



OUDPC- White Lining Focus Group

Minutes

9/3/24

Call to Order/Opening Statements: Clayton Heitz

Roll Call: Clayton Heitz, Jason Broyles, Frank Riegler, Dave Coniglio, James Finucan, Will Cramblett, Deron Large, James Mandera, Johnny Henson, Lori Wade, Jim Collins, Greg First, Scott Tustin

Review/Approval of Minutes: Minutes were sent out prior to meeting. Minutes reviewed. Clayton motioned and was seconded by Scott Tustin to approve as presented. There was no opposition.

White Lining: Jim Mandera opened by asking if the group was good with white lining superseding the ticket description. Scott Tustin added that often, the work area description on the ticket does not match what is premarked which is why Ohio needs to define which takes precedence over which. Jim Mandera stated that if there is a premarked area, that should outline and act as the description. He also added that the utilities need to know how many premarked locations there are on the job site. This would allow the locators to be more thorough when utilizing white lining to identify where on the property the excavation(s) will be taking place. Lori Wade agreed that any white lining should be considered the scope of the ticket. Clayton Heitz mentions that even with premarking, the locators still need to go back to the description to ensure everything requested is marked. Dave Coniglio stated that he does see how the premarkings and ticket description not lining up leads to confusion, however, he is not in complete agreement with the white lining taking precedence over the description as found on the request.

Scott Tustin asks if changing the parameters around ORC 3781.29(F)(1) could help. Stated that by putting footage in legislation could alleviate the issues around property lines and could also help limit the size/scope when getting large areas requested with only a small portion of that being utilized for excavation (example: planting a tree and requesting entire property). Dave

Coniglio states that he understands the issues that this type of behavior can create. Lori Wade asks if the footage that is currently in the Ohio Universal Marking Standards could be used (25' in all directions from a single point Premark and 10' in all directions of a premarked path)?

Scott Tustin added that with legislation not defining what a "precise location" is, it leaves too much up in the air. Asks if we can legislate that the "precise location" be based on the excavator using the property descriptions as outlined in the Ohio Universal Marking Standards to describe the "precise location"? States that by utilizing what we already have in the marking standards, it would allow the industry to make changes down the road without having to go through legislation to do so.

Jim Mandera states that we need to alleviate the issue surrounding "entire property" when it is a single point on the property and excavator moves to a different location on the property away from what was premarked without calling in an additional notice. Deron Large stated that he would be in support of looking at setting a distance from the white marks to create the scope. Jim Mandera stated that even with possible changes to ORC 3781.29(D) and (F)(1), it still needs to be legislatively stated which takes precedence for those who try to CYA by requesting entire property. James Finucan submitted possible language to be viewed that could be used in either section being reviewed. It stated:

"When excavator identifies white lining in the ticket notification, they need to do the following:

- 1. Accurately describe the excavation location(s) in the comment section of the request.*
- 2. Label white lining with identifying excavator performing work on the excavation location.*
- 3. Understanding that excavator is acknowledging that white lined area plus X number of footage around those markings will be defined as the excavation scope."*

Deron Large stated that he agrees with the intent behind this language.

Next Steps: Jason to put together starting language and send out to focus group by end of week (September 6).

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

