

**BSR ES1.7-20xx, Weather Preparedness  
PR1 Comment resolutions**

**Reference document:** BSR ES1.7 - 20xx, *Weather Preparedness for Special Events* (document number ES/2019-20010r0.1)

**ANSI public review period:** 08 Nov 2019 through 24 Dec 2019

**Question:** Do you recommend that the Event Safety Working Group accept BSR ES1.7 - 20xx, *Weather Preparedness for Special Events* (document number ES/2019-20010r0.1), as an American National Standard?

**Responses:**

Commenter	Yes	Yes, with comment	No, with reasons
Janet Sellery, Sellery Health + Safety (JS)	X		
Steven Adelman, Adelman Law Group (SA)			X
Bill Gorlin, McLaren Engineering Group (BG)		X	

**Comment Summary:**

Number	Commenter	Section	Comment	Proposed Resolution
1	BG	3.1	The site evaluation should also consider the required actions of the OMP. Propose adding the following to the end of this sentence: ", or where the operations management plan requires actions to be taken to the structure based on weather conditions."	Accept in principle. Revise the commenter's proposed wording to, " <i>, or where the operations management plan requires actions to be taken based on weather conditions.</i> "  This does not limit the actions to the structure.
2	BG	3.4.2	Propose adding the word "action" between "triggering" and "thresholds" in order to clarify the statement.	Accept.
3	BG	3.5.3	Propose adding the word "infrastructure" between "as" and "terrain" in order to broaden the statement.	Accept.
4	BG	6.1.3	Change "should" to "shall."	Reject. The task group deliberated on this topic prior to public review. We believe that it should be up to the weather professional to determine if this is required.
5	BG	8	Propose adding the words "delay or" between	Accept

Number	Commenter	Section	Comment	Proposed Resolution
			"day-of-show" and "cancellation" in order to broaden the statement.	
6	SA	General 3.2 3.4.1 5.2	Alas, I think the current draft suffers from a variety of significant issues. Most important, two assumptions seem to be baked into the document that would create trouble. (1) The standard would require all events to fulfill large event needs such as express emergency plans and off-site weather monitoring, which may be neither economically possible nor logistically necessary for smaller events. E.g., 3.2 would seem to require a site climate profile for a birthday party in a local park, which would make no sense; 3.4.1 requires a written Weather preparedness plan; 5.2 requires communication redundancy. Rather than requiring things which are common for big shows but uncommon for small ones, creating liability problems for small event organizers who cannot meet these safety requirements, it would be better for the text to explain WHY a certain measure is desirable so users of the standard can make an informed decision under their own circumstances.	Accept in principle. The scope, and sections pertaining to the commenter's cited clauses have been revised or enhanced to alleviate confusion, and to permit flexible interpretation.
7	SA	General 3.2 3.3 3.4.2 6	(2) Likewise, off-site weather monitoring is listed as mandatory in 3.4.2 and 6, but it would cause far less mischief to identify this as desirable, then to explain from a meteorological standpoint why private weather monitoring is better than an app on one's phone.  Our meteorologist friend Kevin Kloesel rolls out of bed discussing 3.3, Determination of services required. But some events will lack the resources to hire DTN or their peers, so it would be better to say what every organizer should know, then recommend how they might learn it, rather than to require services or technology	Accept in Principle. <u>Off-site</u> monitoring is not required in section 6, and a sentence has been added to 3.4.2 to clarify the requirement.  As noted, we've revised the document to allow flexibility, and to consider smaller events, which might not need a full complement of weather preparedness tools.

Number	Commenter	Section	Comment	Proposed Resolution
			that may be out of reach for some organizers. Again, 3.2 would benefit from a discussion where one might obtain a site climate profile.	
8	SA	General 1.2 2.5 2.6 3.5 3.5.1 3.5.4 4.2.2 6.2.1 8 8.2.1 8.2.2	<p>I have other issues with the writing itself. Many of the sentences are awkward, and there is a certain imprecision which makes the text not merely hard to follow, but would hobble the standard's usefulness. For example, 1.2 Intent claims the document is meant to establish minimum standards. No. Local laws and regulations are the minimum standards; an ANSI standard should articulate a reasonable standard under the user's own circumstances.</p> <p>2.5 and 2.6 are more fully defined in the Crowd Management standard.</p> <p>3.5, Event-specific weather risk assessment, is the heart of this standard, but could use a much more detailed discussion of the factors an event organizer might consider, and how those factors might play out depending on some of the more common event variables. For example, there is no mention of the importance of understanding WHO is at an event, yet the crowd demographic will dramatically affect other important issues such as evacuation time. This sort of expert guidance makes standards worth reading.</p> <p>3.5.4 refers to "radius boundaries" as if anyone knows what they are or how one can have several of them at once.</p>	<p>Accept in principle. In general, the sections cited by the commenter have been revised or enhanced for better clarity.</p> <p>Reject. This document follows ANSI's guidance on the use of those words, and uses the TSP's approved definitions. The definitions are clear and concise; no further clarification is necessary.</p> <p>Reject. Annex note A3.5 provides guidance and two very useful references. The task group feels that easy access to those resources ameliorate the need to provide redundant information as part of the document's normative requirements.</p> <p>The task group deliberated this, and agreed that the words are easily understood by using the dictionary definitions for "radius" and "boundary". NOAA thanked us for the use of these words in their informal commentary. We have also updated the wording to include more clarity with regard to time-based hazard mitigation actions, relative to distance boundaries</p>

Number	Commenter	Section	Comment	Proposed Resolution
			<p>Certain words are either undefined ("Chain of Command" in 4.2.2),</p> <p>wrong ("stop-show" appears in 3.5.1, as opposed to the correct "show-stop" in 8),</p> <p>or just unclear (does the onsite weather monitoring required in 6.2.1 include someone looking up at the sky?).</p> <p>And some guidance seems too specific to always be meteorologically necessary or sufficient, such as the 30 minute delay recommendations in 8.2.1 and 8.2.2.</p>	<p>Accept in principle. The commenter did not provide a specific suggestion, so the wording has been changed to reflect the intended results of meeting the section 4.1 requirements, and so that no definition is necessary.</p> <p>Accept. This was an oversight, as we had agreed to use stop-show in all places. It's fixed.</p> <p>We think the annex note clarifies what is necessary.</p> <p>Reject. These two clauses are written to address specific conditions. The thirty-minute delay is required only when a weather professional is not available to assess and forecast the conditions, and note that the last sentence in 8.2.1 has been revised to reflect an alternative, not an additional, consideration ("<i>or</i>" instead of "<i>and</i>").</p>