

OUDDPC Training Discussion Group

Conference Call #4: 6/11/19

10:00am

Call Participants: Al Tonetti, Kevin Schimming, Regan Noble, Joe Igel, Alice Miller, Gilan Emam and Jeff Kursman

Joe Igel began the meeting of the Training Discussion Group by stating that the UTC frequently incorporates training requirements in the process improvement plans for both companies and individuals found to be in non-compliance with Ohio Revised Code. The UTC does not recommend a specific party(ies) to be the provider(s) of this remedial training to avoid creating potential liability issues.

Joe also discussed prior OUDDPC discussions regarding the inadequacy of “association or center membership” as a fulfillment of training and mentioned that he received questions on the subject when he testified before the state legislature during consideration of prior iterations of Ohio Safe Digging laws.

With consensus that current language is inadequate, Al Tonetti raised the issues that the discussion group must address, namely whether training standards and requirements should be general or specific. Joe suggested that the issue could be argued either way.

Four questions were discussed:

- Who needs training?
 - o Six parties were identified: Commercial Excavators, Utility Owners, Locators, Designers, Developers and Contractors.
- What should be the focus of the training?
 - o Discussion regarding fundamental lessons and basic standards that should be incorporated in all training programs versus specific training for various parties.
 - o Ex: A locator should have general standards training and locator training. While beneficial to have a general understanding of the difference between directional boring and trenching, detailed training would be unnecessary.
 - o Currently, Ohio811 Safety Talks and Excavator Seminars focus on the OHIO811 notification process, locate work order, membership and tools, excavator and utility owner responsibilities, types of excavation activities, marking standards and the complaint-driven enforcement process established by Senate Bill 378.
 - o Alice offered to create a spreadsheet for each of the six identified groups with potential requisite vs. recommended training (group members to contribute)
- How frequently should the training be required?
 - o No clarity on frequency.
- Who should / can provide that training?
 - o Example of OSHA training being delivered through 10 or 30 hour programs, or by other individuals certified to deliver those training programs.

New York's online module-based excavation training program was discussed. Per information read from the New York 811 website, NYS Code Rule 753 will require any municipality or operator that engages in excavation work to require its excavators to complete a training and education program from their local One Call Notification Center. For other excavators, becoming certified through the program seems to be used as a competitive differentiator in the marketplace.

The group agreed that while a clearer requirement of training should be required under Ohio Revised Code, not having that training should be enforced through the UTC and shouldn't prevent an individual or company from submitting a locate request / ticket. Questions were raised regarding who would maintain a database of trained excavators.

Next Call:

Tuesday, June 25th at 11:00AM