OUDPC Training Discussion Group
Conference Call #7 10/8/19
10:00am

Call Participants: Al Tonetti, Kevin Schimming, Alice Miller, Jeff Kursman and Jason Broyles

The participants on the conference call discussed next steps for the OUDPC Training discussion group, including the need to proactively engage additional participants. To move forward, representation is needed from the various industry subgroups, including both large commercial and smaller excavating companies, corporate and municipal/governmental utilities, contract locators, designers, developers and engineers.

It was agreed that the elimination of the Third Party Accountability subcommittee, the merger of the Life of a Ticket discussion group into the Large Project/Scope subcommittee and the pause in the work of the 48 Hour discussion group may have created availability amongst the broader OUDPC membership and that the current discussion group members should proactively invite others to join.

There is continued agreement that current Ohio Revised Code language regarding training requirements is insufficient and that the UTC is regularly directing ORC violators to receive training. Two potential paths were identified:

A. Minimum fundamental lessons and standards in underground utility excavation and safety should be required of all industry partners, including: utilities, excavators, designers, developers, engineers and locators. These requirements could be covered under broad modified language requiring training in accordance with ORC requirements, or specifically outlined in Ohio Revised Code. These lessons may include an overview of the one-call OHIO811 notification process, responsibilities of utilities, locators and excavators, positive response, marking standards, Ohio Revised Code and the complaint process. Al is taking the lead on development of Path A proposals.
B. Specific training requirements for sub groups of industry partners could be developed and included within the Ohio Revised Code or as Best Practices. Kevin is taking the lead on development of Path B proposals.

Once the group grows to be more representative and the proposals are drafted, the group would further consider
1. Who is qualified to deliver this training or "train the trainers"
2. Potential use of learning management systems and technology in delivery of this education and to test for competency
3. The frequency of required training

Next Call: TBD