

OUDPC- White Lining Focus Group

Minutes

7/1/2024

Call to Order/Opening Statements: Clayton Heitz

Roll Call: Dave Coniglio, Jason Broyles, Clayton Heitz, Chris Russ, Johnny Henson, Jim Collins, Jim Mandera, Lori Wade, Scott Tustin, Deron Large

Review/Approval of Minutes: No minutes to review/approve

White Lining: Clayton started off by asking the group how we can utilize white lining to better serve the industry and questioning what the overall objective is? Jim Mandera stated that getting white lining in the law was good, but still requires some more clarification. The overall objective of the group would be to 1) provide clarity to locate community, 2) the use of white lining to alleviate unnecessary locates being done bogging down the system and 3) when white lining is required, the white marks should hold more weight than the ticket description. Lori Wade agreed that there needs to be legislative language stipulating whether the white lining or the ticket description would supersede.

Dave Coniglio responded that the contractors feel that the ticket description should supersede the white lining to avoid confusion. Jim Collins recommended that the law should have distances set to where locators must locate a set distance from white lining. Jason Broyles stated that it is already covered under the Ohio Universal Marking Standards and that those standards are legally mandated through the language found under *ORC 3781.29 (2): "All underground facilities shall be marked in accordance with the Ohio universal marking standards…".*

Scott Tustin stated that when looking at 3781.29 (D), "*when possible*" should be taken out of the current language thus making it mandatory for excavators to "*shall indicate the excavator's identity by name, abbreviation, or initial."* There are few who actually complete this and it adds to the confusion that locators have to deal with when they go to a jobsite with more than one

excavator working in the area. Jim Mandera and Johnny Henson made comments around possibly looking at making it mandatory for excavators to document on their locate request the number or pre-marks present on the job.

There was conversation about possible changes to 3781.29 (F)(1). Scott Tustin stated that if we attempt to make changes to the 4 times pre-marking is not required, it will have a high potential to shut down any forward movement of this topic. Taking into consideration the increased costs to excavators of having to make numerous trips to a job site even if the pre-marking really wouldn't be necessary due to the way the excavator managed their request by being specific and providing all pertinent information through the notification. Johnny Henson stated that it can be very frustrating for a locator. He stated that white lining should take precedence over the ticket description and the number of pre-marks should be required on request. Scott Tustin mentions that 3781.29 (F)(1) could also fall under the size/scope focus group as well. Continue working with other focus groups to come to a consensus on language. He also stated that it might be good to look at breaking down language for large projects with multiple contractors.

Adjournment: Motion made, seconded, and carried with no opposition.

.