



have to do so with the addition of Bridge Park. She added that rates could be raised and that is an okay idea, but she said she does not know if that it would curtail the races from coming here or not. There just seems to be an abundance of races in Dublin. Races aren't bad, but perhaps, as Ann noted last month, they aren't balanced well with other events. Not that other events are being turned down; it may simply be they are not coming forward.

Ms. LeRoy spoke regarding the cost study. When doing the cost study, the DCRC is subsidized 50%; Community event costs, including street's personnel and police, are subsidized 100%. Dublin does not want to make money on these. In addition, right now, we do not want to distinguish between a resident and a non-resident. We have never distinguished events in that manner. For example, with the Cancer Society, someone [resident] in Dublin is a member.

Ms. Baker stated her concern is not about resident or non-resident events; she does not want to go that route. She said she is more concerned with an overload [on staff] and if there can be an increase in fees if the City cannot consider an increase in full or part-time staff right now.

Ms. Bohman inquired about races as the event that requires street or road closures more so than other events. In her opinion, that is what annoys residents the most.

Ms. LeRoy responded that not many events other than races close the streets. She added the Farmers' Market does close some streets but not main thoroughfares so no one is really affected by that closure. Typically, most community events other than races are not closing roads. Ms. LeRoy said that some races literally go out the bike path at the DCRC, run down the path and then come back. Those types of races barely affect staff or residents. A few years ago, a rule of thumb only allowed two races per month that required a road closure. That might be something to reconsider.

Ms. McClain said she could attest to races closing roads. She said she lives a mile from Jerome High School where the Fore!Miler and the Turkey Run take place. She said it seems like a larger preponderance of races seem to involve the Hyland-Croy/Glacier Ridge Park area.

Ms. LeRoy stated that those races are not in Dublin during the entire race and when they end up in Glacier Ridge or Delaware County, Dublin does not have to staff it. Those types of races may be cheaper because costs are charged by the county or by Metro Parks. She added that Metro Parks have put a cap on the number of races because they do not want the parks closed too often. While a park closure may not affect traffic, if you want to go hiking that presents an issue as well.

Ms. Baker asked if there are areas where event staff has concerns or areas where input is needed from the Commission.

According to Ms. LeRoy, street staff places barricades in roads and puts cones out. There are things we offer that we may not have to do. For example, if the event were not on a public road,

rather than offering for staff to deliver cones, cones would have to be rented from another source. The City of Columbus has a policy where street staff do not close roads down. The event coordinators close the streets and then Columbus City staff checks them. The City of Dublin looked at that policy but did not feel comfortable with that process. Dublin wants to make sure, if a street needs to be closed, our staff closes it.

Outside of the police, Ms. LeRoy said they might revisit items that do not necessarily need to be handled by City staff.

Ms. McClain broached discussion about the Bridge Park area, the beautiful green space, and the bridge, as it relates to those wanting to use it for concerts or weddings.

According to Mr. Earman, large volumes of usage requests for the Bridge Park area are to be expected. By design, urban settings beg for small venues such as hotdog stands, ice cream vendors and entertainers. On a small scale, those types of events will not be that interruptive. On a grander scale, we anticipate accommodating larger events but we do not want the park to be exclusive to a single event, such as weddings. For example, a wedding on the plaza may shut down the entire plaza. We do not want to shut down public access. The whole idea of the park is to keep it open. By nature, we are anticipating the park to be non-exclusive.

Administering of events has changed by reorganization of the Events Department. Without going into detail, Mr. Earman explained that the idea is to find a way to be much more efficient when processing requests. Currently there are 120 permits. Calculations indicate that number may double or triple when Riverside Crossing Park opens to the public. He added, we are years away from that. There are opening ceremonies, temporary access design issues and substantial construction processes extending out for two plus years before the park can be utilized as it was intended, so there is time to plan. We have a good sense of what to anticipate. Mr. Earman further elaborated on discussions he and Ms. LeRoy have had concerning future funding and the sheer volume of certain events. He added that there are means to raise revenues to offset some of the cost and the management of staffing. We are going to have to start thinking about contracting out a lot of the work we are currently doing. There is homework yet to do.

Ms. Baker asked Ms. LeRoy to comment on requests already received for future or current use of that space. According to Ms. LeRoy, requests have been coming in since the announcement that a park was going in. People are very excited about it. Professional event producers look at that lawn space and the large size of it. The lawn in the park plan is almost the same size as Columbus Commons. We do not want to get to the same point as Columbus Commons with huge stages and events occurring every weekend. However, because it is such an attractive property, we are anticipating more requests than we are going to want to take care of.

Mr. Earman said we are on a two-pronged approach. We are going to need to have a policy today that will evolve into our policy tomorrow. We need to figure out what we are going to do today

in order to try to accommodate. Our maintenance is another plan and we will not go into that today; it is going to be very strategic.

Mr. Dritz asked if there were statistics that show how many events happen each day of the week. According to Ms. LeRoy, the event calendar, which was recently updated for Council, shows 95% of events fall on the weekends.

Ms. Baker asked if Council had any particular questions or concerns [involving events].

Ms. LeRoy referred to three policy proposals that went before Council.

- All new tier 3 events will be vetted by the internal committee and then will be forwarded to Council for approval.
- All tier 3 events must give Dublin a 12-month notice unless otherwise approved.
- New tier 2 events will be vetted by the internal committee and will only be added if staff feels there is not an added burden to staff/residents/facilities and provides a unique benefit to the Community.

Ms. LeRoy added that in the past, no events have gone to Council unless the event had a request to serve alcohol, but we do want Council to be aware when something big is coming in. Our policy does state that we can say no, although we have almost never said no. We want our policy to be flexible but we also want to make sure the events benefit the community as a whole.

Ms. Bohman asked if the event calendar is accessible to the public. According to Ms. LeRoy, the calendar is located on the City website and is included in the Council packet but is not necessarily published for community reference. Ms. Bohman said, as a resident, it would be beneficial to reference the event calendar when planning for family events within the community. She also stated that events are costing us [the City] money and asked if any revenue is coming back into the community. Ms. LeRoy gave examples. She highlighted the Arthritis Show, and various tournaments, pointing out that by bringing people into the City, hotels are filled, and therefore revenue is recouped by the hotel tax.

Ms. Baker inquired if anything in particular piqued the interest of Council that would involve having the Community Services Advisory Commission to look at further. In response, Ms. LeRoy stated that [Council] realizes there is a lot going on and wants someone to look at the policies and possibly take that back to Council.

Mr. Strup liked the idea of having the guidelines to refer back to when having to say no. Having procedures spelled out is key.

Mr. Earman stated that the three concerns heard from City Council, came down to three primary factors:

- Impact [negative impact] on the community
- Cost
- Demand on staff

When vetting [events], those three factors receive the most focus. When developing a policy, flexibility should be a consideration.

Ms. Baker added that a notation on the application could state that any event can be declined based on certain factors such as [community] impact, cost, or staff needs. That addendum would provide flexibility as well as fairness. Mr. Earman referenced the memo prepared for the last meeting. Ms. LeRoy responded by citing some of the criteria listed in the memo:

- Advanced notice
- Staff availability
- Conflict of interest
- Community value
- Public safety
- Organization's reputation \*Important because some organizations do not uphold their obligations.

Ms. Baker said that the *impact on the community* and *cost* were not mentioned in the criteria and, therefore, needs to be added to the criteria list.

Mr. Dritz commented, that he thought cost was a non-issue because all costs were covered. According to Mr. Earman, it is true, but there may be unfortunate or unforeseen circumstances occur. He went on to explain that there could be a potential risk involved when putting on an event of a magnitude that has not been done before. It could pose a possible financial risk if expenses are not known beforehand.

Mr. Dritz asked how the event organizer is billed. Ms. LeRoy referenced the tiered fee structure, and pointed out that time spent preparing for the event is not billed other than through the fee. Mr. Dritz commented that he did not realize that planning was as huge a factor as organizing police and street staff. Ms. LeRoy expressed that since attendees do not know who is running the event, City staff try to help as much as possible. Along that line, Mr. Strup asked if it was feasible to bill for extra costs that are incurred. Ms. LeRoy agreed with billing for extra or out of the ordinary services that were beyond those normally provided. Ms. Bohman asked if all event organizers apply, get permission to have the event, and are charged a fee upfront, even the non-profits. Ms. LeRoy replied yes.

Ms. LeRoy asked Mr. Earman if City Council wanted a recommendation from the Commission. Mr. Earman stated that when City Council sends a project to the Community Services Advisory Commission or any commission, they anticipate a formal response in the way of a recommendation or direction. Mr. Earman noted that items brought up during this session were

not completely consistent with what is in the memo that was presented in May, because flexibility terms were mentioned. However, the fee upfront issues and added costs were great pieces of information that can be incorporated into the vetting process. He added that what Event Staff and City Council are looking for is how to officially vet out new events that come to the City. What guidelines are we going to put into place to protect the City from being overburdened?

Ms. Baker asked if there are areas where staff needs guidance from the Community Services Advisory Commission. Ms. LeRoy said the criteria could be refined and then they could come back [to the Commission].

According to Mr. Earman, what City Council is primarily looking for is how we are going to vet the new tier 2 or tier 3 event requests and what guidelines are going to be put in place to protect the City from becoming overburdened. New 2 and 3 tier events should be referred to the City Manager first and foremost but where should they go after that? Should they go to the Community Service Advisory Commission by City Council or from staff as a recommendation to City Council for approval? There should be internal vetting, but also should there be discussion from the Community Services Advisory Commission, or a formal committee of Council, or by City Council as a whole? Or, perhaps, all of the above.

Ms. McClain asked if reflection over past events or historical data might help with planning. According to Ms. LeRoy, there was one tier 3 event held last year that was asked not to return. That was a first. She added, there are events that come and go. For example, one race, in its 10<sup>th</sup> and final year is not returning. At the beginning of the year, it is common to see some drop off.

Ms. Strup asked for clarification of the tiers. Tier 1 is simple, just above a shelter house rental, no road closures, no meeting, just a quick phone call. Internal vetting by staff is all that is necessary. Example: Kiwanis Easter Egg Hunt is a tier 1 event. They may need a sandwich board or a sign but that is it. An example of a tier 2 event would be a race, which would rank as a tier 2 event because they require a road closure and meetings involving police and street staff. A race would be a tier 3 if it is a completely new event or when the routing is drastically changed. With a tier 3 event, various levels of staff attend the planning meetings. The risk manager, fire department staff, multiple police staff and additional street staff are required to attend. Tier 3 events may also involve tents and serving of alcohol.

Mr. Dritz asked why the Pancake Breakfast is a tier 1 instead of a tier 2. Mr. LeRoy responded, saying that there is not a lot of pre-work needed from staff for that event. The amount of trash is just a bit more than a shelter house rental and the event organizers are required to clean up their own trash. Mr. Dritz asked if having staff involved makes an event a tier 2. Ms. LeRoy said not necessarily, because they can be billed for staff involvement after the fact.

Mr. Dritz commented that staff capacity seemed to be the most difficult element to forecast. Mr. Earman stated that staff capacity depends on the circumstances. It is a variable. For example,

staff capacity during the first weekend in August is near zero [due to the Irish Festival]. Staff capacity in mid-September is entirely different. Staff capacity can change due to a weather event or the time of the year. It is going to fluctuate; it is a moving target.

Mr. Dritz proposed graphing *required* capacity needed during specific timeframes; not what you have, but what you *believe* you will need. Mr. Earman stated that for every event we have a known, scripted number of exactly what is needed. Mr. Dritz countered that you could compare your anticipated staff need to your on-hand. With that information, you could go back to City Council to say we need to stop these events or we need more people.

Mr. Earman stated that there is probably an algorithm or equation that could be used to figure this out, but that algorithm is going to change. He provided an example of how a snowy winter can affect the staff's availability, stating that when staff has worked overtime all winter, they take off during other times, which can affect staff availability during spring.

Ms. McClain says, to bolster what Mr. Dritz is saying, you have to know your resource capacity, level it out and then when something extraneous happens, you cannot absorb any more. Mr. Earman responded stating that we do have data and all the metrics on our staffing requirements throughout the year. Our full-time staff capacity pretty much stays the same. Seasonal part-time staff will fluctuate. We track how many full-time employees we need at any given time of the year as closely as we can forecast. Then we have another graph that indicates how many overtime hours are worked in order to accommodate what is happening. The graphs are consistent and show the overtime trends. In the winter, overtime goes up. In the spring, overtime goes down a bit. Then it goes back up around July 4. During the beginning of August, overtime sharply increases due to the Irish Festival. Therefore, to your points, I understand but can evaluate the charts to see where we may have gaps.

Ms. LeRoy discussed overtime as it relates to mandatory versus voluntary. Currently, staff signs up voluntarily for overtime. Obviously, events like the Memorial Tournament, Fourth of July and the Irish Festival are not voluntary and staff cannot take vacation during those times. However, most events like a 5K race that falls on a Saturday are voluntary. A signup sheet is posted and staff voluntarily signs up. This process has worked so far and we have not yet reached a point where overtime has had to be mandated. Mandated overtime has only occurred a *very* few times with the police department. Having said that, we will know when people stop signing up for overtime, they are burned out and then it is time to worry.

Ms. Baker commented, with double or triple the number of events predicted when Riverside Crossing Park opens, City Council is looking at how the staff will manage that. Ms. McClain broached the subject of hiring more staff versus outlaying dollars to pay overtime. A balance must be found between hiring more staff and paying overtime dollars. What will the cost be to the taxpayers?

According to Ms. LeRoy, more often than not, costs are not getting charged back to the taxpayer as the current fee structure takes into consideration the possibility of overtime. At other times the second shift staff can handle race events therefore, overtime is not involved.

Ms. Baker raised the concern with the large number of expected tier 2 events and the toll it would have on the City's event staff and internal committee time. She inquired about the average time it takes to plan each tier 2 and tier 3 event and suggested that some policies and decisions need to come into play as far as time spent planning for these events.

Mr. Earman stated the tier 2 and tier 3 events are a concern as the biggest potential burden on the city staff, community, residents, or traffic. Policy could take that into consideration. Then we need to decide how those are vetted and when they are approved.

Ms. Baker asked about using logs or time sheets [for all staff/all divisions] as they pertain to hours spent on certain events such as tier 2 events or races [like tracking grant expenses, instead of paying outside sources to figure where time is spent]. If [everyone in] the City is not tracking that information, you won't have an answer for City Council if they ask.

Mr. Earman stated that every two years staff goes through a process when we estimate our time. It has to be an estimate since salaried staff does not clock in or out. Part-time seasonal staff hours are documented and are easily tracked.

Mr. Strup commented about the two processes in the works. First is developing policies that would be in place for staff to vet and follow, consisting of metrics such as cost analysis, staff timing and benefit to the community. Secondly, there is the approval process. The approval would begin with staff and then logically it could come to the Community Services Advisory Commission. However, with that, timing could be an issue since CSAC only meets once per month and has two months off (July and August). Then, if we do not meet quorum, that could be an issue as well. Having said that, Mr. Strup said he could see steps forming with the possibility of the Community Services Advisory Commission meeting next month, working to get something in place to help with vetting the tier 2 events.

Mr. Dritz asked if the Community Services Advisory Commission would be the group that would evaluate the benefit [of the event] to the community. Mr. Strup explained that staff would do the vetting first and then the Commission would conduct further vetting before it would go to City Council for approval. Between staff and CSAC, it would be thumbs up or thumbs down.

Ms. Bohman asked if City Council has a service committee. Mr. Earman explained that there is a Public Service Committee that can be asked to take on certain topics and their meetings are fewer and farther between.

Ms. Bohman suggested the Community Services Advisory Commission have a sub-committee if the vetting of events were going to be added. Mr. Strup disagreed. He stated having a sub-committee could further delay the vetting process.

Mr. Dritz asked for clarity regarding the other committees. Mr. Plouck explained that City Council has a Community Development Committee as well as a Public Services Committee, among others.

Mr. Strup commented, without being bogged down, we want to figure out how to help with next steps and felt that the Commission could fit it in.

Ms. LeRoy said many of the tier 2 events would be easy to vet. Ms. Baker proposed helping when staff has too many to handle. Ms. Bohman's thoughts were to assist with vetting the new events. Ms. Baker said her thoughts were not necessarily geared toward old or new events. Ms. LeRoy proposed coming to the Commission in January and soliciting help with vetting events coming up in June.

Mr. Earman stated the policy consideration is in the memo that was submitted last month. He said, based on what he was hearing, we have talked and modified it to a better policy.

Ms. Baker asked if a motion was needed. Mr. Earman said if the commission members were ready to make a motion on the details of the policy, we would need a vote as a recommendation to go to council. If the Commission would like to wait and think about it, that is up to the commission.

Mr. Earman suggested taking the minutes from this meeting, incorporating what we heard into the policy and recommending it for consideration.

Mr. Dritz spoke to the last bullet point on the Policy Proposals slide regarding new tier 2 events. He said there needs to be criteria as to what would add burden to the staff and residents versus what would add benefit to the Community. If those items are not addressed at the September meeting, then it will drag on into October.

Mr. Earman said there are fundamentals that are followed when writing a policy. Once those are hashed out, the policy will not be so wordy.

Mr. Strup thanked Mr. Earman and Ms. LeRoy and asked if there were other items of interest.

## **V. Other Items of Interest**

Ms. Baker noted there is legislation proposed by the state preventing municipalities from banning plastic bags. She stated that Bexley had already [banned plastic bags] but did not know if the legislation could reverse that ban. Residents have been inquiring about it.

Mr. Plouck responded stating that Cuyahoga County had passed bans on single-use plastic but added that legislators in that area want to banish such bans. The Ohio Municipal League has put out a call to action as a violation to the Home Rule. It is something we are tracking because we were excited to see Bexley and Cuyahoga County make those changes. The topic has come up with our sustainability team. Corporations like Kroger have made statements that they are planning the elimination of single-use plastics at some point within the next five years.

Ms. Baker commented that another area where Bexley is taking the lead is with composting. A resident taking the lead with composting in Dublin came to the Community Service Advisory Commission meeting a few months ago and he recently discussed with Ms. Baker the idea of having residents in three homes leave composting containers in one driveway for collection, which would cut costs for the City, if it initiated compost collection.

Mr. Plouck commented that Michael Darling, the new Street & Utilities Operations Administrator presented at the last sustainability team meeting and is interested in researching composting and food waste recycling. In addition, we have a good relationship with Mr. Ray Leard with Innovative Organics. Mr. Leard helps with the Irish Festival, is active with the Farmer's Market and engages with the Dublin residents. We are continuing conversations with him.

Ms. Baker heard there was a problem with bedrock at one end of the bridge that was halting progress. She inquired about the issue.

Mr. Earman responded, on the east side of the bridge, the abutment for the bridge up against the plaza wall was moved forward to a certain extent and required some core drilling for structural integrity of a new retaining wall that supports the shared use path along the front of the plaza under the bridge. That is the only adjustment made to bedrock. We are not behind schedule.

Ms. Baker asked if there was a delay due to waiting on drills. Mr. Earman said we were waiting on cables that were being extensively tested. The cables are now available and as far as he knows, everything is okay.

Mr. Dritz asked if the policy [for vetting] events could be given to Committee members in advance. Mr. Earman asked Ms. LeRoy to provide the policy as soon as possible prior to the next meeting.

**VI. Next Meeting:** September 10, 2019

**VII. Adjournment**

Respectfully Submitted by:



---

Sandra Pickens, Administrative Support III

Attachments: Large Events in Dublin Presentation - May  
Large Events in Dublin Presentation - June