



OUDDPC- Ticket Expiration

Minutes

3/6/25

Call to Order/Opening Statements: Opening remarks by Clayton Heitz.

Roll Call: Jason Broyles, Clayton Heitz, Jim Wooten, Frank Riegler, Jaime Gillen, Jim Mander, Chris Russ, Lori Wade, Mary Logan So, Mike Lambdin, Chuck Muller

Review/Approval of Minutes: No minutes to approve

Expiration of a Locate Request: Meeting was stated by reviewing the current draft language:

Proposed: A notification will be valid for a period of (30 or 45) calendar days from the date of the notification to the protection service, provided the utility facilities markings made under section 3781.29 of the Revised Code are visible and continue to clearly identify the approximate location and direction of underground utility facilities. If the markings are not visible and/or clear, the notification is no longer valid, even if it has been less than (30 or 45) calendar days since the notification was provided through the protection service. If an excavator leaves the job site, relocates to another site, or is otherwise absent from the site for a period of 16 consecutive calendar days, the notification will be considered expired, and the excavator shall make notification through the notification center as required under section 3781.28 of the Revised Code. This notification shall occur prior to any additional work on the site occurring, even if the original locate marks, provided under section 3781.29 of the Revised Code, are still visible.

Clayton explains that since the group has come to some consensus on a ticket expiration when an excavator leaves a job site for a certain period of time causing the ticket to expire, that he feels the group should focus on that and move it forward to the subcommittee. He also explains that since there is still a lot of conversation and very little agreement surrounding a set number of days leading to ticket expiration, that the focus group will continue to meet and discuss on that point. Lori Wade speaks in agreement with this recommendation.

Jim Mandera comments that there is no value in this conversation and questions why we are doing this because it won't fix anything.

Chris Russ asks what the hang up with the set number of days is? Conversation is had surrounding both perspectives (utilities and excavators). Mary Logan So comments that a large concern from the excavators is the additional tracking and maintenance issue with the probability of many having to update tickets and track them even in situations where they are maintaining marks and doing things right. Jim Wooten and Jim Mandera both speak in support of having a set ticket life. Jim Mandera explains that under current legislation, excavators could be working a job and not realize that some marks have been destroyed since others were not and could relate in damages: specifically referenced "you don't know what you don't know until you know you don't know". Through having a set ticket expiration time line would assist in alleviating this type of situation. Jim Mandera also stated that he believes that the "shelf life" of paint on the ground is approximately 26 days in normal working conditions.

Conversation was then had due to concerns that language might hinder or remove the ability for excavators to request updates more frequently than the set number of days. This was brought up specifically for excavation companies that have internal policies to update tickets at set intervals (ex: every 10 days). It was explained that the intent of this would not hinder these practices and comments were made that language decided on must not leave that open ended or prohibit this practice.

Clayton Heitz asks for utilities to show the group some data that would support what number of days is the right number and why? Jim Mandera challenges the utilities to look up and provide the data by looking at damages that the root cause was no marks present or faded/destroyed marks. By looking at that data they should be able to quantify.

Mary Logan So also pointed out that some of the issues also come from contract locate providers not always having access to information on newly installed utilities and how this practice creates situations for excavators in the field surrounding unlocated lines. Conversation turns to excavator basis feeling like changes are being forced down their throats. Jim Mandera questions when this process turned into an us vs them conversation and speaks to the point that this is about all in the industry and needing to make Ohio safer. Mary Logan So responds with conversation surrounding the "true 48" and 16 calendar days start by date from language that was submitted to state house in 2024. Lori Wade comments that both sides are giving and getting and recommends gathering data from both sides to continue the conversation. Comments that this is in attempt to clarify process to get paint on the ground and create a safer work environment for all involved.

Lori Wade comments that she could possibly live with 45 days but feels it would be difficult to track. Recommends 30-day expiration. Chuck Muller stated that a lot of states have decided on 21 days for tracking purposes: easy to track 3 weeks.

Next Steps: Move agreed upon suggested language to full subcommittee for conversation.

Meeting Adjourned: No opposition, meeting adjourned.