**OUDPC Training Discussion Group 2**
Conference Call 2/21/19
10:00am

Call Participants:  Al Tonetti, Kevin Schimming, Regan Noble, Kris Klaus, Alice Miller and Jeff Kursman.

Al began the second meeting of the Training Discussion Group with a few questions:

1) Is the current ORC language "'shall obtain training' for excavators, contractors or utilities" sufficient if they receive it from OHIO811 or a statewide association?
2) How is that training obtained and what standards exist?
3) Does the law need to specify how often training needs to occur?

"After reviewing CGA Best Practices and materials from a number of states, many require 'locators' to also receive training, but don't specify what that training entails.  Last meeting, Joe Igel recommended that the Discussion Group stay high level and general as opposed to trying to specify.

The group continued to identify the challenges in current legislation language and practicality, including the lack of defined "training," challenges to enforcement, and applicability to all groups.  Regan noted that the current training requirement doesn't include locators, and doesn't provide any methodology for assessing or enforcing training requirements.  He agreed with previous sentiments that it would be impossible to list all the specific training requirements for each segment, and questioned whether CSRs from the OHIO811 center should survey excavators calling in tickets about their existing training processes.

The group also reiterated that membership alone in a protection service or a statewide association in no way guarantees that all employees of those member organizations have taken advantage of educational offerings or received adequate training. Al pointed out that just because excavators, contractors and utilities may be members of OHIO811 or state associations that offer training as outlined in ORC doesn't mean they received that training.  "How do we set standards for what minimum training should be?"  .

"Everyone talks about training, but no one defines it."  What is the training you would expect for the locating community?

Following up on initial discussions, the focus should be on general applicability versus trying to identify the specific training needs and multiple standards and requirements of each group or function. Kevin suggested very broad minimum standards on topics including:  Safe Excavation Practices, the Theory of Locating and Legal Requirements of participants in the one-call process.  For example, excavators need a much deeper understanding of safe digging techniques, while locators need a much more thorough understanding of the Theory of Locating.  The degree to which each is applied varies per segment.

The group discussed the importance of defining "commercial" vs "professional" excavators, noting that it would be unrealistic to expect homeowners to engage in a training program before planting a garden.

Regan identified that from the pipeline side, DOT and PHMSA require training and requalification every three years.

Kris conveyed that from the homebuilder's perspective, their biggest issue is the expectation that the markings are correct and timely.

There is an art to creating language that is all-inclusive and yet not very specific and avoiding lists. The primary objective is to improve safety through training by modifications of the ORC language.

General Language was discussed for further consideration:

> *"Commercial excavators, contractors, locators, utilities and other professionals engaged in the excavation process shall obtain training from a utility protection service, state or national trade association, internally adopted safety program or other qualified instruction in best practices and obligations consistent with Ohio Revised Code and federal laws and regulations governing their respective roles in safe excavation in the presence of underground utilities."*

Next Steps:  Continue to look at lists of potential training needs, and language adopted by other states.

Next call: Thursday, April 4th at 10:00am.