



Date: July 8, 2021
Location: Remote via Google Meet
Present:

✓	Chris Kampmann	✓*	Jim Moody		Patricia McKinney-Clark	✓	Ted Jensen
✓	Dale Kishbaugh	✓	Lori Warner	✓	Patrick Fitzgerald		
✓	Dana Bijold		Mark Frasier	✓	Ray Swedfeger		
✓	Jeannette Jones	✓	Mark Williams	✓	Rob Ellis		

* Indicates arrival after roll call . - indicates technical difficulties during roll call

Note: The meeting was recorded and started at 10:00 am. These minutes represent a summary of this meeting and are not intended to be a verbatim document. Audio recordings of the meetings can be obtained by contacting cdle_safetycommission@state.co.us.

MINUTES APPROVAL

A Motion was made to approve the minutes from the June 10, 2021 meeting: There was no discussion; a vote was taken to approve the minutes. It was approved unanimously.

A Motion was made to approve the minutes from the June 22, 2021, meeting: There was no discussion; a vote was taken to approve the minutes. It was approved unanimously.

TRAINING COURSES

- No submissions at this time

MARKING BEST PRACTICE

- *Positive Response Section: Documentation and Process*
 - The Commissioners discussed with CO 811 staff the statement from the June 22 meeting minutes: "Positive response codes prevent an automatic renotification from being sent. It does not mean that the marks have been done." At this time, this statement is correct. It was noted that when technology allows, CO 811 will monitor to ensure that attachments are included (if that is part of the requirement to use a code). When not included (in the future) it may result in renotification since the positive response was incomplete.
 - Discussion on how to proceed to include what is in the law, and what the intent, and what is happening in reality when positive response codes are used, was had. Specifically trying to understand what positive response is and how it is used.
 - Attempt to define "positive response" including using the definition developed by CO 811's procedures committee: "Positive Response: A facility owner's response to the One Call Center/Excavator with regard to the status of the Locate Request" - concern that people think a positive response = facilities have been located.

- **A Motion was made to align with CO 811's definition of positive response:** it was noted that while this definition may be true, there may need to be changes made with CO 811 to change how it's used in the future. The intent of this motion is to get consensus on a definition and further in the best practice document address other concerns around the use of positive response. Discussion around the intent of the law - the use of positive response when a locate is not completed was discussed (section 6.5 of the law). Renotification should only impact the facility owner that has not completed the locate - vs a new ticket that impacts all facilities in the area. Currently the challenge is that if any positive response code is used, the ticket is 'closed' and even if marks are not done, there is no follow-up. These items will be addressed separately in the document. A vote was taken to approve the minutes. It was approved unanimously.
 - Discussion around what positive response is continued. If it is a "status report" it might want to allow any and all statuses to be shared - including "I did not get to it." Consider if some positive response codes should be able to get notifications and/or if some statuses are not valid and can not be reported. This was not resolved due to meeting time ending.

OTHER BUSINESS

- Members discussed a meeting summary to provide at the full Safety Commission meeting (July 8, 2021 at 12pm).
- Members discussed potential topics for the next Best Practices meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for July 19, 2021.

Meeting adjourned at 11:50 am.