan- I thought we had already done that before.

Jim Wooten- I thought the intent was for appurtenances that are above ground, and the current language is missing that. Need to make sure we correct it to show above ground/exposed.

Scott Mergler- It is only for exposed.

Cicic Bojan- I believe that the word appurtenance was trying to replace exposed enclosure.

Jason Broyles- Appurtenances was in place of structure. Can play with the wording we have to clarify the intent.

Jim Wooten- Agree with visible, once we say exposed, then it causes issues with utility lines that have been exposed.

Shawn Hudgel- The fix is in the definition, can leave the language the way it is if we adjust the definition.

Jason Broyles- Think that we have to fix the wording with both.

Dave Coniglio- Pointed out that the section of the ORC for the definition is incorrect and needs fixed.

Jason Broyles- Concern over putting above ground due to a curb box or a water meter being slightly covered up by sod.

James Mandera- Wouldn't number 1 cover that?

Jason Broyles- only if it is for locating purposes.

Kyle Mangione- Should make sure we cover what appurtenances are covered.

Jason Broyles- Problem is everyone uses different terms, and we won't be able to put all the terms from every industry and get the intent we are looking for in the language.

Cicic Bojan- I thought we put something in for pedestals/vaults

Jason Broyles- Yes we did, the first term we used was structures, but that caused some issues, then we used assets, then changed it to appliances.

Bojan Cicic- Wants to make sure no one later one says that it doesn't include pedestals or pipes sticking out of the ground.

Jason Broyles- Does the group think we should put "this includes but not limited to..." and then name some examples?

Jim Collins- I Like that idea

Kyle Mangione- I like that idea, so people understand what road you are headed down there.

Lori Wade- What if we used something like pertaining to the operation or installation of a utility facility? Would cover a curb box to a ped to a meter. Do need something in there like "but not limited to" Do think appurtenances covers that, but not everyone would probably understand what it means

Justin Fruedeman- Why don't we just adjust the definition of what appurtenances are. If someone is to look it up, it will spell out exactly what it is.

Bojan Cicic- From the definition it could also mean equipment.

Justin Fruendeman- If someone did a google search on what appurtenances means, what would come up?

Jason Broyles- About 5 different things would come up, tried to take a combination.

Justin Fruedeman- Looks good to me.

Shawn Hudgel- Like the way the definition is written now.

Jim Collins- Is everyone good with the language that is on the screen now?

Jason Broyles- To Lori's point, still looking at where would be a good spot to put operation and installation.

Lori Wade- I am good with the way things are written now.

Bojan Cicic- likes what Justin Freudeman suggested.

Jim Collins- Motion to approve number 2 and the definition to move on for further review?

Jimmy Stewart seconded, Scott Mergler made a motion.

Motion passes, 1 no (Patrick Murphy)

Jason Broyles- At next month's full coalition meeting, we can put it to a full vote to move it over to LSC.

Jim Collins- Thank you everyone for work and cooperation,

Meeting adjourned at 1:27pm