

**DUBLIN CITY COUNCIL
WORK SESSION
MAY 1, 2023**

Minutes

Mayor Fox called the Monday, May 1, 2023 work session to order at 6:02 p.m.

Council members present: Ms. Alutto, Ms. Amorose Groomes, Vice Mayor De Rosa, Mayor Fox, Mr. Keeler, and Ms. Kramb and Mr. Reiner.

Staff present: Ms. O'Callaghan, Ms. Readler, Mr. Ranc, Ms. Rauch, Mr. Earman, Ms. Noble, Ms. Weisenauer, Ms. Steiner, Ms. Gee, Mr. Krawetzski, Mr. Ament, Ms. Goliver, Ms. Blake, Chief Paez.

Also present were: Leon Younger, Pros Consulting and Rick Fay, OHM Advisors.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Reiner led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Renewable Solar Energy Equipment Update

Ms. Noble provided an overview of the topic for this meeting's discussion. She stated that staff would be providing updates including:

- Further understanding of architecturally integrating materials;
- More clearly defining where panels can be located on the front of a home;
- More information about solar materials, costs and climate;
- Solar panel resources and example legislation;
- Map of Dublin's subdivisions that define Homeowners Associations (HOAs) and Civic/No HOA locations; and
- Further refinement of draft Code language regarding permitted location and design requirements.

She provided background information regarding previous discussions and the variety of venues where this topic has been discussed. She noted that staff conducted two surveys in January 2023; one with HOA leadership and a Citywide survey.

She reviewed existing regulations for renewable energy equipment in the Zoning Code in the following five districts: West Innovation (WID), Bridge Street (BSD), Historic (HD), Mixed Use Regional (MUR-1) and Tech Flex. Staff reviewed the development text for Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) and found 17 PUDs that regulate roof materials and therefore would not permit solar equipment. Residential properties are also subject to any rules and regulations from the neighborhood HOA (if applicable).

Ms. Noble provided the following updates to Council:

Comprehensive Review of Sustainability

Council expressed, in previous discussions, the desire to have a comprehensive review of sustainability. Staff is currently working with a consultant on updates to the City of Dublin Sustainability Framework Plan. Solar energy is one component of the City's sustainability efforts.

HOAs versus Civic Associations.

There are 63 HOAs, 17 condominium associations, and 41 civic associations within the City of Dublin. Ms. Noble clarified that condominium associations act similarly to an HOA in regulating authority; whereas civic associations are an organized neighborhood group, but they do not have any legal authority. Therefore, civic associations would be more susceptible to any regulations adopted by the City. In response to Mr. Reiner's question about the warranty deed assigning the legal authority, Ms. Noble responded affirmatively.

Solar Panel Cost

Ms. Noble shared that there are a variety of solar options at varying cost points available to residential and commercial properties. The approximate costs per square foot are as follows:

- Integrated panels: \$6 - \$15 per square foot;
- PV Roof: \$14 - \$19 per square foot;
- Solar Slate/Tile: \$21 - \$25 per square foot; and
- Tesla Solar Shingles: \$26 - \$50 per square foot.

She shared that the City of New Albany spent approximately \$231,000 on solar panels for the roof of their Public Service Complex.

SolSmart Solar Program

Staff has been working with the SolSmart Solar Program. SolSmart is a national solar accreditation program that helps local municipalities and regional governments become solar leaders. SolSmart reviewed the City Code and found that increased efforts are needed to specifically address solar energy. The draft code language addresses much of SolSmart's comments. The City is currently in the process of obtaining a Bronze level SolSmart designation.

Solar Benchmarking

City	Details	SolSmart Designation
Columbus, OH	Solar permitted in all districts.	Gold
Upper Arlington, OH	Solar permitted in all districts.	Gold
Lancaster, OH	Implemented a new chapter to their code that permits roof, integrated, and ground mounted panels. Also includes specific guidelines for their historic district.	Gold
Franklin, TN	Includes specific solar guidelines for their historic district, including roof-top or free standing. The solar systems are to be screened by architectural features.	N/A
Richmond, IN	Implemented a city-wide solar initiative that permits panels in all zoning districts	Silver
Carmel, IN	Permitted as an accessory use for residential and commercial buildings.	Silver

Ms. Noble stated that staff looked closely at Bronzeville, IL. Bronzeville, Illinois is a Section 8 housing community in Chicago that is completely self-sustaining in terms of energy. The installation of rooftop solar has allowed the community to exist as a microgrid with power. The Great Plains Institute designed a solar model ordinance for Midwestern states. While they have not studied Ohio specifically, staff looked to Indiana to provide comparisons. Indiana notably is facing similar issues. The Great Plains Institute provides recommendations for solar standards as well. Ms. Noble provided a map illustrating the efficient light trespass for solar energy. We produce enough light energy to warrant this discussion.

Solar Co-ops

Solar co-ops are a combination of residents, businesses and other entities that partner with a collective energy need to garner bulk discounts. Staff has been in contact with Solar United Neighbors, who has been establishing programs across Ohio and has partnered with Sustainable Columbus, IMPACT Community Action and MORPC to launch programs.

Solar Technology:

Ms. Noble provided the following information regarding solar technologies.

- Building Applied Photovoltaic (BAPV)
 - Solar roof-type panels
 - Separate design feature from existing building
 - For best functionality, recommended to be mounted 3.9 – 4.3 inches from the roof (ventilation)
 - Wiring and other components can be concealed.
 - Black delineated sectioning is an improvement.
- Building Integrated Photovoltaic (BIPV)
 - Integrated into building structure as either a dual functioning building material or panel flush with roof
 - Replaces traditional building elements with solar modules
 - Solar roofs may come in slate or tiling form for more diversity.
 - Solar windows (14% efficiency), blinds (22%) and cladding in prototype stage.

Mayor Fox asked about the efficiency of solar panels. Ms. Noble stated that windows and blinds will lose a little efficiency due to the orientation and they are still in early technology versus a panel on the roof with direct sun. The percentage of efficiency depends upon the roofline.

Ms. Noble shared photos of different BIPV examples.

Configuration and front façade

Council requested clarification regarding language about placement and the configuration of roof materials.

- Building or Roof Mounted Equipment:
 - o Existing definition is, "Any building face generally oriented along a front property line either within the front building zone or behind the front setback."
 - o Suggested language is, "Panels shall be permitted to be installed on roof surfaces that do not slope toward the front building line." Staff sought Council's direction as to the suggested language.

Ms. Noble shared photos illustrating where panels could be placed on roofs that are not typical (corner properties with multiple frontage).

Ms. Noble provided the following discussion questions to Council and requested their feedback in an effort to move this topic forward.

1. What additional modifications or information is needed prior to moving the proposed Code language forward for adoption?
2. Does Council support modifying the Code based on the draft language that "Panels shall be permitted to be installed on roof surfaces which do not slope towards the front property line"?
3. Does Council support modifications to these existing districts for BSD, WID, MUR-1, HD, and Tech Flex to ensure consistency amongst the regulations and providing restrictions regarding renewable energy equipment for solar as a principal use?
4. Does Council support staff's recommendation to review the adopted language following adoption of the Sustainability Framework to evaluate its effectiveness?
5. Other considerations of City Council

Ms. Kramb sought clarification regarding question four. Ms. Noble stated that when the Sustainability Framework Plan is completed, the Code language regarding Solar would be evaluated to ensure that it is consistent with the plan.

Ms. Kramb asked about the title in the Code. Ms. Rauch stated that it was to leave the option open to add additional sustainable solutions and it is consistent with the five districts that already have regulations.

Mr. Keeler asked about the sides of the gables facing the front of a house and clarified that panels would be permitted on the sloping roof on gables that are facing front. Ms. Noble responded affirmatively. Ms. Rauch asked Council for feedback regarding allowing panels on the roof covering the gable.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that gables are the most visible part of the roof as you come up and down the street. She suggested language that would specify that panels are not permitted on, "surfaces that slope toward the front building line or off of a surface that does." She acknowledged how difficult it is to write Code because there are so many unintended consequences. Ms. Rauch stated that the goal is to have visual examples that will help explain what is allowed. Ms. Amorose Groomes added that she would like to see an overarching purpose statement that describes what we are trying to accomplish.

Mayor Fox suggested addressing whether or not panels are permitted on the front of the house. Ms. Rauch clarified that if the solar is integrated into the building materials, as shown in the presentation of different solar technologies, then that would be permitted on the front of the home. It is the solar panels that are in question as to whether they would be allowed on the front side of the home.

Ms. Kramb stated that it will be too difficult to determine what the front is on some homes. It would be better to say panels are allowed as long as they are comparable to the roof in color/material and less than 5 inches from the surface. She added that these panels will only last for about 10 years, and the technology will continue to improve.

Mr. Keeler agreed. The City is trying to be sustainable. He agrees that it is too hard to determine what the front or the back of a house is sometimes; however, he would prefer they were installed on the back or side.

Mr. Reiner stated that the panels should not be seen from the front of the home, roof tiles should be permitted. As technology improves, it will get more attractive and be less expensive. It our duty to protect the integrity of the neighborhood.

Ms. Alutto stated that the City is trying to make a commitment to renewable energy. Having the panels mounted closer to the roof is an improvement. She is fine allowing them, in a square or rectangular formation, she doesn't want any jagged shapes that draw attention.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she is a huge fan of sustainability, but she is not sure if this is solving the sustainability question. There are expectations of the visual experience, so we have a responsibility to protect the appearance of the built environment. She is for limiting where panels can be installed for now, waiting for the technology to progress and then re-evaluating where they can go. There are better ways to achieve sustainability than putting a panel on the roof that would be only marginally effective. She would be in favor of looking into starting a pilot for a micro-grid using our facilities and the schools facilities.

Vice Mayor De Rosa referred to the HOA slide and stated that many of the HOAs, regardless of Council action, will prohibit the use of solar. The amount of impact that allowing solar panels could have on the City, without the HOAs changing their regulations, could be minimal. The cost of solar energy is prohibitive for most homes. She stated that using the orientation of the house as a basis of whether or not you can or cannot have panels on your home does not feel good. Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that she would be in favor of allowing the panels on a home with very specific definitions as to height, color, materials, etc. She also stated that if we intend to allow wind energy solutions, then the Code should speak to that as well. She suggested that this topic comes back annually (in addition to the sustainability plan) for a while so it can be evaluated as technology changes. She stated that she also feels a duty to protect the visual experience, but it gets complicated to say that panel can be seen from the back but not the front. She would like to really lean into the aesthetics and what would be required, but still allow the panels.

Mayor Fox agreed that it is difficult to say we are a Sustainable City but then not allow solar panels. She stated that it is important to include an objective statement in the Code to say what we are trying to accomplish, (i.e. sustainable city, encourage solar panels), but that we would prefer if these panels could be hidden on the back or side if possible. If it is impossible for you to have them hidden, you should still be allowed to have them. Mayor Fox spoke about the importance of education for those interested in purchasing solar equipment because a permit is required due to fire and safety requirements.

Mr. Keeler agreed that the requirement should be to make the installation of the panels as aesthetically pleasing as possible. Ms. Rauch stated that staff can include language to make the requirements clear. Discussion was held regarding the desire to have the panels match the shingles of the roof by either changing the shingles to match the black panels or getting solar skins on the panels to try to match the shingles.

Mayor Fox asked for feedback from Council on the third discussion question. Council consensus was to have consistency in regulations among the five districts. Regarding the fourth question, Council consensus was to re-visit the Code to ensure effectiveness and consistency after the Sustainability Framework Plan is adopted and annually thereafter.

When asked about other considerations to think about, Council had the following comments:

- Vice Mayor De Rosa asked if there is a coverage requirement to make this economically work.

- Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that when subsequent versions of the Code are adopted that there will be no “grandfathering” situations.
- Ms. Krumb stated that ground-mounted only applied to non-residential in the Code, but there would be opportunity for ground-mounted on lots of a certain size with the same criteria. Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that the other requirement would be where on the property it would go in relation to neighbors. Mr. Keeler stated that he agrees with Ms. Krumb that it is possible as long as the criteria is set and followed.
- Mayor Fox confirmed that HOAs will still have their regulations in place. Staff responded affirmatively. Mayor Fox suggested that the Historic District may need additional conversation due to the restrictions that are already affecting the District. Vice Mayor De Rosa and Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that if there are no HOA protections in place, they are not in favor of having separate discussions by neighborhood or district.
- In response to Mr. Reiner’s question, Ms. Rauch stated that if an HOA wanted to regulate solar, then they would have to govern it.

Ms. O’Callaghan stated that staff would like to bring Ordinance 70-22 back to Council for a second reading. Vice Mayor De Rosa reiterated that Council will expect to see language regarding all the discussion about aesthetic requirements. Council consensus was to bring the Ordinance back for second reading.

Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update

Mr. Earman introduced Leon Younger from Pros Consulting and Rick Fay from OHM Advisors. He stated that tonight’s discussion will include:

- A project recap,
- Cross-tabulations,
- Parks/facility & Operations review,
- Key Focus Areas – Implementation strategies,
- Major Projects, and
- Discussion Questions/Next Steps.

Mr. Earman provided a graph showing how the Master Plan process has evolved. He shared the preliminary recommendations of the key focus areas, which include:

- Focus for Parkland: Acquire and develop new parkland, and maximize the value of each park type currently in the system to reach the full recreation value associated with its design;
- Focus for Recreation Facilities: Enhance park and recreation facilities through new or improved program services to maximize the community’s investment in its parks and recreation facilities and enhance their impact on the quality of life for Dublin residents;
- Focus for Program Services: Activate parks and recreation facilities through program services to maximize the community’s investments made in these facilities and enhance their value and impact on the quality of life for living in Dublin;
- Focus for Park and Recreation Operations: Provide industry-leading and innovative services for parks and recreation operations to deliver an exciting and high-quality experience for Dublin residents;
- Focus for Financing: Expand the funding options available to the Parks and Recreation Department to fund the community’s desire for a world-class parks and recreation system that meets or exceeds the community’s vision for Dublin.

Mr. Younger, Pros Consulting, provided an overview of the Priority Investment Ratings (PIR) overall results and then the PIRs of the age related groupings. Mr. Younger stated that the City of Dublin has an outstanding parks system. He stated that consideration must be given to the fact that we are becoming regional. As we look at maintenance and providing new services, we must consider that it is a broader user base than just Dublin residents.

Park/Facilities Maintenance & Upgrade Recommendations

Mr. Younger shared that 20 community parks were visited as part of the technical analysis. Maintenance and upgrade recommendations were included for all 20 parks. These recommendations will be addressed via the operating budget and/or annual park maintenance in the Capital Improvements Program (CIP). Mr. Younger stated that part of the analysis was making sure that the amenities at each park were still relevant and attracting users. Mr. Younger provided a chart illustrating the current best practices, plans and policies and how the City of Dublin fared in those categories. He recommended that the following be updated:

- Business, Marketing and Recreation Plans;
- Maintenance Standards;
- Partnership Policy; and
- Sponsorship Policy.

Key Focus Areas – Implementation Strategies

1. Parkland: Acquire and develop new parkland, and maximize the value of each part type currently in the system to reach the full recreation value associated with its design.
 - 1.1 Increase the number of traditional and non-traditional sports fields and hardcourts to meet demand within the City.
 - 1.2 Determine highest and best use of undeveloped land, including leasing park ground to an adventure entertainment venue as a livery, high ropes course, or sports entertainment provider within a site that can provide City residents with access to activities and/or equipment rental for recreation.
 - 1.3 Update existing park site master plans to maximize the value of each park type currently in the system to reach the full recreation value associated with its design.
 - 1.4 Establish arboretum/botanical garden(s) in one of the key parks as a major attraction to the City development jointly with the City and community partners. Gardens could include a Japanese Garden, Woodland Garden, Children's Garden, Xeriscape Garden, Herb Garden, Rose Garden, and/or Iris Garden.
 - 1.5 Focus on strategic land acquisition in support of future park development.
2. Recreation Facilities: Enhance parks and recreation facilities through new or improved program services to maximize the community's investment in its parks and recreation facilities and enhance their impact on the quality of life for Dublin residents.
 - 2.1 Work with community partners to conduct feasibility studies of new recreation facilities within the park system that meet local needs and draw in visitors to the City.
 - 2.2 Develop business plans for revenue producing facilities that also draw visitors to the City for recreation purposes.
 - 2.3 Refresh the Dublin community Recreation Center with new interior elements to improve visitor experiences and programming opportunities.

3. Program Services: Activate parks and recreation facilities through program services to maximize the community's investments made in these facilities and enhance their value and impact on the quality of life for living in Dublin.
 - 3.1 Revise the existing recreation program plan including all core program areas and ancillary services at parks and recreation facilities to maximize their use and reach residents who are not currently using the parks, facilities and programs.
 - 3.2 Use program plan and program priority investment rating (PIR) to inform updates to existing parks and facilities, making spaces as multi-functional in design, as possible.
 - 3.3 Annually assess the Core Program Areas to identify opportunities and address declining programs and events.
4. Parks and Recreation Operations: Provide industry-leading and innovative services for parks and recreation operations to deliver an exciting high-quality experience for Dublin residents.
 - 4.1 Research and implement the development of smart parks and facilities by integrating advancing technology.
 - 4.2 Conduct an assessment to determine the cost of service to operate and maintain the parks and recreation system.
 - 4.3 Maintain an acceptable life cycle replacement program for all parks and recreation assets that demonstrates a commitment to continuing Dublin's high quality of life.
 - 4.4 Work with Communications and Public Information (CPI) to create a specific parks and Recreation Services marketing strategy including the components and strategies identified in this report.
5. Financing: Expand the funding options available to the Parks and Recreation Department to fund the community's desire for a world-class parks and recreation system that meets or exceeds the community's vision for Dublin.
 - 5.1 Identify new dedicated funding options for development or enhancement of parks, recreation facilities and program services.
 - 5.2 Develop diversified funding strategies and allocate funding for the development and operations of new facilities to keep the investments sustainable over the full life cycle and beyond.
 - 5.3 Develop implementation of financial direction across divisions and services to achieve identified outcomes.
 - 5.4 Update the Department's pricing policy and partnership policy for revenue producing facilities across all groups using parks, recreation facilities and program services across the system.

Vice Mayor De Rosa asked about the absence of events within these focus areas. Mr. Younger stated that this would be relative to events by making the parks support the events better. Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that she expected to see events when talking about revenue generating possibilities. Mr. Earman stated that events are not called out specifically, but there are areas of the plan that describe improvements that would benefit events, such as the Coffman Park Master Plan and making sure that park is planned in a way to support the Dublin Irish Festival.

In response to Mr. Reiner's question regarding Riverside Crossing Park, Mr. Earman stated that most of the support and amenities are in place with the latest phase of the project. Mr. Earman stated that the lawn area needs expanded to the north to get Wi-Fi access and electrical needs that are not there yet.

Mr. Earman provided a graphic illustrating how these Master Plan recommendations support the City's strategic framework of being sustainable, connected and resilient.

A list of major projects was presented to Council for feedback. Mr. Younger stated that these were developed after hearing from Council and the public, and to further the key focus areas. Many of these projects will bring more people to Dublin and could therefore be partner projects regionally. Mr. Ranc added that Council requested to look at a cost-per-user. Mr. Ranc stated that the results of that information gathering was in Council's packet. He noted that they did not calculate cost-per-user for the indoor fieldhouse project or the performing arts center project as those would be two examples of users throughout the region. Mr. Younger recommended a feasibility study for these examples.

In response to a question by Mr. Keeler regarding the \$125,500 amount included with the Indoor Fieldhouse, Mr. Ranc stated that it was to cover the cost of a feasibility study.

Mr. Younger highlighted a few of the projects, including: the DCRC Interior Refresh, Outdoor Adventure, Arboretum/Botanical Gardens, Regional Indoor Aquatic Center, Sports Fields/Indoor Fieldhouse and the Performing Arts Center. Regarding outdoor adventure specifically, Mr. Reiner asked if there were any areas of the City that seemed to fit this purpose. Mr. Younger answered Riverside Crossing Park with its close proximity to the Scioto River.

Mayor Fox asked staff to hit any highlights they would like to hit due to the lateness of the hour. Mr. Ranc stated that he would like to point out the Japanese Garden because this is something that staff feels it can move on quickly. He welcomed Council's feedback on the Japanese Garden.

Mayor Fox stated that staff provided the following questions for discussion:

Council Responses to Discussion Questions:

- 1. What is Council's feedback regarding the strategies and tactics outlined in the draft parks and recreation master plan?*

Mr. Keeler stated that he felt the plan was very well laid out.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that her recollection is that we would be dovetailing this plan with the housing strategy. Identifying what level of investment it would take as the population grows is important. She would like to see the level of service element with a growing population included in the plan. Mr. Younger stated that there is a level of service discussed in the plan and, as of now, Dublin is meeting or exceeding those expectations. He added that there are standards that measure whether or not the level of service is being met. The standard is based upon the expectation of the community and the national standard for amenities per population that cities are measured against. Mr. Younger stated that in the plan, growth is measured on a five-year and ten-year plan for level of service. Mr. Ranc noted that what Mr. Younger is referring to is mentioned on pages 80 and 81 of the plan, but that he is happy to be far more direct in the service analysis.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that the more we build, the more we have to maintain. Can we afford to maximize value with every one of these? She would like to see a schedule of the parks that are hitting that 25-year mark and what will be required to maintain them in the next few years. She stated this would be helpful for when we develop the CIP. Council can determine what percentage we want to maintain or upgrade and what we want to install new. She also stated the importance of knowing the FTE (full-time employees) required. She stated we already have a high FTE and she

would want to know the impact that this work would have on that. Mr. Earman stated that FTEs can be tricky. He added that he likes to look at FTEs not per population, but per park. We have 64 parks in the City of 50,000. Many cities of 50,000 people will not have 64 parks. Mr. Earman stated that staff can provide clarity on that.

Ms. Alutto thanked the consultants for this work. She stated that, referring to the comments made regarding the schools, our school boundaries are twice the size of the City boundaries. She suggested acknowledging a little more that the schools are larger and are big users of amenities. She would like to tie the projects that we do have some concrete number on into CIP discussions to help Council make necessary decisions. The Plan was comprehensive and brought a lot together. She appreciated the attention to policies and business continuity. Mr. Earman thanked Ms. Alutto for mentioning the CIP process. He stated that many of these major projects will require a feasibility study for scope, size, maintenance etc.

Mr. Reiner appreciated the work and noted that the cost per user is helpful. He suggested that there might be lower hanging fruit that could be done sooner rather than later on the project list. He appreciated the idea partnering with another company for the outdoor adventure.

Mayor Fox stated that this plan covered a wide variety of what we need. The maintenance piece is important. Taking care of what we have and making sure it looks as good as it can look is important. She would be interested to look at optimizing what we have rather than building something new. She added that she would like to see more on maintenance and what we can add to what we already have.

2. What is Council's feedback regarding the proposed major projects? Does Council have feedback regarding the priority for implementation of the major projects?

Mr. Keeler stated that he would like to see what could be accomplished in the current parks we have. Sports complex is his number one priority. Riverside Crossing east and west sides following closely at second in priority for him. He stated that the DCRC refresh is important as the needs of our residents change. He asked if there was room to enlarge the equipment area of the DCRC. Mr. Earman stated that enlarging the space is not part of the refresh. Mr. Keeler advocated for expansion.

Mr. Reiner stated the outdoor adventures is a priority. He also listed the arboretum and sports fields as his priorities. He would like to move on some projects soon if possible.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the sports fields seem to make the most sense as the first major priority. Her other priority item is a hybrid coagulation of a botanical garden, nature preserve, educational center that would be useable in the summer time. She likes the idea of a "cluster" of smaller projects that could be brought together to serve multiple interests with one project in one space.

Ms. Alutto stated that sports fields are high on her list and the DCRC refresh is definitely needed. She would be supportive of a more comprehensive look at DCRC. She also likes the idea of combining smaller projects into one larger project. She would like to keep a cultural arts center in their vision for the future as well.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that she is very supportive of the DCRC refresh because it is such a center for health and wellness. She believes that there may be additional space available with reconfiguring what is there. She stated that the aquatics facility must be looked at because it was high on the list of so many in the community. She added that it would have to be a partnership, but she suggested doing a feasibility study to learn more. She mentioned the popularity of pickleball and stated that she was surprised she didn't see it mentioned in survey responses. She stated that we need to balance maintenance with these big projects.

She asked how a Japanese garden was settled upon? Mr. Ranc stated that the Japanese Garden was part of Coffman Park Master Plan. Staff was looking at some smaller attainable "lower hanging fruit" projects that they could execute quickly.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that the only other thing she would add is connecting the bike paths particularly in downtown.

Ms. Krumb stated that her priorities are maintaining the Recreation Center and sports fields.

Mayor Fox stated that the Recreation Center has to be a priority as well as site planning for undeveloped properties. Coffman Park and Riverside Crossing Park have great potential. She agreed that turf fields are important. She agreed with making a big impact in small ways if possible. She also agreed that pickleball courts are popular and could create quite an impact.

3. Are there additional opportunities or challenges that Council would have considered as part of the draft parks and recreation master plan?

Mr. Keeler stated that he would like to see more art.

Mr. Reiner agreed and added it needs to be more uplifting art. He suggested giving the Dublin Arts Council some direction on getting more positive, uplifting art.

Mayor Fox had a number of opportunities and programming that she listed, including: public wellness hubs, converting unused park spaces, serenity spaces, multi-mobility opportunities for people who can't get outside otherwise, bringing the outdoor theater back, fly-fishing lessons in the Scioto River, wildlife shelter days, bringing wildlife to the parks and making it an education event.

Next steps: Council consensus to staff was to bring the Plan back to a City Council meeting under "Other Business" for additional review and input. Council consensus was to see a list of major projects, but to clarify language to explain that it is a list of possible projects subject to the CIP process, not every project will be done. Ms. O'Callaghan stated that staff will provide a list calling out the items that would need a feasibility study.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that Council can accept the report with the understanding that Council will keep these projects in mind as opportunities for implementation arise.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.



Presiding Officer - Mayor



Clerk of Council