### SIGN CODE UPDATE
Public Feedback Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response to Comment and/or Action Taken:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Retain the political sign provisions. Although the population in Kitsap has grown, we no longer even have a local radio station and the cost of radio/TV in Puget Sound is beyond the reach of most races. Signs give the public exposure to the names and something for the public to do.</td>
<td>Comments noted, thank you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Arper, R.    | • For our church I would like to see a code that allows an electronic sign where we could announce events daily.  
• I don't see where "No Trespassing" or "No Fireworks" signs fit in. Silverdale Lutheran church currently has these types of signs in our parking lot to prevent people from bothering us and/or our neighbors. | Legal informational signs would be included into Exempt Signs section.                                                                 |
| Biggs, M.    | Section 17.446.080 would prohibit any political sign more than 36" high. Wooden stakes are 48" long, and are required since metal stakes are prohibited.                                                        | Political signs would be restricted to 36” high and with no metal stakes only if placed in the County right-of-way. This regulation responds to the requests from Public Works. Metal support frames damage mowers when cutting brush in County right-of-way. |
| Crabtree, W. | I feel the proposal is on target. Our county simply must give businesses and churches the ability to have electronic reader boards attune to what the YMCA has in Silverdale. These can be done modestly (no flashing colored lights etc). I would think if we don't allow electronic reader boards then we need to removal all back lit signs as they cause more "light pollution" that a one color reader board. Please don't let one or two loud voices in opposition to this stop this very needed effort. Thank you. | Comments noted, thank you.                                                                                                    |
| Garrido, R.  | I'm writing to comment about your proposal to allow electronic signs. In recent years Kitsap County has put strong emphasis on conservation. Your administration building is one example of this. I don't think you should be allowing signs that require additional energy use to operate as well as in their construction. In addition the visual impact of these signs is distracting and a potential safety problem. I also want to tell you that the way this form is built makes it very difficult to fill out and/or edit. You should really use best practices when designing forms for the public to use. | Under this proposal electronic signs would be encouraged to use energy efficient lighting or electronics. Thank you for your comments. |
| Gillespie, R.| • Please look at the Kitsap Sun Poll results on electronic signs. This corresponds with the people that I have talked to. Non electronic signs - not needed - not necessary and not compatible to any of Kitsap's communities. I would amend section 12 under Prohibited Signs to: Electronic Signs. 
• Prohibited signs should include electronic signs. Even though you have regulations they can be flashy and exhibit characteristics that you prohibit in other signs – like giving the impression of rotating etc.  
 o CK High School Sign is a good example of this. Aesthetically this does not fit the community. Urban areas are extensive and different: Urban Low, Medium and High Residential, Urban village. Treating these all alike will allow signs to go up all over the county and we will literally be lit up. Good idea on human signs staying on the premise and not right of ways. At the community meeting someone said that permanent signs are to remain content neutral – does this mean that churches can not preach – especially if they are allowed electronic signs – which should be prohibited. Also at the meeting there was comment about enforcement being done through a hearing officer. None of this is mentioned in the code.  
 o Also enforcement is the issue, I would get enforcement worked out first.  
 o A nice ordinance without the meat is just that nice – but meaningless.  
 • 17.446.080 Conditionally Exempt Sign 4) Political sign: a) A political sign is allowed in Kitsap County right-of-way provided that a sign a) using metal faces, metal supports, metal frames, or wire frames is prohibited b) is limited to a size no greater than four (4) square feet may not extend higher than 36 inches measured from the point in which it is placed in the ground in the top of the sign c) shall not be within 200 feet of a sign associated with the same campaign or cause and d) shall be removed 14 days after voting has occurred. b) Any political sign found to be inconsistent with the requirements contained within this subsection is subject to removal and disposal by the county at the cost of the campaign or candidate? If I am reading your proposed correctly, the largest political sign can only be 4x4 or 2x8 feet and not be higher than 36 from the ground. So that actually leaves the 4x4 sign out of the picture since 48” is higher than 36”. Quite a new regulations. Also the signs can not be within 200 feet of each other so this prohibits clustering of signs. Again quite a regulation. I would add that this really changes a lot of campaign strategies and I would say basically unenforceable. Also it seems that someone on the committee hates campaigns because the ordinance threatens to be enforced with removal and cost. If neighbors put a sign up within 200 feet of each other for the same issue or candidate will one be arbitrarily taken down and the campaign charged for the expense? So much for freedom of expression. I believe that this whole section needs to be seriously reconsidered, otherwise it will be ignored or complaints are made. | While Kitsap County was not associated with the Kitsap sun poll, it is acknowledged that arguments have been submitted both in favor and in opposition to Electronic signs. 
• Electronic signs are part of a new technology which can significantly help with economic development. The regulations regarding message duration and transition and the prohibition signs with animation or flashing specifically address most concerns regarding electronic signage. Studies have been performed with conclusions both for and against electronic signs relative to safety concerns. Electronic signs are prohibited in areas outside Urban Growth Areas, Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development, and specific areas within UGA’s and LAMIRD’s such as Old Town District Silverdale. 
• A blanket statement wherein electronic signs are prohibited would result in multiple non-conforming signs. 
• Political sign regulations would only apply if the sign is placed in the County right-of-way. 
• Design Guideline incentives would now be included as required elements and the size bonus removed. 
• Enforcement challenges noted. 
• Creating Master Sign Districts which include multiple parcels would be

---
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The real issues about signs is the removal time period, that can fairly be enforce when the county will pick up all signs after 14 days of the elections and then fine the campaigns based on the number of signs you collected for their issue or candidate if that is what you really want to do. The way that I read the ordinance proposed is that a campaign issue such as marijuana legalizations, a pro sign can not be within 200 ft of an anti sign on this campaign?

- The first considerations I make when reviewing a policy or proposal is the configuration of the committee that is responsible for its development. This is important in determining the leanings and biases of the group. When I looked at 17.446.020 Purpose, there is recognition that signs are important to the business community as well as “promoting the visual quality desired by Kitsap County residents.” I will concede that business owners are residents of Kitsap County but for the purpose of this ordinance it would be safe to say they are reflective of the business community and not the residents at-large. So, does the committee have a fair balance between residents and business people where legitimate debate could play out in the development of a balanced proposal? As I read it, I would say that the committee members are predominately business oriented.

- As a resident of the county I would adamantly oppose the incorporation of electronic signs in the urban area of Silverdale because it does not represent the visual quality I desire. By adding electronic signs to the mix we just add to the untidiness of our current signiverdale.

- Electronic Signs are not aesthetically pleasing, they do not eliminate the need for other signs, they will be just another distraction on an already dangerous road, they are better fit for larger cities than one like Silverdale and most of all they are not needed. Gig Harbor has prohibited electronic signs because they want to have a livable area that is supportive of business and tries to maintain an aesthetic quality while this sign ordinance only gives minimal weight to aesthetic concerns.

- Aesthetic concerns are also the first casualties of lack of regulatory enforcement. This is why I stated that the business interest on the committee must far out weigh the residential interest. Let’s show some concern about making Silverdale more livable and not let Silverdale turn into our neighbor, Belfair. 17.446.050 Variances 1) The application of the sign code would substantially limit the applicant’s ability to put the property to its highest and best use. “Putting the property to its highest and best use” can be argued by almost anyone. I am not even sure what this means? Please provide some examples that are not taken into account by the Master Plan? For example – by having my business advertised with a bunch of other businesses on the same sign would make it difficult for my business to stand out, thus the ordinance reduces my highest and best use. Thus I need a new sign. Also I do not know what section 3 on variances means. 3. The hardship suffered is unique to the property and was not created by the applicant for the variance. I think the variance section needs to be clearly spelled out and the application and procedure for getting a variance made clear. This section is way to ambiguous to have meaning. 17.446.060 Prohibited Signs: I would change 12 to prohibiting electronic signs. 17.446.150 Non-conforming Signs The continued existence of lawfully established and permitted non-conforming signs shall be subject to the following: 1) No sign previously erected in violation of any County Code shall, by virtue of the adoption of this section, become a legal non-conforming sign. Why aren’t these signs just taken down? Is there a consequence for erecting a sign in violation of any County Code? 17.446.110 Design Guidelines Incentive: Here you have the opportunity to set quality for signage and some landscaping standards but instead of making them Rules you only use them as guidelines. Who will be making sure that once approved that any of this ordinance will be followed? The county is very good at developing policies, regulations, and ordinances but very poor on enforcement.

- Enforcement personnel have been reduced to the point where it is virtually nonexistent and as a consequence only the pressing issues of the day are given attention. Sign ordinance enforcement is way down the list.

- 17.446.130 Master Sign Plan: This is really a misnomer. How many master plans could be developed just for Silverdale Way alone? A Master Sign Plan should be the broad plan where individual units would have to fit. Instead, you have individual units develop their plan and that plan is called the Master Plan. If we want signage to be controlled in Silverdale there has to be a big picture but the way that I read this is that we will have a bunch of smaller plans that will make Silverdale Way know as Hodgedpodge Avenue. The current signage of Silverdale is pathetic and not enforced. Now we want to add electronic signs that will just add to the mess. Rather than add to the clutter, lets make Silverdale more beautiful by just enforcing the regulations we have now. Please say no to electronic signs as the start of Silverdale beautification. From my perspective a town and the broader community have a symbiotic relationship. The community takes pride in a town that takes pride in itself, a town that is walkable, provides a sense of familiarity and community and is aesthetically pleasing. A town is not just a retail center but is also a part of the larger community. I would like to quote Carolyn Neal – one of the authors of Silverdale from an article in kitsapweek Feb. 14, 2014. “She hopes the book helps people understand that Silverdale is more than just a retail center; it’s a community. ‘I was thrilled with the sense of place,’ she said of the experience of working on the book. ‘Silverdale could be just considered a retail center on the highway, but there’s still a sense of a real town and a real community.’” Don’t try and make us appear bigger than we are – let electronic signs reside in Seattle. I know that this is a county-wide proposal and I am writing from the perspective of Silverdale. But that is were my interest lie. I also have the impression that many of elements of the plan specifically apply to Silverdale. Again, please do not allow electronic signs to dominate our “townscape.”

- I would amend section 12 under Prohibited Signs to: Electronic Signs.

**PRELIMINARY DRAFT**

- Variance language has changed from the preliminary draft Sign Code to reference variance language which already exists in Title 17.
Grasmick, K.
I support the new sign code.

Green, W.
I am for the approval of electronic signs.

Hueneke, I.
I approve of and support the new sign code.

Logan, J.
Email sent to K1:
Hueneke, I. I approve of and support the new sign code.
Green, W. I am for the approval of electronic signs.

By the way, I am not a business owner. My opinions expressed below just show my tendency to err on the side of liberty over regulations. (I can provide a better copy of this in an easier-to-read format if I was provided a good email address for it.)

- 17.446.060 Prohibited Signs 8) Signs, temporary or otherwise, affixed to a tree, rock, fence, lamppost, or bench. I think we should allow this kind of stuff to be temporary, just add this in with the section on conditional exempt.
- 10) Signs placed on public property, including Kitsap County right-of-way, except when authorized by the appropriate public agency or specifically authorized in this sign code. I'm not against the idea of some small signs, like A-frames, being allowed on county right-of-way property, like sidewalks. I'm OK with it as long as the sign doesn't block the flow of traffic. I realize that's what we're trying to capture with the term right-of-way, but in my experience most sidewalks (or that small section between the sidewalk and the curb) are big enough for a small A-frame sign without blocking the walking path of people. And it can have a significant impact on a business's ability to advertise and get their store out there. I mean, we're going to allow political signs or open-house signs in the right-of-way.
- 17.446.080 Conditionally Exempt Signs 4) 4 and 12d, but not an A-frame advertising something more long-term? Those political signs block the walking path beside a road almost as much as a little A-frame.
- 14) Stationary or mobile billboards. I would be fine with allowing this 15) Signs with animation, flashing, or fluttering lights. I would be fine with allowing this 16) Rotating signs. I would be fine with allowing this 18) Advertising wind signs. I would be fine with allowing this
- 17.446.070 Exempt Signs 5) Seasonal or Holiday decorations. I'm glad to see this included as an exemption. And even without any time limits. So people can keep up light strings (Christmas lights) all year around (as long as they are kept in good condition so as not to violate the requirement to be in good repair).
- 7) Flags used only to represent a government or government agencies. Seems like we need a bit more leeway with flags. What about Boy Scout flag, or POW flag, or I have 3 children serving in the military flag, or a 12th man flag?
- 17.446.080 Conditionally Exempt Signs 1) A-Frame Sign: What if a business wanted to rent out its space and put up an A-frame sign not for its own business, but for another? For instance, a business on a corner may put up an A-frame sign that indicates what businesses are down the road and point people that way. The corner business is still getting its business advertised in other ways (like a wall sign or blade sign or window sign), but uses its space to advertise for other stores at a cost. This would mean that the sign may be within 15 feet of the corner store, but not within 15 feet of the businesses it advertises. This idea is not addressed exactly in the code. But I would be fine with this idea and I think the code should allow a business to put up signs that don't have to do with its own business if that is what they want to do.
- 10) Agricultural Signage Program: d) Attachments, including balloons, shall not be placed on signs. I would be fine with attachments or balloons on temporary signs like this 7) Special event banner, wall, or inflatable sign. The code does talk about and address temporary less-robust signs for specific events that take place at specific times (like yard sales, fairs, markets, etc.), and gives leeway/exemptions for those types of signs. But about what "missing pet" signs or "12th man flags", or the like, that have no specific event date of completion? How long can they stay up? As long as they are maintained?
- 8) Human sign: Similar to the A-frame discussion above, I would be fine with human signs using public sidewalk space. They are even less in the way than a small A-frame sign or political sign because they are always manned and the human can get out of the way. There should certainly be language about human signs saying that these can't be too close to traffic (pedestrians or vehicles) or touch or hit. Or block people's safe view around corners to see oncoming traffic, etc.
- 17.446.100 Regulations for Electronic Signs Electronic signs are prohibited outside Urban Growth Areas; except when authorized or exempted for schools, churches, or public safety agencies. (Also listed in 17.446.060 Prohibited Signs, 12) I would be fine with electronic signs outside Urban Growth Areas. Why should churches and schools be the only ones exempt? What about community centers or small community businesses? I would probably be fine with any location using one, except maybe a personal residence. I do support, however, the prohibition of these signs in very specific, small cultural areas, like Silverdale Old Town or Poulsbo Viking Row, in order to keep the ambiance of those specific small areas. Just like we prohibit internally lit signs there.

Response:
- The guiding principles include the reduction of sign clutter as a visual preference in Kitsap County. Prohibited and conditionally exempt signs are typically associated with temporary signage which are the typical source of sign clutter.
- Conditionally exempted flags would now include non-profit or sports organizations.
- The planning commission draft sign code would not restrict an A-frame sign to be within 15 feet from the main entrance of an organization.
- The planning commission draft would require an A-frame sign to be placed on-premise.
- Agricultural signage program uses the emergency program language adopted in 2012.
- Wall mural size restrictions have been rescinded from the preliminary draft sign code, the proposed language would allow murals of any size.
- Violations of code now reference Title 5, code violations.
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McQuillan, C.  I support the proposed new code, it is balanced  

Merkel, J.  64% of the people who voted on the Kitsap Sun’s Poll rejected electronic signs. This is out of 323 voters. People just do not want them so please do not force them on the citizens of the community. Like I said earlier - just because we can do it does not mean that we should or ought to do it.

At a town meeting about this new sign code there was discussion about a change in the way the code will be enforced. Some change that would put the power to enforce more directly in the hands of the county code enforcement agency, versus having to use higher-level court systems. I would like more information on this. The code I’ve read online doesn’t really seem to tell me how the code is enforced. Do cops give tickets? Code Enforcement agents? Courts involved? Is that related to this “strict liability” section? If so, as discussed above, I have fundamental issues with that.

Lozier, B.  I would just like to comment on the proposed rules regarding electronic signs. Please ensure they are banned, not allowed! They are distracting to drivers, and can cause people to pay attention to the signs instead of pedestrians and bicyclists. They are ugly and a waste of energy. The existing electronic signs in Silverdale at the High School and the YMCA are terrible. Please stop allowing these signs in our town!

Martin, D.  I believe that in order for a sign code to be good for all concerned, it must be edited to less than one page. This way it will be easily understood by the entire community. Businesses can then create their strategic marketing plan. Other community members will have a clear idea of the rules of the game. Those in charge of enforcement can easily determine if code is being followed.

Mary (Real Estate)  Thank you for asking for our input. The new proposed rule that an arm post be only 5 ft. is not what we currently use, i.e., 6 1/2 ft. Neither do the other post companies as far as I know. The reason is economics; since lumber is milled in no shorter than 8 ft lengths and is expensive, using all of a length of wood is a necessary cost savings.

- We use 8 ft. lengths that are sunk about 1 1/2 feet into the ground, leaving 6 1/2 feet above ground. The arms are 4 ft long (also cut from 8 ft lengths.) This way there is no waste of wood, time or money. The top of the arm is about 10 inches from the top of the post. The arm width is 4 inches + 1/2 " hardware + 2 inches for "Y" hook, so sign can swing in wind. So, the sign is hung about 16 inches from the top of the post. This configuration is visually appealing and, much more importantly to agents and sellers, the sign is hanging high enough from the ground to be visible from a road. This also leaves some clearance for hanging longer signs (Reid and Windermere), or, additional strip signs (by appt., view, waterfront, arrows, etc.). The 6 SQ feet seems reasonable for overall sign size, but Reid or Windermere signs with riders will be very close to the ground on a 5 ft post. And, if there are shrubs around the base of the post, they might cover up part of the sign.

- Here are some questions Jim and I thought of while writing this email:
  - who is asking for these changes and why? If we know why, we might be able to offer alternative suggestions.
  - what about out-of-county agents, i.e. Gig Harbor, who are using to enter the configuration described above, including a 61/2 foot post? If they send their post company into Kitsap County, do they have to cut off their posts?
  - who does the county hold responsible if a post is not within the county specs? The way I read the old ordinance, everyone who has anything to do with a non-compliant sign is on the hook. If this is still the case, it needs to be clearly spelled out in the ordinance.
  - who will enforce the ordinance and approve exceptions (i.e., unmarked easement roads).
  - how will the county handle post/signage that are currently up?
  - will the ordinance clearly spell out what the county right of way is? And then give a rule of thumb to go by such as: the tip of the arm must be behind the phone and power pole lines. That would be really helpful to agents explaining to their sellers why the sign can’t be set out further.
  - I assume the "no signs in the county right of way" means no offshore posts. If that’s the case, can it be stated that way, or at least more clearly so when the seller tells the agent they want a sign out on a main road, the agent can refer them to the county person in charge of enforcing the ordinance.
  - O.K. I think that’s all for now, hope I haven’t overdone it!

McQuillan, C.  I support the proposed new code, it is balanced  

Merkel, J.  64% of the people who voted on the Kitsap Sun’s Poll rejected electronic signs. This is out of 323 voters. People just do not want them so please do not force them on the citizens of the community. Like I said earlier - just because we can do it does not mean that we should or ought to do it.

Just because it can be done does not mean that it should be done. This is my perspective on Electronic Signs. There are a number of reasons that I would recommend not incorporating

• 17.446.120 SIGN DETAIL SHEET: WALL MURAL SIGN  I don’t agree with the need to limit the mural size to 75% of building, or to limit size in any way. I mean, we are already saying it must be public art and not advertisement. So why limit the size? Why not let artists use all available space if desired? There are existing wall murals in the Bremerton area that wouldn’t meet these requirements and I see no need to get rid of them. I think all artistic wall murals should be exempt from sign laws (except for safety stuff, like the need to not be a hazard to traffic, etc).

• 17.446.170 Violations Violations of this ordinance shall be treated as strict liability offences regardless of intent. I disagree with the very concept of strict liability. Intent matters. The spirit of the law is way more important than the letter of the law. The reason a person does something “even breaking the law or code” is very important when deciding how to punish them or what fine they should pay. People should have a right to have their story heard by appropriate authority, up to and including a jury of their peers if necessary, before decisions are made about whether or not they should be punished for violating a law, and by how much. It disturbs me the trend toward strict liability for more and more laws in this country. They make it easier for law/code enforcement agencies to enforce laws, but at what cost? Punishments on people that are not deserving of being punished. The burden of proof should be with the law enforcement agencies, etc. That very fundamental principle protects our important civil liberties.

• Comments noted, thank you.

• The preliminary draft Sign Code has been changed to reflect the dimensions according to the comments provided. Thank you.

• Comments noted, thank you.

• Comments noted, thank you.

• While Kitsap County was not associated with the Kitsap sun poll, it is acknowledged that arguments have been submitted both in favor and in opposition to Electronic signs.

• Prohibited signs would include those located in medians and...
### Munson, P.

- In the 14 years I have been a member of Silverdale Lutheran Church, I have wondered why we didn't have a sign on Ridgetop Blvd. The awkward Ridgetop intersection is partially blocked by the trees in the median, so there is not a lot of warning.
- Please approve this sign code update.

Comments noted, thank you.

### Myers, T.

As a business owner I recommend the rules be adopted as written.

Comments noted, thank you.

### Nevins, T.

17.446.150 Non-conforming Signs 6) Replace......natural disasters, acts of God, and without any contributing fault by sign user,...... With: and all natural phenomena whose effects could not be prevented by the exercise of reasonable care and foresight......

The preliminary draft Sign Code language was revised to reflect the suggested comment.

### Ottenbacher, J.

Fantastic!!! Great proposal. Thank you for all your work in this code update. As a member of Silverdale Lutheran Church, we sought a permit for a reader sign in 2011. I am very happy to see this finally get to the point of a new code.

A reader board would be a great addition to church ministries, as well as to the great many people who use our facility and are not regular Sunday members. In so many ways, our church is like the Ridgetop Community Center. We offer a free meal to anyone who shows up every Wednesday, there are so many meetings held there, a calendar kept by the church office secretary
Weisel, C.

Walcott, L. Please do not vote for electronic signs in Silverdale. Our community has managed to keep Silverdale Way fairly attractive with wide landscaped areas and no billboards. Electronic signs...

Schiersch, F. From: Fred Schiersch, Randy & Ann Marie Olsen, Pacific Properties Nancy knodie, Dave Nowak & Karen Ross owners Quilt Shop Building, Paul and Heather Pluska

Sansgaard, J. I think this proposal suggests some much needed updates for Kitsap County to be up to date with other communities. I appreciate some expansion on electronic signage, but with some good regulations as well.

Ryan, M. Your program is all screwed up. What should have taken 15 minutes is going on an hour. Retain the political sign provisions. Although the population in Kitsap has grown, we no longer even have a local radio station and the cost of radio-TV in Puget Sound is beyond the reach of most races. Signs give the public exposure to the names and something for the public to do homework. With regard to electronic signs, please pass the ordinance as written. I would add a provision to add within sight distance of Highway 16 between Port Orchard and Pierce County line. With a population of a quarter million people living on 394 sq miles, we aren't a rural county by most measures. I think it's great that the Pastor doesn't have to trapse out in weather to announce the name of this week's sermon. Given that these messages are controlled provision to add within sight distance of Highway 16 between Port Orchard and Pierce County line. With a population of a quarter million people living on 394 sq miles, we aren't a rural county by most measures. I think it's great that the Pastor doesn't have to trapse out in weather to announce the name of this week's sermon. Given that these messages are controlled.

Pignon, P.

• I have reviewed your 2014 Sign Code update and find a very disturbing new change to the signage in Kitsap County.

Relax the political sign provisions. Although the population in Kitsap has grown, we no longer even have a local radio station and the cost of radio-TV in Puget Sound is beyond the reach of most races. Signs give the public exposure to the names and something for the public to do homework. With regard to electronic signs, please pass the ordinance as written. I would add a provision to add within sight distance of Highway 16 between Port Orchard and Pierce County line. With a population of a quarter million people living on 394 sq miles, we aren't a rural county by most measures. I think it's great that the Pastor doesn't have to trapse out in weather to announce the name of this week's sermon. Given that these messages are controlled.

Pignon, P.

• I have reviewed your 2014 Sign Code update and find a very disturbing new change to the signage in Kitsap County.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Kitsap County Code writers, I was reading the preliminary draft of the 2014 Sign Codes for Kitsap County. I have found a very disturbing entry that apparently was written for and by a real estate agent with disregard to the environment, public safety and beauty of the county. Your new codes Section 17.446.080 CONDITIONALLY EXEMPT SIGNS, Item 12 (Real Estate Signage Program), Detail E states: Arrow Signs: A Maximum of four (4) off-premise arrow signs per property for sale... I wish to enlighten you a bit of what will happen if this entry is permitted. I recently moved here from an area where there were no laws governing real estate arrow signs. On every intersection, down every rural road, and every subdivision there were at least 3, 4 or more real estate arrow signs pointing to their properties for sale. These signs were everywhere and very distracting, not to mention an eye-sore to the countryside. Under current Kitsap codes as it written today, real estate ARROW SIGNS are not permitted as best I understand it. Real estate agents still disregard the code but most do so consiously. Today, the countryside and towns are not too blighted by the arrow signs under the current codes, but allowing 4 arrow signs per house would be like opening a flood of arrow signs, reminiscent of my former living area. Even 1 sign per house is too much. We live in a new era where GPS, Mapquest, and even virtual tours can be done to every house and for the most part it actually is that way. We can look at street views online, tour the house and even do a flyover all from our chairs in front of our computers. We can literally buy and see a house without even going to it, all from our computer. We don't need to see it, but if we do we know how to find it by using our computer and clicking google maps, mapquest, GPS all with precise directions on how to get there. Even "Siri" will tell us to "turn left at next intersection", etc. from our cars. We don't need ARROW SIGNS to tell us how to get there. Lastly, if we want to look at a house for sale, you know as well I do, that the real estate agent will drive us and take us there to see it. Are these arrow signs for their use? Will they remember how to get to their properties they have for sale? They are not. It is an advertising tool plugging their name and business. That's all. Arrow signs are a complete nuisance and not needed. They clutter and destroy the beauty of the area. They add confusion and distractions to our everyday drives. They are quite frankly LITTER! I urge you to revise this code and eliminate real estate arrow signs entirely. Real estate arrow signs should be moved to the PROHIBITED section.

Regards, Phil Pignon

Ryan, M.

Your program is all screwed up. What should have taken 15 minutes is going on an hour. Retain the political sign provisions. Although the population in Kitsap has grown, we no longer even have a local radio station and the cost of radio-TV in Puget Sound is beyond the reach of most races. Signs give the public exposure to the names and something for the public to do homework. With regard to electronic signs, please pass the ordinance as written. I would add a provision to add within sight distance of Highway 16 between Port Orchard and Pierce County line. With a population of a quarter million people living on 394 sq miles, we aren't a rural county by most measures. I think it's great that the Pastor doesn't have to trapse out in weather to announce the name of this week's sermon. Given that these messages are controlled.

Schiersch, F.

From: Fred Schiersch, Randy & Ann Marie Olsen, Pacific Properties Nancy knodie, Dave Nowak & Karen Ross owners Quilt Shop Building, Paul and Heather Pluska

We feel the code should not apply differently to any one part of Kingston. Upper and lower should treated exactly the same. Many signs that are currently in use were reviewed years ago by a Kingston sign committee. Karen Ross was part of the leadership of that committee.Signs that are currently in use shall be grandfathered against any new county rules. We will be employing Philip J. Havers Law Offices,Inc. to take any legal action that may be required regarding these rules. Commissioner Gelder will be informed of the same as well.

Walcott, L.

Please do not vote for electronic signs in Silverdale. Our community has managed to keep Silverdale Way fairly attractive with wide landscaped areas and no billboards. Electronic signs would look cheap and tawdry. Our roots are rural and becoming more suburban, but can still have a more natural look.

Weisel, C.

I have been to two of your public meetings in Silverdale discussing the updated sign code. (at the Oxford Suites and at the Silverdale Chamber of Commerce meeting.) I have also read the revisions of the code. I have been in business in the 3100 Bldg for 12 years. I was moved here through domestic violence with only my business dreams and five children. I opened my office 2 weeks after I moved here. I was broke but knew hard work would cure that. It was because of my sidewalk sign that I could post on Buckhill Hill that gave me my first opportunity to advertise for myself. I was located inside the building and NO ONE knew I was here. Within the first year and half , I went of government assistance. All because of that sign and lots of handing out of business cards. I feel it is of utmost importance to support small businesses in our community. We have too many vacant office spaces. Sidewalk signs are critical in exposing a new business. Please reconsider the 15 signs in front of entrance to our businesses. We are responsible and capable of monitoring when there are too many signs...it looks bad for our community as well.
Walker, J.

Feedback to Draft Kitsap County Sign Code (Title 17 KCC), Dated 1/28/14
Johnny Walker, Kingston, WA 360.297.1347

Summary:
First analysis of the Kitsap County draft 2014 sign code (Title 17 KCC), though in a preliminary phase of central planning by the Kitsap County Department of Community Development, is fundamentally flawed and should be strongly considered for early rejection and re-development using a zero base approach. While central government planning is oft considered benevolent, this particular regulatory effort heavily tips the balance away from self-governing principles without the compelling reasons to do so. The proposed regulation is an example of an unwarranted control and increased central government authority over a broad range of diverse communities and the individual. The result of this regulation will inhibit innovation, hinder investment, increase costs, and have an adverse impact on the region’s economy.

Discussion:
Fatal flaws beginning with the organization and development process are manifested throughout the preliminary document with highly restrictive and costly regulations that erode constitutionally protected rights, necessarily increase costs, and will inhibit economic growth. One particularly egregious example of the code’s affect is described in the following logic chain:
1. 17.446.020 rightfully acknowledges that signs are necessary for competitive commerce.
2. 17.446.060; however, creates a condition making commerce utterly dependent on government by prohibiting anything not expressly permitted.
3. 17.446.040 then protects government and undermines the individual by forcing a citizen to indemnify government from the adverse results of its complete control in order to exercise their individual right to promote commerce.

This kind of central planning and excessive use of government force is abhorrent to Washington State law and the fundamental principles of a self-governing, free, society. Indeed, free speech and expression in the conduct of legal business to be self supporting is crucial to a healthy and competitive free market. This presumption of exclusive government authority to control this is converse to individual liberty, innovation, and a free market economy. Such authority is a dangerous precedent that reverses the source of political power by putting government in charge of the people instead of the other way around.

Article I, Declaration of Rights, Section 1, Political Power, reads that “All political power is inherent in the people, and governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and are established to protect and maintain individual rights.” The protection of individual rights is paramount in the constitution. In the above example, Kitsap County government, by virtue of the proposed sign code, wrongly seeks to restrict and not protect individual rights by removing the citizen’s ability to innovate outside of the government’s express permission to do so. The government further protects itself and not the individual by compelling the citizen to indemnify government from the failures of it’s own express control. As a general premise, it is widely acknowledged that individual rights can be limited by law when there is a compelling reason to do so. The key word is “compelling.” The commonly used example for this is yelling “Fire!” in a theatre. The speech exists but there are compelling reasons to hold accountability through law. In the previous sign code example, there are no compelling reasons to take such extremes except to protect government and central planning - which is not constitutionally protected. Instead, self governing principles are constitutionally protected.

Planning and the Kitsap County Sign Code:
The biased state of the draft sign code is predictable when the working group composition is analyzed. As presented by Kitsap County Project Lead and long-range planner Darren Gurnee, a full 50% of the 16-person working group is composed of current or prior Kitsap County planners and public works staff, complete with their central planning agendas. Three members of the group represent organizations or businesses that will directly benefit from a sign code, one member represented the Central Kitsap Community Council, leaving only four business owners to represent their individual, business expertise: 25%. The ideological weight for an agenda is clearly pro central government. It is noted that the County has proposed that Darren Gurnee also contributes as a Kingston business owner and co-chair of the Kingston Advisory Council; however, these relationships should be dismissed as a direct conflict or perceived conflict of interest. Outside of Darren Gurnee, only one rural business from North Kitsap was represented on the work group but no Kingston urban area businesses were represented. Most importantly, however, is that no member was on the workgroup to explicitly represent the very things the Central Kitsap Community Council, most importantly, however, is that no member was on the workgroup to explicitly represent the very things the State constitution requires that government do; protect individual rights as applied to property rights and free expression. This, perhaps, is the fatal flaw in this particular process.

Select Details:
While there are many proposals in this preliminary document that deserve rebuttal, only a handful will be addressed at this stage.
1. 17.446.010 Sign Permit Process – There is no process indicated to innovate or improve the code outside of an implied review period. The work group should consider a way to change the code as quickly as the market requires.
2. 17.446.020 Purpose –
   a. Public nuisance should not be subjective and requires a measureable definition to protect the individual.
   b. The blanket statement that all unregulated signs constitute a public nuisance is an unsupported assumption.
   c. Convenience and aesthetics are entirely subjective; central government should not have that kind of express power.
   d. The individual right to express the character of a business should have priority over a periodic government assessment of what some residents believe visual quality is. The free
market can decide what is supported and is not supported as people move in and out of a community more frequently than planning updates.

e. Safety, hazards, and adverse impacts should be measureable and compelling, not merely suppositions.

f. All regulations must be considered in the context of whether a violation is compelling enough to force someone with extreme measures to put them in jail. It is easy to think in terms of a fine, but having the compelling argument for shutting down a business or put someone in jail as the result of non-compliance is the more appropriate test.

3) 17.446.040 Permitting –
   a. Section 1) requires a variety of skills that unnecessarily increase costs and are entirely unnecessary for small businesses and micro-businesses.
   b. Fees: County fees should be credibly articulated to include the cost of the process and not a means of government revenue. The code could include “Fees shall not exceed the cost of process” language.
   c. Hidden costs of the process born by the applicant should be assessed so that the citizenry understands the true cost of the regulation. For example, administration, required photography, graphics and scale drawings have commercial values that are born by the individual.
   d. Section 5) requires an individual to give up a right in order to exercise a right. The right of individuals to conduct business and express the nature of their business with a sign outweighs the desire of the government to protect itself.

4) 17.446.060 Prohibited Signs
   a. As previously discussed, bullet 1) should be entirely eliminated as an egregious hindrance to individual property rights and freedom of expression.
   b. The extensive list of prohibitions should be clearly supported. In many cases, prohibitions inhibit freedom of expression without a reasonable, measureable and compelling argument.
   c. Items 2, 8, 11,14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 are all questionable regulations driving the use of government force.
   d. Item 20 suggests the County assert authority over advertising on legally licensed and operated vehicles, where and when they can be parked, and what might be a normal course of business. This seems like a catch all regulation for a problem not well defined, and seems like over-reach. Would this mean I couldn’t have a vehicle wrap on a business vehicle, which I might also drive during hours my storefront is closed?

5) 17.446.070 Exempt Signs
   a. Item 7); A government flag should not have superiority of precedent over individual expression. For instance, would I be prohibited to put up a Christian flag at a church, or a Seahawks flag outside a sports bar? Flags have a long tradition of expressing ideas and speech that the government should not attempt to control.

6) 17.446.080 Conditionally Exempt Signs
   a. A-Frame 1) b) should be allowed to be placed anywhere within the property boundary as authorized by the property owner. Restricting to 15’ is arbitrary and does not account for strip mall access points and storefront locations.
   b. Requirement to register an A-Frame or any other conditionally exempt sign should be eliminated. The only purpose this would appear to serve is increase costs, grow government, and artificially drive enforcement action.
   c. Item 4) a) Metal frames are cost effective and recyclable. They should not be unnecessarily prohibited. 200’ restrictions of signs with the same campaign or issue is too restrictive and probably unenforceable.
   d. Item 4) b) - charging a campaign for an action it cannot be directly attributed to and was possibly the action of an individual contributor, political action committee, or other entity, directly or indirectly, and perhaps even an opposition group is arbitrary. I can sympathize with the problem but the burden of proof remains on government.
   e. Item 7) a) - restricting special event banners in a community to twice per year is an inhibition to growth and economic vitality.
   f. Item 7) b) – 100 square foot limitation is arbitrary and does not support a purpose. If a community or organization can do something larger within the agreement of its property owner, then there should be no restriction.
   g. Item 8) - the limitation of a “human sign” is unwarranted social engineering and does not serve a purpose. If the advertising does not work, businesses will not pay for their employees to do it. Free market should prevail not a predefined and subjective aesthetic.

7) 17.446.090 Regulations for Permanent Signs

8) Item 2) Quantity – the number of signs seems arbitrarily limited and may not adequately account for the number of businesses on a site. Combined with the restrictions on an individual sign, this may mean some business locations are not able to acquire signage visible from a street, thus hindering their business.

9) 17.446.100 Regulations for Electronic Signs
   a. Inherently, government agencies should follow the same rules required of the people. If a government building can have an electronic sign outside the urban growth area, then so should an individual business or property.
   b. Items a), b), and c) – presumes there is actual science and not supposition that makes these limitations appropriate. For example, an illuminated sign should at least exceed the illumination level of wide area security lighting (unclear if this would be considered ambient) so message is usable. .3 foot candles might not be a sufficient value in all business areas.

10) 17.446.120 Sign Detail Sheet:
    a. Window Sign - Miscellaneous – what agenda is promoted to discourage vinyl cut letters? This sounds like an environmental agenda that does not belong in code. If more cost
b. Window Sign – It is unclear, as with other signs, why coverage is limited. c. Wall Murals – the problem seems unclear except to limit free expression of public art. The proposed limits would not allow the existing mural artworks in Kingston be repeated (or repaired if heavily damaged by vandalism), nor similar artworks used in Poulsbo to enhance the tourism value of the downtown district.

11) 17.446.150 Non-conforming signs
a. To the degree that a new or revised regulation restricts maximizing the initial investment by a property owner of a legacy sign that only becomes non-conforming by virtue of a later code revision, then the County should bare the cost. The County should not promote mandates that penalize investors that act in good faith and in accordance with the existing law. b. 6) This section appears to be a catch all disclaimer that compels a sign owner to “upgrade” their legacy sign regardless of an expected life cycle even when a condition may exist that was not reasonably predicted or of their making. The burden of this regulation should fall on government to prove the upgrade is compelling and not the individual. It is an unreasonable force of law for government, with almost unlimited power and legal resources, to require the individual to prove their defense.

Conclusion:
The existing process to formulate a revised sign code is poorly constituted and bias to central planning and government authority, while at the same time seeks to undermine individual rights of property, speech, expression and the ability to innovate and own a business. It unfairly puts the burden of change on the individual. It prevents individuals from working and using their government, increase taxes, hinder a fragile economy, reduce investment and undermine individual rights. The proposed code in current form is arguably unconstitutional in content.

Solutions:
Not unsympathetic to the challenges of safety and continuity in a highly mobile society, a reasonable sign code supporting individuals, businesses, and unique communities is rationally desirable. But considering the background of planning thus far and the difficulties indicated by the draft regulation, the intuitive proposal is to recognize a bad foundation and start again. There is no obvious reason that this process needs to be rushed through on an arbitrary schedule.

1) Zero Based development: Using a stronger self-governance foundation of protecting individual rights, assemble a team that can more effectively balance the benefits of central government planning with self-governance by individuals and communities.
   a. Government representatives should not be the dominant influence but only act as ad hoc advisors when needed.
   b. Industry representatives should also be limited to their advice on trends, state of the art, and capacity of the industry.
   c. A legal representative should be available to clarify the law and be a guardian to individual rights as required by the State constitution.
   d. Private business, individuals, and representatives of local organizations should be the dominant active input to any work group.
   e. A one size fits all regulation may not fit the needs of all communities

2) What is the real problem that needs to be solved and how is that presented in the document.
   a. Some problems are not government’s to solve.
   b. Education might be a more lucrative strategy.
   c. Every regulation should be able to directly map to a specific problem government is charged to manage.
   d. The problems should be well defined.
   e. Providing incentives for individuals in communities to solve problems should be considered.

3) Regulations should have a compelling reason to exist, including an understanding of what happens when an individual does not comply.
   a. Is the force of law to put someone in jail or close a business appropriate?
   b. Is the increased cost of regulation to business productive to the economy?

4) The full financial impact of the regulation should be made transparent, including the fee structure relative to the permitting process, and the hidden costs born by the applicant. This should not be onerous.

5) Devise a change process that allows for code to be as agile as individual innovation. New technologies and ideas should not require months and years for adaptation or the permission of government.

Wetter, D. Comments by section number:
• Section 17.446.030 “Abandoned sign”: The time frame for a commercial building that has been for sale, sold, renovated, advertised, leased, engineered for tenant improvements, construction of tenant improvements and occupied easily exceeds 365 days. Consequently, 365 days is unrealistic. If a structure is actively going through this process, this time limit should be waived.
• Section 17.446.060 sentence # 6: Signs on corner lots that are less than 150 feet in width (typical in Kingston UVC) would be prohibited with this language and therefore discriminated
Wood, C.

I don’t understand the provision under 17.446.080 6 a). Community signs placed by Kitsap County. Is county funds going toward this sign? If so, how are they ensuring the community is entering an agreement? Seems impossible for the county to enter an agreement with a community, if the county is giving a sign to a non-profit organization, which is made up of dues paying members, then that is a different story. That is not the community. This provision seems to do nothing except remove the responsibilities from the county to ensure the sign, however it got there, is used properly.

This exemption requires a lot more definition and explanation.

Carol Wood

R. Perkerewicz

Sign code comments

17.446.010 at the end of the flowchart there should be added a box showing that an inspection and approval of the installation is required in order to complete the process

17.446.020 the purpose is to support business... There should be a statement that includes that the purpose is also to provide information from schools, churches and other community organizations

Electronic sign, flash the definition should also include signs that simply are flashed on and off such as “OPEN” signs that are not part of electronic message center

A definition of Flag should be included as someone can use a flag as a sign and indicate that is not regulated by the sign code. The definition should distinguish between flags such as the American flag and those that advertise a product or contain a corporate logo

17.446.010. The required information in the checklist should be similar to what is required for building permit and that would include the assessor’s account number and possibly a letter of consent by the property owner for the person who is obtaining the permit to act as their agent. If the sign is an off premise sign the approval of the owner of the off premise property should also be provided. Should reference section 17.446.160 with regards to contractor license requirements

17.446.050 will the neighbors be notified of the proposed variance?

17.446.060 in the title the exclusion should include not only Kitsap County but any other government authority. 5. An exception should be included for signs approved by Kitsap County that would encompass such things as “landscaping donated by the local rotary club” etc. 8. The exclusion of signs on benches against. It appears that sentence # 4 adequately covers the intent.

- Section 17.446.060 sentence # 20: It is unclear why a different standard applies to “Franchised delivery vehicles, busses or taxis…” Most business trucks and trailers have a sign on the side that is greater than two square feet. During non-business hours the probable parking position for those vehicles would be in the parking area of the establishment. Perhaps this section needs to be reworded to prevent a truck or trailer from being used for advertising as its sole purpose.

- Section 17.446.080 sentence # 7a: Some events like the Kingston Friends of the library book sale happen up to 4 times per year. Their banner usually goes up a week before the event and is removed the day after. Language (7a) would prevent this frequency.

- Section 17.466.060 sentence # 7d: In light of the above paragraph (7a) the cost/benefit of this regulation is dubious.

- Section 17.446.100 sentence #c: The concept is clear, but .3 foot candles is questionable particularly for businesses that are open at night like a theater marquee. This proposed illumination level needs to be validated with sign manufacturers who have experience with various customer types.

- Section 17.446.110 sentence #4: The concept is clear, but it raises the question what to do with existing older free standing signs.

- Section 17.446.110 sentence # 5: Minimum letter size and maximum sign size need to be compatible. The minimum proposed letter size can be non-compatible with a multi-word sign like a monument sign. Case in point is the Village Green monument sign (25 mph). There is no way that 6” letters would have worked. 6” letters are almost 3 times existing size.

- Section 17.446.120 wall mural sign, size A: The art mural on the east end of the CenturyTel building in Kingston covers the covers the entire end of the building as did the previous mural. The proposed 75% façade coverage would not allow this type of mural. For non-advertising type (i.e. art mural) coverage a rationale for a 75% limit needs to be made.

- Section 17.446.150 sentence #1: While not specifically stated, it is implied that a sign erected in accordance with a previous applicable sign code OR prior to any sign code adoption, then becomes a “legal non-conforming sign”.

- Section 17.446.150 sentence # 3: It is unclear if the “degree” of non-conformance is impacted by a sign’s location.

- Section 17.446.150 sentence # 4: Comments in the above section 17.446.300 address the proposed 365 day hurdle.

- Section 17.446.300 sentence # 6: changed to a 30 foot setback from intersecting County ROW lines. 150 foot setback removed.

- Vehicles or trailer sign size restriction has been removed.

- Special event sign restriction of 60 day total was removed. Only restriction is placement 14 days prior and removed 5 days after.

- Ambient foot candle restriction to 0.3 is a standard established by the International Sign Association and signs.org.

- Minimum letter size requirement has been removed.

- Wall murals size restrictions have been rescinded.

- Community signs placed by Kitsap County would allow for an established community information sign to be place on private property or Kitsap County right-of-way. Continued maintenance of the sign would then transferred to the community who requested the placement of the sign.

- The flowchart was removed from the sign code and may be used in a brochure for the sign approval process.

- The purpose statement modifications will be recommended to the planning commission during the work study.

- Open signs are a type of electronic sign and will be required to adhere to electronic sign standards.

- Flags of most types have been considered exempt.

- Off-premise signage is prohibited unless a variance is acquired and proof of property owner approval is required. The variance requirements for notification shall be consistent with those already established in Title 17.

- Comments noted regarding additional government entities being exempt from the sign code. At this time the proposed code will remain as is with only Kitsap County signs being exempt from the permitting process.

- Requirements to take signs in at night is an action which Kitsap County is unable to enforce. Comments noted.

- The illumination restriction from 10pm to 7am is applicable to any and
should be discussed with Kitsap transit as this can become an economic issue with them as some of the benches are provided for free if they can include some advertising. What about inflated balloons with advertising on them being included in the prohibited siding category?

A section needs to be included that will clarify the issue of whether or not previously approved site plans, PUDs or RE zones that had specific sign requirements will have to comply with the restrictions included in those actions Or can they simply comply with this sign code.

Consideration should be given to developing a citizen’s type sign code enforcement assistance program for the county to aid in the monitoring signage. I tried to develop an acronym for this type of citizens committee but ran into a brain block. Suggestions

17.446.080 1) do these signs need to be taken at night and if so should this be included in this section.

17.446.090. 5) does the 10pm to 7am time frame apply to schools and churches in rural areas or outside UGA’s?

A section needs to be included that will clarify the issue of whether or not previously approved site plans, PUDs or RE zones that had specific sign requirements will have to comply with the restrictions included in those actions Or can they simply comply with this sign code.

A section needs to be included that will clarify the issue of whether or not previously approved site plans, PUDs or RE zones that had specific sign requirements will have to comply with the restrictions included in those actions Or can they simply comply with this sign code.

Consideration should be given to developing a citizen’s type sign code enforcement assistance program for the county to aid in the monitoring signage. I tried to develop an acronym for this type of citizens committee but ran into a brain block. Suggestions

J. Armstrong  
The following comments are summarized from a package of supporting articles which are available upon request.

- Opposition to Digital Billboards due to light pollution, aesthetics, and safety concerns.

D. Gordon  
The following comments are summarized from a package of supporting articles which are available upon request.

- Opposition to Digital Billboards in the greater Silverdale Area because of aesthetics and safety concerns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R. Hanson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sc....Exposed neon is the correct term in the industry and is very common still today and used by many national franchises. It is highly unusual if it is restricted in any commercial district and if it is it’s usually is a requirement of a shopping center rather than the local jurisdiction. Exposed neon allows for many design options and creativity. I would understand if it was restricted outside the UGA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sd....Internally illuminated signs shall be “halo” lighting?......Halo lighting in the industry can only be accomplished when using individual channel letters. Because the way they are wired very few buildings can accept this style of letter. Halo lighting does not apply to cabinet style internally illuminated signs. Both the channel and halo letters are in the definitions. I recommend that ALL signs be allowed to be internally illuminated (or not) using lighting application as per industry standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regards,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. Carpentier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following comments are summarized from a preliminary draft Sign Code attached with specific comments and deletions in the word document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permit application: We recommend that the County include a reasonable time line for permit review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A-frame and political signs. We recommend limiting content requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We believe that neon should be allowed since this allows additional design options and can create a retro look when desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We recommend that addition illumination methods be allowed to allow more design options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficult to administer since who determines what is energy efficient and when it is feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficult to administer this section. The EMC signs should be regulated separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Not more than one foot candle of illumination may leave the property boundaries.” This standard may not work since I have not seen any studies or basis for this level of illumination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments noted, thank you.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Staff will recommend at the Planning Commission Work Study session to remove the language addressing neon and internally lighted signage. Existing sub-area plan restrictions with regards to these two items shall remain in effect and be incorporated into the sign code.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments noted, thank you.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A-frame signs are addressed as two separate functions. One is a business identification sign, the second is a special event sign. While it is not appropriate for 4 A-frame signs for business identification, it is for special events, hence a distinction of content is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Political sign restrictions only exist for those placed in the right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff will recommend at the Planning Commission Work Study session to remove the language addressing neon and internally lighted signage. Existing sub-area plan restrictions with regards to these two items shall remain in effect and be incorporated into the sign code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Studies resulted in appropriate brightness of 0.3 foot candles according to signs.org and International Sign Association.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>